

The Council on Student Affairs *Annual Report* 2021-2022



"CSA serves as the principal link between students, the student governments, the faculty and administration to encourage a sense of community and improve the quality of student life on campus."

PURPOSE

The Council on Student Affairs (CSA) is broadly responsible for overseeing the student experience from a co-curricular perspective. CSA serves as the principal link between students, the student governments, the faculty, and administration to encourage a sense of community and improve the quality of student life on campus. Primary responsibilities include:

- Review, allocate, and administer the Student Activity Fee Review and the Student Code of Conduct
- Administer rules and regulations surrounding student organizations
- Initiate reviews of any issue that is relevant to the student's co-curricular experience
- Advise the Senior Vice-President for Student Life on the services, programs, and administration of the Office of Student Life
- Keep the best interest of all students at the forefront of the Council's mission

MEMBERSHIP

Students (Voting)

- Caroline Karwisch, CGS (CSA Chair)
- Peter Carrera, CGS (Allocations Chair)
- Kelsey Lowman, USG (Issues Chair)
- Baffoa Baffoe- Essilfie, USG
- Jacob Chang, USG
- Ming Lei, USG
- Gabe Myers, USG
- Kameron Rinehart, CGS
- Jordan Kalthoff, IPC
- Will Vu, IPC

Student Life Staff (Voting)

- Alisa Tate
- Kidron Stamper

Faculty (Voting)

- Dr. Ryan Skinner (Vice-Chair)
- Mandy Fox
- Dr. Jill Heathcock
- Dr. Mandy Smith
- Dr. Janna Stephens
- Dr. Lucille Toth

Non-voting Members

- Dr. Melissa Shivers, SVP
- Dr. Danny Glassmann, CSA Administrator & Dean of Students
- Nikki Tascar, Secretary
- Dr. Matt Couch, Associate Dean of Students & Sr. Director of Student Activities
- Elizabeth Rowles, CSA Fiscal Coordinator
- Britany Crall, OU Business Manager
- Brian Menard, OUC Chair
- Sarah Heemstra, Rec Sports

Allocations-only Members

- Katie Jennings, USG
- Ania Campbell, OUAB
- Julie Schnell, Non-selective Student Org
- Vaishu Labhishetty, Selective Student Org
- Brooke Olson, OSL
- Angie Wellman, OSL

REFLECTIONS ON THE YEAR

The 2021-2022 academic year was an unpredictable one, as COVID-19 was still very much present, but some normalcy was returned during parts of the year. We made an intentional effort to hold hybrid meetings. This consisted of meeting in the Sphinx Room of the Ohio Union with a zoom option. Therefore, we had a camera, and intercom system with microphones, and projectors to ensure that the members on Zoom felt as included as possible. A few meetings were held on Zoom at the beginning of the Spring semester due to the COVID-19 Omicron variant, but we were able to transition back to in-person meetings once it was safe to do so. We received positive feedback from the members of the hybrid format, and they appreciated the flexibility and effort of the Council.

As seen in this report, the Council was able to cover a wide array of topics this year. We began to form strong relationships with the new Student Life Senior Leadership Team and worked on finding ways to collaborate and capitalize on their new structure and centralization of Student Life offices under AVPs. Through the reports, we as a Council got a picture of what the student experience looked like this academic year given all the uncertainties of the pandemic. From there, the Issues Committee took some of these issues on and collaborated with other university partners to form solutions and start conversations. We also supported important topics by passing resolutions like calling for a \$15 minimum wage for student workers and calling for more support for religious accommodations for students.

Further, the Council had the important task of conducting the Student Activity Fee Review that occurs every three years. Thanks to the hard work of many members of the Council and others appointed to the committee it was completed in a thoughtful and efficient manner. We worked with the Center for the Study of Student Life (CSSL) to survey all student organizations on the usage of CSA programming funds. We also addressed discrepancies within our operating procedures and the Faculty Rules. Amendments to the operating procedures were carefully discussed and drafted to ensure compliance so that the Council can operate at its full potential. Overall, the Council had a productive year in which the groundwork was set to continue to tackle student concerns and issues to ensure a rich and fulfilling experience for students at Ohio State.

REPORTS

The Council routinely hears reports from various University offices and committees based on the interests of the Council and the need for input on various Student Life policies. The Council heard reports from the following entities:

- Student Life Multicultural Center
- Ohio Union Council
- Ohio Union Activities Board
- University Recreational Sports Committee
- Student Health Insurance Committee
- University Residential Services
- Dining Services
- Off-Campus and Commuter Student Services
- Counseling and Consultation Services
- Ohio State Police Chief, Kimberly Spears-McNatt and Deputy Chief, Tracy Hahn
- REASON Project
- Student Life Leadership
 - Dr. Melissa Shivers, SVP for Student Life
 - Dr. Shawnte' Elbert, AVP for Health and Wellbeing
 - Dr. Tanisha Jenkins, AVP for Belonging and Inclusion
 - Dr. Anne McDaniels, AVP for Academic Partnership and Career Services
 - Dr. TJ Logan, AVP for the Residential Experience
 - Ryan Lovell, Associate Dean of Students

ISSUES COMMITTEE

The Issues Subcommittee, chaired by Kelsey Lowman (she/her), devoted a large portion of time this year to policy advocacy and collaboration in support of resources for marginalized students. The subcommittee partnered with first-generation student activists to secure funding and identify the partners and connections needed to create an Ohio State chapter of Tri-Alpha, OSU's first honor society for first-generation undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, faculty, and staff across all campuses. Additionally, the subcommittee partnered with student labor justice organizers to successfully advocate for increased student wages and improved working conditions in the form of a resolution that unanimously passed through the Council on Student Affairs. Further, the subcommittee partnered with student leaders from the Muslim Student Association to successfully advocate for religious accommodations for students observing religious holidays during the academic year and unanimously passed a resolution in support through the Council on Student Affairs. The subcommittee also began the process of identifying stakeholders across the University to create a food security coalition.

Moreover, the subcommittee partnered with Ohio State offices to collaboratively discuss issues facing students on campus including:

- Student basic needs
- Food security
- Housing security and Housing rights
- Programming for Juneteenth
- Regional campus collaboration and support
- Mental health
- Student safety
- International student concerns

ALLOCATIONS COMMITTEE

Programming and operating applications from undergraduate student organizations, graduate student organizations, and professional student organizations were received and reviewed according to CSA's Student Activity Fee distribution guidelines. New & Re-Established Student Organizations may apply for up to \$2,000/year for their programs while Established Student Organizations may apply for up to \$3,000/year. Student Organizations can also apply for Operating Funds up to \$200/year to help cover administrative costs.

The Allocations Subcommittee identified multiple areas in the Programming and Operating application process with room for improvement through a survey sent to all student organization Treasurers and Presidents, hearing directly from multiple student organization leaders, and lived experience reviewing applications. A number of changes were workshopped with Student Life staff to rectify them. These include:

- Revamping the online application to improve clarity and ease of review by the subcommittee
- Improving the preciseness and responsiveness of approval/rejection feedback student organization leaders receive
- Expanded resources (general event planning and marketing support available through established OSU channels) available to programming organizers on application page
- Updating/Improving student organization treasurer and president training

The Allocations Subcommittee met 20 times for a total of 28 hours across the Fall and Spring semester, averaging one, hour and fifteen minute long meeting per week. Due to the tight nature of application deadlines, there were multiple weeks where the Subcommittee had two or more meetings during a single week. The group reviewed 649 Programming Requests during Fall 2021 and Spring 2022. Of these requests, 397 were approved, initially or during the appeals process, to host a Student Activity Fee supported event.

SAF REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Committee was chaired by Peter Carrera and had 12 other members representing the student governments, faculty, student life staff, and more. See Appendix 8 for the full report and further detail. CSA's SAF review was originally meant to be completed during the 2020-2021 academic year, however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was pushed to this year. Over the past 2 years, most beneficiaries were unable to spend their allocated budgets due to university guidelines that restricted spending and thus carried forward a significant amount of funds which CSA voted to not pull back. Going into the 2022-2023 year an estimated ~\$2.2 million is projected to be carried forward across all beneficiaries entering the 2022-2023 school year. This is equivalent to ~\$750,000 annually across beneficiaries over the three-year, 2022-2025, review period. The estimated revenue collected by the SAF for 2022-2023 is ~\$4.8 million (the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 years are expected to be similar). This projects to around an average of ~\$5.5 million annually when the carryforward is split across all three years.

To best spend these additional funds, the SAFC collaborated closely with each beneficiary to ensure that their budgets allowed a full return to pre-COVID operations and to identify sustainable expansions of services and events for students. In addition to providing summaries of their operations/budgets for the past three years, each beneficiary was asked to specifically detail how they would utilize additional funding if they received any. The SAFC reviewed these Targeted Beneficiary Funding requests and decided which ones to fund.

The other part of the SAF process is reviewing applications for Signature Events. For an event to be a Signature Event, it must be planned by students and have the potential to attract 1,000 student participants. The SAFC decided to fund 21 events (17 repeat, 4 new) annually in the amount of \$328,199, a 28% increase since the previous review. 13 repeat events received more funding than they had during the previous review, the four that received the same amount received their entire funding request. See Appendix 8 for a list of events.

Highlights of Beneficiary Specific Funding

- Bringing all ~70 SAF-paid student positions to a living wage, these positions represent around 27,595 hours annually
 - Student Assistant 1 (S01) positions were brought to a wage of \$14.17 (maximum wage allowed for S01 students to receive financial aid work study)
 - All Student Assistant 2 (SO 2) positions were increased above the S01 wage to maintain pre-change pay differentials
- The following existing positions were raised to \$14.17: D-Tix Info Center Assistants, Resource Room Assistants, Student Video Employees, and Buck-I-SERV Student Assistant
- The following existing positions were raised to \$15.17 or higher: D-Tix Info Center Lead, Resource Room Managers/Project Managers, Student Graphic Employees, and Buck-I-Serv Student Manager
- Establishing 2 new OUAB grad/prof events student positions (\$14.17/hr)
- Establishing 1 new full-time employee to support all 3 student governments
- Establishing 1 new full-time Resource Room student organizations coordinator position
- Establishing 5 (growth to 10 in 3 years) new Student Organization Success Coaches to support student organizations (\$15.17/hr)
- Significant investments in USG and IPC to increase resources and programs that benefit OSU's student populations:
 - USG: Expansion of access to news sources, subsidization for GRE, LSAT, and MCAT test prep services, a mental health emergency fund, and more
 - IPC: An additional LGBTQ+ centered event, fund 100% of student organization requests instead 70%, increase funding for Mental Health Series (MHS) Events, and more
- Investment in Pay It Forward to improve service initiatives through the inclusion of internal and external speakers

OTHER INITIATIVES

Code of Student Conduct Review

Since the SAF Review was moved to this academic year, CSA moved the Code of Student Conduct Review to this upcoming academic year 2022-2023. To keep the spirit of the Review an ad-hoc committee was formed to start to discuss the Code and potential areas for the review to address. The group consisted of students from the three student governments, non-student-government students, and Kelly Smith the Director of Student Conduct. The main goals for the review will be to incorporate more plain language into the Code, make the Code more easily accessible through a multi-modal approach, and clarify where concerns and reports go and what offices and individuals are involved. See Appendix 9 and 10 for more details on the committee and to view the recommendations from the group.

CSA Programming Fund Improvement Effort

Throughout the year, many efforts have been made to improve the CSA Student Organization Programming Fund process. To start, in the fall CSA partnered with Brooke Olson, Coordinator for Student Involvement and Organizations, for a workshop called Funding 101 for student organization leaders to learn more about how to turn in an approvable programming fund request. CSA also worked with Brooke and other Student Activities staff to make improvements to the online application discussed above on page 7.

Also, CSA worked with CSSL to administer a survey to all student organization leaders to gain feedback about the funding process. Through this report, we were able to see that many groups are underutilizing CSA funding and because of the survey now have a better idea of how to address the barriers keeping organizations from applying. See Appendix 11 for the survey report.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2021-1

Moves Code of Student Conduct Review to 2022-2023 academic year.

Approved 9/27/21 (Appendix 1)

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2021-2

Now null due to A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2022-2

Approved 10/25/21 (Appendix 2)

A Resolution Initiating a Modification to the Faculty Rule 3335-9-21 to Guarantee that Students Receive Excused Absences from Scheduled Course Instruction and the Necessary Accommodations When Absent Due to Religious Observances

Approved 1/24/22 (Appendix 3)

A Resolution Initiating Action from the Office of Academic Affairs to Inform Course Instructors About the Religious Accommodations Available to Students and Encourage Course Instructors to Make Note of These Accommodations in Course Syllabi

Approved 1/24/22 (Appendix 4)

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2022-1

Brings CSA operating procedures in line with Faculty Rules and further clarifies requirements for regional campus seat.

Approved 3/7/22 (Appendix 5)

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2022-2

Gives Chair voting privileges

Approved 3/21/22 (Appendix 6)

A Resolution to Support Student Workers and the Call for a \$15 Minimum Wage

Approved 4/18/22 (Appendix 7)

2022-2025 Student Activity Fee Review Report

Approved 4/25/22 (Appendix 8)

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2021-1

Recalling that the Council on Student Affairs Operating Procedures Article X currently requires a comprehensive review of the Code of Student Conduct every five years, specifically the year 2021-2022 and;

Understanding that the 2021-2022 academic year is currently designated by the Operating Procedures as an Activity Fee review year, and;

Acknowledging that the COVID-19 pandemic has caused a major disruption Student Life at OSU which in 2020 caused a resolution to be passed in CSA to move the Student Activity Fee Review from 2020-2021 academic year to the 2021-2022 academic year¹, and;

Noting that as it stands because of that resolution in the 2021-2022 academic year CSA would be conducting both a Student Activity Review and Code of Student Conduct Review, which is unprecedented in this body, and;

Further noting that the Chair of the Council on Student Affairs plans to create a committee to collect student concerns about the Code of Student Conduct in a report to give to those who conduct the review in the next academic year² and;

Believing that conducting both reviews would take away from the quality of work of each review, therefore moving the Code of Student Conduct Review especially given that it was reviewed in 2019 would ensure it was given the full attention deserved,

The Council on Student Affairs **hereby amends** the Council on Student Affairs Operating Procedures to reflect the following change(s):

Article X Code of Student Conduct Review and Revision Procedures

The council shall review the Code of Student Conduct every five years (specifically the ~~2016-17, 2021-22, and 2026-27~~ **2022-2023, 2027-2028, and 2032-2033**, etc. academic years). This may be assigned to a subcommittee or ad-hoc committee. The following steps shall be taken by the Council to approve Code revisions:

- a. The Council shall approve an initial draft of changes.
- b. The draft shall be sent to the President's and Provost's offices and to the Steering Committee of the Senate.
- c. The Steering Committee may desire to share the changes with other Senate committees where appropriate (based on the content of the changes).
- d. If after review by the President, Provost, and Steering Committee there is a disagreement on the changes, the Chair of the Council shall convene a conference committee to adjudicate the differences.
- e. Once all changes have been submitted the draft shall be returned to the Council for its final approval.
- f. The Council shall vote and recommend the changes to the University Senate.

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2021-2

Recalling that the Council on Student Affairs Operating Procedures Article IV Section A currently states The Chair shall: Cast a tie-breaking vote on any issues brought to a vote of the Council, and;

Noting that having the Chair not vote gives impartiality to the role and makes sure all work of the Council comes to the floor and is presented in an impartial way, and;

Understanding that with the Chair being nonvoting this then leaves the student government that the Chair is appointed from with one less student voting, and;

Acknowledging that for the smaller student governments, Inter-Professional Council (IPC) and Council of Graduate Students (CGS), this leaves IPC with one voting member and CGS with only two voting members, and even for the Undergraduate Student Government (USG) this leaves them with 4 voting members and;

Further acknowledging that with this current system, the student government that the Chair is appointed from is hindered as they lose a member who can adequately represent the student constituency on the two subcommittees and in full council meetings, and;

The Council on Student Affairs **hereby amends** the Council on Student Affairs Operating Procedures to reflect the following change(s):

Article III Membership

Section A. Membership

The membership of the CSA is outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-484. The membership of the Council is composed of 18 voting members and 6 non-voting members. The voting members shall be:

- a. Six (6) regular faculty members, at least two of whom are members of the Senate, selected by the faculty council. The term is three years which begins in summer term.
- b. Ten (10) students whose term of service begins in summer term. **These students do not include the Chair, once the Chair is appointed their seat is replaced by the student government they represent.**
 - i. Three (3) graduate students selected by the Council of Graduate Students. The term of service is one year.
 - ii. Two (2) professional students selected by the Inter-Professional Council. The term of service is one year.
 - iii. Four (4) undergraduate students selected by the Undergraduate Student Government. Two (2) of these students shall have a term of service of one year. Two (2) of these students shall have a term of service of two years and the terms are staggered so that one member retires each year.
 - iv. One (1) student, either undergraduate or graduate, who has spent a minimum of one full academic year on a regional campus.

(...)

Non-voting members shall be:

- a. **The Chair of the Council on Student Affairs, except in a tie.**
- b. The Senior Vice President of Student Life, or designee.
- c. An Associate Vice Present chosen at the discretion of the Senior Vice President of Student Life.
- d. The Administrator for CSA, as appointed by the Vice President for Student Life. This person should be a full-time staff member within the Office of Student Life.

A Resolution Initiating a Modification to the Faculty Rule 3335-9-21 to Guarantee that Students Receive Excused Absences From Scheduled Course Instruction and the Necessary Accommodations When Absent Due to Religious Observances

Author: Manar A. Alrjub

WHEREAS the Faculty Rule 3335-9-21 be modified to include that students be given the ability to request and receive excused absences from scheduled course instruction when due to any religious observance(s) if course instructor has been given notice of absence at least two weeks prior to date of absence

WHEREAS the Faculty Rule 3335-9-21 be modified to include that course instructors be obligated to provide the necessary accommodations to students who miss scheduled course instructions due to the sole reason of religious observance

WHEREAS an excused absence is any absence for which a student cannot be penalized

WHEREAS the Faculty Rule 3335-9-21 currently reads, “Each department or school may make its own rules relative to occasional absences by students from scheduled activities.”¹ and does not note the case of religious observance

WHEREAS students who are absent from scheduled course instruction in the case of religious observance(s) are not to be relieved from any academic responsibilities that were required during the period of the excused absence but are to be provided reasonable alternatives and/or accommodations by course instructors to ensure students can ultimately fulfill academic assignments without penalty

WHEREAS the Undergraduate Student Government General Assembly passed the bill 52-R-17 illustrating the undergraduate student population’s concern for religious accommodations and confirms the undergraduate student population’s support for such legislation², and

WHEREAS the Muslim Students’ Association, an organization dedicated to advocating for the necessary religious tools for all students at The Ohio State University, has collaborated with the Undergraduate Student Government at The Ohio State University to develop such crucial legislation, and

¹ <https://trustees.osu.edu/university-faculty-rules/3335-9>

² <https://osu.app.box.com/s/l9ogepkcp0juhwwakwzefl44sjqtrd39>

WHEREAS other Big Ten Academic Alliance Member Universities, including the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Minnesota have adopted similar policy and/or provide excused absences for students who are absent due to religious observance(s),^{3,4,5} and

WHEREAS other universities in Ohio, including Miami University and Ohio University, allow for students to receive excused absences from scheduled course instruction when in the case of religious observance(s), and The Ohio State University is more than competent and should be willing to do the same^{6,7}

Therefore, Let It Be Resolved that the University Senate approve the proposal to modify the Faculty Rule 3335-9-21 to read, “Each department or school may make its own rules relative to occasional absences by students from scheduled activities *except in the case of absences due to religious observance(s) in which all students of all departments and schools must be granted an excused absence(s) if notice was given to course instructor at least two weeks prior to date of absence. Course instructors must provide reasonable alternatives and/or accommodations to students who are absent in the case of religious observance(s) without penalty so long as students are demonstrating regard for their academic responsibilities.* If, however, a student is absent from a course to such an extent as to imperil his or her credit, or is notably irregular in attendance, it shall be the duty of the instructor concerned to report the facts promptly to the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled. The dean may take such action as deemed appropriate.”

³ <https://reg.msu.edu/roinfo/notices/religiouspolicy.aspx>

⁴ <https://kb.wisc.edu/lis/page.php?id=21698>

⁵ <https://provost.umn.edu/about-evpp/policies/academic-accommodations-religious-observances-and-fall-2021-semester>

⁶ <https://www.ohio.edu/provost/academic-policy-update>

⁷ <https://miamioh.edu/policy-library/students/undergraduate/academic-regulations/class-attendance.html>

Appendix 4

to Make Note of These Accommodations in Course Syllabi

Author: Manar A. Alrjub

WHEREAS the Faculty Rule 3335-8-19 will be modified to include religious accommodations as they relate to excused absences, as outlined in Senate Resolution #1

WHEREAS the University Registrar offers the option for undergraduate students to complete examinations during an alternate time at the University Registrar's Testing Center when in the case of unique circumstances, such as, but not limited to, religious observance, so long as course instructor, student, and University Registrar staff are in agreement, and

WHEREAS this resource has been available since 2016 and, according to Associate Registrars, has been underutilized, and its announcement in course syllabi will likely generate usage of such valuable tool, and

WHEREAS the inclusion of undergraduate students' right to receive an excused absence in the case of religious observance and inclusion of the University Registrar's testing accommodation will inform students of the resources available to them as they relate to religious accommodations and can reach the necessary students

WHEREAS the Undergraduate Student Government at The Ohio State University represents the entire undergraduate student population and has demonstrated utter support for such legislation, and

WHEREAS the Undergraduate Student Government at The Ohio State University has worked in conjunction with the Muslim Students' Association at The Ohio State University to develop such legislation to advocate for the interests of all religions, and

WHEREAS The Ohio State University promotes itself as an innovative and inclusive campus that strives to "intentionally foster a sense of belonging where all are valued" and encourage "open-minded exploration, risk-taking, and freedom of expression."¹,

¹ <https://oaa.osu.edu/vision-mission-values>

Therefore, Let It Be Resolved that the University Senate approve the proposal to, with the assistance of the resolution's author and the Office of Academic Affairs, create and provide a sample syllabus statement for course instructors that highlights the right for students to request and receive excused absences when in the case of religious observance, as outlined in **Senate Resolution #1**, and the University Registrar's resource that allows undergraduate students to complete examinations during an alternate time slot than scheduled by course instructors, if necessary on the basis of religious observance, to accommodate for religious observances such as, but not limited to, fasting.

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2022-1

Whereas the Council on Student Affairs Operating procedures were amended in 2021 to add an additional student seat to the Council on Student Affairs membership to have a distinct regional campus student seat and campus change student seat

Whereas the Chair was made aware by University Senate Leadership that this added seat must go through the formal University Senate approval process before implementation

Whereas discussion took place in Full Council to discuss the merits of adding another student seat

Whereas the Council discussed that there was not enough of a distinct student experience between regional campus and campus change to merit the added seat, when no other student groups are explicitly represented in the membership of CSA in that way

Whereas the Council discussed the importance of filling the current seat preferably with an active regional campus student, given importance to the Council of the regional campus experience

Whereas instead of adding a seat, the Council discussed making an explicit call to the student governments to appoint students that have a diverse set of perspectives and how that would be a more effective solution

Therefore **Let it Be Resolved** that The Council on Student Affairs **hereby amends** the operating procedures to reflect the following changes:

The membership of the CSA is outlined in Faculty Rule 3335-5-484. The membership of the Council is composed of **18** voting members and 6 non-voting members. The voting members shall be:

- a. Six (6) regular faculty members, at least two of whom are members of the Senate, selected by the faculty council. The term is three years which begins in summer term.
- b. **Ten (10) students, who should represent a diverse set of student perspectives.** The term of service begins in summer term.
 - i. Three (3) graduate students selected by the Council of Graduate Students. The term of service is one year.
 - ii. Two (2) professional students selected by the Inter-Professional Council. The term of service is one year.
 - iii. Four (4) undergraduate students selected by the Undergraduate Student Government. Two (2) of these students shall have a term of service of one year. Two (2) of these students shall have a term of service of two years and the terms are staggered so that one member retires each year.
 - iv. One (1) student, either undergraduate or graduate, from **preferably a regional campus or who has spent a minimum of one full academic year on a regional campus who will apply, with a short statement of interest, and be** selected by a meeting of representatives from both the council of graduate students and the undergraduate student government.

A Resolution to Amend the CSA Operating Procedures 2022-2

Recalling that the Council on Student Affairs Operating Procedures Article IV Section A currently states The Chair shall: Cast a tie-breaking vote on any issues brought to a vote of the Council, and:

Understanding that this then leaves the student government that the chair is appointed from with one less student voting, and:

Noting that according to Robert's Rules the chair can vote,

The Council on Student Affairs **hereby amends** the Council on Student Affairs Operating Procedures to reflect the following change(s):

Article IV Responsibilities of Council Members

Section A. Chair

The Chair shall:

- a. Preside over the meetings of the Council.
- b. Communicate actions of the Council to appropriate individuals and/or agencies of the University.
- c. Provide an orientation for all members to the Council.
- d. Establish regular meeting dates, times, and locations for Council and Subcommittee meetings.
- e. **Maintain voting privileges given their appointment as a student representative.**
- f. Meet with the Vice President for Student Life and the CSA Administrator on a regular basis to discuss issues concerning the Council.
- g. Appoint members of the CSA Issues and Allocations subcommittees.
- h. Determine, in consultation with the Council and the Vice President for Student Life, the priorities of the Council for the year.
- i. Work with the Administrator to determine a schedule for office or committee presentations to the Council by the second week of the term.
- j. Issue charges to the subcommittees.
- k. Maintain speaking privileges at all subcommittee meetings
- l. Attend Executive Committee meetings of Faculty Cabinet.
- m. Complete an annual report briefly summarizing the activities of Council during the academic year to be presented to University Senate during Spring Term.

Appendix 7

A Resolution to Support Student Workers and the Call for a \$15 Minimum Wage

Author: Anna Valerius

SYNOPSIS: To properly compensate and dignify student workers amidst rising costs of living and a global pandemic, this resolution calls on The Ohio State University to implement a \$15 minimum wage, among other guarantees to ensure equity, accessibility, and safety for all students.

WHEREAS the Undergraduate Student Government represents all undergraduate students at The Ohio State University; and

WHEREAS the Ohio State University employs over 15,000 students;¹ and

WHEREAS the federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour has remained unchanged since 2009;² and

WHEREAS as of December 19, 2021, hourly rates for non-tipped student employees must be at least \$9.30 and for tipped student employees must be at least \$4.65;³ and

WHEREAS most student workers at Ohio State are paid anywhere from \$9.30/hr to \$12/hr, with the majority being at or below \$10/hr; and

WHEREAS the student pre-tax income for a standard OSU student worker starting wage of \$9.30 is \$19,600, extrapolated for a full-time work year;⁴ and

WHEREAS the Franklin County 1-adult living wage estimate is \$14.12;⁵ this “living wage” is the estimated hourly wage a full-time worker would need to make in order to afford basic needs given the local cost of living; and

WHEREAS the university’s existing minimum wage of \$9.30 thus fails to meet Franklin County’s local living wage; and


WHEREAS the Columbus area is additionally mired in high rent costs (\$965/month on average),⁶ food insecurity,⁷ extreme poverty, and a lack of resources; and

WHEREAS the per diem rate (a comfortable cost of living rate per day) for food in Columbus is \$64 a day,⁸ meaning a student worker would need to work about 6.5 hours every day while getting their degree in order to afford food and incidentals in the campus area; and

WHEREAS the rising rate of inflation, which hit an over three decade high of 6.2% in October 2021,⁹ has put an additional strain on students trying to afford basic necessities; and

WHEREAS Ohio State University’s estimated yearly Cost of Attendance is \$23,617.40 for in-state students and \$47,518.40 for out-of-state students; these expenses include tuition, fees, supplies, room & board costs, and other living expenses;¹⁰ and

WHEREAS the ‘Fight for 15’ advocacy campaign has been a nationally popular push for a \$15 an hour minimum wage since 2012;¹¹ and



WHEREAS student workers' advocacy and organizing to increase student wages to \$15 an hour has garnered local media attention through on-campus protests, to which the university has had no response;¹ and

WHEREAS “student workers include Federal Work-Study (FWS) students and international students, who can face specific challenges with campus employment, such as weekly work schedule limitations and/or restrictions on where/if off-campus work is allowed;”¹² and

WHEREAS the fight for labor justice is an intersectional issue; increases to the minimum wage are particularly beneficial to the low-income, immigrant, and BIPOC students communities who are disproportionately harmed by insufficient wages;¹³ and

WHEREAS “a significant number of higher education institutions, including four-year public and private universities, have taken steps towards (or are already providing) a \$15 an hour minimum wage for campus workers;”^{12 14} and

WHEREAS “Big Ten Universities have previously sidestepped minimum wage increases for student workers through a variety of means, including the use of Land-Grant status to avoid paying student workers the minimum wage of their local city or count;”^{12 15} and

WHEREAS at their winter conference this past January, The Association of Big Ten Students (ABTS) passed “A Resolution Calling for a \$15 Hourly Wage Increase for all Big Ten University Student Workers,” calling on all Big Ten Universities to “take swift and tangible action to increase the minimum wage for student workers on their respective campuses to at least \$15 an hour,” and endorsed “efforts to increase the student worker minimum wage [...], so long as those increases meaningfully improve access to basic needs and are not offset by tuition hikes or heightened student fees;”¹² and

WHEREAS substantive increases to the minimum wage for student workers would improve student mental health,¹⁶ advance university efforts for racial equity,¹⁷ address campus staffing shortages,¹⁸ and increase access to basic needs.¹² and


WHEREAS such staffing shortages have caused the university to close and limit access to certain facilities, all while resisting the provision of comparable wages to those of off-campus jobs; and

WHEREAS seeing the building momentum of the labor justice movement around the country and other universities,¹ Students for a Democratic Society at Ohio State (SDS) and Young Democratic Socialists of Ohio State (YDS) circulated a petition¹⁹ to gather support for their demands; to date, the petition has garnered 867 signatures; and

WHEREAS the demands set forth by SDS and YDS include a \$15 minimum wage, free CampusPARC for student workers, higher holiday pay and paid sick leave, more frequent and larger wage increases, and university advocacy for higher work hour limits for international and DACA students; and

WHEREAS students seldom see even one wage increase per school year, assuming their position offers any wage increases at all; and

WHEREAS currently, a student's pay can increase by only 50 cents, an increase that is often discouraged by managers in order to maintain the standard that workers get paid less; and



WHEREAS student workers currently must pay out of pocket to park their vehicles through CampusParc, posing a financial barrier to guaranteeing students safe, accessible, and reliable transportation to work; and

WHEREAS the safety and security of our workers is essential to maintain a healthy work environment; and

WHEREAS in a global pandemic, wherein the university forces student workers to be on campus, the need for paid sick leave is essential; and

WHEREAS a student worker's international or DACA status should not be an excuse to overwork them; it is imperative that these students receive higher work hour limits in order to maintain a healthy work/school life balance as well as lessen the stress of having to choose work over health, safety, and school.

NOW THEREFORE LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Student Government supports and commends the efforts of Students for a Democratic Society at Ohio State, Young Democratic Socialists at Ohio State, and all student workers and organizers in their continuous fight for labor justice; and

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Student Government calls on the university to raise the minimum wage of student workers to at least \$15 an hour by the first day of Fall 2022 academic semester; and

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Student Government supports student workers' call for larger and more frequent opportunities for wage increases, at times that are clearly defined by university employers; and

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Student Government supports the call for free CampusParc for student workers to ensure the principles of equity, accessibility, safety, and security are guaranteed by the first day of Fall 2022 academic semester; and

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Student Government supports student workers' call for higher holiday pay and sick leave to prevent illness from further affecting both their work and studies; and

LET IT FURTHER BE RESOLVED that the Undergraduate Student Government itself calls on the university to support federal level advocacy for higher work hour limits for international and DACA students.

The Ohio State University - Council on
Student Affairs

2022-2025 Student Activity Fee Review

Drafted April 2022 by the Student Activity Fee Committee

I. Executive Summary

The Chair of the Council on Student Affairs (CSA), Caroline Karwisch, established the Student Activity Fee Committee (SAFC) during the Fall Semester of 2022 to distribute the Student Activity Fee (SAF) amongst its beneficiaries. Care was taken to gather a broad and diverse group of students, faculty, and staff members within the committee makeup restrictions of CSA's operations procedures. SAFC members were:

Peter Carrera (Chair, CGS)

Dr. Matt Couch (Student Life)

Dr. Nate Craig (Faculty)

Brittany Crall (Student Activities – SAF Business Manager)

Kelsey Lowman (USG)

Emily Montenegro (General Student Body) – 1x alternate Casey Petrae

Brooke Olson (Student Activities)

Amanya Paige (USG)

Josh Parker (USG)

Elizabeth Rowles (Fiscal Officer)

Dr. Janna Stephens (Faculty)

Will Vu (IPC)

Yuan Zou (General Student Body) – 1x alternate Jingjing Zhou, 8x alternate Jacob Chang

The SAFC met 10 times for a total of 11 hours throughout the Fall and Spring semesters to review the allocation of the SAF.

CSA's SAF review was originally meant to be completed during the 2020-2021 academic year, however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was pushed to this year. Over the past 2 years, most beneficiaries were unable to spend their allocated budgets due to university guidelines that restricted spending and thus carried forward a significant amount of funds which CSA voted to not pull back. Going into the 2022-2023 year an estimated ~\$2.2 million is projected to be carried forward across all beneficiaries entering the 2022-2023 school year. This is equivalent to ~\$750,000 annually across beneficiaries over the three-year, 2022-2025, review period. The estimated revenue collected by the SAF for 2022-2023 is ~\$4.8 million (the 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 years are expected to be similar). This projects to around an average of ~\$5.5 million annually when the carryforward is split across all three years.

To best spend these additional funds, the SAFC collaborated closely with each beneficiary to ensure that their budgets allowed a full return to pre-COVID operations and to identify *sustainable* expansions of services and events for students. In addition to providing summaries of their operations/budgets for the past three years, each beneficiary was asked to specifically detail how they would utilize additional funding if they received any. The SAFC reviewed these Targeted Beneficiary Funding requests and decided which ones to fund. These decisions are summarized in Section III and in the paired SAF Review Workbook. The SAFC then considered broad ways to distribute funding across all beneficiaries. These included: bringing all SAF-paid student positions to a living wage, offsetting revenue generated by beneficiaries that were charged to students and student organizations, and full-time staffing positions to benefit SAF beneficiaries. The committee focused on the first and third of these broad goals. These broad decisions, and the targeted beneficiary funding are noted in Section V.

Highlights of Beneficiary Specific Funding:

- Bringing all ~70 SAF-paid student positions to a living wage, these positions represent around 27,595 hours annually
 - Student Assistant 1 (S01) positions were brought to a wage of \$14.17 (maximum wage allowed for S01 students to receive financial aid work study). All Student Assistant 2 (SO 2) positions were increased above the S01 wage to maintain pre-change pay differentials
- The following existing positions were raised to \$14.17:
 - D-Tix Info Center Assistants
 - Resource Room Assistants
 - Student Video Employees
 - Buck-I-SERV Student Assistant
- The following existing positions were raised to \$15.17 or higher:
 - D-Tix Info Center Lead
 - Resource Room Managers/Project Managers
 - Student Graphic Employees
 - Buck-I-Serv Student Manager
- Establishing 2 new OUAB grad/prof events student positions (\$14.17/hr)
- Establishing 1 new full-time employee to support all 3 student governments
- Establishing 1 new full-time Resource Room student organizations coordinator position
- Establishing 5 (growth to 10 in 3 years) new Student Organization Success Coaches to support student organizations (\$15.17/hr)
- Significant investments in USG and IPC to increase resources and programs that benefit OSU's student populations:
 - **USG:** Expansion of access to news sources, subsidization for GRE, LSAT, and MCAT test prep services, a mental health emergency fund, and more
 - **IPC:** An additional LGBTQ+ centered event, fund 100% of student organization requests instead 70%, increase funding Mental Health Series (MHS) Events, and more
- Investment in Pay It Forward to improve service initiatives through the inclusion of internal and external speakers

II. Background

The Student Activity Fee was established in 2003. The implementation of the fee was supported by the three student governments with oversight of the fee delegated to the Council on Student Affairs. At that time, the student governments agreed on specific provisions for the implementation of the fee. However, that agreement was only established for the first five years of the fee with the expectation that CSA would undertake a review of the fee to make any necessary adjustments. Currently, the SAF review is conducted by the CSA every three years. The [2008 SAF review](#) has a few more details on the history of the SAF and its review.

III. Special Note Regarding Carryforward, Pullback, and Variable % Allocations

Given the large amount of carryforward going into the next three-year period, our distribution was not based on assigning percentages to beneficiaries as has been done in the past. Rather we started by determining the minimum dollar amount each beneficiary required to *fully return to their pre-COVID levels of services/offering/programs*. This was set by taking the average of each beneficiary's spending in 2018 and 2019 and ensuring it would be reached in 2022-2025 between each beneficiary's baseline allocation and split carryforward (1/3 of their carryforward for each year in the period). After this baseline

was met, the committee then provided additional funding through targeted beneficiary funding or broad funding goals.

*It is imperative that the following beneficiaries' carryforwards are not pulled back over the 2022-2025 period: **Signature Events, OUAB, D-Tix, Buck-I-SERV, Pay It Forward, USG, CGS, IPC.** Their budgets necessitate them using their carryforward over these three years. The beneficiaries listed above can keep any funds over 10% of their budget without having to submit justification to CSA for this period.*

Lastly, many of the previous fixed annual allocations did not accurately represent the costs they were meant to cover. For example, Staffing's allocation has been set at \$545,000 for many years when the 9 positions covered through it will actually cost more (\$593,986 for 2022-2025) to fully fund. The following beneficiaries' fixed allocation budgets have been adjusted to properly account for their expenses: Staffing, Resource Room, and Graphics/Video/Photo. Their new allocations fully cover their primary expenses. These beneficiaries should not build up carryforward in-between years and any carryforward that is generated should be pulled back by CSA and distributed via the SAF variable beneficiary %s, unless they have specific requests to keep funds for non-fixed cost expenses (e.g., operational costs, paying off encumbered expenses, renovations, etc.). During any year where SAF-covered Staffing positions are unfilled then Student Life should charge the Staffing line the cost being incurred to fill-in/cover unfilled positions' responsibilities, up to the cost of having the position filled full-time. During every subsequent SAF review the costs for Staffing, Resource Room, and Graphics/Video/Photo should be updated to reflect changes in the cost of the positions/operations they cover (e.g., merit increases, salary changes, etc.).

V. Future 2022-2025 CSA Decisions and the 2025-2028 SAF Review

Due to the changes in Staffing, Resource Room, and Graphics/Videos/Photo, CSA should be able to pull back \$445,964 in carryforward in 2022-2023. Graphics/Video/Photo is requesting to keep \$75,000 of their expected \$157,810 carryforward to complete a renovation of their student office space and the purchase of new graphics and video stations. The Resource Room is requesting to keep \$15,000 of their expected \$157,810 carryforward in 2022-2023 to partially maintain their Member Development Grant (started during COVID) as they phase it out.

Fixed Allocations Pullback after 1 year		Priority: student organizations, sustaining targeted beneficiary funding		
Pullback from Staffing	\$ 231,765			
Pullback Graphics&Vid	\$ 71,389	Includes - 75k spend on equipment		
Pullback Resource Roo	\$ 142,810	Includes - 15 for temporary member development grant		
Total	\$ 445,964			

The most important priority for this pulled back \$445,964 is to ensure that the Student Organizations line item/beneficiary has sufficient funding for the next three years. We are making significant investments (Resource Room Coaches, Resource Room Coordinator) in improving the availability and accessibility of programming and operating funds and expect see a significant increase in fundable requests by OSU's 1400+ student organizations. The \$445,964 would allow \$148,654 worth of programming and operating fund requests to be approved annually for three years. Our 2022-2025 distributions allow Student Organizations an annual budget of

Student Organizations		
Year	Budget	Used
2022	\$ 957,416	\$ 328,015
2021	\$ 786,452	\$ 157,051
2020	\$ 620,296	\$ 297,802
2019	\$ 685,953	\$ 465,131
2018	\$ 466,924	\$ 466,924
2017	\$ 647,115	\$ 647,115
2016	\$ 559,440	\$ 559,440

to

\$500,825. To put this in perspective: view below the budgets and utilization of the Student Organizations line for the past several years. Pre COVID-19, OSU's organizations spent over \$500,000 regularly. We expect to return to these numbers. Preliminary analysis of operating and programming requests from 2019-2021 shows between 414-893 programming requests being submitted with an average request of \$470 per request (they can request up to either \$2000 or \$3000 annually). Operating funds requests are between 323-508 with an average request of \$118.80. If 70% of student organizations put in programming requests for \$800 each there would be \$784,000 worth of programming requests. Additional analysis can be found in the Student Organizations worksheet in the paired SAF Review Workbook.

This year's SAF review did not result in an increase in the activity fee itself due to the large buildup of carryforward. From 2022-2025 that carryforward will be spent by beneficiaries to benefit students. The next SAF review will thus have less money to distribute across all beneficiaries. The major changes (living wage, additional staffing positions, targeted funding) this review have accomplished are meant to be sustainable ones. To maintain them it is possible that the activity fee might have to be increased during the next review and that certain beneficiaries' average annual budgets will decrease (in particular Signature Events will likely receive a similar allocation amount but have a smaller annual budget). Specifically, the Resource Room's Coaches budget will need to be enlarged to maintain 10 coaches each year (2022-2025 budget allows for a growth of 5 to 10 coaches (average 7.5) over three years).

Variable Allocations	SAF Variable Beneficiary %s
OUAB	54.43%
D-Tix	15.91%
Student Organizations	9.35%
Buck I Serv	4.21%
Pay It Forward	2.67%
USG	9.20%
CGS	2.19%
IPC	2.03%
Total Variable	100.0%

SAF Funded Beneficiaries

Below are summaries of each SAF beneficiary. The summary includes the annual allocation with note of the beneficiary specific funding the committee approved. In the charts, Y means the funding was approved; N means the funding was not approved. To the right, please find our beneficiary variable %s, this is referred to as the published SAF formula in the SAF guidelines. Note these %s do not include fixed allocations

Buck-I-SERV:

Buck-I-SERV's baseline allocation is \$134,570 with an additional \$5,409 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation of \$139,979. Their first-year carryforward will be \$418,437, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$279,458. BUCK-I-Serv's existing student assistants and student managers were brought to a living wage.

Buck-I-Serv		Wage	Hours			
		\$11,844.00	\$10.50	1128	5 Buck-I-Serv student assistants, 1 school year (12 hours a week, 34 weeks), 4 summer staff (10 hours a week, 18 weeks)	
		\$15,983.76	\$14.17	1128	SO 1	1128 hours enrolled 0.40%
\$	4,140 Y	\$4,139.76	\$14.17/hr difference			
		\$3,910.00	\$11.50	340	1 Buck-I-Serv student manager during school year (10 hours a week, 34 weeks)	
		\$5,157.80	\$15.17	340	SO 2	1128 hours enrolled 0.40%
\$	1,248 Y	\$1,248	\$15.17/hr difference			
\$	17 Y	\$17	Benefit Rate Premium SO1			
\$	5 Y	\$5	Benefit Rate Premium SO2			
\$	5,409	Total Buck-I-Serv				

Signature Events:

Signature Events' baseline allocation is \$256,712. Their first-year carryforward will be \$214,462, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$328,199. Section IV reviews and explains Signature Events in greater detail.

Staffing:

Staffing’s baseline allocation is \$593,986 with an additional \$130,000 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation and budget of \$723,986. Two new coordinator positions are being created to better support the three student governments and all student organizations. A third hazing prevention & education coordinator position was considered but not funded as the funding for such a position could come from an external source, unlike the other two. During any year where Staffing positions are unfilled then Student Life should charge the Staffing line the cost being incurred to fill-in/cover unfilled positions’ responsibilities, up to the expense of having the position filled full-time. Carryforward built up in Staffing should generally be pulled back annually and distributed via the SAF variable beneficiary %s.

The 11 positions covered by SAF’s Staffing line are:

- Student Government Office Associate
- Buck-I-SERV Coordinator
- Resource Room Coordinator
- D-Tix Coordinator
- OUAB Program Coordinator (2)
- OUAB Coordinator
- OUAB Assistant Director
- Associate Director – Student Programming
- Student Government Coordinator (New position)
- Resource Room Student Organizations Coordinator (New position)

STAFFING								
\$ 65,000	Y	\$65,000.00	1 full-time employee to support all 3 student governments					
	N	\$65,000.00	Hazing prevention & education positions. All student organizations (potentially funded outside of SAF)					
\$ 65,000	Y	\$65,000.00	1 full-time RR employee, student organizations coordinator position					
\$ 130,000		Total All Staffing						

Ohio Union Activities Board (OUAB):

OUAB’s baseline allocation is \$1,728,992 with an additional \$78,853 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation of \$1,807,845. Their first-year carryforward will be \$405,000, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$1,942,845. OUAB received targeted funding for two student positions paid at a living wage that support graduate/professional events and the remaining balance of available funds (\$59,372) after all targeted beneficiary requests were determined. The remaining balance of funds was distributed to OUAB as they have significant flexibility to flex their spending with more funding.

OUAB			Wage	Hours					
		\$13,650.00	\$10.50	1300	2 OUAB grad/prof events positions. 10-15 hours/week. B/t \$10.50 and \$16.12/hour				
\$ 18,421	Y	\$18,421.00	\$14.17	1300	SO 1	450 hours underenroll	15.90%	0.346154	
		\$4,771	\$14.17/hr difference			822 hours enrolled (33	0.40%	0.632308	
\$ 1,060	Y	\$1,060	Benefit Rate Premium SO1						
\$ 19,481		Total OUAB							

D-Tix:

D-Tix’s baseline allocation is \$493,436 with an additional \$35,045 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation of \$528,481. Their first-year carryforward will be \$30,000, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$538,481. D-Tix’s existing student information center assistants and leads were brought up to a living wage. Attempting to offset some of D-Tix’s revenue was considered but not funded as the discounts provided by D-Tix are already significant and the possibility of giving away tickets for free would cause complications it would cause with

students' financial aid.

DTIX		Wage	Hours				
		\$72,755	\$10.50	6929	SO 1 info center assistant hours worked at wage \$9.40		
		\$98,184	\$14.17	6929		1945 unenrolled hours	15.90% 0.280704
\$ 8,180	Y	\$25,429	Difference			4984 enrolled hours	0.40% 0.719296
		\$25,634	\$11.50	2229	SO 2 info center lead hours worked at wage \$10.50		
		\$33,814	\$15.17	2229		342 underenrolled hou	15.90% 0.153432
\$ 25,429	Y	\$8,180	Difference			1887 enrolled hours	0.40% 0.846568
		\$33,610	Total Difference				
\$ 1,208	Y	\$1,208	Benefit Rate Premium SO1				
\$ 227	Y	\$227	Benefit Rate Premium SO2				
	N	\$500,000	Estimated annual revenue from tickets				
\$ 35,045	Total DTIX						

Student Organizations:

Student Organizations' baseline allocation is \$310,686. Their first-year carryforward will be \$570,416, which split evenly over three years this allows for an average annual budget of \$500,825. We expect a significant increase in the number of programming and operating funds requests and approvals, see the Student Organization's worksheet in the paired SAF Review Workbook.

Student Governments (USG, CGS, IPC):

USG

USG's baseline allocation is \$185,442 with an additional \$120,000 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation of \$305,442. Their first-year carryforward will be \$86,210, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$334,179. USG received targeted funds for an expansive array of significant initiatives/events summarized below.

USG							
\$ 10,000	Y	\$10,000	Mental health emergency fund for students who are referred to off-campus counselors				
\$ 11,000	Y	\$11,000	Free safe sex products (condoms, plan b, birth control) + potential for more plan b				
\$ 43,000	Y	\$43,000	Expansion of access and accessibility of news sources to OSU students				
\$ 3,000	Y	\$3,000	Annual Black History & Arts highlight				
\$ 7,000	Y	\$7,000	Expansion of Buckeye Road Trip to cover regional campuses				
\$ 15,000	Y	\$15,000	Subsidization for GRE, LSAT, and MCAT test prep services				
\$ 8,000	Y	\$8,000	Car, household, and individual safety devices				
\$ 8,000	Y	\$8,000	Increase of student organization funding allocations				
\$ 15,000	Y	\$15,000	DEI-centered/Academic Enrichment Grant scholarship contributions. All of these contribution-based scholarships will be open for any OSU student to apply.				
\$ 120,000	Total USG						

CGS

CGS's baseline allocation is \$72,753. Their first-year carryforward will be \$16,000, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$78,086. CGS did not ask for any additional funding.

IPC

IPC's baseline allocation is \$40,728 with an additional \$26,600 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation of \$67,328. Their first-year carryforward will be \$8,000, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$69,995. IPC received targeted funds for an array of significant initiatives/events summarized below.

IPC			
\$ 1,800	Y	\$1,800	6 \$500 MHS events instead of 6 \$200 MHS events
\$ 1,300	Y	\$1,300	1 additional Donut Day
\$ 10,000	Y	\$10,000	Fund 100% instead of 70% of student org requests
\$ 6,000	Y	\$6,000	Additional LGBTQ+ event
\$ 7,500	Y	\$7,500	IPC's biggest event (Casino Night)
\$ 26,600	Total IPC		

Pay It Forward:

Pay It Forward's baseline allocation is \$48,774 with an additional \$40,000 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation of \$88,774. Their first-year carryforward will be \$5,000, which split evenly over three years allows for an average annual budget of \$90,440. Pay It Forward received targeted funds to supplement their service-based events with OSU and external speakers. They also received targeted funds to replace an inconsistent external source of funding.

Pay it forward			
\$ 2,000	Y	\$2,000	Internal OSU Speaker Fee (10 @\$200 ea)
\$ 8,000	Y	\$8,000	Replacing uncertain Target Grant
\$ 30,000	Y	\$30,000	2 high impact / profile external OSU speakers
\$ 40,000	Total PIF		

Resource Room:

Resource Room's baseline allocation is \$193,000 with an additional \$116,224 of targeted beneficiary funding for a total annual allocation and budget of \$309,224. Resource room received targeted funds to initiate and grow a cadre of student leaders as Resource Room Coaches. The funding allows for the cadre to grow from 5 to 10 (annual average 7.5) students over the course of 2022-2025. Note the next SAF review will need to expand the Resource Room's budget to maintain 10 coaches. The coaches and all existing Resource Room Assistants, Managers, and Project Managers were brought to a living wage. A .25% GTA was considered but not funded once the full-time Staffing Resource Room Coordinator was funded. Offsetting revenue the Resource Room generates from OSU students / staff was considered but not funded. Carryforward built up in the Resource Room should generally be pulled back annually and distributed via the SAF variable beneficiary %s.

Resource Room		Wage	Hours		
\$ 29,325	Y	\$29,325	\$11.50	5 coaches Y1, 7.5 Y2, 10 Y3, 10 hours/week, 34 weeks/yr, \$11.50 an hour. Coaching meetings for student orgs, "get involved consultations", programming planning and implementation	
\$38,684		\$38,684	\$15.17/hr	340 \$ 19,550 SO2	5 7.5 10
\$ 9,359	Y	\$9,359	Difference		
\$ 155	Y	\$155	Benefit Rate Premium SO2	340 enrolled hours	0.40%
	N	\$28,000	Revenue from supplies and services to students, student orgs, and some university departments		
		(\$21,500)	Sig Events Spent extra 21.5 last year on career fair -- Came from general expense line		
\$ 38,632	Y	\$38,632	Additional budget needed for current staff at current wage. (Current budget for wages \$70k, current spend \$108k)		
		\$89,082	\$10.50	8484 Hours	Existing SO 1 RR Assistants
		\$120,218	\$14.17	8484	2160 underenrolled hc 15.90% 0.254597
\$ 31,136	Y	\$31,136	Difference	6324 enrolled hours	0.40% 0.745403
		\$19,550	\$11.50	1700 Hours	Existing SO 2 RR Managers/Project Managers
		\$25,789	\$15.17	1700	1700 enrolled hours 0.40%
\$ 6,239	Y	\$6,239	Difference		
\$ 1,353	Y	\$1,353	Benefit Rate Premium SO1		
\$ 25	Y	\$25	Benefit Rate Premium SO2		
	N	\$10,800	.25% GTA appointment, 9 month. Advising coaches & programming initiatives		
\$ 116,224	Total Resource Room				

Graphics/Video/Photo:

Graphics/Video/Photo's baseline allocation was \$75,000 with an additional \$18,958 of targeted beneficiary funding. For a total annual allocation and budget of \$93,958. All existing Graphic/Video/Photo student employees (video and graphic) were brought to a living wage. Carryforward built up in the Graphics/Video/Photo should generally be pulled back annually and distributed via the SAF variable beneficiary %s.

Graphics, Video, Photo			Wage	Hours			
		\$27,563	\$10.50	2625	Hours	SO 2 Student video employees	
		\$37,196	\$14.17	2625		2625 enrolled hours	0.40%
\$	9,634	Y	\$9,634	Difference			
		\$30,240	\$12.00	2520	Hours	SO 2 Student graphic employees	
		\$39,488	\$15.67	2520		2520 enrolled hours	0.40%
\$	9,248	Y	\$9,248	Difference			
\$	39	Y	\$39	Benefit Rate Premium video SO2			
\$	37	Y	\$37	Benefit Rate Premium SO2			
\$	18,958		Total Graphics, Video, Photo				

VI. Signature Events

Signature event applications were opened and distributed to student organizations on February 3rd. The applications were due February 25th. We received a total of 26 applications; 17 were repeat applications and 9 were first-time applications. All applications were individually reviewed by SAFC members, and they reviewed by the entire committee. The Student Life Associate Director of Campus Events joined meetings as a non-voting member when questions were being formed and Signature Event funding was being distributed to provide additional input. The entire SAFC came up with necessary questions needed to be answered in order to fully consider each event. First-time applicants had virtual 15-minute meetings with 3 members of the SAFC. The first-time application owners presented their event, its significance, and answered any SAFC generated questions. Repeat event owners answered all questions SAFC generated via email. After all meetings with first-time applicants were completed and all application questions answered, the SAFC revisited each event and decided how much funding it would receive.

The primary criteria of importance were the Signature Event Application requirements. The foremost being the ability to attract 1,000 OSU students' attendees. The event's previous years' OSU student attendance records, amount of external funding raised (% of non-Signature event funding), history of hosting organization in hosting other Signature Events or other large events, projected numbers of attendees, the organization's requested change in funding (increase Y2Y), and the event's general cost efficiency in reaching students (cost of event / divided by projected OSU student attendees).

The SAFC decided to fund 21 events (17 repeat, 4 new) annually in the amount of \$328,199, a 28% increase since the previous review. 13 repeat events received more funding than they had during the previous review, the four that received the same amount received their entire funding request.

Event Name	Repeat Event?	Amount Funded			
			African Night	Y	\$ 9,300
Blood Battle	N	\$ 1,195	Buckeye Nation Week	Y	\$ 14,700
Rivalry Run	N	\$ 3,000	International Students Welcome Party	Y	\$ 16,000
Spring Play	N	\$ 5,900	31st Annual Thanksgiving Dinner Event at The Ohio State University	Y	\$ 30,000
Spring Musical	Y	\$ 5,900	HACK OHI/O	Y	\$ 25,573
TEDxOhioStateUniversity Main Event	Y	\$ 6,800	Commencement Week (Fall / Spring)	Y	\$ 34,250
Light up the Lake	Y	\$ 7,000	Welcome Week and Welcome Back Week (Fall/Spring)	Y	\$ 18,655
RUOK Day	Y	\$ 7,000	Student Involvement Fair	Y	\$ 28,200
Stroll Competition	Y	\$ 7,225	African American Heritage Festival & Homecoming Tailgate	Y	\$ 37,000
Taste of OSU	Y	\$ 15,000	Homecoming Parade & Celebration	Y	\$ 46,035
Time for Change Week	N	\$ 9,467			

Note regarding Signature Events that receive external funding from Student Activities

Certain Signature Events receive funding through a general expense line item in Student Activities. The above allocation of funding to these events is based on the expected projection that they receive the following funding from Student Activities: Student Involvement Fair (\$20,800), Homecoming Parade & Celebration (\$11,700), Commencement Week (\$12,500), Welcome Week and Welcome Back Week (\$11,500), Buckeye Nation Week (\$3,500).

VII. Conclusion

With this review, the SAFC took into consideration the unique opportunity we had with the increased carryover due to the COVID-19 pandemic. With this in mind, we prioritized creating a budget that was sustainable and would not overcomplicate the next review, while also taking advantage of the funds we had to allocate. We prioritized a livable wage for student workers as we believe this is an important goal the university needs to reach for all students. This will make a significant impact on the students in those positions. We also increased staff capabilities for the student governments, OUAB, and all student organizations. We did this in the hope that this support will alleviate some of the burden put on students with administrative work. This will allow for more space for creativity for these different student organizations to better utilize their funding to put on events and programming that impact our OSU community. With the Student Organization Success Coaches, we hope they can be an impactful resource to assist student organizations in applying and strategically utilizing CSA programming funds. The programming funds are currently being underutilized and serve as a great opportunity for these organizations to put on unique and meaningful events. Overall, the SAFC made strategic decisions that ensure the SAF is prioritizing the reality and needs of students given all the changes the last few years have brought. This is reflected in how we chose to allocate the SAF funding.



APPENDIX

FY 23 Summary

	<u>FY 23 Expected Beginning Bal.</u>	<u>Base Annual Allocation</u>	<u>Targeted Beneficiary Allocations</u>	<u>Total Annual Allocation</u>	<u>% of Total SAF Allocation</u>	<u>SAF Variable Beneficiary %s</u>	<u>3 Year Average Annual Budget</u>	<u>FY 23 Total Budget</u>
Fixed Allocations								
Staffing	\$231,765	\$593,986	\$130,000	\$723,986	15.4%	0.0%	\$723,986	\$955,751
Resource Room	\$157,810	\$193,000	\$116,224	\$309,224	6.6%	0.0%	\$309,224	\$467,034
Graphics/Video	\$146,389	\$75,000	\$18,958	\$93,958	2.0%	0.0%	\$93,958	\$240,347
Signature Events	\$214,462	\$255,000	\$0	\$255,000	5.4%	0.0%	\$326,487	\$469,462
Total Fixed	\$750,427	\$1,116,986	\$265,181	\$1,382,167	29.4%	0.0%	\$1,647,349	\$2,132,594
Variable Allocations								
OUAB	\$405,000	\$1,728,992	\$80,565	\$1,809,557	38.5%	54.5%	\$1,944,557	\$2,214,557
D-Tix	\$30,000	\$493,436	\$35,045	\$528,481	11.2%	15.9%	\$538,481	\$558,481
Student Organizations	\$570,416	\$310,686	\$0	\$310,686	6.6%	9.3%	\$500,825	\$881,102
Buck I Serv	\$418,437	\$134,570	\$5,409	\$139,979	3.0%	4.2%	\$279,458	\$558,416
Pay It Forward	\$5,000	\$48,774	\$40,000	\$88,774	1.9%	2.7%	\$90,440	\$93,774
USG	\$86,210	\$185,442	\$120,000	\$305,442	6.5%	9.2%	\$334,179	\$391,652
CGS	\$16,000	\$72,753	\$0	\$72,753	1.5%	2.2%	\$78,086	\$88,753
IPC	\$8,000	\$40,728	\$26,600	\$67,328	1.4%	2.0%	\$69,995	\$75,328
Total Variable	\$1,539,063	\$3,015,380	\$307,619	\$3,323,000	70.6%	100.0%	\$3,630,619	\$4,862,062
	2022-2023 SAF Revenue		\$ 4,705,167					
	Fixed Allocations		\$ 1,382,167					
	Variable Allocations		\$ 3,323,000					
	Available Funds		\$0					

FY 24 & 25 should have similar SAF Revenue numbers to FY 23. After paying the fixed allocations the SAF variable beneficiary %s will be utilized, if carryforward is split 1/3rd across each year this will result in very similar budgets Y2Y.

Beneficiary Contact Information

Beneficiary	Contact	Title
Staffing	Matt Couch, Brittany Crall	Associate Dean of Students and Senior Director, Student Activities and Orientation - Ohio Union Business Manager
Resource Room	Jen Pelletier	Associate Director, Student Activities
Graphics, Video, Photography	Jen Cottrell	Director, Marketing Operations
Signature Events	Tonya Dawson	Associate Director, Campus Events
OUAB	Krystal Vielman, Emily Montenegro	Assistant Director, OUAB - President
D-Tix	Megan Haddock	Discount Ticket Program Coordinator
Student Organizations	Brittany Crall, Brooke Olson	Ohio Union Business Manager - Coordinator of Student Involvement and Organizations
Buck I Serv	Rebecca Delo	Senior Coordinator, Buck-I-Serv
Pay It Forward	Madison Yee	Coordinator for Service and Outreach
USG	Jacob Chang	President
CGS	Nicholas Messenger, Michelle Scott	President - Treasurer
IPC	Shivani Patel, Will Vu	President - Vice-President, Treasurer

Code of Student Conduct Audit Committee 2022

Charge:

This committee will act as an opportunity to connect students and the Office of Student Conduct in a meaningful way to foster communication and discussion. They will collaborate to ensure that the Code meets the needs of students and is accessible to them. This group will create a report summarizing the discussions and concerns they bring to be utilized during the Code of Student Conduct Review of 2022.

Membership:

- **One representative from IPC:** Claire Halffield
- **One representative from CGS:** Caroline Karwisch
- **Two representatives from USG:** Gabe Myers and Andrew Wong
- **Two representatives from the general student body:** Mason Darner and Skylar Clawson
- **One representative from the Office of Student Conduct,** Kelly Smith
- **Chair will be selected upon the formation of this group from membership above.**

Timeline:

- The group will plan to meet at least once over the course of the 2021-2022 academic year for one and a half hours each time.

Code of Student Conduct CSA Discussion Notes
Meeting 1: April 29th, 2022

1. Introductions and Overview of Agenda
2. Kelly Smith, Director of Code of Conduct Office
 - a. Brief overview of Code of Conduct Office, Code of Student Conduct, and the University's Shared Values
 - i. How we can be creative in making the language more legible in the style of the code.
 - ii. All discrimination reports go to OIE
 - iii. Academic Misconduct goes to COAM
 - iv. Have the Shared Values in mind when CSA is reviewing the Code
 1. Identify if the University is actually displaying those values
 2. Growth mindset, you can make a mistake
 3. Students need to be treated with respect and can frame it with care and compassion
 - v. Code of Conduct office had an outside review that gave feedback, looking to communicate better
 1. Need staff for Colin's law
 - vi. Conduct board review needs to be shorter than 90 days
3. Claire Halffield- IPC
 - a. Imputing parts of the code written for individual liability onto student organizations.
 - i. SBA as a student organization was viewed as creating an environment where high-risk drinking was viewed as acceptable when a student got sick from drinking at their event
 - ii. Claire came in as a new president and had to deal with this
 - iii. Administrative review or university conduct board were their options to have review the case
 1. They went to the conduct board and SBA was responsible for proving why they weren't in violation
 - iv. **Currently, a student organization is viewed as a student (since it's included in the definition) and this might not be necessary**
 1. **Separate carve out of how these might be different is something CSA can look at**
 2. **All student organizations have advisors and they need to be working with the students through the process**
 - a. **Doesn't specify say who is technically responsible in Code**
 3. **The Code needs a lot of work in this space**

- b. How the student conduct office staff works with the accused student/organization as they move through the student conduct process?
 - i. Felt like a biased process that office staff is working with student organization as well as giving the evidence against, and sitting with the conduct board

4. Mason Damer- General Student Body Rep

- a. Any measures in place to prevent/clauses that address racial inequalities?
 - i. OIE and legal counsel for CSA review will address this
 - ii. Staff must have the humility to be able to address when this happens
 - iii. Developing a stronger DEI curriculum for their staff
 - iv. Audits- case management system allows them to look at all the years cases and look at demographics and compare them to university demographics and see if there are strong discrepancies
 - v. Benchmark against other universities
 - vi. Not much diversity on Conduct Board
- b. Are there annual statistics on conduct violations and their outcomes (#, # to trial, # found in violation and sanctions given)?
 - i. Currently not public, hoping it will be
 - ii. Drug and alcohol offenses went down during COVID-19
 - iii. Mask and quarantine violations
 - iv. High thefts and dishonest conduct
- c. Why do we not have a standardized “minimum sanction” for each violation and ways to walk a panel on determining if more harsh penalties are warranted?
 - i. Other codes seemed more uniform than OSU
 - ii. Lots open for interpretation
 - iii. Requires consistent sanctioning with Drugs and Alcohol-based on Federal laws
 - iv. Minimum sanctions would have to be very specific
 - v. Kelly says we should be publishing what the alcohol and drug sanctions are so people have all the information
 - 1. Educating the student body on the Code so they know what to expect
 - vi. Progressive sanctioning of any second violation is an escalation in sanctions
 - 1. Information is supposed to be from the hearing
 - 2. Cannot guarantee that the administrative process is the same as hearing
 - 3. There are aggregating factors like discrimination that can result in a harsher sentence
 - 4. The board coordinator is in hearings to protect student rights

5. Andrew Wong- USG

- a. What are some ways to reform the current disciplinary sanctions that would allow elements of education, in particular in COAM?
 - i. Cases are getting heard within two months with COAM
 - ii. No educational sanctions for COAM
 - 1. For the first offense disciplinary probation for one year rather than a formal reprimand, 2nd is probation to graduation, 3rd Sanction is suspension or dismissal
 - a. Kind of concerning, feels punitive
 - b. Dr. Jennifer Whetstone heads COAM, she would like to explore some educational interventions or outcomes
 - iii. Many students just don't know that some things are a violation
 - iv. **Informal Admonition- allowed for a finding that yes, the student violated the code, but won't result in a conduct record**
 - 1. Not sure why it was removed, Kelly wouldn't have removed it before her time- Ask Matt Couch if he remembers
 - 2. Definitely something for CSA to look at adding back during the Review
 - v. **Also, an informal resolution option that could remedy this some**

6. Gabe Myers/ Jacob Chang- USG

- a. Code should have accountability for hate speech and other non-physical violence, especially for APIDA students.
- b. Discrimination against protected classes should be redirected to OIE.
- c. **Sanctions are not clear.** It has an option for a "plead" deal which allows involved people to resolve the issue on their own
 - i. Also has formal procedures
 - ii. It seems like case by case basis
 - iii. A remedial option is an option (only when they don't know who is the perpetrator)
 - iv. **Under Section X, who is consulted when these decisions are made?** especially about a dismissal/suspension. Needs clarification in the code.
 - 1. Administrative decision, an admin employee from student conduct makes that decision, the student can appeal it
 - 2. If the student disagrees 3 students 2 faculty members in hearing will then make a final decision on whether the sanction is fair
 - v. In section V1, there shouldn't be a 5 day time limit on the reporting process. UM allows for 180 days.
 - 1. **Why is that? Can it be changed?**

- vi. They mentioned informal educational procedures for the perpetrator, but these training or procedures need to be clearly outlined and reviewed by outside groups.
 - 1. It shouldn't be a one-person decision from the OIE Coordinator.
- vii. A standardized training should be created and leave no wiggle room for it.
 - 1. **Thoughts?**
- d. Reporting Process:
 - https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?OhioStateUniv&layout_id=13
 - i. **What is the current follow-up process for someone that fills out this report?**

Kelly's response

OIE is going to turn 3 in August

- When all discrimination complaints got moved over
- Regulations from the Department of Education are going to change again

Main goals for CSA Code Review

- **Plain Language for the code**
- **Making the Code more easily accessible**
 - o **Multi-modal approach**
- **What concerns go where, who will you have to work with, and what are the possible outcomes?**
 - o **This is confusing- multiple offices might be responsible for a report**
 - o **Should be an email kickback that says we got your report, and this is who you should call if you need more information**

Code of Conduct Office should respond to every report for someone who fills that out

Complaints about residence halls first go to the Hall Director

- Some end up in Conduct Office, why does that happen?
 - o If they are going to get suspended or dismissed, they are not going to go back to the residence hall and the hall director therefore shouldn't be responsible
 - o Take cases that the Hall Director doesn't feel or thinks there would be a perception of not being neutral

Section of Code of Student Conduct- Used to be O. for other but now N.

- **Kelly wants to change that**
- **The residence hall living handbook is in there**
- **90 university policies that apply to students**
- **Code is built to encompass all these other policies**

Language needs to be more engaging and the ordered structure

- 7. USG Resolution- any comments/ thoughts about implementation

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

In February 2022, a survey was sent out to leaders of student organizations at The Ohio State University in order to gain feedback about the student organization funding process. The survey was sent to 1,611 students occupying a leadership role in one or more organizations. One hundred and ninety students responded (143 undergraduates, 47 graduate/professional students), resulting in an overall response rate of 11.8%.

Student Organization Funding

Has your organization applied for Council on Student Affairs funding for an event during your time in the organization?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 118)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 33)
Yes	29.7%	45.5%
No	42.4%	30.3%
I don't know	28.0%	24.2%

As a follow-up question, respondents who reported that their organization had never applied for Council on Student Affairs funding for an event during their time in the organization were asked why they had not applied for funding.

If not, why?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 50)	Graduate / Professional student organizations (n = 10)
Never needed it	48.0%	30.0%
Did not know if the event was eligible	18.0%	50.0%
Was confused on how the CSA funding process works	20.0%	10.0%
Other	14.0%	10.0%

Write-in responses for those who selected "Other":

- Undergraduate student organizations:
 - Didn't have time/resources to put together a budget and proposal
 - didn't know about it
 - Didn't know it existed.
 - Didn't know about it
 - In the process of applying/have not applied yet
 - We are a direct beneficiary of SAF
 - We haven't had the chance to host our own events due to covid, and I also never had experience applying for CSA funding so I'm also a bit confused on the process.
- Graduate/professional student organizations:
 - We are a student government and receive allocated funds from the SAF through CSA

Respondents who reported that their organization had applied for CSA funding for an event during their time in organization were asked whether their organization had ever been approved for funding.

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

Has your organization ever been approved for Council on Student Affairs funding during your time in the organization?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 35)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 14)
Yes	68.6%	71.4%
No	31.4%	28.6%

Respondents who reported being approved for CSA funding in the past were asked how much funding they received in 2021. Because the number of graduate and professional students who answered this question was below 10, aggregate results are reported.

Among the 19 students who answered the question, the mean dollar amount received in 2021 was \$1,085.18.

Student organizations are eligible for between \$2,000/\$3,000 of programming funds each year. How much money did your organization receive in 2021?

	All student organizations (n = 19)
\$0	26.3%
\$1-\$500	21.1%
\$501-\$1,000	10.5%
\$1,001-\$2,000	26.3%
Over \$2,000	15.8%

Respondents were also asked how much funding they received in 2020 and 2019; however, because fewer than 10 total students answered each question, these data were not able to be reported.

Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 33)			Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 12)		
	Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neutral	Strongly agree/ Agree	Strongly disagree/ Disagree	Neutral	Strongly agree/ Agree
The ability to access programming funds allows my organization to successfully run events.	24.2%	21.2%	54.5%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%
Our student organization would run more/better programming events each year if the programming funds allowance were higher.	6.1%	27.3%	66.7%	8.3%	25.0%	66.7%

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statements on a five-points scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." For reporting purposes, these five response options were collapsed into three: "Strongly disagree / Disagree," "Neutral" and "Strongly agree / Agree."

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

The 30 students (22 undergraduates, eight graduate/professional students) who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their student organization would run more/better programming events each year if the programming funds allowance were higher were asked how large of an increase to the programming fund limit would significantly influence the quantity and/or quality of events their organization could run each year. Because fewer than 10 graduate/professional students answered the question, aggregate results are reported.

Among the 27 students who answered the question, the mean dollar amount for an increase to the programming fund limit was \$2,200.00.

How large of an increase to the programming fund limit in dollars would significantly influence the quantity and/or quality of events your organization could run each year?

	All student organizations (n = 27)
\$0	3.7%
\$1-\$500	18.5%
\$501-\$1,000	37.0%
\$1,001-\$2,000	18.5%
\$2,001-\$3,000	7.4%
Over \$3,000	14.8%

Note: Respondents were asked to write in a dollar amount. For reporting purposes, these write-in responses were collapsed into the above categories.

What other sources of funding does your organization typically receive?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 93)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 25)
Club dues / fees paid by members	17.2%	12.0%
None	15.1%	16.0%
Fundraising events	15.1%	12.0%
Corporate sponsors/companies	7.5%	16.0%
Donations (general)	7.5%	4.0%
Club funds	6.5%	8.0%
Grants	5.4%	4.0%
Resource Room	5.4%	0.0%
Alumni	4.3%	0.0%
USG	4.3%	0.0%
Selling merchandise	3.2%	0.0%
A particular OSU department	3.2%	40.0%
Charging event entry fee	2.2%	0.0%
Private External funds	2.2%	4.0%
Church	1.1%	0.0%

Note: Respondents were provided asked to report other sources of funding that their organization typically received and were provided with a write-in box. Their responses were coded into the above categories.

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

Barriers to the Funding Process

Respondents were asked what barriers they saw with the current CSA funding process. A total of 93 students (70 undergraduates, 23 graduate/professional students) wrote in responses. These responses were qualitatively coded for themes. The themes are reported below along with example comments.

The most common theme, discussed by 23 respondents (15 undergraduates, eight graduate/professional students) pertained to the strictness of requirements in attaining funding, or limitations related to the funding.

“The funding is broken down into strict categories. We can't spend as much as we want on apparel, food, or room reservations as long as it doesn't exceed the limit. Let us budget money ourselves.”

“It's not the amount of programming funds that are the issue, it's how strict the guidelines are for the funding. The operating funds amount is too little though, my club has national dues we need to pay that are over \$200.”

Twenty-one respondents (17 undergraduates, four graduate/professional students) reported no issues with the funding process.

“None that I can think of.”

Twenty respondents (16 undergraduates, four graduate/professional students) discussed difficulties with the accessibility of information needed to apply for funding.

“I don't think there's a lot of information sent out about it and many of us don't know that it exists.”

“I think since I barely had experience applying for funding at CSA I am not very clear on the process, as well as what kind of events may be eligible for what kind of funding.”

Fourteen respondents (11 undergraduates, three graduate/professional students) expressed having problems with the deadline for the proposal.

“I think the deadlines of applying for funding are complicated, especially with COVID. It was difficult to be flexible and we found it difficult to plan events so far in advance to hit the funding window.”

“There are very limited deadlines for when you submit proposals for funding, and often times, we are students first and our ideas come after the deadline, but we cannot put our proposal in at that point.”

Twelve respondents (10 undergraduates, two graduate/professional students) explained that the process for receiving funding is confusing.

“The descriptions are too vague, there are too many hoops to jump through for approval and to validate receipts.”

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

"I think since I barely had experience applying for funding at CSA I am not very clear on the process, as well as what kind of events may be eligible for what kind of funding."

Seven respondents (four undergraduates, three graduate/professional students) reported slow communication time with CSA, making it difficult to receive funding.

"The descriptions are too vague, there are too many hoops to jump through for approval and to validate receipts. It also takes way too long for organizations to actually receive the funds."

"It is my opinion that the prolonged response as to if we were granted the requested funds is a huge barrier."

Five respondents (three undergraduate, two graduate/professional students) have not tried to apply.

"Haven't tried using it, so no comment"

Five respondents (one undergraduate, four graduate/professional students) did not receive a response from CSA, which limited accessibility to funding.

"I never got a response. I was told I would be emailed when the time comes for me to present my request, and I was never given a follow up for the chance to present."

"We proceeded with applying for the operating funds to use towards organizational t-shirts for our active members to wear for the upcoming symposium, but we have not yet heard back if we were granted the funds, therefore we may not proceed with t-shirts since they would not be in for our symposium."

Four respondents (four undergraduate students) expressed difficulty with bank cards or setting up a bank account.

"It would be helpful for the school to provide more guidance or online resources for new treasurers in regards to starting a bank account, EIN numbers, and setting up vendor accounts with the school. Since I had to figure out most of this information on my own while juggling other responsibilities, this put a significant delay in my org being able to hold events and apply for funds."

"At least at a cursory glance, some new leadership may have trouble with bank cards and how to set up bank accounts for their orgs. I might recommend offering some basic instructions on how to do that embedded in the 'how to apply for funds' section to prevent future problems"

Four respondents (three undergraduates, one graduate/professional student) reported a lack of available funding.

"Many speakers we would like to have talk to our club charge very expensive speaking fees."

A full list of comments can be found in the Appendix.

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

Student Organization Events

Respondents were asked a series of questions about the largest event that their organization hosts each academic year.

Is the event a Signature event?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 96)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 28)
Yes	43.8%	32.1%
No	56.3%	67.9%

Have you ever applied to be a Signature event?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 54)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 19)
Yes	3.7%	0.0%
No	96.3%	100.0%

Note: This item was only shown to respondents who answered "No" to the question "Is the event a Signature event?"

Roughly how many students attend the event?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 85)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 26)
50 or fewer	51.8%	76.9%
51 to 100	20.0%	7.7%
101 to 200	14.1%	11.5%
201 or more	14.1%	3.8%

Note: Respondents were asked to write in the number of students that attend the largest event of their organization. For reporting purposes, these write-in responses were collapsed into the above categories.

When is the event typically held?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 81)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 26)
Annually	66.7%	69.2%
Autumn	23.5%	26.9%
Spring	33.3%	42.3%
Summer	1.2%	0.0%
Once per semester	19.8%	19.2%
More than once per semester	8.6%	0.0%
It varies	1.2%	7.7%

Note: Respondents were asked to write in when the event was typically held. For reporting purposes, these write-in responses were collapsed into the above categories. Percentages add up to more than 100% because respondents who reported an annual event and specified the semester were counted under both "Annually" and the specific semester in which their event was held.'

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

How much does the above event typically cost?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 82)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 25)
Less than \$100	36.6%	32.0%
\$100-\$500	13.4%	28.0%
\$501-\$1,000	11.0%	20.0%
\$1,001-\$5,000	24.4%	8.0%
Over \$5,000	14.6%	12.0%

Note: Respondents were asked to write in a dollar amount for how much the event costed. For reporting purposes, these write-in responses were collapsed into the above categories.

Is the event open to all Ohio State students?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 88)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 27)
Yes	72.7%	70.5%
No	27.3%	29.6%

Organizational Expenses and Activities

What is the biggest expense, generally, for your organization?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 80)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 25)
Catering	37.5%	80.0%
Supplies or gear	33.8%	12.0%
Booking space	22.5%	16.0%
Fees/Honorariums	11.3%	32.0%
Travel/Lodging	8.8%	4.0%
Advertising	3.8%	0.0%

Note: Respondents were asked to write in their organization's largest expense. For reporting purposes, these write-in responses were collapsed into the above categories. Percentages add up to more than 100% because participants could write in more than one expense.

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

What is the typical, estimated total budget for your organization each year?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 73)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 24)
\$100 or less	16.4%	12.5%
\$101 to \$500	19.2%	20.8%
\$501 to \$1,000	2.7%	16.7%
\$1,001 to \$5,000	38.4%	41.7%
\$5,000 to \$10,000	8.2%	4.2%
Over \$10,000	15.1%	4.2%

Are the events that your organization holds typically open to all Ohio State students/the public?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 81)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 26)
Yes	66.7%	73.1%
No	33.3%	26.9%

Does your organization expect members to participate in any type of fundraising?

	Undergraduate student organizations (n = 81)	Graduate and Professional student organizations (n = 25)
Yes	42.0%	40.0%
No	58.0%	60.0%

Additional Feedback for CSA

Respondents were asked if they had any other feedback for the Council on Student Affairs. A total of 24 respondents (17 undergraduates, seven graduate/professional students) provided feedback. These responses were qualitatively coded for themes. Each theme, along with example comments, are provided below. Due to a low number of graduate/professional student responses, feedback is reported in aggregate.

The most common theme, mentioned by nine respondents, was a request for more funding opportunities or that funding requirements were less stringent.

“My biggest issue is simply the funding window. Taking over as president did not allow me time to get acclimated, trained, review the old president’s plans, and move forward with new or changed/updated ideas.”

“CSA funding should be provided to allow organizations cover the expenses of events that are meaningful to their organization, and the restriction that all Ohio State students must be invited

CSA 2022 STUDENT ORGANIZATION LEADERS REPORT

sometimes goes directly against our organization's goal to specifically build camaraderie among the 4 Biomedical Science Major cohorts."

Seven respondents requested better communication between CSA representatives and students.

"Please be more proactive while responding to emails."

"I think there should be better communication with the student orgs about the status of a funding request. More than one person should be able to work on a funding request. It's unclear who to contact with questions about the process."

Four respondents requested more accessible resources or information on how to obtain funding.

"Better online/easily accessible resources would be the biggest help, especially for new treasurers. It often takes way too long to hear back via email from the CSA staff, so it would be great to have more resources on the websites to answer quick questions or alleviate issues that are common for treasurers."

"I would love more information on how we can receive funding for our organization. We normally have to pay for everything out of pocket."

Three respondents wrote in their appreciation of CSA.

"The funding is awesome! Thank you from BBLB."

"Thank you soooooooo much!! Because of CSA, we are able to give students tangible tools to deal with their mental health."

For a full list of comments, see the Appendix.