



WELL Advisory Group Meeting
Wednesday, February 26, 2025
Terrace Suite, The WELL

Minutes

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:40am by Reddish in the absence of Chairperson Colin-Vasquez
 - a. Present: Elena Larson, Lisset Cruz, Michael Love, Jacob Gonzalez, Wayne Linklater, Brooke Milam
 - b. Also Present: Andrew Reddish, Bill Olmsted, Kayla Irlbeck, Steven Dasman, Andrew Nguyen, Erica Wood, Jill Farrell, Rina Chhong
2. Public Comment: None
3. Consent Calendar
 - a. Approval of The WELL Advisory Group Meeting Minutes – January 22, 2025
Consensus of approval of the minutes as written: Passed
4. New Business
 - a. Intramural Sports Player Pass Update: Irlbeck
 - i. Irlbeck reports that the transition to the player pass system has been successful. Approximately 800 students have purchased the pass, with 5% participating in multiple sports. Reddish provides additional information on the fundamentals of the player pass.
 - b. IM Sports Summer 2025 Player Pass Proposal: Irlbeck (**MSP: Larson, Linklater**)
 - i. Irlbeck reviews the proposal to waive the Intramural Sports (IM) player pass fee for Summer 2025 as a trial to boost participation. She shares data from Summer 2024, noting that of the 97 summer IM participants, 80% also participated in the fall. The revenue from summer-only participants totaled \$200, suggesting minimal financial impact while possibly significantly increasing the number of participants.
 1. Larson adds that summer enrollment is 6,000 and mentions a grant program for students retaking classes after receiving a non-passing grade during the regular semester.
 2. Linklater asks if there are other barriers besides the fee. Irlbeck mentions the lack of awareness of summer offerings. Reddish adds that parking is also a barrier, stating that some students are unable to afford a summer parking pass.
 3. Olmsted asks about program promotion efforts. Irlbeck explains that push notifications via the Fusion app, in collaboration with the membership department, will inform students of program offerings.
 - c. Programs Service Price Increase Proposal and Addition of Charge Rates, Event Services: Wood (**MSP: Gonzalez, Love**)
 - i. Wood reviews the Event Services price increase proposal, explaining that program fees are re-evaluated annually in response to minimum wage increases. Despite the increase in minimum wage, the proposed staff charge rates reflect minimal increases, taking the Event Monitor charge rate from \$19 to \$22. It also establishes two additional staff charge rates of \$25 for an Event Supervisor and \$75 for an Event Coordinator, which was previously a single rate regardless of attendance. The two new charge rates will address the staffing needs for larger, more complex events. Olmsted clarifies the UEI fee, explaining that Union WELL, Inc. contracts HR services through UEI, which bases its fee on total expenditures for payroll,

wages, and benefits. Reddish adds that, although an employee may make \$17 per hour, the total financial impact on the organization may actually be \$19 due to additional costs.

d. Program Service Price Increase Proposal, Intramural Sports: Dasman, Irlbeck (**MSP: Milam, Linklater**)

- i. Dasman presents the Intramural Sports price increase proposal. Key factors in staff rate calculations include minimum wage, equipment wear and tear, and full-time staff contributions; the average cost is determined to be \$25 per hour. Reddish explains that campus groups frequently request WELL sports officials for tournaments. The WELL has a structured system for coordinating officiating services, with Irlbeck managing intake, pricing, and contracts. The proposal adjusts the rates for these services from \$22.25 to \$25 for student groups, \$25 to \$28 for campus groups, \$27 to \$30 for university sponsored groups, and \$28 to \$33 for unaffiliated groups.

1. Larson appreciates the thoughtfulness that goes into the pricing structure, stating that it's clear how thoughtful, fair-minded, and pro-student it is.

e. WELL Build Price and Duration Adjustment Proposal, Climbing: Dasman, Nguyen (**MSP: Larson, Cruz**)

- i. Nguyen presents the WELL Build proposal, recommending an increase from \$10 to \$12 per student with a two-hour minimum. He notes that one-hour bookings are common but often insufficient for delivering an effective program. Reddish clarifies that the proposed changes are to adjust the cost structure and introduces a two-hour minimum. Groups insisting on a one-hour program may still do so but will be billed for two-hours. Programs longer than two hours will incur a higher rate. The current price structure is based on a per-participant, per-hour rate: \$10 for student groups, \$11 for campus groups, \$12.50 for university sponsored groups, and \$14 for unaffiliated groups. The proposal increases the cost for up to two hours of programming to \$20, \$22, \$25, and \$28, respectively. Programs exceeding two hours, up to a maximum of four hours, the rates would increase to \$40, \$44, \$50, and \$56, respectively.

1. Olmsted asks about usage and group demographics since Andy joined the team. Dasman responds that historically, one WELL Build is hosted per month, and they are still establishing semester goals. He notes the new pricing remains competitive—particularly for unaffiliated groups—and is comparable for student and affiliated groups.

f. WELL Reservations Activity Space Reservation Policy Update Proposal: Wood (**MSP: Love, Milam**)

- i. Wood presents proposed updates to the WELL Reservations Activity Space Reservation Policy. Changes include updating the name of SHCS to Student Health, Counseling, and Wellness Services, and adding the phrase “at no cost” to the end of policy 2.1.b. Policy 5.3.a is revised to define a “no show” as failing to check-in within 30 minutes of the event start time. Policy 6.6 ties back to the WELL Academic Use policy, which outlines what academic classes may use the facility for, preventing the facility from becoming overrun by academic use.

1. Olmsted asks how the no-show fee will be communicated to users. Wood clarifies that while it has always been stipulated in the event contract they sign, the fee will now be prominently highlighted.
2. Larson asks what would happen if a group shows up later than 30 minutes. Wood responds that the space will be closed and reconfigured for the next scheduled event.
3. Linklater asks about the effectiveness of fee collection. Wood responds that collection has been consistent because the group is directly invoiced for the fee. Larson comments that the policy is good to have because it teaches consequences. Love adds that, due to limited campus space, it is paramount that a booked space is used.

- g. WELL Reservation Conference Suite Policy Update Proposal: Wood (**MSP: Linklater, Gonzalez**)
 - i. Wood reviews the proposed updates to the WELL Reservation Conference Suite policy. Updates include correcting the formatting of The WELL's name by capitalizing the "T" and aligning the cancellation policy with the updated Activity Space Reservation policy. Additionally, the policy is being adjusted to accommodate increasing demand for meeting spaces by specifically stating that The WELL will allow student organizations to reserve up to two conference rooms once per month with up to four hours of use at no cost. Off-campus groups will remain limited to one reservation per month, for a fee.
 - 1. Linklater asks which outside organizations utilize the space. Wood clarifies that only nonprofit organizations are eligible to reserve the Conference Suite.
- h. WELL Conference Suites, Student Organization Rental Rate Proposal: Wood (**MSP: Linklater, Milam**)
 - i. Wood presents a proposal to update the student organization rental policy for the WELL Conference Suites. The proposal allows student organizations to book additional meetings beyond their one free monthly reservation, using the "less than four hours" rental rate. Additionally, the No Admission Fee rental rate for the Terrace Suite will increase, as the current rate is lower than the cost of renting two individual rooms, creating a pricing inconsistency.
- i. The WELL 25-26 Project List: Reddish (**MSP: Linklater, Larson**)
 - i. Reddish reviews the proposed project list for the 2025-26 fiscal year, highlighting planned initiatives across multiple departments. Under climbing and group facilitation, there is a plan to acquire a training board, which differs from traditional climbing walls by allowing customized hold placement. Nguyen explains that this will create a broader range of climbing routes, making The WELL more competitive with other recreational facilities.
 - ii. To address the high turnover among personal trainers, a new initiative will offer a certification preparation course for students seeking personal trainer credentials. To increase faculty and staff participation, a Fusion data import will be implemented, and program eligibility will be communicated during new employee onboarding.
 - 1. Linklater shares a concern about the Fusion app, citing frequent forced logins and authentication which may be barriers to participation. Reddish appreciates the feedback and explains that while the app's security features require additional steps, the team is working with Fusion to improve usability. Wood advises users not to select "Clear Barcode," which triggers a login reset. Reddish adds that this safeguard is in place because some users have previously shared screenshots of their barcodes in the past, and security remains a priority.
 - iii. Other focuses include increased collaboration across campus departments in areas such as Intramural Sports, Operations, and Recreational Therapy.
 - 1. Linklater asks about the potential impact of campus budget constraints on Union WELL, Inc., noting that he foresees student enrollment declining. Reddish responds that while he has not heard of student enrollment declining, fiscally responsibility remains a priority.
 - 2. Gonzalez asks if other avenues or strategies have been explored to increase alumni participation, such as a partnership with UTAPS for parking support. Reddish responds that while parking continues to be a longstanding challenge – given UTAPS' control over parking on campus and per space fee structure – providing free parking could raise alumni membership costs and hurt competitiveness. Larson notes that UTAPS is a self-supporting entity, everybody pays to park. While some union-represented groups have negotiated discounts, others must pay full price. Love adds that parking fees vary by bargaining unit.

3. Larson asks if there are different parking passes available in the machines located in the parking structures. Wood responds that there are two-hour passes for \$4 and full-day passes for \$8. Milam notes that the pay-by-phone system only offers a full-day option. Gonzalez adds that passes are also available at the kiosks. Farrell shares that Assistant Director Swart has had conversations with UTAPS which revealed that paying to reserve spots could raise the prices in other parking tiers.
 4. Linklater asks whether there is data on which days alumni typically visit. Reddish confirms that check-in time data is available. Linklater suggests that alumni may be attending when parking is low and that it may be beneficial with lower financial impact to reserve spots during slow times.
5. Reports and comments
- a. Reddish shares updated renderings of the Event Center. Wood provides updates on the upcoming 5K event, noting that registration has reached 1,018 participants and mentions the need for volunteers for the event. Love asks how to sign up to volunteer, and Wood responds that registration is available online.
6. The meeting was adjourned at 9:06a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Sevinch Nigmat Oct 8 / 2025

Authorized Signature

Date