

Services and Activities Fee Committee
Minutes
May 18, 2011

Meeting called to order: Megan Hammond, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

Agenda: Agenda approved.

Attendance:

Student Members: Brad Nelson, James Rae, Megan Hammond, Ivana Trotzman, Ian White, Andrew Williams, and Michael Wittenbrink.

Professors and Professional Staff: John Bowen, Ed Day, Kay Kenison, Scott Robinson, Emily Spoor, and Wendy Williams. Absent: Jack Baker

Guests: George Clark and Sherer Holter

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of the minutes from May 11, 2011: Michael Wittenbrink moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Ian White seconded. Motion carried.

Public Comment: Mike Mertz voiced concern that the agenda states SURC 301.

The meeting has been scheduled for Hertz 125 since the beginning of the year because SOURCE takes the rooms in the SURC. Room change notice was sent with the announcement and the agenda on the internet as usual.

MOTION: James Rae made a motion to table the discussion for this evening because the change of location and students not aware of the location change. Michael Wittenbrink seconded. Motion failed. (3 yes, 3 no, tie breaker no)

Discussion: There is no reason to delay-guests are present to discuss. There was no signage in the SURC stating meeting location changed, but it was thought, they could ask at the information desk. There are only two meeting left in the year.

New Business:

Discussion: Administrative Fee Assessment:

George Clark and Sherer Holter shared the “common-sense approach to balancing the cost for University services that benefit everyone.” “CWU seeks opportunities to streamline workflow, reduce redundancies, and improve the quality, consistency, and efficiency of services. Many university activities are necessary for the daily operation of the university. These are functions that directly or indirectly benefit every student and every member of staff and faculty. Although this practice is new to Central, it is standard at public and private universities and at businesses everywhere. Common sense says that services that benefit all should be funded by all.” With State funding being cut, it is felt that this is fair across the board and is the “best practice” methodology, although they have looked at many models. The proposed listing of the “market basket of services” is for the current year and several items and titles could be changing or eliminated for the next budget cycle. A concern of the administration is raising tuition too high may “price us out of the market” for students coming to Central.

The S&A Committee is concerned with this additional fee because students are already paying tuition which includes the S&A fee and now the S&A funds are being allocated for the administrative fee and they feel that the S&A fees should be used specifically for services and activities. They also thought that it may be better to raise tuition to help balance the short fall, instead of the addition of the administrative fee. It was felt that this is “double dipping” by paying tuition and S&A fee, and then using S&A funds to pay for the additional administrative fee. As we look at the list and decide on which fees to pay and which not to pay or by what percentage, but in the long run; it will probably come out to the same 3.4 % administration fee. We don’t want to micro-manage or nit-pick over the items in this proposal.

The rejection of the market basket is due to the following reasons:

1. Lack of clarity of items in the market basket
2. Lack of clarity as to what each item in the market basket consists of
3. Lack of knowledge of cost of items in the market basket
4. Lack of current information used to propose the market basket
5. Lack of justification for the services and activities funded by the S&A committee to pay items that are not consumed
6. Lack of justification for those students who have no ability to consume these items to pay for the items

Mike Merz brought to the attention of the committee: RCW 28B.15.041 “Services and Activities Fees” defined: “. . .Services and activities fees shall be used as otherwise provided by law or by rule or regulation of the board of trustees . . . for the express purpose of funding student activities and programs. . . .”

MOTION: James Rae made a motion to reject the proposed 3.4% administrative fee to be charged to S&A. Michael Wittenbrink seconded. Motion carried. (5 yes, 1 no)

With the rejection of the proposed 3.4% administrative fee, the Chair, Megan Hammond, will start the dispute resolution process by convening a dispute resolution committee within the next 14 days.

Other Business:

Emily Spoor: Emily has not received any more responses to her survey. She plans on writing a summary of results and sending it out by email to those completing the survey.

Schedule of Next Meeting: May 25, 2011.

Adjourned: The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.