

**Services and Activities Fee Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**October 30, 2019**

**Called to order:**

Brandon Wear-Grimm called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**Attendance:**

Alejandro Alcantar, Eric Bennett, Joseph Bryant, Tonya Buchanan, Edgar Carreno, Monica Carreno, Dane Gillin, Alex Harrington, Aubrey Heim, Josh Hibbard, Martin Kennedy, Lacy Lampkins, Kirti Patel, Jessica Thomas, Brandon Wear-Grimm

Excused: Gregg Schlanger

**Minutes:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes of October 23, 2019. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried.**

**Agenda:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Alex Harrington seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

**Reports:**

Chair – None.

Advisors – Gregg Schlanger is excused from this meeting for his 60<sup>th</sup> birthday. He says he will not miss any more meetings this year. Welcome Josh Hibbard to the Committee.

**Public Comment:**

None.

**Old Business:**

**A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting**

- i. #2001: ACP/CMA Annual Fall National College Media Convention (Observer, Pulse, CNW) - \$12,858  
Discussion: Can we pull up the annual report for this group? This is 3 different groups, are you looking for the financial pieces? Yes. This does not include the actuals for fiscal year 19. Central News watch is new to the conference this year, correct? Yes. CNW is base funded basically only for student payroll. They do not have funding for goods/services or travel in their budget. At the end of fiscal year 18 they had about \$1,700. The observer had about \$13,000 carryover into fiscal year 19. The budget for fiscal 19 had a carryover of \$5,537. Looks like it will end the quadrennial at a negative balance. That has to do with their

goods/services i.e. printing and travel. I am comparing carry over to the request. Would employee development or training fall into payroll? Not in this context. Can we see where the carryover is budgeted to be allocated this year? The Observer has a beginning funds account of \$41,000 and that is budgeted to remain flat. This is basically the same for Pulse. They began with \$1,100 and will end with \$1,800. So this is excess revenue. Does this get swept back to S&A? After fiscal year 21 it would. Can the surplus money be used for travel? It is an allowable expense. It might be good to ask if they had other things planned for those funds. These are good questions to ask at presentations. In general, any changes in the budget of base funded areas are asked to be presented on. Would the students requesting funds typically know about the fiscal aspects of things? Not typically. They do have fiscal managers and we can ask for information to be sent after the request. Sometimes the fund manager comes to the request.

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to deny Supplemental Funding Request #2001 Eric Bennett seconded.**

Discussion: Since we are asking for more information, should we table the request instead? Denying it would make the request dead. The three groups are separate. The fund balance is in the Observer. Would the committee have a problem with money from the Observer funding students who are not a part of the Observer? Would not be a problem if they choose to do so.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion carried with one abstention.**

Discussion: The request has been denied. I thought we were voting to deny the motion. A question was called on the previous motion, the motion was to deny the request, the motion passed, the request is now dead. Given that this is the second meeting, are others clear we were denying the motion. I thought we were denying the motion to deny the request. The motion was to deny the request, and we were voting to deny the motion.

**Vote recalled. Previous motion called to question. Motion failed with one abstention.**

**MOTION: Dane Gillian made a motion to table this request. Alejandro Alcantar seconded.**

Discussion: To clarify, we are tabling this and asking them to provide information, or are we asking them to come here? We are asking for more information whether in person or over email. Do we need to put a time limit on that? By next week. Be sure when you contact the group to be specific on what you are asking for. Is it the financial plan? What specific information are we requesting? Explain why they cannot use their \$40,000 balance to cover this request.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- ii. #2002: Women in Jazz Day (CWU JEN) - \$10,250  
Discussion: Is this the group that we got an email about? Yes, it stated that 5 people were recruited to the major after last year's Women in Jazz Day. Can we pull up the base funding financials for this group? This is a club that is not base funded. The music department base funding is for marching band, pep band, and S&A music.

**MOTION: Tonya Buchanan made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2003 in the amount of \$10,250. Martin Kennedy seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- iii. #2003: JEN Conference Trip (CWU JEN) - \$6,550.94

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2003 in the amount of \$6551. Martin Kennedy seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- iv. #2004: Students of Color Conference (BSU) - \$ 3,000

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request # 2004 in the amount of \$3,000. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with three abstentions.**

- v. #2005: Trumpet Fest (CWU Trumpet Club) - \$2,300  
Discussion: Did we receive any information on if the cost of attendance would cover this cost? No, but the presenter is in the gallery. General admission is \$25, trumpet club members get in for free, other CWU students have to pay the full amount this year, but next year they may get a discount. Any word on if this income would cover the cost of the event? The amount requested is just to put on the event itself. It is just for the clinicians and pianist accompaniment.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request # 2005 in the amount of \$2300. Martin Kennedy seconded.**

Discussion: I don't feel we should give full funding if students have to pay to get into the event. I don't feel comfortable funding this with student funds when students have to pay for admission. With the 2 JEN requests we approved people have to pay dues for the archives, so that is somewhat a double standard. The club dues are going towards club related things, but the funds will not be used to put on an event that students have to pay to attend. What is the intent of charging for admission? The charge is primarily for those outside of the university.

Historically, CWU students outside of the trumpet club have not attended. Are there any expenses for the event that are not being covered by this request? No. Has there been any thought about how CWU students may not come because there is a charge to get in? Presenter will talk with his advisor, but the event is primarily for the trumpet club. Another concern is that the club will make money that does not go into paying for the event. We estimate they could make about \$750 on the high end. But that is not the full amount requested. For any S&A funded event, the income would have to go back into an S&A account. It would

not be able to go into a specific club account. So those would be S&A dollars. The admission charges would be swept back into S&A.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion failed with one abstaining.**

Discussion: We should still fund a reduced amount.

**MOTION: Dane Gillin made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request # 2005 in the amount of \$1,500. Martin Kennedy seconded.**

Discussion: The issue is that CWU students need to pay to get in. What if students got in for free? Most of the people who come are trumpet club members. It sounds like the principle was that if it is funded with student dollars, then students should get in for free. If they charge for outside groups, they could make a profit. But we discussed that. Can we approve with contingencies? No, we have to approve or deny funding based on the request that is submitted. Could they resubmit with the condition of allowing CWU students in for free. Yes, but the event is next week. How many people are in the club? 20-something. If we fund \$1,500, that would come down to about \$65 per student. We all pay about \$230 a quarter for the S&A fee. They could make a little bit of a profit here, but how many clubs have done the same thing in the past. On that argument we could go all the way up to the \$2,300. Any Central student can also pay the \$15 dues to get in to the Trumpet Club and then get into the event for free.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion failed with one abstaining.**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request # 2005 in the amount of \$2300. Martin Kennedy seconded.**

Discussion: Funding in this amount would be about \$100/student. The Trumpet Club does have another event this year. We have no other submitted requests at this time from that club. There is no per person cap on how much funding they can receive, correct? Yes. This may be mincing hairs for no reason. Having a conversation about how much students pay for S&A fees makes sense, but I caution against looking at any one student who is coming forward multiple requests. You may want to have the discussion if we see groups coming forward multiple times, but we don't want to penalize students who are a part of multiple groups. Central students can pay dues and get into the event for free. The dues money would go into a different pot than the profit from the event, it would go back into a club account.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion carried with one abstaining.**

- vi. #2006: National Council on Family Relations Annual Conference (Family Science Club & Family & Child Life Graduate Club) - \$7,036

**MOTION: Tonya Buchanan made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2006 in the amount of \$7,036. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried with three abstentions.**

**New Business:**

**A. Committee Business – Meeting Structure and Funding Priorities:**

- i. What: The S&A budget is over \$7.2 million, yet the majority of the committee's time is spent discussing the \$300,000 supplemental budget. The priority should be to focus on the base funding and measure its effectiveness.  
Discussion: We don't want to give the misconception that we do not spend time on base funding. It only comes up every four years and we spend a lot of time on thought and discussion. Last time there was a 9 hour deliberation. This presentation is about wanting to focus on continuously evaluating rather than waiting every 4 years. Our current structure has us spending a lot of time on supplemental. We could be evaluating so future committees have data that can help them see the effectiveness of base funded departments, services, and programs.
- ii. Why: Statutorily, base funding is our priority. We are not focused on best allocating the fee when we don't work with the bulk of it. It is our responsibility to analyze how we allocate those funds. There is no consistent criteria for evaluation of how the funds are being spent or how effective the funding is for student impact. We have the highest fees in the state and no justification for why that is.
- iii. How: We want to move in the direction of being able to create data and have set criteria for evaluation. We need to restructure in a way that allows us to effectively have these conversations. A proposed idea is to set a supplemental funding request deadline for each quarter and set aside specific meetings for requests and voting. Other meetings would be focused on committee business and discussing how to start evaluating the effectiveness of funding.  
Discussion: For clarification, if we set certain meetings to focus on supplemental requests, do we have to vote immediately or do we have time to deliberate? How many requests do we get a quarter? We had 65 last year. If we do 2 meetings a quarter where we hear 8 requests, that would put us at 48 a year. Maybe we should talk about what that cap should be. I understand that the \$300,000 is the most active thing we talk about right now, but we do want to make sure we are allocating that money right. If we are having 16 requests in a meeting, do we vote immediately? Do we wait a week and forget what's been said? I don't want to throw supplemental by the wayside. We were thinking closer to 8 requests a week. Why is tuition not covering these fees? We have a false sense of having a low tuition, but then have the highest fees in the state. These are the discussions we should be having, but we can't with the way things are currently structured. A deadline may be helpful, but a cap at a certain number would most likely mean that some organizations would submit several

requests and fill up the cap quickly. A deadline allows us to see the requests that have come in and better plan how to divide them over the coming meetings. In the past we might not know until the week before how many requests we have and have had to cram them in. Deadline allows us to be more intentional. Why are the fees not in tuition? It was until 2 years ago and the fees were parred out to improve transparency of where the money is going. We want to have a time for meaningful discussion on fees. For now, we should discuss restructuring so that we have this time to discuss business in the future. Deadlines are a good idea but may not be plausible for this quarter because it could blindside students. Maybe winter. If we do a deadline for fall, it needs to be farther out than Friday. If we identify business items we would like to discuss, those take precedence and we schedule requests around that. We may want to give more warning because our current guidelines are restrictive. Requests need to be submitted before the event or trip. We may need to revisit that. Without these restrictions, the deadline may not be a negative. Mark that discussion as a point of business please. If we start this process, would we start with the investigation piece? That is something we can discuss. We would identify KPIs, expectations, and criteria for evaluation. Do we have ideas of how to measure effectiveness? The CFO has suggested some, like attendance numbers, retention rates, satisfaction, and graduation rates. We can do what makes sense for us. We can discuss this more in the time we set aside for business. This is a priority, reports are challenging to interpret with no KPIs. We will need to figure out what the priorities are for S&A. We can discuss whether we want to adhere to current priorities as laid out in our policies. These are less tangible. Want to make sure the KPIs we put out there feed back into our goals and priorities and be as consistent as possible. Anyone know how many areas are base funded? Around 60. It would be good to have these discussions but to have good empirical data we should choose assessment tools after formal, researched reports and not decide everything in one meeting. I agree we need to take our time. There are others in the university working on this that we can have come present. These criteria are important because it provides feedback to the base funded areas and having data would make it easier to evaluate the effectiveness of the funding. It will take a lot of time to go through all of the different base funded groups. To have a unified KPI may be difficult. We fund things across the board in different areas. A lot of the groups are very different. Can we create a sub-committee to focus on base funding? Statutorily, base funding is our top priority. Not a permanent sub-committee, just to get this jump started. They could look into this and report back or we can take the time to discuss it. Maybe we could have an external entity that looks into what to change and how to measure effectiveness. We would have to do that internally, it is our responsibility as a committee. At some point someone will need to collect data, so we will need to know what data to collect. That is a discussion we need to have, this restructure will give us time to have those conversations. We may

need to take more time to establish our priorities before we set a deadline. We may be a couple quarters out on this. Are there other universities doing this that can help guide us? One possible KPI is to compare ourselves to other institutions. Our university has the most information available to the public. Other universities are not doing this. They also have much smaller amount of services and programs funded through S&A. They are not evaluating the effectiveness of the funding, they only look at it from a financial standpoint. We would need to begin an assessment of what the fee is currently funding to compare to other universities. There is a divergence in S&A policy at this campus than other universities based on our campus's historical interpretation of the policy. The committee decides where the line for funding is and how this affects the fee. We are very transparent comparatively. This group is focused on stewardship and less on learning outcomes or program impact. Is there a place we can find examples of the empirical data we may be looking for? This will vary by program. We may need to create different categories for different areas. We can focus on things like student learning outcomes, environmental factors, or retention. We can use the empirical data to make assumptions about retention or satisfaction. We would have to separate this out based on what the different programs are doing. The committee will need a good understanding of the factors that relate to retention. This will take a lot to do it the right way. Would we focus on one thing like retention in the beginning? We would have to decide as a committee. We might have multiple priorities that apply to different kinds of operations. We would need to break the programs into categories due to the breadth of things that are funded. We may want to dedicate time to this at a later meeting. Is there really a need to restructure? Committee business takes priority, so if there is business we need to discuss then the requests will just remain in the que. Yes, but we cannot push requests past spring. A deadline may help us to plan more effectively. We may just need to re-prioritize business, rather than restructure. There is a lot of initial work that makes this seem like a lofty goal. Once all of this is in place, it will be easy to maintain. It will benefit future committees, but is a lot of work now. Whose responsibility would it be to get the data through the Human Subjects Review Council? We will want to discuss that in more detail in the future and what kind of data we are collecting. Not all of the data will go through human studies. We can look at cost per square foot for custodial services and compare that to national data. Some areas are split funded and this can make a difference. I think we should spend 45 minutes at the next meeting to discuss what data we want to collect and form a subcommittee to gather the data. That might not all happen in 45 minutes but it will be good to start. We can look at speakers coming in to touch on the data and financial pieces. Is there a rubric to help with allocating base funding every four years. No, it comes down to the committee priorities. These are established as first continuing base funding, then funding student positions, then funding staff positions, and finally funding new programs. Then we look at if requests

are allowable. The current evaluation process focuses on what is being funded rather than how effective the program is. This puts new committee members at a disadvantage if they don't know the effectiveness of programs. We will want to have a discussion on goals and priorities because it will be a change in priorities to evaluate effectiveness rather than continuing funding for existing programs. New members should be able to see the impact on the student body and make knowledgeable decisions. Are we advised to set a deadline moving forward? In a general sense, this would be beneficial. We will have to look at spring and what happens to requests that come in past the spring deadline. If we do not set a deadline for fall and start one in winter, a lot of requests are going to be pushed through for winter. Does meeting the deadline guarantee that a request will be heard that quarter? That is what we would want. That may have the opposite effect of what is intended and force us to prioritize supplemental funding in order to get through the requests. In the past, we have always tried to wrap up the fall requests before the break. The deadline would allow us to evaluate and par out the requests. As currently structured we do not know what is coming. We have four meetings left this quarter. Do we want to make the next meeting just discussion of committee business and then do presentation the following week and alternate ongoing? Would we have to define that since business is the priority? We still want to be mindful of the time of those presenting. If we do alternating weeks, we would deliberate and vote after two weeks which is a long time. I was thinking we would vote on the same day. That would be a change in procedures. We have been asking for a lot of supplemental information so we need to give the presenters a chance to gather that information. Having consistent criteria would help guide discussions on presentations and help presenters know what information we will need from them. Currently we vote on impassioned requests rather than tangible criteria that is met. This will help future committees see why programs have been funded in the past. We will have to set aside more time to think about our criteria. Is the first step is to define the categories of base funded groups? The big first step is to determine KPIs and the first step of that is to break down the categories of base funded groups and look for similarities and differences. Would it be appropriate to ask those with experience in these areas to have input on what the KPIs should be? Most of us only have a few years or months of knowledge within this committee. We could definitely bring in the CFO and Provost, or the Dean and Advisors to present on this. Ultimately it is up to the committee. I urge everyone to read the Killian Outline. It will be very impactful on this discussion. Make sure you are informed. Based on this, I will make sure that on the agenda for next week we have time to discuss this further. We may have time for two new supplemental requests. We should discuss the proposed deadline and how to handle the rest of fall. November first may be too soon. We don't need to figure everything else out before we set a deadline, correct? Yes. We could do the 8<sup>th</sup> of November. That would be an easy one because any

requests received after that would likely not be processed in time to be heard in fall anyway.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to set a deadline for fall supplemental requests as the 8<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019. Edgar Carreno seconded.**

Discussion: Could we make the deadline the 6<sup>th</sup> of November instead, so that we know by the next meeting.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion failed with 4 abstentions.**

**Point of order:** You can ask to amend motions.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to set a deadline for fall supplemental requests as the 6<sup>th</sup> of November, 2019. Josh Hibbard seconded.**

Discussion: How will we disseminate the deadline around campus? We will put it on the website, post it in SURC accounting, and send an email to base funded areas. The current requests that we have, some are for later in the year. Can we prioritize requests for those which happen first? The requests could have other deadlines we don't know about. The funding is all reimbursement only. They may need to have secure funds in order to contract with vendors. Can we do a campus-wide email? No, but we can post the deadline on Central Today. We will also report this at Club Council and Student Government.

**Previous motion called to question. Motion carried.**

**Other Business: Communications Received**

None.

**Public Comment:**

Reminder to the committee that we will take pictures before we leave.

**Adjournment:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Tonya Buchanan seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.**

**Schedule for Next Meeting:**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 6<sup>th</sup> in SURC 301 starting at 5:30 p.m.