

Services and Activities Fee Committee
Minutes
November 6, 2019

Called to order:

Brandon Wear-Grimm called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

Attendance:

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

Excused: Josh Hibbard

Agenda:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Tonya Buchanan seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.

Minutes:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes of October 30, 2019. Alex Harrington seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.

Reports:

Chair – None.

Advisors – Our supplemental list is not updated with all the requests that we got. The deadline for supplemental requests for fall 2019 was today at 5:00. We have 16 more requests for the quarter and have processed about half of them. Is the intent to see all 25 requests we have gotten this quarter?

Discussion: How was it phrased when the deadline was announced? Any request received after the deadline will not be reviewed until winter quarter. It was not explicit but there was room for interpretation. In the past we would fit in what we could before the end of the quarter. We could try to see them all, but we might have to see some of the ones that happen later in the year on the first week of next quarter. Requests normally get added to the que in the order they come in. Some of the requests that have come in don't happen until spring, some happen before winter. Do we want to try to prioritize the ones that happen before winter quarter? When is the next PBAC meeting? There is one about every two weeks with the next on November 12th. There will be about 4 before January. In the past we have tried to wrap up fall requests before the break. If we do this they can get voted on by PBAC. I don't think we should prioritize based on the dates of the event. It discourages people to think ahead. They may have a reason they needed to submit early. Not using the order they were submitted in could cause a problem. Since it is all reimbursement only, we can try to fit in as many requests as we can. We should take them in the order they came. Could we plausibly get through them all? We have about 8 hours' worth and 3

meetings left. We would be here beyond 8:00 or have to add an extra meeting. We could likely get through about 10 of the 16 left. Could we do the other 6 after the break? Would that be outside of the event timelines? There would probably be a few. There are 2 conferences the first week of January so they may not be here to present at the first meeting of the quarter. I wanted a sense of what we wanted to do so I could report back to the requesting groups. All requests should be processed by next meeting. There are at least 3 groups that may not be here when we schedule them to present. They are not all approved yet. There may be some back and forth. Do we want to hear all 16 or closer to 10? I think we should hear them. I don't want to limit anyone. Maybe we should spend less time on other subjects. Next quarter we will be more prepared. Something has got to give. We can't make other things a priority right now without asking the group to stay longer. We may need to look at other options. Taking on bigger issues may mean not hearing supplementals or being here longer than 3 hours. We can't do it all. Can we discuss this more in depth later and get through the requests we have tonight? This is exactly what we want to talk about later tonight.

Did everyone get the email that was sent out tonight? Yes.

Public Comment:

It's great to be here.

New Business:

A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Presentations

- i. #2007: American Geophysical Union Conference - \$2,994

The AGU research conference covers various scientific fields. It will be held in San Francisco, California December 8th to the 13th. The 6 students going will all be presenting research in various fields. They hope to gain professional development through presenting, attend sessions and seminars, and expand their knowledge bases. They hope to bring back knowledge and research ideas to the CWU campus. They have been given \$1,300 in funding and applied for another \$1,500 already. They also have a pending request with SAS for \$1,200.

Presented by: Daniel, Rob, Jessica, Sarah, Alexis

Questions: Is the \$1,200 request for the Funding Council? Yes, that presentation is tonight as well. The graduate funds are secure? Yes. What is the status for the undergraduate funds? The form is due tomorrow, we will not know until closer to the trip. If they aren't secured, what is the plan? We have 2 students applying from Chemistry and 2 from Geology. We hope one group or the other will get funded. Are you receiving credit? We get credit for the research on campus, the trip is to further our knowledge. Will you continue research when you come back? Yes. How will you bring the information you learn back to other students on campus? There will be many experts in the field there. We can get feedback on our projects and apply that to other projects. These experts also often reach out to our research advisors. Do we know the benefits to CWU outside of the chemistry and geology departments? It helps to publicize student accomplishments. Are you presenting at SOURCE? Most likely. Is it a requirement to

present at SOURCE if you receive undergraduate or graduate funds? Yes for undergraduate. It is unclear for graduate funds. Are the Chemistry or Geology departments financially supporting you at all? The Chemistry department paid for our registration and is waiting to get reimbursed.

ii. #2008: Big Band Tour of Vietnam & Thailand - \$11,910

Six students will be performing at a wide variety of concert venues in Thailand and Vietnam alongside professional musicians. All of the concerts are outreach concerts that are free to the public. They are asking for funding for flights and hotels, and have secured other funding sources for other expenses. They hope to gain valuable networking experiences with the professionals they work with. They also hope to bring back knowledge of different styles and influences to share with other students upon return.

Presented by: Liam, Nick, Tim, Max, Joel, Lane

Questions: Have any of you gone on this trip before? No. Previous CWU students have gone on similar trips to different countries. You are just volunteering? Yes, there is no compensation. What does IHS stand for? International Horn Society – for the French horn. The World Orchestra part encapsulates us. Have you had any contact with the students from last year? Yes. What did they bring back to share with you? They held an open forum, discussed style differences, and brought in new culture and diversity to the music. How were you selected to go? We were recommended by last year's students and selected for quality of musicianship. Would this bring international students to campus? It would show the high caliber of the music program and continue building our relationship with Asia. Do any women ever go? Only men this time. There is still a large female to male discrepancy in the music program and we are working on improving that. Are there no female volunteers interested? We are personally selected and asked. There were other students before us who declined, but we are not sure who they are. Are you the only American university going? Yes, the only group from North America. The groups aren't all colleges? No, they are professionals. They see the quality of our work. What is your plan of action once you return? Host an open forum like they did last year. We are all also in ensembles and can bring our experiences to improve them. It is a unique opportunity for students to be able to play in a professional setting and hope it helps us mature.

iii. #2009: USHLI Conference - \$23,559.20

20 students and 4 chaperones are attending a professional development conference on Latinx initiatives in Chicago from February 20 to 23, 2020. They will attend workshops, network, build leadership skills, engage in a professional environment and find empowerment. Returning students will serve as mentors to those who are going for the first time. This will be an opportunity for interdisciplinary integration and finding a sense of belonging on the CWU campus. In the past, people who have come back from the trip have run for offices in ASCWU or other organizations. They have also started the Latinx club. All 91 students who have attended the conference in the past have gone on to continue at CWU or graduate. The request does include the registration and

flight costs for 4 trip leaders. They have also secured \$2,300 in funding from other sources.

Presented by: Osvaldo Sanchez and Morgan Rodriguez

Questions: It looks like you were initially anticipating \$2,000 from Club Council but it is no longer on the request, why? They no longer take funding requests if not from a specific club. How many of you have gone to this before? Not all of the travelers have been chosen yet. Those who have gone before serve as mentors to the new people. Are the chaperones professors? They are admin. What leadership movements has this created? The Latinx club which is now the Latinx Organization which strengthens communities and helps to develop leaders. Also, many people have run for offices in clubs or student government. The application is open to everyone on campus, so it has a wide reach and builds multicultural connections. Congratulations on the 100% retention rate. That is commendable.

Old Business:

A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting

- i. #2001: ACP/CMA Annual Fall National College Media Convention (Observer, Pulse, CNW) - \$12,858

Discussion: Did everyone receive the email this group sent us? Yes. The email said the rollover is used for advertising in case the funding does not come in. They supplement the Observer through advertising. Spending this could impact their operations or wages. This could affect next year's base funding. So yes, they provided reasons for why they are not using their balance to fund the travel. These are three different groups and two of them do not have a balance. There are concerns with Observer paying for all three groups. This is not laid out in the email, but the balance will likely be used for student wages. The intent is to use the balance to prolong base funding. If they use those funds, they may apply for a base funding adjustment. This may change the operations of the Observer. The 3 groups are separate but were advised to submit one joint request. Your decision is whether to provide funding. If you deny the request, they do not have to provide the funding from elsewhere or go on the trip. They have already gone. How did they incur \$90,000 in expenses when they were only base funded \$56,000? They had \$33,000 in ad revenue. Their operating expenses are more than they are allocated. They maintain through ad sales. When they came through in the last base funding cycle they requested more than was allocated. Everyone going on the trip is a part of a class that they get credit for, is this a grey area? They don't get credit for the conference per say. They get credit for the class but I am unaware of any credit from the conference itself. This trip has been traditionally requested as students are up for awards. It is not the whole class, just a select few. So it is not a class requirement. In the past, the individuals going are editors and those nominated for awards. We didn't vote on this last week? In the review of the request the committee looked at the Observer fund balance. They decided to table the request to

ask why they weren't using their fund balance. The carry-forward is combined within the funding cycle.

MOTION: Dane Gillin made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request # 2001 in the amount of \$12,858. Tonya Buchanan seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.

B. Committee Goals and Priorities

We need to develop a plan of action. It is difficult to hear supplemental requests and conduct business at the same time. This may not all get done this year. We should look at if we want to do base or supplemental funding first. We will do both, but we need to determine priorities and what direction we want to go.

Discussion: We should focus on base funding since next year we will be hearing base funding requests. We can leave supplemental for next year. Statutorily, the committee has the ability to propose program priorities and budget levels to higher administration. Historically, the main purpose is base funding. The committee has gone through a number of shifts. Previous fee was not as large and there were no supplementals. Base funding cycles have changed from 1 to 2 to 3 to 4 years based on the committee decisions and feedback from funded areas. Next year's committee would could make that decision. Base funding requests every year would take up a significant amount of time. Since our ability is to recommend, both base and supplemental funding fall under us. With the current process we have an annual review of our base funded groups and there are specific questions we ask. The questions are determined by the committee. We can determine at what capacity we want to review those. You have the ability to decide not to hear supplemental requests anymore, but we will need a plan to spend down that money to benefit students. Keep in mind the authority and ability of the committee is to recommend. We should think about that when making motions, we recommend funding, we do not approve it. Have any of the bodies above this committee ever denied anything that we have recommended? No, but there has been pushback and questions. We make recommendations to PBAC, they vote on it, and it comes back to us if they don't agree with our recommendations. If we disagree with their choice, we can go through dispute resolution. PBAC has asked questions about decisions, or asked the committee to be more mindful of certain things. In my experience, they haven't denied anything. They have asked detailed questions about funding departments and what the conversation around the table was like. As a caution – PBAC has asked questions about the process when it comes to funding departments. The last time there was pushback, it was when the committee chose not to fund pieces and it went through dispute resolution. The feedback is mostly about base funding, not supplemental. The members of PBAC do change, which can change the dynamics. Be mindful about the requests and the discussions around the table. It can be helpful to have a written statement. They do see the denials as well. There is more of a discussion as the dollar amounts go up. Dean Heinselman is a voting member of PBAC and can help speak to the wishes of the committee. In the past we have had committee members who sit on PBAC, there aren't this year. This can help cut down on the amount of back and forth. PBAC does have open meetings so committee members are welcome to go. We haven't seen department requests yet this year, but that is something they take more seriously. Some departments have different funding sources and different models they go through. PBAC looks at

the rationale of why they came to S&A. 2 years ago we approved funding for Orchestra and the BOT said they couldn't have supplemental funding but they could have base funding. Is this one of those situations? I believe so. What about the Rec Center? The Rec Center and SURC don't have other funding sources. Some areas are funded by student fees and some are funded through tuition. If other sources are available, they ask why they are requesting student funds. With the ASL funding for student wages, they didn't question the dollar figure, but the process and how the committee made a decision. PBAC will sometimes have the deans of the colleges at the table that they can ask when it could fall under academics. Looping back into the priorities conversation: How do we want to prioritize the ability to conduct committee business and review funding? How do we want to go about reviewing annual reports? What other information does the committee need? We will get to a point that we have to cut off supplemental funding. This may come in winter if we can't fit all the requests in. Normally we get maxed out in spring, but it may happen earlier if we keep getting more requests. How do you want to look at base funding this year? There will need to be adjustments to FY21 base funding, and we try to wrap that budget before the end of winter. It will need to go up to PBAC who meet in late February. We need to figure out how to structure time and prioritize the schedule. We need to determine how to conduct and assess base funding adjustments. We currently have no criteria for them. We need to discuss the structure and the supplemental requests we have now – the 16 this quarter and then a deadline or possibly a cap for next quarter. First we need to determine the criteria we are looking for, or we are spinning our wheels. There are two things tonight which may require a motion. First, do we want to form a subcommittee? Second, would we like to find a way to hear all of the requests before winter, or hear as many as we can? I would like to hear them all. Dean Heinselman has experience on committees like this – what other options might we have to balance things? You can create the options you need. Now that you are partially into the year, it may become an issue of equity for requesting groups. There are some models with one day a quarter to hear requests for a certain time frame. Some groups do it once a year for the following year. With the rolling model currently in place, you will need to give fair warning of any changes or be prepared to respond to their reactions. In the past there have been no firm dates or expectations. You roll the funding until it runs out. I've been in groups that set deadlines and breakup the funding into different pots for the quarters. There is always an annual review to discuss expectations of what you need from the presentations. You need to look at different categories differently. At a minimum, there should be an annual review. We have a bi-annual budget cycle as an institution, so base funding cycle needs to fit with that and be either 2 or 4 year cycles. Should align with that process since some groups get funds through the university process. Annual review is a wise choice and meets statutory authority over the funds. Our decisions are also reviewed by PBAC, the President, and the Board of Trustees – so they get the lens several times. Setting a date might be good. We can decide if we want to roll or separate dollar figures. We don't want to get locked into the current structure and try to squeeze in requests just because that's the way it has always been done if there are other models that work better. I would love to review the annual reports. There are 65 areas so this would take up a big chunk of time in January. A couple of base funding adjustments along with this could take half of winter. We may want to put together a calendar of what committee business we have and look at open dates to hear supplementals, so we have a plan going into spring. Will annual reports and

base funding adjustments come in together? That is the intent. All base funded areas also come in for program reviews. They are split into three groups to be heard in the three years between base funding cycles. So a third of the base funded areas will come into present in winter and spring as well as the review of the annual reports. This is a presentation by those area, not the same paper document as the annual reports. We can tweak what we need. It may be beneficial to look at the questions that are asked on the annual reports. Have we clustered the 3 groups of areas by type to create some standardization? It has been somewhat structured with like groups together. We haven't had these conversations about categories in the past. For base funding adjustments, it would be good to have the departments come in and present like we do for supplemental requests. That way we know what is happening and can ask questions. Based on equity, we need to have the 16 groups present this quarter based on the deadline that we determined. If they wanted to present in winter quarter they would have waited to submit their requests. If we hear the requests, we need to determine how to evaluate them so it is equitable. We don't want to run into this issue again in later quarters. I like the idea of spending January going through the adjustments and annual reports and then setting a date for supplementals. We would want to set a deadline if we are setting a date to start hearing supplementals. February 5th? A deadline on the 5th? Or a deadline in the middle of January and starting to hear requests on the 5th? You will want to give SURC accounting some time to process the requests. It can take a lot of time because we will need to meet with students. Around the 2nd or 3rd week of January would be good. If we set a deadline for January 22nd and start hearing presentations on the 5th of February, groups would need to be told now. This could put us in the same situation we have now where we don't have time. This quarter we gave a one-week window and only have 3 meetings left. This deadline would give us six meetings so we would have more scheduling flexibility. Could we set monetary standards for lodging or meals? This would eliminate some of the conversation and spend less time on presentations. Groups have had a wide range of hotel costs over the last couple of weeks. They can use funding from other areas if need be. Sounds great in some ways. Could use Per Diem, but conference hotels are sometimes an advantage to students. This may create an equity issue for those who cannot afford the difference in cost. Looking at the Killian, we could have a broader discussion about standards. How does travel fit into the Killian? What is the impact on the student body as a whole? Travel in general may be a broader discussion to have. Is a 10minute presentation a requirement? We established that standard and have the ability to change it. Other funding groups have less structured presentations.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to set a deadline for supplemental requests for winter 2020 as January 22nd, 2020, and to begin review of these requests on February 5th, 2020. Alex Harrington seconded.

Discussion: To stick with the current deadline structure, should we have it on a Friday? We moved the deadline to Wednesday this quarter. Would this work well with SURC Accounting? Yes. Is this predicated on the idea that we set up more structure. I am planning on another motion to form a subcommittee to have discussion about applying guidelines for looking at supplementals.

The previous motion was called to question. The motion carried with three abstentions.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to create a sub-committee which will create guidelines for evaluating funding. Edgar Carreno seconded.

Discussion:

Amendment: Eric Bennett amended his previous motion to state that the sub-committee will be charged with coming up with recommendations to present to the committee by December 15th, 2020. Jessica Thomas seconded.

Discussion: Good amendment.

The previous amendment was called to question. The amendment carried.

The previous motion was called to question. The motion carried.

Discussion: If anyone is interested in serving in the sub-committee, please let Joey know ASAP. As the Vice Chair, Edgar will chair the subcommittee. Do we need a motion to spend the rest of our meetings on supplemental requests? No. We will need to add an additional meeting. Aubrey will send out potential times so we are sure we can have quorum. No need to make a motion. To be clear, 16 requests have been submitted, but they still need to be vetted. Can Aubrey send out a DoodlePoll? Yes. Who would like to add a meeting and see all the requests for the quarter? Everybody. We will most likely need this additional meeting, but it may not be necessary. If you are interested in serving on the subcommittee, please let Joey know by Friday so we can start scheduling meetings. Is that for defining criteria for base funding or supplemental funding? Both.

Other Business: Communications Received

None.

Public Comment:

Tomorrow is Student Success Day. There will be lots of activities in the SURC from 11:30 to 1:30. Please come. It makes it easier for students to find the resources available to them.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Alex Harrington seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Schedule for Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 13, in SURC 301 starting at 5:30 p.m.