

**Services and Activities Fee Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**November 20, 2019**

**Called to order:**

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

**Attendance:**

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

Excused: Tonya Buchanan

**Agenda:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried.**

**Minutes:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes of November 13, 2019. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

**Reports:**

Chair – None.

Advisors – As an update on budgeting for Fiscal Year 21, PBAC made some decisions that will impact the budgeting process. Dates have been moved up and things will need to go to PBAC by the end of January. Joey and Lacy are currently working on scheduling January with base funding adjustments and Fiscal Year 21 budget presentations. Communication will be sent to the base funded areas this week. They should be ready to present at the beginning of winter.

As a committee we have approved to recommend \$80,000 of the supplemental budget to date. \$32,000 is on the docket for tonight and requests to date total \$204,000 out of the \$300,000 budget.

Discussion: Keep in mind the future requests we may or may not see, especially from base funded areas which should be our first priority. We are on trend to run out of funding before winter ends. We should put an emphasis on the stewardship of the funds and their longevity.

The next meeting will be December 4<sup>th</sup>, and we will be meeting in SURC 202.

Annual reports from base funded areas are due on December 1<sup>st</sup>. There are updates to them that are waiting something from Fiscal Year 19 to open. We are tentatively extending that deadline to December 16<sup>th</sup>.

The minutes have been doing a good job of documenting all of the points of discussion. I appreciate you all reading thoroughly through them.

I [Joey Bryant] am currently on call, so I will need to step out if this phone rings.

### **Public Comment:**

Last week, with the funding request about the Jazz students' trip to Vietnam, I [Eric Bennett] want to explain why I voted no. I had asked about why no women were going and the response was that none were invited. I find this distasteful if CWU wants to promote diversity and equity. Students should go to events that support the same ideals. We should think about not participating in conferences that don't invite young women.

When we are in discussion before voting, please be mindful to explain why you may be voting no in the discussion. It may influence someone around the table and it also lets funding groups know why we may not be funding them.

Thank you Eric for bringing that up.

### **Old Business:**

#### **A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting**

- i. #2010: American Conference for Irish Studies - \$1,808.22

Discussion: I do not think we should fund travel until we have a way to determine the impact on the student body. The sub-committee is getting there. I agree that we need to have a discussion about travel. It behooves us to continue with our current processes because we have not discussed how to evaluate travel.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2010 in the amount of \$1,809. Dane Gillin seconded.**

Discussion: I agree, we need to get there, but to continue with the current process would be fair. New processes may not come into effect this quarter for continuity reasons. However, if you find something difficult to support, I am not saying to vote yes on it. Let's give everyone the benefit of the doubt that met the deadline we established for this quarter. I agree we should be consistent and I will therefore be consistent in my vote against funding.

**The previous motion was called to question. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- ii. #2011: Music Business Clinic (CWU JEN) - \$1,200

Discussion: Lacy mentioned it is common for clubs to use club funds and then seek reimbursement. Correct. I have received communication from this club as well. To summarize, the club used club funding to front the costs for the contract in hopes of getting reimbursement to the club account. This happens frequently. I think if the funds were present in the account, there is no need to reimburse. I agree, if there were funds in the account this is not a necessity. Were they comfortable spending the money from their account if funding was denied? We asked, there was some confusion followed by discussion of the JEN conference they had requested funds for. They initially planned to request through SAS, but were advised to come to S&A because club funds council was not yet set up to accept requests. It is in the minutes. We asked, they said the funding came from the club account and that funding would be used for other

events JEN hosts. So, JEN would be coming forward with other requests for those events. I would like to see those requests and the financial status of the club at the time.

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to deny Supplemental Funding Request #2011. Edgar Carreno seconded.**

Discussion: We would be denying the request because they have funds in the account and can come forward in the future. Is this consistent with what we have done? Yes, they can request in the future. It is consistent with the committee asking what the available funds would otherwise be allocated for. This is the same answer the Observer gave us and we approved that request. We had another group that came forward with funds available. They basically said if we don't get approved now, we will have to ask for it later. I would like to note my nay vote on the Observer request. The Observer was funding student wages. We need to stay on topic with this request.

**The previous motion was called to question. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- iii. #2012: Association of Writers & Writing Programs Conference - \$935  
Discussion: We get requests from many departments and Creative Writing is not something we see all the time. I think it is important to support them.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2012 in the amount of \$935. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- iv. #2014: AMA Annual Conference (CWU Marketing Association) - \$21,488  
Discussion: If I remember correctly they were taking 18 students with them. This is more that I would consider to be a good group.

**MOTION: Eric made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2012 in the amount of \$8,000. Dane Gillin seconded.**

Discussion: Why \$8,000? They have \$9,000 in the club account that they can use to fund more students. S&A is here to support all students. With that in the bank it behooves them to use it if they want more than a cursory amount of students to go.

**The previous motion was called to question. The motion carried with two abstentions.**

- v. #2015: Santa Barbara Shootout Tournament (Women's Lacrosse Club) - \$6,000  
Discussion: In the presentation they discussed that they were unable to go last year. I like that they returned to Rec to see if they could get funding. They were approved for \$5,000 in funding with the potential for more. To create equity and diversity I feel we should have female sporting events as much as male. The team contributes to the Ellensburg community and is trying to spread lacrosse across the state.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2015 in the amount of \$6,000. Edgar Carreno seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

**New Business:**

**A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Presentations**

i. #2013: Wildfest 2020 (Campus Activities) - \$24,000

It has been a proposition for many years to have a whole day of activities for student appreciation. This event is 100% student driven. Last year they worked with partners from all over campus. The budget last year was \$40,000 and that is what Campus Activities earmarked to be set aside for this year. 40-50% goes to artist costs. This was all students, from funding, media, artists, auditions, talent, and even set up/take down. Last year Hobo Johnson was chosen by students, and other performers were students. This year the hope is to go bigger. The event will be held May 28, 2020 in the Recreation Sports Complex. They are looking for funding for a larger artist. When they have a budget, they can get a list of artists that can be released to the students to vote on. They want this event to be free to students, which is why they are seeking funding. The artists also have tech requirements, and the larger the artist, the more requirements they will have. Last year there were 2,100 in attendance, which is the largest student activity to date and a 35% increase over 2018, and the event won student-driven program of the year. This year they hope to grow the program, have a bigger artist (in the \$30,000-\$45,000 price range), have more involvement from campus partners, and potentially have sponsors.

Presented by: Robbie and Ronnie

Questions: What is your plan if funding is denied? We have two potential routes. One is to see what additional sponsors we can find. The second is to downgrade the program or decide if we need to charge a fee. That photo looks like a small crowd, is the 28<sup>th</sup> a Thursday? Yes, we traditionally host this event on the last Thursday of May. It is in the evening from 4:00-11:00. We have classes that go until 9:00, have you thought about a weekend? This is usually the Thursday before Memorial Day, which would not be a good weekend to have an event. There is a lot of programming to compete with in May, but this day has been unofficially earmarked for this event. How much was the artist price range in prior years? It was \$24,000 in 2019 and \$18,000 in 2018. Do you attribute the growth of the program to an increase in funding? It has to do with the variety of activities available. Big, multi-hour events are more successful. The \$24,000 is in addition to the allocation? Correct. We have secured most of the funding. Rec and Dining were unable to contribute at the same level this year. We are coming up with the difference. This is still student driven? Yes, there is student talent, we have students working on the audition process, student interns, and media and marketing students. Do we have an estimate of how many students are taking the poll to vote for an artist? Last year it was 1,400, in 2018 it was about 900. We plan to use student platforms to distribute the poll such as Hype and social media, and not rely on just a Twitter poll. What time of day is pictured

there? Hobo Johnson went on at 8:00. I am not sure if that is during that time. Is that your peak time? The peak time was about 7:00 and there were 2,100 entrances over the day. Is the total cost \$63,000? Last year we spent about \$55,000. Asking to spend more this year. Is the 2,100 individual students, or number of entrances? We were able to use the connection card swipes to count the individual students and to also ensure that everyone at the event was a student.

ii. #2016: Society of Physics Students National Conference (CWU Chapter - Society of Physics Students)- \$3,155.41

The Society of Physics Students is seeking reimbursement for a congress they attended last week in Providence Rhode Island. 5 members attended and met scientists and professors in the field including a Nobel Prize winner. There was a grad school fair in which they got to explore different programs and specializations, as well as table for their own SPS chapter. CWU was one out of two schools from the Washington/Oregon zone to attend the conference. They learned about fundraising and outreach opportunities, had lunch with scientists, and attended a panel of graduate students. They are requesting \$3,155.41 rather than the \$4,231.77 shown on the original paperwork. They received \$2,000 from SAS and one student received a scholarship.

Presented by: Natalie Velez

Questions: Looks like this is a good event and networking opportunity, but what are you doing to impact the rest of the student body? Our advisor went to the grad fair every day and grabbed information and brochures to compile a list of options for students here as they think about grad schools. It was helpful to talk with schools across the nation and make connections with the other school in our zone that attended. We brought home ideas on how to better serve our students. We are an outreach focused club, but this congress helped us realize that we have neglected student support. Mental health was a focus of the congress. This helped us realize how important it is to have resources to support physics students. 2 members were a part of the congress, how did the other students get selected? Everyone was invited, but we did have to pay out of pocket with the hope of getting reimbursed. Those who couldn't pay out of pocket were not able to attend.

iii. #2017: Lion Rock Visiting Writers Series - \$3,000

This series brings acclaimed writers from all over the nation to the Central campus. This creates a forum for student involvement and a model for professional engagement. The event promotes and connects to the mission and goals of the department for more representation. These sessions are recorded and can be shared within the Central community. This also provides a showcase for faculty and alumni. There is a culture of interdisciplinary collaboration, as several departments' help, such as the Brooks Library hosting. These events happen quarterly. Funds are needed for the planned events in winter and spring.

Presented by: Maya and Gabby

Questions: How many students attend this event versus community members? We don't have a specific count. The last event I know there was at least 100 of *my* students there. It is mostly students, but there are community members too. In the past it has been hit or miss. We focus on student outreach. We always set up between 75 and 1-00 chairs and there are people standing. It is a small space so it is not our goal to get thousands to attend. Is Lion Rock a program in the English Department? It is a writer's series sponsored by the English Department. It is only connected with a course in the spring. It is meant to serve the entire campus community. Is this a school program? Yes. Why does the English department not fund this? No money from the English department can go to this. You could consider it English funding since you get funding from the College of Arts and Humanities. Yes, it gets approved at the college level. Does anyone get credit for this? They study the authors in spring, but credit is not tied to the event. Some people get extra credit. I encourage all my students to go. Does Lion Rock have base funding? No, they got supplemental last year in the same amount. Part of that money went to a nationally acclaimed author whose fee is normally \$6,000, but we had her for \$4,000.

iv. #2018: Hawaii International Conference on Education - \$4,816

A group of four students were selected by a panel of educators to attend the Hawaii International Conference on Education on January 4-7, 2020. They have asked SAS for \$1,362 and are asking S&A for \$4,816. The Education Department has granted them \$1,000 (not sure if as a group or individually). They have each also applied for a travel grant for \$750. The total estimated cost is \$13,785. It is costly, but an honor to be selected to go to the conference. They have made careful spending decisions like eating breakfast at the hotel and taking shuttles to the airport. CWU is being awarded the HEED award. There are new findings by Dr. Daisy Reyes that they would like to address and act as the catalyst for change. We There is an emphasis on being inclusive and reaching everybody. One way is to take what they learn from the conference and apply it at Central. They will be fully submerged in a multi-cultural atmosphere. They will also be published in four undergraduate journals under the CWU name.

Presented by: Chelsea, Emilia, Areli, and Hailey

Questions: If S&A denies funding, what is the plan moving forward? We plan to work hard to gather feedback on our presentation so that we can improve it and continue to go to other funding sources. We may have to cut down on days or lose a member, but then we would lose the opportunity to present. You mentioned that Dr. Flores recommended you to apply, did she indicate that the department would help fund the trip? Yes, we went there first. With persistence we got \$1,000 of funding, but we are unsure if that is as a group or individually. We are hopeful that it is individual since that is what we requested. We are all sacrificing a lot of time to do these presentations. It is disheartening to hear that students don't get as much funding as faculty. Since we are representing the department, we discussed with them that we are expecting department funding. What is

the amount you are getting from the department? We got an email saying that we would be funded \$1,000. We have not heard back yet about whether this is individually or as a group. Have you gone to the DEC yet? We are focusing on the large funding sources first. Are you requesting \$13,000 or \$4,000? The \$13,000 was overall cost. The request is the \$4,000.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn for five minutes. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion Carried.**

**Meeting was called back to order at 6:58 p.m.**

**B. Sub-Committee Report:**

The sub-committee has two main projects. One is to create KPIs to measure the base funded areas moving forward. The other is to create a procedure for how to fairly and efficiently evaluate supplemental requests. We are still in the process of creating guidelines for the supplementals. This will allow a clear direction on how to fund supplemental. Tonight we want to talk about base funding. We have established a form of questions to add on to the annual reports for base funded areas. (Please see Addendum #1). Asking these 12 questions will collect data which will help us mold the KPIs. Please look at the 12 questions and we would like your thoughts and suggestions. We want the departments to answer to their best ability. This can help us determine how to help the areas collect data. The first two questions are already a part of the annual review process and the rest are new. You can ask questions as you read through these.

Discussion: For #3, are they forecasting for the upcoming year? These are past tense. It will be answered for Fiscal Year 19. This would not make sense without a financial report, but those reports will be expanded. Goods and services will be multiple lines instead of one line. They should earmark what is mandatory vs. discretionary spending. Are we asking what the plan is to spend the remainder of their allocation, or what they spent the budget on? We just want to see how it is being spent. It shouldn't be put into large groups, but broken down into costs so we have more information. The grammar should be "spent". For the sake of the base funded areas, we may want to give an example of the degree of detail we are looking for. Otherwise some areas may be too detailed. There would be common areas where we could give an example but not detail everything. Categories will not be as detailed as "pens". There are some set categories we could use. We would want to give each department a chance to explain what those categories consist of in their area. In SURC Accounting, goods and services are minimal whereas our largest expenses is student wages and staffing. Is "student wages" too vague as a category? #5 has more detail about student wages. At this point it is not clear what details are needed. These questions are the first step towards figuring that out. The 56 directors are going to be asking how much detail they need. These areas are so different, some may have detailed answers to some of the questions, but only be able to answer a few. This can help us capture parts of the base funded areas. It is not perfect but it is a start. You spoke about the sub-committee developing KPIs and a model for these requests. Are these questions a year-end report, or are these meant to be the KPIs? We have a lot of questions to answer before we set up KPIs. This is the first step. These

questions will be included in the annual report for each program. These will inform our future work on developing KPIs. The sub-committee will form these, rather than the departments? That depends on the timeline and if we collect all of the information that we need in time. It would be the responsibility of the sub-committee to develop these. S&A can have a handful of standard KPIs, and the programs can expand on their own. Some of these things they may already measure. Base funded areas can range from bonded operations, to small amounts of student wages. The first step is to categorize. We have no idea what the categories there will be until we collect the data and develop performance indicators. These 12 questions can help us see the themes in the departments. Any department has goals and measurements. KPIs help us determine if the groups are trending towards their goals and how healthy things are. KPIs may be more practical to see how groups are doing with regards to their goals. If they are funded, are they achieving the goals they presented to us or can you explain why not? The 12<sup>th</sup> question alludes to that. It asks what their initiatives/goals are. Gives us an idea of what goals are set. Currently there is no documentation of these goals. The hope is to document them so that we can compare year to year. This is a starting place. With #11, since this is in connection to annual reports and not a funding request, we may want to re-word that to say “if your funding was lowered or not funded”. Can we change funding in the middle of a funding cycle? We have the purview to review and recommend a change in funding to PBAC if we have a strong reason based on an unallowable use of funds, or funds not being used for the purpose that they were allocated for. Some rewording to the questions would be good. If this is approved, we will send it out to the base funded areas. I recommend you review this at our next meeting so that we can send it out to those areas. You can update the grammar or add questions you think should be asked. This questionnaire is for the end of the fiscal year. Are those reports due in June? They are due December 1<sup>st</sup>, but we are looking at moving that date to the 16<sup>th</sup>. This is for the annual review of last year. Yes. The base funded areas were sent the questions from years past. We may want to extend the deadline to give them time to answer these. Questions 1 and 2 and 10 to an extent were already on the old set of questions, and 5 and 6 were answered in the program reviews. Most of these are not out of the norm. Some areas may not have all of the information. It may be helpful to know what information departments have. If most departments aren’t collecting a certain kind of data we may not be able to use it as a KPI immediately. #4 may not be answerable for last year by all areas. SURC Accounting would have no way to answer that yet. We would respond saying that we do not have the information and that we would need more resources to collect it. If we don’t have the data, it would be good to know why. This lets us know what data departments do or do not have and what we think is necessary. These questions are like a survey to give us a sense of direction moving forward. If an area cannot answer a question, they need a guideline of what to answer so that we understand why. We could give options like “we don’t have the resources” and if we want this from every group then we need to provide those resources. That is ideally business we could do as a committee. The advisors of the committee could do an open forum with the directors of the base funded areas so that they fully understand the new process. Assuming that the committee chooses to move forward with this, we can send it out to the base funded areas. Just so you know, these individuals have a lot on their plate right now and they would have to turn this around quickly. Extending the deadline would give them the opportunity to focus on their FY21 budgets. I am not aware of all of the groups

with base funding, but they are broad and not every question will be answerable by every area. I am unsure of how to address that. That is the biggest uphill battle. We can look at the Killian for categories. The questionnaire can help us answer some of the questions about different categories. Some may have different questions they can answer. Using something as solid as the Killian will give us something to reference back to. Is it worthwhile to look at each area and set questions for each one individually? It would be helpful to have standard questions. Our role is to determine the questions applicable to the areas. Do we need to look at each individual area before the annual report is submitted? As we look at the questionnaire and annual reports, things will come up. We can ask the areas to come in. There may be some areas that cannot answer any of these questions. I advise we send this out to collect the initial information. I recommend that we revise #11 to say “what would be the impact if we reduced your funding by 20%; what would be the impact if we increased it by 20%”. Less threatening, because we are not eliminating funding, we are looking at investments. That is a good idea, we will edit #11. I like what Josh said, we should ask what the goals or learning objectives are. We should also ask this when we are base funding. This gives us the ability to see if those objectives are met. A lot of the areas will be very different. That was the intent. We will be taking edits on these questions. This will be on the agenda for the December 4<sup>th</sup> for a vote. We will take your suggestions over the next two weeks. The deadline for the annual reports can be discussed further on the 4<sup>th</sup>. The first two meetings of Winter Quarter, maybe the first three, already have full agendas. We can push the deadline to mid to late January. I am curious about the sub-committee’s discussion about requests for travel. We may want to use a similar format to Undergraduate Studies where we do approvals quarterly. The sub-committees still working on things. Some of the ideas may require changes to our guidelines. Supplemental funding is currently treated and presented like base funding. Another future discussion would be the possibility of doing a format similar to OUR where the requests are essay based and we remove the presentation portion. There would be one day a quarter to sit down and go through the requests and do day-of voting. It would not bog-down the rest of the meetings. We are looking at our model and also looking at the limitations. We could do a price-per-person lump sum. We are looking at what would be the best fit for us. To remove presentations would be a change to procedures. These changes will take time, but will maximize the processes. It is a work in progress to figure out our guidelines.

### **Other Business: Communications Received**

None.

### **Public Comment:**

On Monday there was mediation between areas of the administration and two base funded areas which presented themselves under the title of “Student Media”. The minutes of the meeting can help make specifics clearer. I will give a brief overview. A couple of articles and a protest have been held around some allegations of censorship. The articles had specific instances that were discussed in the mediation. There was an article about Athletics communication which, when discussed, it came to light that a lot of the information was false. One being a conversation with Caleb Dunlop who had allegedly informed a student not to speak with student media. It came out that this was not the case, and that student media was aware of this before publishing. Other examples include saying Dr. Elbert was not allowing interviews unless questions were submitted

to her beforehand. This was not the case and no interviews have been denied between the meeting which resolved how interviews would be conducted and the protests. Based on this information, in the mediation there was a consensus that there was not censorship. There was not consensus regarding publicizing that there was no censorship. This ties into the stewardship of student funds. Funds are going to these organizations and they are providing information that is not adhering to their mission or what they have been funded for. It is hard to imagine a scenario – where the media was aware of this information and publicized anyway – that is not a malicious and purposeful misrepresentation of information. This is not adhering to the standards and mission that we funded them for. I suggest that we give them the opportunity to come in to present on potential solutions. If those are not acceptable I would like to propose a resolution, if it would be allowed on the record, I will read what this resolution would look like. (Please see Addendum #2). That is the proposal I would like to submit if we are not provided with a resolution for the misuse of funds.

Discussion: For context, we cannot make any decisions based on the content of student media. We have the purview to see if the funds are being used in the way they are allocated. We can see if the spending is allowable or an appropriate use of student funds. But our discussions cannot be based on the content. Other boards on campus have the purview to look at the content part. If we want to look into this, we can review the allocation and allowable use and make a recommendation to PBAC. We need to avoid any point about content as this can be views as censorship or retaliatory. We need to be intentional with how we go about this. We can ask about spending, but not content. Other places in the university deal with content. In the proposal it mentioned a “misuse of funds” can you elaborate on this? The proposal did not say “misuse of funds”. Okay, we need to be careful with that term. It is a slippery slope. It is protocol to initiate an investigation. If anybody has any information that alludes to a misuse of funds with base funded departments, please let us know. Misuse is a serious term, so please feel free to come forward. For context, the proposal did say they were a poor steward of student fees. These are questions within our purview. With these allegations of violation, has anything been referred to Student Conduct. We cannot say. Is it being considered? This is not relevant to this committee. We need to focus on the purpose of the committee. Students do not have any control over budgets or base funding, you mentioned having the advisors come in. It would be the professional staff in the conversation. Would you want to bring the advisors in? That is within our purview. Is this just the Observer and Central News Watch, or all media? It would be good to get clarification on that, as they referred to themselves as “student media” in prior meetings. I believe there is one business manager for all four areas, and four separate advisors. To be consistent and equitable we would need to include all similar areas. So all four aspects of student media and any other similar groups. We need to be intentional to include other areas that may fall under the questions we need to ask. How is this malicious? In one instance, there was an Athletics story that was being crafted around a coach leaving. Media reached out to the department and got the response that they would try to schedule something when time allowed. The same occurred with students. Media then reached out to former players and the athletes went to ask the athletics department. The individual in athletics said that it was the choice of the athletes. Because the athletes decided to decline the interview, it was the media’s understanding that they were under pressure to not speak. There was a meeting between media and athletics to

clarify the situation. Documentation was provided to the contrary and this was understood by both parties. Then the story was published that Athletics pressured students not to speak to the media. Everyone understood that was not what occurred, but they published that it did occur. We could chalk that up to negligence. Malicious is different. Part of the meeting was to discuss the intent and character of the media. Can you definitively say it was malicious? This is why we want to have this conversation. From the discussion we had, it seemed deliberate. Legally, malice is an important word. This is public comment. But the committee does not have purview over whether this was malicious. Is there an investigation from other powers that be, or is this resolved? If this is the case, it sounds like there should be administration involved. Are we punishing students for faculty decisions? This would be good to discuss outside of our purview. We fund the Observer for printing. Are we questioning how they spend the funding? Part of the question is what specifically we fund them for. We as a committee need to remain within our purview. I do not feel that we should be discussing this. It sounds like retaliation to discuss this, even if it is only as a recommendation. I don't want this to turn into a tit-for-tat situation. I think we are retaliating to discuss this. I don't want any problems for the committee. Looking at the funding piece is within our purview. It would not be about content, it would be about performance and printing. Maybe we can use the questions discussed earlier as a guide. Is that why we want to bring them in? Yes, we wouldn't want to bring in the students. It is a question of the mission of what and how they are funded for. We must be careful because this could be the censorship they are talking about. Raising this specter – taking funding away could potentially end production. This is censorship. We should use the review of our questionnaire to see if we have any questions to call them in for. Is there a timeline to call them in by? There is no requirement. We are entertaining the idea of having them in. I think we should simmer down and table this until the first of the year to let cooler heads prevail. Is there a need to make a motion? There is not a need. I think we are just crossing a boundary now without having all of the information we need and without giving them adequate time to respond. I would like to amend that we table this until we receive the annual reports from all the base funded areas. There is no need to make a motion. I agree.

During one of the presentations tonight I thought I understood more students wanted to go, but could not afford to pay the costs up front. Is there a way we mitigate this as an issue of equity? According to the guidelines, S&A funding is reimbursement only for supplemental requests. In theory, the students have to front the costs out of pocket. Student Involvement has been able to adapt to help with this. The students can pay everything up front and get reimbursed, or they can meet with a student engagement coordinator. They can prepay for state-allowable pieces. This is the biggest chunk out of travel. This is new this year and specific to clubs and orgs. They would go through a funds request, but after they are approved we can release the funds the next day. This helps students who would not be able to pre-pay. Not all trips are associated with clubs and orgs though. Some departments on campus help. If there is not a department to help, this is a conversation in the works. Some of the requests come in after the fact. They have to submit the request ahead of time to go through the process. From my end, I see the students with financial struggles. It is a good feeling to have departments extend help to students. It is a much easier process and a lot happier when we can work with the department for reimbursement.

**Adjournment:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Edgar Carreno seconded. Motion carried with one abstention. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.**

**Schedule for Next Meeting:**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 2019, in SURC 202 starting at 5:30 p.m.

# ADDENDUM #1

## S&A Annual Financial Report Questionnaire

1. Please list any S&A funded positions that have been vacant longer than six months. If any vacancies exist, please explain how you utilized the funds and what your long-term plans are for the position?
2. Provide a detailed explanation of any fund transfers from one service and activities fund budget to another.
3. Please provide an explanation of how the program plans to spend the budget in each line item of the Annual Financial Report, including an explanation of increases or decreases from the previous year's request. Items that are vague, such as "contract services" should be clearly explained.
4. How many students utilize the services and activities provided by your program? Describe how statistics are obtained and provide demographics on graduate, undergraduate, male, female or other categories you believe important and relevant to your unit.
5. Does your program provide employment opportunities for students? Please explain the nature of student employment within your unit, including total FTE and number of students employed.
6. How do you gauge the effectiveness of the services and activities you provide to students? Is student input collected and used in this process? If your unit has an advisory committee, in what capacity is it involved in your budgeting process?
7. How do you ensure that student fees do not subsidize non-student uses? If previous requests have included statistical analysis on this point, please provide similar analysis using this year's demographics.
8. Have alternative (non-S&A Fee) funding sources been pursued to the fullest possible extent? If yes, please elaborate. To what extent does your unit rely on earned income?
9. Are there any long-term obligations associated with this funding request?
10. What was your fund balance at the end of the year? If positive or negative, please provide a detail explanation on your spending plan?
11. What is the impact to service students if your request is not funded or lowered?
12. What are three new initiatives for future years?

# ADDENDUM #2



LEARN. DO. LIVE.

## Resolution 19-01

### A Resolution on the S&A Committee's Funding of Student Media

**WHEREAS**, Student Media deliberately and maliciously misrepresented the actions and statements of members of the Central Washington University community, including members of university administration, the Associated Students of Central Washington University, and CWU alumni; and

**WHEREAS**, Student Media willfully provided misinformation to the student body, an action which is in direct opposition to their mission and purpose; and

**WHEREAS**, Student Media has failed to adhere to agreements that were reached in meetings between itself and the Central Washington University administration; and

**WHEREAS**, Student Media was a poor steward of student fees;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the CWU Services & Activities Fee Committee will, effective immediately, cease base funding and retract current base funding for Student Media, including the Observer and Central News Watch.

**ADOPTED** and signed this day of December 4, 2019.

### Services & Activities Fee Committee

Office of the Dean of Student Success

400 E University Way • Ellensburg WA 98926-7432 • Office: 509-963-1515  
Bouillon 204 • Email: [aubrey.heim@cwu.edu](mailto:aubrey.heim@cwu.edu) • Web: [cwu.edu/services-activities](http://cwu.edu/services-activities)  
EEO/AA/TITLE IX INSTITUTION • FOR ACCOMMODATION EMAIL: [DS@CWU.EDU](mailto:DS@CWU.EDU).