

**Services and Activities Fee Committee
Minutes
February 5, 2020**

Called to order:

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

Attendance:

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

Excused: Edgar Carreno

Agenda:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion carried.

Minutes:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes of January 29, 2020. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.

Reports:

Chair – None.

Advisors – There is \$92,183.17 left in the Supplemental budget for the year. We do have a budget discussion under New Business tonight.

We did get an email response from Lauren Hibbs regarding our questions about the definition change for Westside Student Affairs. I will forward this on to all of you.

S&A Committee Members,

Thank you for your consideration and curiosity about the Westside Student Life S&A definition and the proposed language change. The question you are faced is one of a changing world and a new model of business. These considerations will no doubt continue into your professional careers.

The short answer to your question is that the requested definition is intended to serve and provide access to all CWU students, regardless of location or modality. S&A funded activities and services by nature are not exclusive, however, the design and access to those services differ (quite dramatically) for varying populations. For example, a CWU-Ellensburg student may have the opportunity to attend a CWU-Lynnwood event, but the

program design (time, location, accessibility), may present a significant barrier for attendance.

University Center programs current enroll 1240 students across 8 locations. University Center coursework is delivered in-seat, hybrid, and online. These students all are assigned to a specific University Center location. The University Center S&A funds are intended for specific programs and services designed to target these 1240 students. The current Westside S&A funding (\$257,000) and staffing (2 FTE Student Life personnel) have not been designed to differentiate service and program delivery to the online population. Access to online services and programs is notable different.

From fall 2018 to fall 2019 CWU's online enrollment grew by 7.1% or 699 students (Source: IE non-IPEDs enrollment data). Fully online students are a differing population of students beyond the 1240 University Center students previously identified.

This is a complex issue to understand and we recognize you seek to make an informed decision. We welcome the opportunity to share more with you in person at the February 26th meeting while present on campus.

Lauren Hibbs, Ed.D

The request is to change their definition to be inclusive of the Eastside. To approve this change the committee would have to make a motion.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the proposed definition change for Westside Student Affairs. Dane Gillin seconded.

Discussion: We are changing the definition from what to what? Currently the definition only supports the Westside, the proposed change includes all 8 centers.

Motion carried.

Public Comment:

None.

Old Business:

A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting

- i. #2032: Cross Cultural Leadership Program (CLCE) – \$19,150

Discussion: The CLCE does a wonderful job of bringing volunteer opportunities and bringing students together for community. This is important to support.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2032 in the amount of \$19,150. There was no second. Motion died.

What are your thoughts? I am conflicted. This is a group of leaders that do wonderful things. We need to treat groups equitably. We should give to those that do not have opportunities. Comparing this to a group that is attending a conference for the first time. I have no doubt this group will go on to be community leaders. They already are leaders. I can't say that it is equitable to give an opportunity for leadership to those that already have leadership. We have been approving the majority of funding since the beginning of the year. In previous weeks I suggested we cut funding and that was not popular. We can't have it both ways. We need to either cut funding or spend until we reach zero. I think I was wrong last week to suggest cutting funding. Part of the discussion we are having is being consistent in voting. To be consistent is without regard to the current budget. It should be first come first served until the budget is gone. How are we supposed to make these decisions without discussing the plan moving forward? It is important you determine if requests are allowable – we will not put anything in front of you that is not allowable – and what the benefit is to those going and for the larger community. Do you see the value? You need to be consistent. Look at each request individually as if this was the first funding request. Be mindful to articulate if you are not in favor of something so we can discuss it as a group and provide information to our requestors of what we are looking for. I do see where you are coming from in trying to be equitable. The decrease in the budget is making people more aware of the benefits to Central from the groups going. Is this going to help Central, or the group going? This all makes sense as we are running towards the end of the money. A much larger pot is there. If this was the beginning of the year I may have a different opinion. What is the benefit for CWU? We ask that of the presenting groups. These ten students are a part of CWU – a small part. This is a unique opportunity. They haven't come to us for funding this trip in the past and won't come to us next year. Other groups come every year. We should weigh each like this is the first week of meetings. Last week took a turn to analyze the bigger requests. We need to continue criticizing in the proper way. There needs to be a balance. It is hard to put a definition of that balance. This is expensive but these students are committed. Previous funding has not been through S&A nor will future funding be. They have a good source of fundraising. This is across the world so it is expensive. This will benefit students on campus. They talked about that.

MOTION: Dane Gillin made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2032 in the amount of \$19,150. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried with four abstentions.

- ii. #2033: 2020 Women in Aviation Conference (Women in Aviation CWU Chapter) - \$6,600
Discussion: Two years ago this was a brand new club. They were still trying to figure out funding sources. It is nice to see the club come back and continue to grow and support diversity in our airline program where the majority are male.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2033 in the amount of \$6,600. Josh Hibbard seconded.

Discussion: I wrote down \$6,000, is that what is on the original form? They updated to \$6,600.

Motion carried with three abstentions.

iii. #2034: Alpha Kappa Psi Conference - \$2,102.39

Discussion: Does the Funds Council request reduce this or is it in addition to this? I believe it is in addition. Funds Council would be on top of this. They have not confirmed the \$2,000 from Funds Council. Were they going to use only \$250 from their club account? They have \$2,000 in the account. Didn't we ask about that? They said if they did not receive funding from us they would pay out of pocket? That is in the minutes. If we would like to continue to discuss this there should be a motion of some sort. Point of information – if there is no motion or discussion the request goes nowhere. When do they hear back from Funds Council? Later tonight. I guess that wouldn't affect us anyway.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2034 in the amount of \$2,102.39. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried.

New Business:

A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Presentations

i. #2035: Women in Jazz Day (CWU JEN) - \$1,493.42

CWU JEN is requesting a secondary sum for their Women in Jazz Day. Their original request assumed that they would receive funding from ESC, which they later found was not taking requests from clubs this year. They are requesting an additional \$1,493.42 to cover the lodging costs of their clinicians.

Presented by: Joel

Questions: \$1,493.42? Yes. Things have moved around at the last minute. Are the clinician fees separate from the honorarium? The honorarium is the fees, hotels, gas, and flights. We need that up front. Since the DEC is funding you \$500, I assume that you support their missions. Can you expand on that? This is an event that we put on once a year to promote gender equality in the field of Jazz. We funded this already this year? Yes, in November it was funded \$10,250 with the understanding that the rest would come from ESC or the club account. ESC is not taking requests from clubs this year. You said that you had a denied request that affected this? Yes, there was one request for \$1,200 which was denied that we used club funds for. Your request says that this event will be a development opportunity for faculty and students – have you approached faculty about any professional development funding? In the past the music department was able to

contribute funding to this event. This year we have been told they are unable to do so. Have you considered asking for a donation from participants? A big part of our mission is to make the event free. I believe we can accept donations but we are not allowed to ask for them. Are you allowed to charge an admittance? We are allowed but it makes the event less accessible and it is hard to ask for university funding and then charge students to attend. Do you have information about attendance numbers from the past? There are about 100-150 participants and about half are from CWU. Are the others from local colleges or high schools? They are from neighboring schools. Ellensburg High School and Middle School and a few from the Westside. We have seen some of those students show up as freshmen in later years.

- ii. #2036: NFL Career Conference - \$1,867.67
Seven students from the Sports Management major and Sports Business minor are requesting funding for flights the NLF Career Conference in Indianapolis on February 26-29. During the conference the students will network and collect information on changes and innovations in the field. This will be the first out of state conference that students in the department attend. The students hope to bring the connections they make back to campus.

Presented by: Julie

Questions: Did you all fundraise for the Airbnb? No, it is out of pocket. Time was not on our side for fundraising. Have you met with Funds Council? We meet later tonight. If Funds Council decides to not support your request, what is the next plan? Most things have already been purchased, so it would be on me to break up the funding and hopefully get it back. How were the 7 selected to go? Were any unable to attend due to the out of pocket costs? One chose not to go after we had discussed what might come out of pocket. There was about \$75 each for the Airbnb. We are planning to cook meals as a group that we can share. So there would be a little more to go to the group fund. We may tour Pacer's Stadium, and we would most likely have to buy a ticket to the game. An email went out to students in the department about who would be interested in going. We held an informational meeting. 9 people attended. One could not go due to timing. The other one had the potential funding issue. I told them to let me know if it was a money thing and we could work something out. They did not take me up on that.

- iii. #2037: Sibshop Training (Family & Child Life Program) - \$7,000
The Family and Child Life Program is requesting funding to host a Sibshop training here on campus. Sibshop is a special place for the siblings of children with special needs – a population that is often overlooked. This would be a two day training. Day one would be open to the public up to about 85 people. This day would be to help raise awareness of the needs of these siblings. Day two would be a hands on Sibshop training open to 35 people beginning with those in

an FCL course, and then opened up to other CWU students. Those that attend both days will be Sibshop certified, which is a great addition to a resume.

Presented by: Katie and Kristen

Questions: What is the age range served? School aged. We focus on elementary aged and there are other programs for teens. We can provide other resources for teens, they are not turned away. We are focused on ages 6-12 though. The second day of the event is open to FCL first and then to CWU or the public? If we do not fill all 35 slots then we will open to the community. The intention is for this to be for CWU students. Is this required for FCL students? This is not required and there is no extra credit for it. It is going to be on a Friday and Saturday so that did not seem fair. How many students are there in FCL? There are 13 in my cohort but a lot in the program. There are 25 in the class that is getting the opportunity to register first. The plan is to market this and target service majors – education and special education. This will probably be first come first served. You have to attend both days to be certified? Will this cause an issue for those with classes on Friday? FCL doesn't have classes on Friday, and there are not a lot of classes for Education of Fridays. They may have to ask to be excused. There is only one trainer in the whole world that can lead this certification? Yes. And they get \$6,000 for two days? The organization gets the money. We would like to see a trainer of trainers program. If we make this a repeating event, we may be able to facilitate. We are assisting this time. They have hinted that we could maybe work something out down the road. Then we could make this bigger and bring in paying customers. This time we would like it to be free.

iv. #2038: NASP Conference (Psychology Club) - \$5,352

Six students are requesting funding to attend the National Association of School Psychologists Conference in Baltimore, MD February 18-21. The students will get a chance to network, learn about new research, and present their own research.

Presented by: Erica, Maritza, Halsey, and Bianca

Questions: It looks like on the request it said there would be seven students going, is that now six? The plan was originally 8 and one decided not to go. There are six total. Five graduate and one undergraduate student. Have you gone before? This is the first time. Have you done any fundraising? This is a new plan. There were only going to be two of us going, but there was interest elsewhere. We just decided to go. Have you requested any funding from the grad school or undergraduate research? I don't think so. I think we requested from Club Council. How were the students selected? Some of them are part of the group presenting. All three school psychologist professors are attending and they opened it up to all first years. The second years all went last year. There are ten first year students. Was there any funding from the department? There was none available. Do you

have anything booked yet? No. These are our estimated expenses. We are waiting to hear about funding because we cannot afford to pay on our own. Since this is reimbursement only have you been in touch with the department or Student Involvement to see if they could pay up front? We have not asked the department. Student involvement can only help once funds are approved. The conference is the 18th. Next Wednesday is the 12th. Ticket prices may change. You will have to move fast. If you are only partially funded, who will go? Bianca and Christian will go since they are presenting. And the undergraduate student.

B. Budget Discussion

After tonight's approvals we are at \$64,000. We are at where we are at. Let's move forward. This is what we have. Let's do requests until we don't have money anymore. There is a reserve that we have gone to in the past to increase our budget. What is that reserve? There is a certain amount we need to retain and we changed that amount recently. For clarification, the changes to the required reserves has not been approved by UPAC. We are still required to have \$1.5 million in the reserves. What we have available is \$3.4 million. There is other funding within the base funded areas, they are intentionally spending down their balances. If we increased the budget we would take money from the \$3.4 million. That is a one-time bucket. We are not adding to that each year. This is part of a previous policy to put a percentage away each year. The only funds going in now would be an unanticipated sum of revenue and any remaining balances after the 4-year funding cycle. We don't know what that will look like. Is that making interest? Are there restrictions on that? A certain percentage we can – it is a little complicated. There are funds we strategically invest. There are lots of requirements as we are a government entity. It may have made \$200,000 in investment. That is included in the revenue figures for S&A. This funding cycle is vastly different than the previous four-year cycle. They are trying to end their balances as close to zero as possible. The last cycle was not the same. This was budgeted into the revenue stream. We are not trying to net positive to add to that anymore. Expenses are going to rise across the board in the next couple of years. The request from Westside Student Life, is there other funding to support activities at the centers? Yes, there is base funding. This request is in addition to that. There is a sense that costs are going up. We may have to tap into that reserve. Can we foresee something catastrophic and really expensive that we would need to use that for – like the A/C system in the SURC going out? I would say we do need to be mindful of that. There are groups that meet regularly for maintenance and to ensure things don't happen. There is only so much we can foresee or prevent. The fee is meant to support the physical building as well. This would be one of the only avenues for funding something like that. I think we should leave the reserve. We don't know what is going to happen in the future. Looking ahead, our criticism of past requests shouldn't fall on the students who are not here yet. Have there been discussions about the possibility of raising the S&A fee? There are always questions about it. That decision would come from this committee. The

intent is to use the full allocation to push out the raise of the fee for as long as possible. There will come a time where we will either need to increase the fee or change the sort of things that we are funding. I wouldn't say we have discussed it, but as a financial step we review the health of the fund yearly – if not quarterly. Does there need to be a motion to not do anything? Only if there was already a motion to make changes. If we hit the budget limit and don't want to increase, what would happen to those on the docket? That is up to you all to consider. Know that everyone on this docket turned in their request by the deadline you set. All of these are on the schedule as of now. I think we should keep the budget where it is and work with the sub-committee to develop the KPIs and have something to recommend to next year's committee. We should discuss all of this ahead of time so that we know the plan. It is disturbing to allow people to present with only a maybe since we set a deadline. We had a discussion when we said we should have criteria for funding, and then that went to a subcommittee. We should deal with where that leaves us. \$300,000 is a bit of money. This year it seems to run low earlier. Make sure you are aware there has been a lot of work and allocations done by the committee. I appreciate your work. We still have requests coming through now. Increasing the budget will keep the door open. Be mindful. If we increase we will be more likely to say yes because the money is there. We can still hear the requests if we are out of money. We can then allocate their requests. That makes sense. Is that the process? Do we add the funds and then see or do we need to hit zero and then go over? I suggest we do not go over the budget. It is important to set a budget. That doesn't mean we cannot increase it. I advise to set a budget. I take issue with you saying things were slowed down because of the subcommittee. There was not a plan when the idea to restructure was presented. We want to watch saying this didn't happen due to the subcommittee. I don't think it is fair to change things in the middle of the year. We need to stay on point discussing the budget. UPAC meets once a quarter and the fall meeting was cancelled, so the changes are on the docket for this month. We should make clear communications with the requestors we have if the committee is at a point where you think we should not be receiving additional requests. It is within your purview to cease receiving requests and handle those we have received however we shall. You all can decide to keep receiving them, it is up to you. We need to make a plan of what to do at the bottom of the balance – will we be fine to still hear requests when there is no more money?

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to inform requestors that the committee would not be receiving any further requests for the year. Alex Harrington seconded.

Discussion: If the committee approves to not accept further supplemental requests, does that mean we are not increasing the budget?

MOTION TO AMMEND: Alex Harrington made a motion to amend the previous motion to include that the committee will not be raising the supplemental funding budget. Eric Bennett seconded.

Discussion: That is the discussion now even though we have not approved the last motion? This is an amendment to the motion. So we would only have \$64,000 for the rest of the year? That is the amendment on the table. There is \$266,000 on the docket. \$64,000 would get us through not quite half of the requests. If we are not receiving more, does that include the ones in your inbox?

The previous amendment is called to question. The amendment was approved.

Discussion: The people in your mailbox, have they been processed yet? There is quite a bit of vetting that needs to be done but this should not affect the requestors.

MOTION TO AMMEND: Eric Bennett made a motion to amend the previous motion that the requests currently submitted to Lacy would be allowable. There was no second. Motion died.

Discussion: Why would we add to the list we have when we can only get halfway through as is? That would be wasting their time. They have already turned it in. We could deny everything up to that point. The wording of the deadline we set said that we would hear all requests submitted by the deadline this quarter.

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

Budgets are good but this is a drastic move. We are halfway through the year. A lot could happen, we don't know. We are back where we started. There is \$3.4 million, it made \$200,000 in interest last year. To grab \$200,000 wouldn't change it. Are there other pots for maintenance? There are 2 other fund groups: Student Union and Recreation. They have their own reserves to maintain. We have a budget that we set, when it runs out it is gone. We can then decide to go into debt when the requests come up, rather than before. Once we hit zero we can decide individually for requests. We should in good faith let people know where the budget is. We made a budget of X amount. \$200,000 was generated through interest. We have extra money in the pool. Other money is being generated. We are here to benefit students now. It is drastic to cut off all funds. If we are generating \$200,000 we don't need to add that. Money is still there to be used. If we get to zero can there be a motion then? We should let people know where we are. Might be a good idea to table this until we hit zero. When we had the original discussion we asked Lacy with this budget what things would look like for the future. As this stands future committees could have \$300,000 budgets as well. I am fearful of future committees where things happen that need to be fixed. We have partners in this building with emergency funds. We need to be mindful of where we are at. Many groups requested funds earlier this year and good for them. If we do vote to increase the budget, is that final or does someone have to approve that? No, they approve our recommendations to fund. That is the intention of listening to our financial

manager. They could just deny every request after the case. We should inform everyone where our budget is at and then table this until it comes up again. Is it a good plan to communicate with everyone where we are? I can do that is SURC Accounting. There is the piece that we do not want to sit on funds. These funds are for students. Be mindful of the impact you will have. We constantly ask about impact. If we increase, look at the impact and what future committees and the student body will get. If we do not raise the budget what is the impact? Communicate your reasons. Most presenters say they “hope” to do this or that upon return. Is there a way to approve their funding as long as they do what they say they will? Is there accountability? I think that should be a future agenda item. Last year we discussed a requirement for groups to present at SOURCE. This is a great idea to discuss at future meetings. Do we have the ability? Can we have a discussion on the consistency of voting? We have been approving most requests with full funding. Should we be doing that? We should look ahead. Like at Westside Student Life. The “vote like it is the first week” mentality is a problem. It is a recurring trend. We should vote to fund programs if they are equitable and benefit Central. We should check to see if they bring it back. If they go to a conference and it is just them, there is no benefit to CWU. We should be thinking more critically about what does or does not get approved. When you vote like it is the first week and you have money to spend – you just give it to them. The subcommittee is discussing how to change this for future years. Once the money is gone it will be a good opportunity to discuss with the full committee. We can see where we are at when we reach the bottom. Can you let people know where we are at? We do have the whole year scheduled with the subcommittee, program reviews, and annual reports. We need to be intentional and critical. We have been good at asking questions. It is up to you all to determine what is the most beneficial and impactful. How do we take the remaining 20 requests and determine if we want to go in order. A group that had an event in November needs to be looked at as critically as now. Everyone on this list met the deadline. I appreciate how thoughtful you have all been in discussions. There are two ways to move forward. We continue as we are and go until zero with the same criteria. We put ourselves in a corner because we were not being critical, now is that fair? This is a tough spot. We can go until zero or we can expand the budget. That is what the discussion should be. Would it help to allocate the budget per quarter? We have done it. The problem is fall requests just get moved to winter quarter and it is still first come first served. We have never had this many requests. Every year we have increased in requests and amounts. Some is people becoming aware of S&A and some is an increase in costs. Some is due to changes in other things. We began fall with a ton of clubs because Funds Council was not up and running. That does have an impact. Are we likely to switch if we run out of funding and they go to Funds Council instead? There are a lot more restrictions. These are all great ideas. We should be critical and be accountable. Do we set aside funding to help track if these groups do what they say they will? Is there a way to distribute that? It is difficult for me to compare what people do and the benefit they bring back. Is it within our power to say they can have funding if they meet our expectations? We could have requirements. These are discussions that are on the docket for spring quarter. I don’t think this is going to get determined tonight. It will be beneficial to think about this and continue the discussion next week. We are not getting to an end result tonight. With that said, think about this over the week and how to approach it – less about the what-ifs.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to table the discussion for a week. Dane Gillian seconded. The motion carried.

Other Business: Communications Received

None.

Public Comment

Thank you for your diligent effort in discussing this and for serving our students.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

Schedule for Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 12 in SURC 301 starting at 5:30 p.m.