

Services and Activities Fee Committee
Minutes
March 10, 2021

Called to order:

Christian Castilleja called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

Attendance:

Aubrey Heim, Björn Pellmyr, Brandon Wear-Grimm, Christian Castilleja, Deanna Corsilles, Gregg Schlanger, Jessica Thomas, Joseph Bryant, Josh Hibbard, Lacy Lampkins, Sean Dahlin, Terry Wilson, Yunus Timurtas, Zoe Brown

Unexcused: Masina Ieremia

Agenda:

MOTION: Björn Pellmyr made a motion to approve the agenda. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion carried.

Minutes:

MOTION: Jessica Thomas made a motion to approve the minutes of March 3, 2021. Björn Pellmyr seconded. Motion carried.

Reports:

Chair – None.

ASCWU – Brandon went over the survey results. There were 480 responses. 105 respondents were not aware of the S&A fee. There was a wide range of students. The goal is to keep doing this survey and tracking the results to make sure the funds are effectively being spent. Are results available in the committee Teams folder? Due to the size, no. It is a tool to help us improve the activities, rather than dictate our decisions. I can add it as a PDF, but it might not represent what the data truly means. If we able to get that summary, that would be great. I have broken them down into the funded groups and am happy to share the data as we discuss them. The new funding requests are not on there, and some of the current funding requests are not.

Advisors – Thank you to those that filled out the survey. That will be used for framing our discussion tonight. Some areas were agreed on, and some will need discussion. We will start with the ones where we have consensus to fund the full amount, then those with consensus to not fund, and then we will spend the majority of the time on the mixed ones. We will need to provide justifications for all of the funding. We will need to be specific on why we are not funding the full amount. We must have a recommendation by the end of next week. Brandon takes this to ASCWU for feedback and Lacy takes it to PBAC to vote on. If they approve the recommendations, Joel takes it up to the Board of Trustees. If there is any disagreement, it will

get sent back to us to look at their recommendation and vote to adopt the modified version or go through the dispute resolution process.

Please disclose if there are any conflicts of interest.

We are here to guide the conversation and answer any questions from you all. We will realistically need to use that time on Saturday.

If there is a conflict of interest, do you abstain only from voting, or from the conversation? From both, unless you are specifically asked a question. Try to refrain from asking questions, because none of the other units are here to answer questions.

Are we voting tonight? We will make a motion on the final recommendation. If we have a specific request that is not looking like a consensus, we may need to do straw poll vote. If there is consensus, we shouldn't need to vote until the end. The survey was to help guide discussion, not a final vote. Deliberation discussions may guide your vote.

Other Business: Communications Received

We received an email response to supplemental questions (see Addendum 1).

Public Comment:

For non-committee members, please use the chat or Q&A.

New Business:

A. University Budget Funding Process

Joel Klucking went over the different university funding sources (state/tuition, summer/fees, student activity, auxiliaries, grants, capital, internal service, and other). The RCM funding model maximizes the funding that goes to colleges and minimizes the amount that goes to overhead. He went over the reserves for different university areas.

Q: We heard a lot that departments don't have funding available in the colleges, but we saw there are reserves. Why is this? There are differences between the colleges. There is something at the end of the year for every college. This is a point in time, and we do not know the plans for those reserves. It is important for a college to have a safety net. There is \$7 million there. Yes, some of it is earmarked. It is not distributed equally. How much do you think is a good safety net amount? Several years ago, the Provost asked this. For larger colleges, it was \$500,000 and for others, around \$250,000. CAH has had a hard time accumulating reserves. They will be around \$250,000 at the end of the year. For academic areas, would there be an opportunity for areas in academics to request new funding from state and local budgets for FY22? It is all up to the Dean and the Provost. The Provost can reallocate funding as necessary. The process for asking for new funding is to ask the

Dean or the Provost. The President has responsibility for the other areas. Deans are uncomfortable making long-term decisions based on the fluctuation of their budgets. Do we know what portion of the reserves is student fees that can only be used for classes? Those numbers don't include mandatory fees and course fees. That is just summer and fee-for-service fees. There are very few restrictions on these funds. Some of the reserves are allocated for professional development money for faculty or technical support; is that counted? That is included. The sum total of that is probably less than \$1 million. The money is earmarked. Some portion of every college's reserves are intended for something. The Dean can redistribute the earmarked amounts, correct? The Dean has the authority to make that decision, but it would be a tough one to make. Departments seem to come to S&A first, before seeking other funding; are there other ways to get funding? Possibly foundations or grants - these are tough to get. That is the responsibility of the Dean and the Provost. The decision-making is on their shoulders. Does the Provost have veto power? The Provost has veto over the Deans, and the President has veto power over the Provost. That is not expected in day-to-day operations. Is there a time limit for reassigning funds? They should be reallocating funds at every opportunity. If you don't have the resources, you go through the process of asking for new funding, which has been highly restrictive for the last 4 years. Do you have any words of wisdom for committee members going into deliberations? Stay true to the intent of the money as best as possible. I have been impressed with how this committee sticks to the guardrails of this money. Think about what this will mean for the future. Don't forget you have reserves of your own. It is our responsibility to have generational equity of funds. If you pay this year, you should receive the benefits this year.

B. Base Funding FY22-25

i. Annual Allocation Amount

The allocation limit is \$7.4 million. The FY21 allocation was \$7.3 million, so it is a bit of an increase. Why is the figure more if we have less students? This is based on the enrollment number of what we project for the next fiscal year. We are predicting an enrollment decline. We don't spend 100% of the allocation each year. We have been in a purchasing freeze. We started with reserves and are saving that money. The \$7.4 million allocation is a middle of the road number.

We have compiled the survey results into four categories – do not fund, fully fund, fund at a lower level, and split decisions.

ii. Deliberation on Requests

i) Wellness Center

This should be funded through the university since it is a state mandated role and we should not use student fees. I would like to fund this and work with

Wellness to lobby for state funding over the next 4 years. I do not want to take a chance on the important services. This is students funding, and this is the time and place to make that point if we want. If the university funds another position, they will need to defund something else.

What are you using as a guide with what to fund? I'm interested in what students thought were the essential services provided.

If we pass this with no funding for Wellness, are we prepared to possibly go through arbitration with PBAC?

I am taking into consideration if these are things that student fees should be funding. Based on the survey, people believe this is essential, but it is not highly utilized.

There are reserves available and the university should fund this. We should not drive our decisions based on how PBAC will respond. This is student money and students should drive the decisions.

We cannot dictate any other funding. We can encourage or hope for other funding. We can only make the recommendation to fund it or not. Without funding, the programs may not continue.

This service is a response service for students who are recipients of Power Based Violence, so it makes sense to not see high usage numbers. Before this was funded, the services were handled through another position. The question is not "do we see value" but "is it appropriate to fund this". We cannot have the caveat that it is funded elsewhere.

The Wellness Center is funded by a student fee. This service may be taxed to students on a different fee. Fees should be dedicated to the intent of those fees. The Wellness fee is only assessed to Ellensburg students, and this service is provided to online and Westside students as well which would not be allowed if it is Ellensburg funded.

If it was decided not to fund this via S&A, it has to be funded somehow. It might be added on to the Wellness fee and expand that fee to other campuses.

It is possible to be added onto a fee, get state funded, be absorbed by another role, or be contracted out. We do not have control of that; we only control what we can fund.

There is a process for new funding requests through the budget allocation process. The process for next year is happening now. If this is not in that process, there may be a year without funding for this.

We should make our decisions from the scope of S&A. We have no idea what the response will be. We need to look at our own scope and if we believe we should fund it.

MOTION: Brandon Wear-Grimm made a motion to move the Wellness Path Advocate request to the "do not fund" section. Christian Castilleja seconded.

Is it possible to fund this for less than 4 years? This process based on our policies is for the quadrennium. We do have the ability to not base fund, but do supplemental funding. The group would need to come back in to request supplemental funding.

Motion carried.

ii) Westside Career Services

The University funds the Ellensburg campus counselors, but not the Westside counselors, which makes the Westside seem like an auxiliary. I don't feel this should be funded by S&A. Why is the Westside treated differently in funding from Ellensburg? How long has this been funded by S&A? Since 2006. We do have an obligation to our historically funded areas. We can change them, but there may not be other funding opportunities. Voting not to fund a program is essentially cutting the program. The deadline to request funding for next year will have passed when these decisions are made. We need to document a clear rationale for cutting any funding. This should not be funded through student fees, for equity.

MOTION: Brandon Wear-Grimm made a motion to move the Westside Career Services request to the "do not fund" section. Terry Wilson seconded.

I am balancing if this is appropriate for S&A funding, with the fact that we may be cutting this program. It may hit the center campuses hard. This was funded, so these are positions that may lose their jobs. The funding would be cut so it would be up to the areas to figure out staffing.

Motion fails.

What does the Administrative fee cover? This fee supports admin costs associated with S&A funded areas. Travel costs, AP, Payroll, IT, etc. for S&A areas. It is an increase. We can look at the in-depth calculations.

Nothing is final until we vote on the final recommendation. The next category to look at is the "do not fund" group. The Music Department and Wildcat Films are currently funded areas that were in the "do not fund" category.

iii) Music Department

This is mostly travel. It is a huge opportunity for the students that participate, and they may not be able to do that. This may not be extending to a large number of students. This committee requested them to request base funding because they were asking for supplemental funds so much.

This funding does not go to music clubs, this is for ensembles. How do we decide what should be supplemental vs quadrennium funding? For one-time expenses, I definitely encourage the committee to think about the supplemental budget. I can see travel go either way. With this one specifically, the committee felt they got hit hard with the amount of requests from Music. S&A is getting a lot of base requests from departments. This funding is meant for services and activities that impact all the students at CWU. This funding is going to ensembles. Is it right letting the academic world use the student money? The departments have their own funding and reserves. More academic departments are asking for base funding. These requests would still have the opportunity to request supplemental funding. The colleges should be able to fund these with their reserves. It is not inclusive, and I don't feel that it should be S&A funded. The reserves are not the same for every college. I don't think there should be any base funding for academic departments. What the university considers reserves is already earmarked. We need to make our decisions based on the intent of S&A funding and not thinking about the what-ifs. We should set the precedent that we do not fund academic departments with S&A funding. It is not so much about the reserve balances, but more about the intent of the funding? Yes, what is important is the intent of the student funds. It should not fund academic departments. It should support all of the students. All performances on campus do provide a benefit to all students. We could partially fund for the things that do happen on campus and not for any of the travel. The request is all for travel.

iv) Wildcat Films

Based on the student survey, most students did not think this was an essential service to be funded by S&A. Very few people know that Wildcat Films exists. This is not something a lot of people access.

Money Savvy Wildcats was in the “do not fund”, and Student Financial Services was split. They seemed very similar, and I was wondering what the distinction was for students. The comments in the survey were that they were similar and should be combined. We will discuss more on Saturday.

MOTION: Jessica Thomas made a motion to continue discussion past 8:00. There was no second. Motion died.

Saturday we will discuss the “funding at a lower level” and the “split” groups.

Old Business:

None.

Public Comment

I will take the PDF of the funding categories out of Teams so it is not confusing to anyone. Are there any references you would all like before Saturday? An updated PDF would be great.

I appreciate you all having these difficult conversations.

For the “funding at a lower level” groups, Campus Activities/Homecoming and KCWU/WSRN both combined two budgets in their presentations.

Good luck with finals for students.

Thank you for speaking your mind. This is a heavy responsibility.

Nothing is final until we have the committee make their final recommendation. Nothing is officially determined yet.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Terry Wilson made a motion to adjourn. Brandon Wear-Grimm seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

Schedule for Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for Saturday, March 13, 2021, online starting at 10:00 a.m.

Addendum 1

From: Jenna Hyatt <Jenna.Hyatt@cwu.edu>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 3:39 PM
To: Joseph Bryant <Joseph.Bryant@cwu.edu>
Cc: Jenna Hyatt <Jenna.Hyatt@cwu.edu>; Andre Dickerson <Andre.Dickerson@cwu.edu>
Subject: S&A Fee Committee - Base Funding Additional Questions for CLCE

Joey Bryant,

Please see below response to the two questions from the S & A Committee.
Is this format of the replies acceptable or do you prefer another format?
Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Jenna Hyatt

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Joseph Bryant <Joseph.Bryant@cwu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:53 PM
To: Andre Dickerson
Subject: S&A Fee Committee - Base Funding Additional Questions for CLCE

Hi Andre,

Thank you for coming this week and presenting before the S&A Fee Committee.

Given the limited amount of time allowed for Q&A, I did receive an additional inquiry from the committee for you all. If you could look over it and shoot me back a response when you have a chance, I'll make sure that it gets shared with the committee at our meeting next week.

Additional Questions:

- This inquiry is about the rationale for the funding structure:
 - Does it make more sense for the student engagement student leaders funding to go straight to CLCE's budget? We could just increase the CLCE allocation by that amount.

It is our intention to keep the CLCE and Student Involvement budgets separate. While the reporting structure has changed for the Engagement Coordinator to report to the Director of CLCE, the focus of the roles has not. The Engagement coordinator supervises these student positions and thus the budget of the student employment with a specific and critical need for clubs and organizations to remain whole and unchanged. The goal is not to co-mingle the budgets at this time.

- Why is the CLCE paying for a DEC Program Manager? You spoke in your presentation of how pressed you are with just the two professional staff, so I don't see why you are funding any role outside of your area.

During the previous quadrennial there were needs of delivering on student services that presented themselves and in such we were able to be flexible and collaborative to fill such needs.

Addendum 1

CLCE coordinated with the DEC to adjust the reporting change of the program manager position that Liz Vidaurri holds. With the reporting change a few of the previous co-coordinated established programs that have diversity components were transitioned with her as well. For instance the Chavez-King Institute.

Due to the financial situation of our campus we remained flat in our ask of the structure and in full recognition that one of the positions is a dotted line with DEC. [Dotted due to budget and supervision change to DEC director].

However, with the ever growing and changing needs of our student body we still need Program Managers (3) to support and focus on Leadership, Service and Club/Org support. We believe with our new structure of staffing that we can adapt and meet the needs of our programs and students. The service and activity levels that have been previous met in our current funding cycle will still continue and grow with the years to come.

Thank you,
Joey



Joseph Bryant (He/Him/His)
Executive Director of Student Rights & Responsibilities
S&A Fee Committee Advisor
509-963-1515
Bouillon 204
Joseph.Bryant@cwu.edu