

**Services and Activities Fee Committee  
Minutes  
December 4, 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, Josh Hibbard, Martin Kennedy, Lacy Lampkins, Gregg Schlanger, Jessica Thomas, Brandon Wear-Grimm

Excused: Kirti Patel

**Agenda:**

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

**Minutes:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes of November 20, 2019. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

**Reports:**

Chair – None.

Advisors – PBAC has approved all of the requests from the last meeting.

Request #2018 has reduced their requested amount to \$2,856 due to more clarity on their funding from CEPS.

Request #2021 is also scheduled to present at Funds Council tonight at 7:00, we should have plenty of time for their request, but be aware of that.

This is the last meeting of the quarter. The next meeting will be on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

The annual reports deadline for the base funded areas has been pushed to December 20<sup>th</sup>. Some reports are already in. The first couple meetings of next quarter will be committee business and we will be hearing the last third of the base funded program reviews.

**Public Comment:**

I am Francesco Somaini, Chair of the Communication Department and Faculty Adviser for The Observer. We have been made aware of the recording of the S&A meeting from November 20<sup>th</sup>. We have a written statement for the record. (Please see Addendum #1)

**Old Business:**

**A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting**

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

Discussion: I went last year, there were a lot of activities. I got a neck tattoo (temporary). The students really enjoy this. This is a social event with all students welcome. Over 2,000 went last year. Their reasoning for requesting more money for a higher quality of entertainment will attract more students. This is a great thing. It also increases accessibility as they are keeping the event free. With over 2,000 attendees, that is only \$12 per student.

**MOTION: Eric Bennet made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2013 in the amount of \$24,000. Edgar Carreno seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

- ii. #2016: Society of Physics Students National Conference (CWU Chapter - Society of Physics Students)- \$3155.41

Discussion: It is important for balance that we send students from the humanities and also from the sciences.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2016 in the amount of \$3,156. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

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

Discussion: Did they get any support from the literature department? They have funding from the college. This is a campus-wide event and the department should contribute more. The college allocated \$5,000.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2017 in the amount of \$1,500. Edgar Carreno seconded. Motion carried with three abstentions.**

- iv. #2018: Hawaii International Conference on Education - \$2,856

Discussion: The University's main moto is that it is the most diverse in the state. This is a big focus in the education department. The project these students are presenting is about bias in curriculum. This follow with university priorities. This would be a good thing to fund. I also appreciated that they were successful in securing other funding sources as well.

**MOTION: Dane Gillin made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2018 in the amount of \$2,856. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

### **New Business:**

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

- i. # 2019: Society of Photographic Educations National Conference - \$15,428.03  
The Student Art Club is requesting travel costs for 18 students and 2 faculty members to attend the Society for Photographic Education National Conference in Houston, Texas from March 5-8. The theme of the conference is 2020 and how to move into the future while decolonizing space, considering gender, and

using new tech. The students will be attending lectures and exhibitions, presenting work, and engaging in portfolio reviews. They will also have the opportunity for one-on-one sessions with grad school coordinators, museum curators, and/or gallerists. Houston is the fourth largest art hub in the United States so the students will also have the chance to immerse themselves in the art world there.

Presented by: Marcus, Thad, and Emily

Questions: Have you gotten any funding from the department or fundraising? The department does not have the money to fund students. We are having an art sale, but the profit will be nominal versus what is needed. We are also applying to Club Senate and the grad students are applying for grants. What is the exact amount requested? \$15,428. What amounts do you expect to come from other funding sources? We expect the graduate students to be fully funded and I believe we are asking for \$2,000 from Club Senate. When the club returns, how will they share the experience with students around CWU? The goal is to spread as far as we can go. The Art Department can be insular at times. These professional experiences can help the students grow outward. They can also take back their critiques to help themselves and their peers grow. Relationships made at the event can help bring in lecturers to campus. We can also do student exchanges with other universities. This all helps create a professional atmosphere and multiplies. This creates an atmosphere of excellence. Is the \$15,000 assuming that the funding from other sources is granted? This assumes that the grad students get their funding, and we feel good about that. Additional requests are to cover other expenses that were not mentioned here. I was not aware that we could add Per Diems, so the Club Senate funding request includes that. How were the students selected? We gathered a list of interested students. That may dwindle if students have to fund it themselves, but we want to make it as accessible as possible.

ii. # 2020: IEEE – Rising Star Conference - \$7,800

Eleven students and one faculty member plan to attend the Rising Star Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada on January 2-5. The students will get the opportunity to network and attend technology based workshops in connection with their majors. The students hope to connect what they have learned at the university to industry standards.

Presented by: Jeff Sargent

Questions: What does IEEE stand for? Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineering. How will this affect other students on campus? There is a coding competition that goes on during the event. We can gather information for other clubs such as robotics. This is our third year attending, and we would like to reach out to other clubs to let them know about the opportunities. How are the students chosen to go? Had

13 sign up and those 13 names were given to the advisor who chose 11 based on participation and grades. How many are in the club? On a good day we see about 20 people at a club event.

- iii. # 2021: Western Psychological Association Conference (Psychology Club) - \$6,720

This request is for twelve student members of the CWU Psychology club to attend the Western Psychological Association Conference on April 29-May 3 in San Francisco, California. Members had to meet certain requirements to attend the conference. Members will attend workshops, symposiums, and present their research. They will also have the opportunity to network. Upon return, the students will present what they have learned at a club meeting.

Presented by: Larissa and Andrea

Questions: How many of you are presenting? We have not yet gotten our acceptance/rejection letters so we do not know. How many have presented in years past? I have presented 3 or 4 times. How many people attending this year have gone before? 5 off the top of my head. Were the 12 members chosen the only ones who met the requirements? We laid out the requirements at the beginning of the year and members had the whole year to meet them. We are willing to make some exceptions based on the circumstance, such as the number of meetings attended for members who joined late. We want to be sure we are accommodating all of our members. How many members are there? I believe there are 272 on the Facebook page and around 160 active members on our email list. I see that your requirements involve paying for registration and food, what about members who cannot afford that? We are working on a potential financial waiver with student involvement. It says here you have \$2,000 in your club account? That has changed. There was a misunderstanding of the encumbered funds for Psi Chi which cannot be touched. We currently have around \$4,900 in the account. Is there a reason why the club is only using \$500 of that? We want to leave a healthy carry-over for next year.

- iv. # 2022: Model United Nations Conference – \$11,500

The Model UN is a brand new club to campus that has not been around since the 90s. They would like for 15 students to attend the Model UN of the Far West Conference in San Francisco on April 17-21. This is an educational simulation in which they would get to learn about diplomacy, and international affairs. This year's theme is Sustainable Human Development. Diversity is an important part of the conference, with over 196 different countries represented.

Presented by: Trenton, Ben, and Daniel

Questions: Does this event move around? Yes, there are three hosted every year. Last year they were in New York, China, and I believe Japan. If we do well we could potentially go to Japan. Right now we are just focused on getting off the ground. Are t-shirts considered advertising? If the funding is approved, the shirts would be owned by the university and would need to be turned back in. That is good because then they can be used in other years. We are also looking at the potential for sponsorship outside of the university. Are you affiliated with a department? We are affiliated with Political Science, but we are open to anyone. Model UN touches on finance, social and economic factors, not just political. There is a diversity of knowledge. You said 7-8 rooms for 15 students, so 2 per room? Correct. Is it possible to share more and cut costs? It is possible, we would have to speak to the group and determine everyone's comfort level.

**MOTION: Eric Bennet made a motion to adjourn for a five minute recess. Monica Carreno seconded. Motion carried.**

**Brandon Wear-Grimm called the meeting back into order at 7:00 p.m.**

**B. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting**

i. # 2019: Society of Photographic Educations National Conference - \$15,428.03  
Discussion: Is this the club that went to San Francisco last spring? Same club, different students. That was just an art trip, not a conference. The budget does include two faculty, I just want to clarify that is allowed. Yes.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2019 in the amount of \$15,428. Tonya Buchanan seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

ii. # 2020: IEEE – Rising Star Conference - \$7,800

**MOTION: Martin Kennedy made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2020 in the amount of \$7,800. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried.**

iii. # 2021: Western Psychological Association Conference (Psychology Club) - \$6,720

Discussion: I was impressed with their presentation. They were cognizant of costs and contributed their own fundraising.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2021 in the amount of \$6,720. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

iv. # 2022: Model United Nations Conference - \$11,500

Discussion: Promotion of diversity and equity is important. Building this new club helps show diversity. I would like to see this club returning to campus. I think that civically

engaged people are at a low and this will help bring the number up. This is important to fund.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2022 in the amount of \$11,500. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with two abstentions.**

**C. Sub-Committee Report:**

The point of business for this is the Annual Report questionnaire that was presented at our last meeting. Are there any more edits?

Discussion: Is this version in the minutes edited? No, that is the initial. We will remove questions one and two since they are already in the annual report. There are a couple of grammatical updates. #6 discusses how they gauge effectiveness of the services/programs and whether they have an advisory committee for the budgeting process. This may need to be two separate questions. #7 discussing how to ensure fees aren't subsidizing non-student uses, the second part says that if previous funding has included statistical analysis, to please include similar data using this year's demographics. There was some confusion on this. Right now we want to ask how we ensure it is funding only students, but there is also that question of providing any statistical data. This is two different questions. Do we want them to provide any data they have, or are we just asking how they ensure that this funding isn't subsidizing non-students? We should definitely ask if they have any statistical data. SURC accounting does a great job of ensuring that funds only go to the students, so that may not be necessary to ask. The second part may need to be optional. If they have it, we would love to know, but if not – thank you anyway. Both answers are helpful at this point to let us know what they need moving forward. The wording suggests that we only want the data if they have included it previously. We may want to adjust that to include all available data. That is more what we are asking. This question and the previous one, what is the criteria for evaluation? Are we setting up that if they don't have these resources they lose points? This seems threatening. Do we need to explain our expectations upfront if we want these things? The intent is that many areas have advisory groups already in different capacities. The question is not meant to hinder groups that don't have them. But other groups do have those committees, it would be impactful to see those answers and see what groups are doing that we may not be aware of. We do not want to come off as threatening. We want to see where all these groups are at with collecting data. There is no point system. It may be helpful to include in the instructions that we are just gathering data about what resources are available and what structures are in place so it is clear to everyone. Advisory committee will mean something to quite a few groups, but we may want to add in a piece about student involvement in budgeting pieces. Some groups get student input in other areas. That would be a great answer to have too. I think the question of "how do you assess the effectiveness?" and whether student input is involved is separate from whether they have an advisory committee. Would be best to separate those questions. Question #11 would be updated to ask what would be the impact if funding was increased or decreased by 20%. So that would help mitigate the perception that we are trying to cut funding. The last edit is reframing the question asking what the programs goals or objectives are, and how are they assessing if they are meeting those goals. Do we need to make a motion to approve these? We need to make sure the committee is comfortable sending these out.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the updated questions for the base funded area annual reviews. Edgar Carreno seconded.**

Discussion: What is the intended timeline to collect these responses? It would be towards the end of January. The groups are working on their annual reports now. We will not get a chance to look at the responses until mid-to-late January. We will need to set a solid date. There are a lot of other responsibilities for the base funded areas right now. We are looking at the last few weeks to give them adequate time.

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

**Other Business: Communications Received**

There is some business from last year to discuss. There was a funding request that was approved last year. They had returned \$17,000 due to timing issues. They had requested to fund two quarters, which were referenced as winter and spring 2019 in the documentation. They only ended up reimbursing for spring and they have had expenses hit for fall 2019. This is the same intent/request, but with a different timeline. Would the committee still support this request if it is moved from winter/spring to spring/fall?

Discussion: It is the same funds? Yes

**MOTION: Eric Bennet made a motion to approve the updated timeline for the request. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried.**

**Public Comment**

Thank you for your work this quarter. I know the sub-committee is still wrapping things up. That should be finalized by the 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> I believe. I hope you all have a great holiday and your finals go smoothly.

When we see you again the deadline for presenting the FY21 budget is scheduled for January 14. We will only have one meeting to go through things. There are a number of groups trying to get an extension. We are planning our presentations, but it may be a quick turnaround if we can't push back that date.

**Adjournment:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Martin Kennedy seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.**

**Schedule for Next Meeting:**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 8, 2020 in SURC 301 starting at 5:30 p.m.

# **Addendum #1**

## To the S&A Committee

The advisers of CWU's student media outlets and the student media business manager (names and titles below) would like to clarify the following 5 points based on serious misstatements and unsubstantiated accusations raised in the S&A meeting of 11/20/19 and broadcast on YouTube:

### 1. Defamatory Statement

Committee member Alex Harrington called on student media faculty advisers and the business manager to appear before the Committee to propose a solution for a "misuse of funds." He later backed down from that wording under questioning by fellow members, but the record shows he used this wording. We consider this a defamatory accusation of criminal activity by faculty and staff of the Communication Department and request a formal apology from Mr. Harrington for making this accusation.

### 2. S&A Base Funding for Student Media

Mr. Harrington suggested S&A base funding to the various student media outlets is given "to inform the student body of things that are occurring on campus." This is a misunderstanding of the base funding given to student media which, as Lacey Lampkins alludes, is allocated principally to pay for goods and services (mostly printing expenses), a percentage of the wages of the student media business manager, and student wages.

### 3. How Student Media Works

Mr. Harrington also called on student media faculty advisers and the business manager to appear before the Committee to answer for material published or broadcast in student media. These comments, as well as statements made by Committee member Gregg Schlanger questioning whether students are potentially being punished for "something that a faculty member did," represent a serious misunderstanding of the role and responsibilities of faculty advisers on student media.

The content of student media is entirely decided and produced by students. Advisers and the business manager do not choose, report, write, produce or censor content in The Observer, Central NewsWatch, PULSE magazine or Wildcat Films.

Further, as Joseph Bryant clarified during the meeting, the Committee should not be making decisions based on content published or broadcast in student media. The Resolution put forward by Mr. Harrington does exactly that. As Mr. Bryant noted, this could be viewed as censorship of student media.

We trust that members of the Committee do not intend to endanger the First Amendment rights of any CWU students, including student journalists, even if what the journalists publish is not to their liking.

# Addendum #1

## 4. Factuality of Student Reporting

Mr. Harrington called information in The Observer stories “false” and accused student reporters of knowingly publishing false information. He described their work as “a pretty deliberate and malicious attempt at misrepresenting the actions and statements of individuals in the campus community” and tied this directly to his proposal to defund student media.

Pressed later to substantiate these serious accusations, he offered only anecdotal descriptions of what he’s heard or been told without providing any actual evidence. We would direct the Committee to the original Observer articles, available online, which provide thorough documentation for all interactions with people cited in the stories.

We would like to inform the Committee that not a single person cited in The Observer stories has come forward to request the publication of a clarification or a retraction of published information.

## 5. Student Journalists are Students Too

We would also like to remind the Committee that the staffs of The Observer, Central NewsWatch, PULSE magazine and Wildcat Films are students who pay tuition and fees.

Mr. Harrington’s proposal that student media be defunded is an indication that the media are not viewed as a valuable commodity. Student media provide a fundamental service to the campus community and beyond. They represent student voices. Those voices change every quarter, just as the staffs of all of the student media outlets change every quarter, but the value of the institutions – which have themselves received national recognition and awards – remain.

Mr. Harrington himself said in a press release dated June 11, 2019 that he was “very passionate about higher education and the ideas of free expression and having a diversity of ideas.” We share his passion.

We also share Committee member Eric Bennett’s concerns that Mr. Harrington’s Resolution carries an implication of retaliation for content published in The Observer and broadcast on NewsWatch. As advisers, mentors and educators, we are concerned about any implied threat to the First Amendment rights of our students.

Signed,

Francesco Somaini, Chair of the Communication Department and Faculty Adviser, The Observer  
Maria Sanders, Director of the Film Program and Faculty Adviser, Wildcat Films  
Terri Reddout, Senior Lecturer of Digital Journalism and Faculty Adviser, Central NewsWatch  
Jennifer Green, Senior Lecturer of Digital Journalism and Faculty Adviser, PULSE magazine  
Cait Dalton, Student Media Business Manager