

**Services and Activities Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 27, 2023**

**Called to order:**

Alice called the meeting to order at 5:01pm.

**Attendance:**

Alice Williams, Brandon Thomas, Evelyn Roehn, Jared Osborne, Brady Smith, Sean Dahlin, Joey Bryant, Erin Sargent, Jessica Kitto

Guests: Lola Gallagher

**Agenda:**

**MOTION: Evelyn made a motion to approve the agenda. Jared seconded. Motion carried.**

4 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

**Minutes:**

**MOTION: Evelyn made a motion to approve the 4/20/23 minutes. Jared seconded. Motion carried.** 4 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

**Reports**

I. Chair: none

II. Advisors: Joey

a. We still have two program reviews that have not been turned in. The departments have responded that they will get them in soon.

b. Erin Sargent was just appointed to be the Student Funds Financial Manager in SURC Accountant and the Advisor for S&A. She starts on Monday.

III. ASCWU: Brady said that ASCWU elections are next week. Voting is done online through Presence. Voting goes live Monday at 8am. There are also two student fees on the ballot. One is a pantry fee (\$6 option or \$10 option) to supply permanent funding for the Wildcat Pantry so that food needs are being addressed on campus. This would be just for Ellensburg students. The second fee is for increasing the WSA fee from \$1 to \$2. It's the Washington Student Association fee. Its mission is to lobby on behalf of Washington students in Olympia and it binds all of the student governments from other universities together. The WSA is asking all of their member institutions to up their fee from \$1 to

\$2. The ASCWU Board can vote to recommend fee increases. Since WSA is a third-party organization, the Board wants to get student feedback.

### **Communications Received**

None

### **Public Comment**

Lola reminded everyone that the Evening of Recognition award nominations close on Sunday. There are 8 categories for students and about 6 for professional staff. They would like to see a lot of nomination for students. The information on the event and nomination information is on the [SLICE website](#). Nominations are open through April 30<sup>th</sup>.

### **New Business:**

#### A. Base Funding Program Reviews:

##### a. Lion Rock Visiting Writers Series

- i. It was mentioned that the structure was very well done which made it easy to read.
- ii. It was great that all their programs are now virtual so that all CWU students can attend. A concern was raised that the online only events might prevent some Ellensburg students from attending who would rather attend in person. Do they have any plans on presenting any in-person events that Ellensburg students might want to attend?
- iii. Lola commented that their events have been both in-person and via Zoom.

##### b. Manastash

- i. They say that they are serving students through two practicum classes (questions 2, 3 and 4). Are they doing this through general education classes or is it degree specific? Sean said that it depends on the program. For his department, students must have major status. This would be a good question to ask. Joey added that we would need to ask if it is general education or not. Are we funding the program piece and materials or the class?
  1. Joey said that the practicum classes are primarily for the editing of the magazine. The submission of the articles is open to any students. The funding is for the actual production of the magazine.
  2. Sean added that the Observer and Pulse had been funded by S&A in the past. It's good to know the distinction between if the money goes to the class or to something else that benefits students. Newswatch is in a similar vein.
- ii. They answered "not applicable" to several questions. Some additional context to those answers would be good. For question 8, the S&A funds don't fund positions. S&A funds only the journal. Joey mentioned that

question 9 seems like there should be some impacts. For question 10, not applicable might be true.

iii. Last year they got \$4,927. They are slated to spend their full budget this year.

c. Marching Band

i. They listed the diversity of year standing in questions 6 & 7. They mentioned that one of their goals is to expand membership. They also wanted non music members to enjoy the performing arts. It would be nice to have the percentages of members who are music majors. How many of the 142 students are music majors/part of music department?

ii. On question 9 concerning budget reduction impacts, they referenced that they went without some positions which seems likely to be faculty positions. Are those positions that we fund? Could they provide more context if those are student positions, outside contractors, or faculty? They are leaving about \$50,000 on the table. If the positions aren't positions that S&A funds, how do our budget reductions impact them.

1. Joey added that in question 10 they mentioned that it was as of FY23. It could be that funding was denied when they asked for funding for those positions.

d. Museum of Culture and Environment

i. They were very specific with question 3. It was nice to see what they have done. The amount of detail was much appreciated.

## **Old Business**

I. 2304: SLICE/CAT Camp - \$50,000 – Funding Request Discussion and Voting

a. It was said that this is a great program especially as they market to marginalized students. The issue with S&A funding it is that they aren't technically students at Central yet when they participate. So, they might not pay S&A fees. We are reducing costs for current students. It is the place for the university to fund this type of program, not S&A since they are not students yet.

b. There was agreement with the previous comment. More metrics on retention would be nice. It seems like a pilot program. It's a small program that is trying to become a big program. Would the costs of the program be paid back? If they get about 50% retention, they should break even. The risk to S&A as a fund is not huge as the retention rate would be low. It is a valid question of who the students serve. It seems like they received funds from S&A in the past so there may be a precedent set.

c. We have funded the program in the past and retention is there. We don't fund Admissions. We probably would get our money back. We shouldn't support programs that aren't for admitted students. It is a program that should be on campus. We don't fund other recruitment programs, why would we fund this one?

- d. Joey added that there are certain parts that they have to do but it could be allowable to use S&A funds. When we talk about orientation and recruitment of incoming students, a current student is defined as a student who is enrolled in classes. If these students were all enrolled in classes for the fall before they attend the program, then S&A could fund it. The larger question is even though it is an allowable use of funds, is it an appropriate use of the funds. The other part of which to be mindful is that they are asking to spend \$50,000 more than their allocation for next year. If everyone came in to ask to overspend, we have to be mindful of that. We would have to have a strong reason if we approve this request to then deny other groups asking to overspend as well.
- e. There was more agreement that this is a great program. The concerns raised about us funding it are valid. Since we approved them to carryforward funds last year, we may be more obligated to approve funds again. If we approve this, maybe we suggest that they will have to find funds elsewhere next year.
- f. This is only \$50,000, but currently we allocate out \$7.1 million, we take in about \$6.8 million. We are still overspending by about \$700,000. Funding this would increase our deficit. There are a lot of programs that we have funded in the past, but at certain points we have to make tough decisions. This is a time when we are trying to reduce S&A funding. We are reducing some programs for currently enrolled students, so it feels difficult to then fund a program that is expanding.
- g. What happens to the program if we partially fund or don't fund the program. In this case, they would have to charge the students to attend. It was asked when we have to decide. Joey responded that the vote would be done tonight. If the committee was split or they needed specific information, then the committee could vote to table the vote.
- h. They spoke about how they would charge students. It should be free for students who are attending camp, especially for students coming from marginalized communities. It is an important program, so it will get funded somehow. The suggestion would be for admissions to fund the program even though they are currently partially funding the program. This is a recruitment/orientation program. It doesn't seem like our place to fund this program.
- i. Joey reminded everyone that they are here to voice their own voices as they are also the voices for the student body. This is a newish program and it used to be the ELP program. The program was specifically geared towards leadership and building community. Last year, they moved into the CAT Camp concept. This year, they are trying to enlarge the program. The growth of the program has changed, but where it is housed has not.
- j. If we were to fund, it was stated that it would be an option to partially fund it since we funded them in the past. We would recommend that they look for other funding next year. Partial funding would be good as they have support from Admissions and Jump Start. This would also help make it more equitable.

**k. MOTION: Brady motioned to deny the funding request and recommend that they seek funding through other options, such as Admissions. Seconded by Evelyn. 3 yes, 1 no, 0 abstaining. Motion approved.**

- i. Alice said that this is a tough one. It is a valuable program, but they don't like continuing the precedent of funding a program when we are in such a budget crunch.
- ii. Jared proposed funding it at 25% to provide them with some support and to suggest that they find additional funding elsewhere next year.
- iii. Vote: 3 yes, 1 no, 0 abstaining. Motion approved to deny the funding request.**
- iv. It was reiterated that this is a very valuable program and that they might want to ask Admissions.
- v. Joey said that he would let CAT Camp know that the committee values the program and that the decision was made based on the funding.

#### **Public Comment – Second Call**

Joey thanked everyone for the discussion. These are tough decisions. Most students probably don't know what types of things this committee has to decide on. Thank you for everyone being honest and brave to voice their opinions.

ASCWU elections open on Monday and will be open all week. Please vote and spread the word.

We will probably do 6 program reviews next week if we don't have any funding request.

ASCWU Board is looking at increasing the SUB fee to \$74 (\$5 increase). This would be the second ever fee increase. The last one was in 2013. Cherie and the Board are trying to be mindful of student dollars. The Board will be voting on the fee increase on Monday.

#### **Adjournment:**

**No objections to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 6:03pm.**

**Our next meeting will be May 4, 2023 (online) at 5:00pm.**

**Check out our website at [www.cwu.edu/services-activities](http://www.cwu.edu/services-activities)**