

**Services and Activities Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**March 15, 2025**

**Called to order:**

Eli called the meeting to order at 8:17 am.

**Attendance:**

Erin Sargent, Mia Young, Robbi Goninan, Nicholas Villa, Eli Alvarado, Nick Moreno, Ian Seymour, Arik Spring, Oscar Martinez, Marisol Torres Alcantar

Absent: Yahir Calderon Sotelo

Guests: Carson Gavin, Verónica Gómez-Vilchis, Lola Gallagher

**Agenda:**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to approve the agenda from 3/15/25. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**Minutes:**

None.

**Reports**

I. Chair:

a. None.

II. Advisors:

a. As of last night meetings, they approved 70% of the \$5.475 million (Option1). If they go with option 2 funding, then they recommended 33% of that.

i. Option 1: \$1.65 million remaining

ii. Option 2: \$1.86 million remaining.

III. ASCWU:

a. None.

**Communications Received**

None.

**Public Comment**

None.

**New Business:**

Last meeting minutes ended with a Recommendation to fully approve the SLICE Office of Student Involvement, which passed.

Deliberations.

A. ECLC

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on ECLC. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Strong feelings were expressed regarding their maximum that they've afforded for student parents is 50% but the rest is faculty and staff. They did not think it was fair to pay for faculty and staff considering that all students pay 272 on top of having to pay \$30 a day for childcare. They suggested matching their max enrollment rate for students.
  - i. The question sheet provided shows a difference in regard to faculty and staff. On average, it's 30% of student parents.
- b. Erin pointed out that in Spring Summer Fall 2024 it is unclear if it was meant to be 2026 since Spring Summer and Fall of 2024 has passed
  - i. They may have meant 2025
- c. A lot of their other funding of \$736K is the daily rates from payment from everyone on top of the state funding for the food.
- d. It was agreed that it's not fair for S&A to pay for it. If they decrease it then it would raise rates for everyone across the board including the students, so it would hurt the students even more
  - i. They serve over 75 student parents. If they increase the amount of the students, then the students would be impacted by the amount of school they get or potentially not even be able to.
- e. The possible effects of cutting funding will affect the students that currently use the ECLC and disrupt their ability to continue their education. Even if the goal is to specifically reduce that money because staff is the majority that using it. But should the S&A fee be paying for this if it's mostly staff / faculty using it.
  - i. It's really important to have that resource. This service determines whether or not about 75 students would be attending or not attending CWU. This should be more targeted for students.
- f. It was mentioned how they choose their rates. It is typically the market rate or a little bit higher. If the committee has to reduce there will be other options for staff or students if necessary. Faculty and Staff are essentially getting a cheaper price then what students are paying for as they are not paying for the S&A Fee.
  - i. Students have to pay for the rates and the S&A fee on top of it.
- g. The debt for the ECLC has been increasing over time.
- h. The S&A fee is subsidizing the ECLC but a majority of that subsidize is going towards staff and faculty. not students.
- i. Do faculty and staff pay more per day?
  - i. It's an indirect way that S&A dollars are helping students
  - ii. Rates were shared:

<b>Student</b>	<b>Faculty/Staff</b>
Infant Full day \$40	Infant full day \$54

Toddler full day \$38	Toddler full day \$51
ECLC full day \$36	ECLC full day \$49
School age full day \$36	School age full day \$49

- j. If they cut the funding for this because faculty don't have to pay in it is more expensive for faculty. Would the price difference equal to, or greater than, what students pay through the S&A fee per quarter?
  - i. A lot of their revenue would go down if that price did go up for everyone. They'd have less funding, and their overall quality would decrease.
  - ii. They do have state requirements to have 1 teacher for every 4 students depending on age.
- k. The parents don't pay the S&A fee but pay more money every day.
- l. Only \$200K of S&A is not going towards staff salaries.
- m. They don't know how prices would have to go somewhere else because of that. It's not a handle they have. It would impact students but by how much?
  - i. If they do raise prices and faculty moves their children out, then that gives room for more students. Once a faculty's child is in, they don't kick them out, but they do give priority to students.
- n. They did submit a 20% reduction. Are they considering more than that?
  - i. They are leaning towards more of reduction. The 50% off of the \$595K would be to match the student enrollment maximum that they have.

**RECOMENDATION: Give the ECLC a 50% cut of the \$595K. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 1 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on ECLC. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### B. DEC / MCC

**MOTION: Nick V made a motion to open debate on DEC. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. They are opening the Multi-Cultural Center. in 2026, which is why they are not taking a 20% reduction because they are looking to increase staff.
  - i. They are taking a 9.21% reduction.
- b. They are looking to add 4 student employees max, which would put them at 14.
- c. If they decrease funding by 20% it would impact their ability to hire new people.
  - i. 14 is a lot of student employees for their space. They are only adding two new areas for their space. The front desk to be what the space is which is understandable but does not require 4 new student staff.
- d. They received money from the state to rebuild and expand the space. The 4 new positions are to support the operations of their new spaces for student staff.
- e. Because they don't know the logistics of it, yet they have a hard time approving the 4 extra staff in their budget. 4 is a broad projection.

- i. They are looking to hire 4 with a minimum of 2 student staff.
  - ii. Instead of \$116K for student payroll it could be \$100K instead.
    - 1. What's tricky is not knowing the amount of hours and students required to get the necessary coverage.
  - iii. They did want to follow the structure of the SURC's operating staff.
  - iv. They do have a lot of events and have a lot of specific data for how students attend a lot of things.
- f. If they moved to decrease their funding to 20% it would bring their total funding down to \$435K as apposed to their current request for \$493K.
- g. 2023-2024 they had 4,470 attendees and 182 events.
- h. They do get a lot of traffic, and their daily traffic is increasing.
  - i. They are not sure how much that would increase with the new building.
  - ii. The new spaces will consist of a kitchen, offices, meeting spaces, areas similar to the ballroom, etc. There's likely to be an increase in traffic due to those additional spaces.
- i. They have 11 student staff for programs and front desk, which is excessive.
- j. Someone is more interested in having them hire 3 students
  - i. Erin pointed that it would be more helpful to look at the number of hours because it's hard to see the hours for 1 student.
    - 1. It's tricky when starting to think about because it could take 3 students to fill in that time period.
  - ii. Salary would be more impactful then hourly.
    - 1. For students look at the hours since that could vary.
  - iii. It's 220 hours for the 11 student staff they currently have.
- k. Recommendation?
  - i. Funding 2 new student staff which was their minimum.
  - ii. Someone is leaning towards not increasing staff until they see their numbers and verify that they need the additional help, which they can do through supplemental funding.
  - iii. Erin asked what that means?
    - 1. They clarified that they would put them at the 20% reduction.
  - iv. The MCC would not be built until 2026.
  - v. Working on the assumption that the \$116K for student payroll is for the 14 students and not giving them what the 4 students requested it would bring them down to 10 student staff. Assuming every student staff is weighed equally:
    - 1.  $(\$116L / 14 \text{ staff}) * 10 \text{ staff} = \$83K$  per student payroll which leads to \$460K compared to their \$493K and is a decrease of \$33K of what they requested.

**RECOMENDATION: Approving the minimum number of students employed to 2 additional staff. Recommendation Failed. 1 (yes), 4 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce their budget to \$460K, which is a 15% reduction. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on DEC. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

C. Transfer Center

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to debate the Transfer Center. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Goods and Services was for snacks and stuff that they are currently paying out of pocket.
- b. This is a new S&A request, and they haven't been funded before. Given that 40% of CWU's student population are transfer students, they are already operating without S&A funds so it may not impact the students
  - i. It was stated that it's a bad time to be a new request.
  - ii. Someone is leaning towards not funding them. They've been operating out of their own budget, and personal spending, and it would not affect a large number of students.
- c. Transfer Center usage is going down from Year to Year, so it seems like they are not retaining students because of snacks.
  - i. They still have trips and activities
  - ii. Snacks are not a priority
- d. It's not just for snacks it's for event stuff and other supplies such as field trips and graduation chords.
  - i. It's for all graduates.
- e. Their foot traffic is going down.
- f. It's not a good year to be additional funding areas but if they approved this funding would that improve the foot traffic within the Transfer Center? It would let them have 1-2 field trip, crafts, and snacks. Graduation chords are the biggest expense.
  - i. They are paying food out of pocket so it's not coming out of S&A.
  - ii. How many people are not eating the snacks?
  - iii. Are people just popping in for snacks then leaving?
- g. There's a priority in the budget for the graduation chords
  - i. The memorabilia is important for graduating students. Other departments have chords and stoles, and this is important to student morale. It shows that students completed something of the specific achievement.
- h. If they don't fund this, they will still have chords.

- i. Part of their request was to use the funds to re-allocate their spending into the other areas. State funding does not allow for food spending which is why they pay for those out of pocket.
- i. They just shared data on how people feel.
- j. Recommendation?
  - i. Deny the current request

**RECOMENDATION: Deny the Transfer Center's budget request. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on the Transfer Center. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### D. KCWU

**MOTION: Nick V made a motion to debate KCWU. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. They were taking an 18% reduction instead of a full 20%, and they had 3 pro staff moved into S&A budget.
- b. The pro staff came out of the SUB Fee.
  - i. Erin noted that in the last quadrennium S&A and SUB fee saw publicity and the radio on the S&A side. Student Union Engineering and Student Union Operations were partially funded by S&A. Last year there was decision to take SUB Funding from KCWU and Publicity.
    - 1. The Student Union building fee would then fully fund engineering and Student Union building operations. The S&A fee would then fully fund Publicity and KCWU.
  - ii. Over the years that reduction only impacted a part of his budget because the building fee portion wasn't being reduced. Though their half was getting reduced as well. It wasn't like they didn't get additional positions in S&A and they got more money for it. It was a result of that correction of how that money was coming in, which was a downside for this budget.
- c. Their request does that include their updated systems?
  - i. This was mentioned because their systems are pushing 20 years, and they were able to get some parts from surplus.
- d. What would a 20% reduction look like?
  - i. It would reduce student staff hours per week. They are feeling the impacts of limited student staff already. Less student support means less events which is how they get revenue, revenue that they rely on.
  - ii. Some of what they do is advertisement through the radio station so that students can also play music at events. They increased that fee.
    - 1. They are paid to play music at orientation which covers staffing and equipment.
- e. Recommendation to approve the full amount asked

- f. Recommendation to do a full 20% reduction

**RECOMENDATION: Fund the budget to the full amount. Recommendation Failed. 2 (yes), 3 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce their budget by 20%. Recommendation Carried. 3 (yes), 2 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on the Transfer Center. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

E. WSPN – Wildcat Sports Network

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the budget for Wildcat Sports Network. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. This budget is for student staff and perhaps this is something that athletics could help fund
  - i. This may not happen
  - ii. This is general sports information.
- b. The number of students that get the experience is 3 students and 1 volunteer.
  - i. How do they see viewership? They have livestream numbers but no way to track the amount of people listening to each livestream.
- c. Why wouldn't they be able to integrate this with the Radiation Station? Why does this have to be separate?
  - i. They already have 14 staff for the radio station. Do none of those staff members want to work sports events.
  - ii. Perhaps people are doing both sides of that.
- d. Number of events they covered:
  - i. Football, men's basketball, women's' basketball, some basketball, some softball, rugby, and rundown
- e. They do the main ones that a majority of people go to watch
- f. What is the \$8K camps per hour?
  - i. In 2023 that was most of the allocation from that year and the year before. There was \$3,700 that they did not spend in 2022 but carried forward. At the end of 2023, everything that they did not spend was swept. Including that plus what they didn't spend in 2023 – Of the 3 years of allocation on the transfer line is what they did not spend.
  - ii. Over the past 3 years they spent around \$4,752. Hold them to that amount.
- g. Recommendation?
  - i. Lower funding to \$4,752 to allow for two student staff

**RECOMENDATION: Lower Funding to \$4,752, which is a 53% reduction. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on the WSPN. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

F. Centers and Activities

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the budget for Centers and Activities. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. They haven't spent full allocation despite the increase in their request. Event when they were allocated \$392K they still didn't spend the full amount. They are asking for \$386K.
  - i. Therefore, lower them to the 20% since they haven't been spending their full budget.
- b. They are spending nearly \$70K on goods and services, which is understandable considering that they are providing a lot for the students.
- c. They did mention the majority of people that they used this is online students for online workshops. There's about 1,400 online students.
  - i. The largest representation is online students. Although there may be a preference for in person activities the exception would be for the online students.
- d. Staffing model for west side student life
  - i. Survey numbers
    1. Flat numbers
- e. A 20% reduction may affect student hours but there are budget cuts.
  - i. Unfortunately, the majority of the budget cut is going to affect student hours.
- f. Recommendation
  - i. Cut a further 20% and not the original 14%

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce their funding by 20%. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on Centers and Activities. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

Budget Update by Erin Sargent

- Option 1: not increasing the fee
  - \$123K left to allocate
- Option 2: increase the fee by 4%
  - \$334K left to allocate

G. University Center (Westside)

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the budget on the West Side Centers. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. This budget is just for the student ambassador salaries. They are involved in recruiting more students.
- b. Per the Killian Guidelines they cannot use S&A funding to recruit students.
- c. They mention 0.5 student ambassadors, which represents labor hours.
  - i. Mean 10 hours
  - ii. It could mean that they have 2 student ambassadors for 3 locations
- d. Satellite locations
  - i. They are students who work at the centers that are there to greet and network with the students that go to those center
  - ii. Per their presentation students going to the centers that could potentially interact with the ambassadors, but they have permanent staff there to do more.
- e. They host with community college students and the ambassadors. The ambassadors are there to foster awareness for the CWU programs through the community college, so they play a key role in helping prospective students understand the benefit.
  - i. How do they draw that line when hosting events and doing programming so that the funding is only going to Central Students and not prospective students?
  - ii. Are they ensuring that funding for events go to mainly CWU students?
- f. Centers are a satellite CWU office at a community college.
  - i. CWU office facilitates certain classes at those locations. The ambassadors are interacting with the students at the community college. They may be networking with non CWU students as a way to interact with them.
- g. Per Killian guidelines it's in a grey area because wording implies that it is broadcasted to all students but seems more intentional to recruit students.
  - i. Per the presentation it is likely the latter.
- h. Big list of responsibilities
  - i. They use a lot of big terms without specifying what they host but to spread awareness of their programs a CWU student probably knows about the programs and are less likely to ask about it.
  - ii. Majority of students are online only and how much of those students.
    - 1. Not all students go to their programming and events
    - 2. Students are coded and may be getting double coded. They are coded to a specific campus, but they could be attending classes fully online.
- i. A reduction would affect ambassadors' capacity to serve at the Center campus students effectively and working to attract new students to CWU. They essentially do both, so it is a grey area.
  - i. \$41,212?

- j. Leaning towards defunding because it violates a portion of the Killian Guidelines. They need to spread the money.
  - i. This would impact the interactions they have with students and there would be affects to that. This is tough because of the Killian Guidelines
- k. Defunding would impact the international students that they have.
  - i. There are still centers activities which could potentially give opportunities to promote CWU.
- l. There's already a student for online students' inaction – they overlap
- m. Recommendations?
  - i. To fully defund the University centers program

**RECOMENDATION: Fully defund the centers program budget. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 1 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on Centers and Activities. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Arik made a motion to recess for 10 minutes. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**Eli called the meeting to order at 10:18 am.**

- It was asked by a committee member how the committee wanted to decreasing lower the total revenue that they are distributing. Would they rather defund things that they originally thought they would have money for or decrease the big-ticket items?
  - It was suggested adjusting the big-ticket items such as SLICE. Although they want to fully fund them that Is not realistic at this point.
  - Erin agreed because seeing where they are at and going back through while all things considered it will be beneficial to put things back on the table to make things more fair for all the areas.

H. Office of International Studies

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate for the Office of International Studies. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. It was acknowledged that they do a lot of travel which is understandable. The issue was what they use for the travel, which is charter buses that are expensive. Although it's the safer option renting a school bus may be cheaper. They are looking at an increase this year.
  - i. Motorpool only goes up to a single 12-seater van.
    - 1. They are exporting 56 students.
  - ii. When looking at that many people it's probably a better option to go with the bus.

- b. The transportation may not be as impactful as the student wages.
- c. If they are only spending \$8,400 on staff, then they are spending that extra money somewhere. Cultural programming and travel.
  - i. They've gone from 4 employees to 2 for 15 hours a week. They have a \$17K increase
    - 1. They list increase costs in travel as a reason for their increase in their presentation, but they list that it's only paying for staff wages in their budget
  - ii. Their explanation of the last funding cycle
    - 1. There was an issue with how that was recorded
- d. Look at the bus tickets to Seattle to determine things. Travel was based on the price to go to Seattle**
- e. Would a 20% be reasonable?
  - i. One thing to. It's less than what they've been spending for the last two years. \$12K is less than what they've been spending on the last 3 years. They've been spending on the lower end of \$9K on wages on the last 3 years.
  - ii. On wages they spent \$10 last year.
  - iii. A 20% reduction from last year's would be \$12K.
- f. Some of their international students that go on these trips and use these programs don't pay S&A fees.
  - i. They pay an extra international student fee.
    - 1. They have multiple budgets, and this is a small portion of what this group funds for them. That lives in a separate fund, and they probably have another limited budget from that.
- g. The increase is due to wanting to hire more students and going on more trips.
  - i. There are no challenges currently impacting them with their current budget.
- h. They don't want to hire new people and increase the budget as it stands. There are currently supporting people that are in that position.
  - i. There was agreement as they don't have the ability to increase, and the 20% reduction would reduce their ability to subsidize for larger events. They could still hold the events they just wouldn't be able to subsidize as much.
- i. What is the current rate of increase for minimum wage?
  - i. No, but they assume it's going to be 35 cents, but this could be incorrect.
  - ii. WA State min wage is expected to increase to \$17 per hour - according to AI. That's about an 85 cents increase.
- j. They would be okay with giving them what they've been spending over the past 3 years plus the increase for minimum wage for the student wages.
  - i. \$11,250, which is a 25% decrease

k. Recommendation to lower funding by 25% - \$11,250.

**RECOMENDATION: Lowering funding by 25% - \$11,250. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for the Office of International Studies. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

I. Manastash

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on Manastash. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. They are looking at 3.59% decrease. They have not been using their full budget, and it is linked to their class that a majority of the class utilizes.
- b. Discussion about the Manastash's connection to their ENG 485 and how that may violate Killian guidelines. The journal itself is a collection of student writing put together. The English class edits and designs the journal. S&A has been paying for the publishing to print and use the online journal. There was discourse about Killian's guidelines and printing what the class publishes since the editing is part of the class. Although any student could enroll in the class and be a part of the publishing, it is more towards the academics.
  - i. S&A has essentially been paying for the publishing to print and the online journal. If the classroom cannot function without S&A funds, then the S&A funds are funding a class.
- c. The class does web postings of the journal, which allows for more visibility. It was recommended to reduce the allocation to only pay for the web posting for the base funding cycle.
- d. Discussions about spendings and the funds requested. They are asking for \$5K but they spent \$235 last year. If they are expecting \$4K for printing costs but have only been spending \$235 in the previous years.
  - i. This is because they wanted to roll over funds to the next funding year, but it was swept back. They had planned to use it entirely for funding.
  - ii. They may have not been printing right before COVID.
- e. Someone recommended to pay for their web posting and keeping it at \$250 for the base funding cycle. If they need more funds for their web postings then they could come back to S&A for supplemental funding.
- f. They are leaning towards the \$900 to pay for the portion outside of the class for students that want to publish that writing.
- g. Recommendation
  - i. To approve \$250 for web posting.
    1. This is a decrease by 83% reduction.
    2. \$250 per year and assuming that it's \$500 every two years.

3. They could do a base funding adjustment to carry the funds forward based on this recommendation for this group.

**RECOMENDATION: Lowering funding by 83%. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Manastash. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

J. Lion's Rock

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on Lion's Rock. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. They are requested 21% reduction from their projected expense amount.
- b. They have been using \$4,000-\$2,000 of their budget but were allocated \$2,700.
  - i. They were looking to increase goods and services in order to have more speakers. They have been in the red despite receiving their supplemental funds
- c. Discussion about Lion's Rock connection to academics. Their intern work on the organization and coordination for Lion's Rock in accordance with an English course objectives. They see that this is problematic especially since students are being required to attend these speaker events for the class.
  - i. There were concerns about this request violating Killian Guideline's because of the connection to the course.
- d. Discussion clarifying the increase. They based their previous base funding cycle on funds that they were hoping to get approved from other funding sources. Those revenue streams are no longer. S&A is potentially their last funding source which is why they are asking for S&A to cover the entire budget rather than the previously requested portion.
  - i. Other funding sources include:
    1. Grants
    2. Annual donor
    3. Rollover funds, which are no more
    4. Fundraising that may have not happened
    5. Projected partnerships
- e. Discussion about the attendance for these events. The modality of the meetings are hybrid: at the library and on zoom. Although they get 471 zoom attendees, this is open to the public and doesn't break down how many of the attendees are students. These events are open to everyone. They wonder the attendance of students to non-student members that attend these events. They also wonder if there are students attending that are not required to attend.
- f. There was a concern of ENG 468 and 568 class requirements conflicting with the Killian Guidelines. They answered in their documentation that English 468 and

568 records these events for their asynchronous learners that watch these events at a later date.

- g. The discussion of the other funding sources came up again. They thought they would have the support of those funding sources in the previous base funding cycle but that did not happen. Because of this they increased their request this year to cover the costs that were not covered both those alternative funding sources.
- h. The issue is the class requirements as this is tied to the class. They'd be willing to fund this if they severed all ties to the class. Despite this they could fund a portion that is not tied to the class, but they agree that they cannot increase their allocation this funding cycle.
  - i. It's somewhat in a grey area since it doesn't follow the Killian Guideline's completely. Reducing may impact them but due to their online meeting options they may have a similar attendance rate if a reduction is enforced.
- i. Discussions about the funding of their request and the changes from the previous quadrennial cycle compared to the next one.
- j. Although Lion's Rock was approved of their supplemental funding request for this AY, they have yet to spend those funds at this time. They could still spend those funds since the AY has not ended.
- k. Although a reduction would impact their in-person events, they have the option to continue hosting these events virtually. This request is in a grey area, and it was agreed that funding should go to things that aren't in such a grey area for this next cycle. Lion's Rock cited course objectives several times in their documentation.
- l. Recommendation?
  - i. To not fund this request.

**RECOMENDATION: Deny this request. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Lion's Rock. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to recess for 5 minutes. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to recess for lunch until 12 PM. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**Eli called the meeting to order at 12:07 pm.**

K. New Docket

- a. There was a suggestion to start with academic related requests first:
  - i. Theatre Arts, marching band, pep band, Mariachi
- b. Mariachi

- c. Case Management
  - d. Theatre Arts
  - e. Veterans
  - f. ESC
    - i. Although their policy states specific funding for their organizations, the committee does not have to follow that.
  - g. Museum
  - h. Art Gallery
  - i. Marching Band
  - j. Pep Band
  - k. Wildcat Farm / Wildcat Community Garden
    - i. Operates through the Auxiliary and supplies food
  - l. Garden
    - i. A community area in the same location / area as the Farm
  - m. West Side Career Services
  - n. SOURCE
- L. Mariachi
- a. Eli chose to remove himself as he as a conflict of interest, so the Vice-Chair (Ian) moved to operate as the Chair for the Mariachi section.

**MOTION: Arik made a motion to open debate for Mariachi. Nick seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

- b. Discussion about issues to fund this request. There was potential to funding through the Music Department. Although they wanted to use S&A funds to get an instructor to teach, this goes against the Killian guidelines.
  - i. They stated in their documents that having an instructor is their top priority followed by the trajes. If S&A provides an instructor, they are essentially simulating a class. Funding an instructor itself would not fall under Killian guidelines.
- c. Discussion about issues funding the trajes. They presented that the trajes have to be measured and altered to fit people in a specific way. They mentioned that in the potential future of one day having enough trajes to make alterations once they have enough.
- d. Discussion about whether or not providing funds for a club violates Killian guidelines. Although S&A can fund a club, there are S&A funds going through SLICE via the RSO funds process.
  - i. If S&A were to approve this request it would alter the precedent that S&A could fund clubs, and there are 100+ clubs.
  - ii. If the club could not hire an instructor. They could hire something more similar to a performer that would have to go through SLICE. There are complexities, legalities, and contracts in hiring that SLICE has more experience and resources to gauge. Clubs need to work through SLICE

regarding the contracting/funding of a performer since S&A has not funded clubs in the past

- iii. Page 3 of the Killian's guidelines that student organizations are allowed to fund clubs. Previously, S&A did fund Clubs, but this quickly became overwhelming as there are 100+ clubs. 4 years ago, the committee decided to give a pot of money to the student club coordinator in SLICE who would distribute those funds instead of S&A funding every individual club.
- iv. SLICE can request supplemental S&A funds for a club. The precedent has not been set for club to seek funds through S&A directly without going through SLICE.
- v. Funding this would open up the avenue for clubs in the next quadrennium to do the same thing, so it would bypass what was done in the past quadrennium.
- e. Discussion about Mariachi's frustration voiced in their presentation about seeking funds through the proper channels in a way that is successful. Perhaps they could request funds from SLICE to purchase the trajes. Working with SLICE for base funding would have been more appropriate.
  - i. Since there are other avenues for them to go through, setting up a new base funding for this quadrennium would not be ideal. Especially due to budget cuts.
  - ii. It would be different if there was an instructor to guide them.
- f. Recommendation?
  - i. Deny the current request for the Mariachi Program.

**RECOMENDATION: Deny this request. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Arik made a motion to close debate for Mariachi. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

#### M. Case Management

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on Case Management. Marisol seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. This is an important service that is offered, and they did the 20% reduction.
- b. Case management does referrals for suicide, hospitalization, basic needs, etc.
- c. Discussion about their org chart and staffing situation. Their org chart showed 4 positions; 2 of them are funded separately as permanent staff and the other 2 positions are vacant. They would like to add an office assistant. Case Management's decision to fill those vacant roles is dependent on S&A funds.
  - i. There are a lot of students being helped and dealt with, which is a large caseload between the 2 Case Mangers. Giving them the funds to hire more staff would offset that load.

- d. Discussion if they didn't receive base funding. They would have to adjust their funding sources, which are limited.
- e. Confusion about the difference between a Case Manager and PATH Advocate. The Case management operations relate the PATH Advocate things and are really heavy. Per the Killian Guidelines is the S&A should not fund things that the committee believes should be funded by the University which is why PATH is funded by the university. The university may not have the option to fund Case Management compared to S&A.
- f. The committee agreed that they could allocate funds for 1 extra permanent position because 2 would be outside their budget range.
- g. Discussion about their other state funding. It's legislative earmarked funding specifically for the funding through the state for mental health budget. They are able to plug into any budget areas. Those funds are not a set amount and only allocated every biennium.
- h. Recommendation?
  - i. Giving them 50% of what was requested last quadrennium. \$85,150.50.
    - 1. If funding 1 position isn't enough then they can always come back to make an adjustment. If something severe happens then the committee could address that need should there be supplemental funds available.

**RECOMENDATION: Give them 50% of what was requested last quadrennium, which would recommend an allocation of \$85,181.50. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Case Management. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### N. Theatre Arts

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate for Theatre Arts. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Discussion about Theatre Arts receiving the Film department in 2023. This also impacted the staffing for the Equipment Checkout Center (ECC). There were concerns about how they received no funding when the Film department was absorbed.
- b. Discussion about this request's connection to curriculum. The ECC is associated with a class, so equipment checkout is used mainly by students associated with a class. There are requirements for classes that require this equipment. They might not have checkout options outside of the department, so if you're a student not in that theatre/film department there is not an option to checkout equipment. Regardless, the connection to curriculum would violate Killian Guidelines.
- c. Discussion about this program getting funding through the departments. This funding is for student employees, but the checkouts itself are by those in the classes. They reflected on the supplemental funding request in fall. Although it

was adding to the job experience in the department, it doesn't seem that there are equipment checkout options for those not involved in those classes.

- d. There was a discussion of a 77% reduction for this area followed by a discussion of the amount of students this impacts.
- e. Discussion about self-generated revenue such as ticket sales. There seems to be a small student patronage and tickets being purchased. It is likely that those funds would go into a self-generated revenue budget.
- f. Discussion about the functions of the positions. These positions use the skills they learn in classes to support classes that require equipment. It was agreed that it should be funded by the Theatre department and not S&A itself.
  - i. They discourse the grey area of whether or not this is a class. Although it's separated, they are using the skills in class to help with these productions through those positions. But then they get credit in class for those productions.
  - ii. It was agreed that the connection to the productions itself tie this to academic requirements. Especially when considering the students are required to attend a certain amount of the productions.
  - iii. They acknowledge the impact that this would have but note that this is not widely accessible to non theatre/film students.
- g. Recommendation?
  - i. Recommend to deny the funding request.

**RECOMENDATION: Deny this funding request. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Theatre Arts. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

O. Veterans Center

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to open debate for Veterans Center. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- i. Ian is abstaining from this vote.
- b. They are taking the 20% reduction.
- c. Discussion about variations in the expenses. Most of variations are in their wages; they may have had a vacant position for some time. They are asking for an 80/20 split of the position. The state is paying 80% for their outreach coordinator position the 20% is being asked to come from S&A.
- d. It would affect programs and goods and partly their outreach coordinator position.
  - i. They support Veteran and Veterans families. They can't reduce more of the salary so a reduction would have to come out of more of that. They support a lot of students and are doing a 20% reduction.
- e. This is fully fundable under the Killian Guidelines
- f. Budget Update:
  - i. Option 1: \$26,500 left
  - ii. Option 2: \$237K left

- g. One is leaning towards fully funding because it services students directly and has no downside. Reducing would impact students involved
- h. Recommendation?
  - i. Recommend to fully Fund the Veterans Center program budget

**RECOMENDATION: Fully fun the Veterans Center program budget. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 1 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to close debate for Veterans Center. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- Budget Update:
  - If the recommendations go through as is and they don't increase the fee for next year, then they are over budget. If they increase the fee, then they are not over budget at this time.
    - Increasing the S&A fee is a separate process that goes through ASCWU to do a formal fee increase. If they choose to set their budget at the increase, then that is their choice but there's a complex process, so it is not an immediate change.
      - Option 1: Over \$12K
      - Option 2: \$200K to go

#### P. ESC

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to open debate for ESC. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- i. Nick V will be abstaining from the vote
- b. They are not taking a reduction and are keeping their current request the same as last year. This was due to their hopes that they could bring on one more organization every couple of years. They interact with a large number of students per quarter. They also fund organizations.
- c. This one is similar to the DEC. They share space and are physically in the same space. Their advisor is paid out of the DEC budget. Although it is similar, it is somewhere in between the DEC and RSO funding. These are orgs, not clubs.
- d. Each org is allotted \$3,500. Perhaps they don't use the full \$3,500 every year.
  - i. Spring is when they organize a lot. They will perform an event if they have the funds for it.
  - ii. If an org didn't use all their funds, then they would keep it. They could repurpose it, but they don't. There is no designated organizer for this.
- e. In the last two years they left upwards of \$17K on the table. This opens the discussion for a 20% reduction. They did note the importance of ESC but were concerned about the unused funds from ESC and the orgs.
- f. ESC designates \$3,500 to organizations per their own constitution. Reducing would impact their programming budget.
- g. Recommendation?

- i. Have ESC Present a 20% reduction

**RECOMENDATION: Have ESC take a 20% reduction. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for ESC. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

Q. Museum

**MOTION: Arik made a motion to open debate for Museum. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. This one has other funds from the COTS at their discretion but is not guaranteed by their department, and if they received those funds it would be \$15K. They also have funds from a foundation account that is limited in use.
- b. They made it work the past 3 years with \$14K but then went into the negative in fiscal year 22 and 23. However, they began to balance their budget better by the end of 2024.
- c. Discussion about the reduction that they did not request for. It was noted that if they incorporate a reduction and it is not enough that they could request supplemental funds from S&A if needed.
- d. Recommendation?
  - i. Make the 20% reduction

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce their budget by 20% to \$11,836. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for the Museum. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to recess for 10 minutes. Arik. 5 yes.**

R. Art Gallery

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate for the Art Gallery. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. This request is asking for a 11% increase. They have a certain amount from the College of the Arts that is not always guaranteed.
  - i. They have a onetime only foundation funds but a self-support of \$4K every other year.
- b. 2024 they had a change in staff. A staff position was partially funded by S&A that got moved back over the college to provide additional programming and there are no permanent staff in this budget only student staff.
- c. Discussion about their goods and services, which covers contracts. Contracts for artists to come display art, travel for artists, and mainly shipping art, and programming supplies. Things to put into their gallery. They also pay for artwork.

- d. Although there are 4,00 visits each academic year it is open to the public, so it might not just be students visiting this gallery.
- e. Discussion about students hired. They only hire work study students. Work study is a component of financial aid and covers about 60% of the wage. It subsidizes student workers. This is a federal program and is a good benefit to the employer
- f. A reduction may impact student employment more than goods and services.
- g. Although the request mentions educational objectives in their request, it might be more of an educational incentive that could teach students about what art is about. It supports education goals to teach students while being open to all students.
- h. Discussion about how they don't charge in the gallery and wondered if they would benefit from changing that in the future.
- i. Recommendation?
  - i. Fund up to \$31,950 of their budget.

**RECOMENDATION: Fund up to \$31,950 of their budget. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Art Gallery. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### S. Marching Band

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate for the Marching Band Budget. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Discussion about this request ties to course requirements. Not only is it tied to a class, but the class is also required for Music Education majors. Due to budget constraints, it was suggested to not fund this in accordance with the Killian Guidelines.
  - i. Co-curricular activities implies that it takes up time in class. Students involved are expected to show up for the activities outside of class, which is in conjunction with the coursework.
    - 1. Co-curricular is activities that take place outside of the classroom but are still to curriculum in some way.
  - ii. There is an instructional aspect of this.
- b. Although the submitted request and their presentation do not match, their request follows their presentation. Their presentation was higher than what was submitted.
- c. Discussion about non-music major participants. Documentation explains their audition process and how it is open to all students. There were concerns about the amount of non-music major participants.
- d. It was noted in previous quadrennium that the S&A voted to no longer fund the Symphony Orchestra. There were concerns about its similarity to Marching Band and concerns about how it was not cut then.

- e. Discussion regarding the student leadership positions. They compared it to paid TA positions. There were concerns that those positions are also required to take the class.
- f. Discussion about why the athletic departments does not fund this. Comparisons to other universities that fund the marching band from the music and athletic departments.
- g. Discussion if there are aspects of marching band that is fundable as it relates to their priorities. They tied this back to being co-curricular therefore not fundable.
  - i. Due to the budget constraints, they are under, and the Marching Band ties to curriculum, there are too many grey areas making this not fundable.
- h. Recommendation?
  - i. To fully defund the marching band

**RECOMENDATION: Deny the Marching Band's funding request.**

- The vote against noted that there may be a piece of this that is fundable but understands the justification to deny this since it is so intertwined.

**Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 1 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Marching Band. Nick M seconded.**

**Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### T. Pep Band

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on Pep Band Budget. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Pep band is different from Marching Band in that it is open to everyone through audition regardless of major. It is not a course requirement, nor does it have any course linked to it. It's outside of academic curriculum.
- b. Discussion about goods and services. There is a stipend for students involved in pep band. A lot of the goods and services goes to programming and travel.
- c. Recommendations?
  - i. Recommendation to do a 20% reduction which is 32% from the prior quadrennium. If more was needed, they could request supplemental funds.

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce this budget by 32% from the prior quadrennium.**

**Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate for Pep Band. Arik seconded. Motion**

**Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### U. Community Garden

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the Community Garden Budget. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. There is a 20% reduction on this. This request includes payroll for students.
- b. They have fairly low interactions. This may not be affected as much because the number of students is about 13, which is not even 25. The metrics from their

breakdown shows that it involves more the 41 students and gardeners. Although the garden produces food to feed up to 200 people, it was not specified how many of those people are students.

- c. The position S&A is funding for the student position, but the review references the garden itself. The coordinator position tracks and delegates the spots.
- d. They made a change so that there could be adoptions for student spots.
- e. The current request is \$9,800 which is less than the last request, but they haven't spent their full budget in the last 2 years. They used \$8,700 out of the amount they were allotted.
- f. Recommendations?
  - i. Recommendation to approve the full request

**RECOMENDATION: Approve this request in full. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to close debate for the Community Garden. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

#### V. West Side Career Services

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on West Side Career Services. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Discussion about Career Services at the main campus versus the West Side Career Services. The main campus is paid by the state, but they are under the same office. This can be due to the specifics of the how the funds are distributed as to why the state funds only go to the main campus. Satellite campus students pay the S&A fee, so this is a resource for those students that are already paying for that fee.
  - i. Discussion about
- b. Discussion about the impacts of a 20% reduction. It would change them to a 10-month contract which would give them no time to plan workshops and do other things during the Summer.
  - i. This would limit their Summer planning. It would also impact their goods and services for programming. This would reduce their funds to coordinate events.
- c. They didn't use all of their funds in the previous quadrennium due to the impacts of their vacant position that is now filled.
- d. They agreed that a 10-15% reduction would be less impactful to their programming and allow for the Career Counselors to continue meeting with those Centers students in-person.
- e. This is one of the few S&A funded programs at the centers.
- f. Recommendation?
  - i. Recommendation to fund 16% less than their previous quadrennium request.

**RECOMENDATION: Fund a 16% reduction of the previous quadrennium request. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate on the West Side Centers Career Services. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

W. SOURCE – Office of University of student resource

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate for SOURCE. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- i. Eli will be abstaining
- b. Their last allocation shows a large transfer (FY23) was due to there not being SOURCE during COVID.
- c. This request has a 15% reduction
- d. Discussion about the details of their budget and allocation. Their allocation last year was \$54K. They have an additional component to their budget that operates similar to 2 budgets. Their reporting looks higher because when they closed out the budgets, they did not close out that second component.
- e. FY 25 (current) their reduction is 15% and they went with their reduced allocation for this year in what they requested rather than looking at the previous quadrennium.
  - i. They are requesting less funds despite growing in SOURCE. They have been consistent with the amount of students that received grant money in each cycle.
- f. Discussion about how it fits within the Killian Guidelines. This is open to all students who apply to receive grant funding while offering several types of presentation options. There is great research experience which is impactful for students that seek higher education. It also provides professional development and gives opportunities for student organizations if needed.
- g. They are leaning towards fully funding their request at the 15% reduction.
- h. Recommendation?
  - i. To approve the full amount requested.

**RECOMENDATION: Approve the full amount requested. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to close debate. Eli seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to recess for 5 minutes. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**Eli called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm.**

- Budget Update

- Current Allocation Recommendations are at \$5,797,184.05 which is 106% of their budget
  - They could increase the S&A Fee up to 4%, which would put them at 102% over their budget.
  - This would be \$11 a quarter
- Funding it at the current rate then eventually Minimum wage and COLAs will eat into the S&A fund. This is what happened last quadrennium and they were in a spot with no wiggle room. They may need to consider a fee increase and to adjust to these inflationary funds. It is good to have a conversation amongst the group about what they think. Perhaps the committee wants to look at the ones approved and reconsider and see where they end up.
  - Option 1: They are \$321,404.05 over
  - Option 2: They are \$109,908.05 over
    - They could do something in between both options.
- All of these areas would be impacted by the minimum wage increase and COLAs.
- They may need to reassess what has been recommended and adjust.
- Data from the previous quadrennial compared to recommended and requested amount for this next quadrennial.
- They may want to adjust their recommendation for an increase when they are more towards the end of their deliberation.

**MOTION: Arik made a motion to look at March 14<sup>th</sup>'s items that were previously voted on and reopen them up for debate. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- They want to reconsider: REC Admin, SUB Custodial, SLICE Umbrella (Campus Activities, Club Travel, Publicity Center, Student Involvement), SUB Scheduling, DEC, ECLC

#### X. REC Admin Fee

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the REC Admin Fee. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Discussion about reducing this request to a 20% reduction. Some felt that a 20% reduction was too impactful. The reduced amount shows that they are already budgeted to end the year in the end and causes them to spend into reserves. They would like to reduce their budget without having the REC reduce their service costs but that does not seem possible.
- b. REC is important for student retention. Decreasing their budget anymore will make it harder for them to make more money through their other funds to supplement themselves. They won't be able to give their employees as many hours and won't be able to do as many events because they won't have the staffing.
- c. Recommendation?
  - i. Hold to the prior decision to stay with the full amount the REC requested

**RECOMENDATION: Allocate the full amount requested. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on the REC Admin Fee. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

Y. SUB Custodial

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the Custodial Budget. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. Reduction would give them less supplies and cut their hours for their employees
  - i. There is a lot of foot traffic and the biggest in the county
- b. This would impact health as cleanliness is needed to be health.
- c. Can they do a 10% reduction? leaving them \$225,822.50
  - i. This would either impact goods and services or student staff
- d. Recommendation?
  - i. Cut funding by 5%

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce funding for Custodial by 5%. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 1 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Arik made a motion to close debate for SUB Custodial. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

Z. SLICE

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the SLICE Budget. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- a. SLICE combined their 20% reduction with Publicity. Reducing them to 15% would be an additional \$11,400.
- b. A reduction would largely impact their programming budget unless there is an adjustment to student staff. There are 11 student employees in SLICE. Although a reduction may impact student staff, 11 student staff seems excessive.
- c. Recommendation
  - i. Reduce their budget by 16%

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce the SLICE Budget by 16%. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Nick M made a motion to close debate for SLICE. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)**

- Nick M had to leave.
- d. What's the difference between Campus Activities and Student Involvement?
  - i. Campus Activities reports up but does programs and activities open to all students. Student Involvement does RSO and has the Secretary Supervisor, Assistant Director, and goods and services to help support SLICE. It's tied to staffing. They are both under their umbrella

AA. Club Travel

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to open debate on the Club Travel. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

- a. They already reduced them to 20% but seeing as they still need to cut funds the least impactful out of the SLICE Budget would probably be Club Travel. It is a luxury to do it. Clubs can always work with SLICE and SURC Accounting with any additional funds that may arise from their club accounts
  - i. While it is club travel, it is not just for travel. Clubs can request for events, programming, etc. It helps club programs to support events or discussions.
- b. Reducing makes it harder for clubs council and clubs. Increasing reductions in other areas would be less impactful. There's a lot of different clubs that this would impact.
- c. The 20% is fine but reducing further would be severely impactful
- d. Recommendation?
  - i. Leave the reduction as it was previously voted on.

**RECOMENDATION: Leave the reduction as is. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on the Club Travel. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

BB. Publicity

- a. Discussion about Publicity's impact on students and involvement compared to the all the SLICE areas. 60% of their budget just goes towards pro staff, which is 2 pro staff and 11 student staff. They are nearing \$90K in student salaries. They make student awareness happen. If they cut this further, it would cut into their quality overall.
- b. This is \$115K but took an additional cut with the intent of offsetting the SLICE Budget.
- c. Recommendation?
  - i. 32% decrease

**RECOMENDATION: Reduce this budget by 32%. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to close debate on the SLICE Publicity Budget. Marisol seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

- Budget Update:
  - Option 1: Over by \$206,455.26
  - Option 2: Over by \$74,999.263
- From the original requests they reduced \$741,544.09, which was difficult to do.

- CC. Increasing the S&A Fee
- a. It would come from the ASCWU member to bring that recommendation to the committee. The committee would vote and then that would go to ASCWU for the student input. If ASCWU felt that it needs to be voted by the students, then that would need to go out on the ballot.
  - b. If the committee is comfortable with the Fee increase, then they can approve it to go to the CFO. If the CFO approves it, then it goes to the BOT to be approved in the next BOT meeting.
  - c. The committee is essentially identifying what the intent is with their budget.
    - i. If they go with option 2 and the fee increase is denied, then they could still go with option 2. At that point there would be too many things in motion.
  - d. Although they want to keep their budget as low as possible it may be best to incorporate a fee increase.
    - i. Adjustments were made last year. Other schools they typically increase mandatory fees every year.
  - e. Due to time constraints, they need more time to discuss adjustments and increases.
  - f. Although a 4% increase would reduce their struggles to meet the needs despite the status quo to maintain the fee, they cannot operate at the current S&A fee.

**RECOMENDATION: Use the 4% increase framework and see what they can cut before they increase the 4%. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to reconvene on Monday (March 17th) at 5:15PM to 10PM. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

### **Old Business**

None.

### **Public Comment – Second Call**

- A. Carson said, “RIP Marching Band.”
- B. Eli thanked the group for the amazing discussion and appreciates seeing everyone’s perspectives. It is hard to be here.

### **Adjournment:**

**MOTION: Ian made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:30PM. Marisol seconded the motion. 4 (yes), 0 (no), 2 (abstentions)**

**Our next meeting will be March 17, 2025 (SURC 301) at 4:30pm.**

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