

Services and Activities Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 17, 2025

Called to order:

Eli called the meeting to order at 5:16 pm.

Attendance:

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

Absent: Yahir Calderon Sotelo

Guests: Verónica (Vero) Gómez-Vilchis, Lola Gallagher

Agenda:

MOTION: Arik made a motion to approve the agenda from 3/17/25. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

Minutes:

MOTION: Arik made a motion to table the approval of meeting minutes from last week. Nick V seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

Reports

I. Chair:

a. None.

II. Advisors:

a. Funding updates:

- i. They are looking to allocate out \$5,687,276 based on their projected revenue and a potential fee increase.
- ii. The current recommendations of \$5,762,235.26 needs to be reduced by about \$75K in order to meet their budget.
- iii. So far, they've reduced \$741,544

III. ASCWU:

a. None.

Communications Received

None.

Public Comment

None.

New Business:

Last Meeting

- There was a discussion in the last meeting about increasing the S&A fee.

- The last programming discussed from March 15th's meeting about Publicity regarding their recommendation to adjust their budget to reflect 32% decrease.

Deliberations.

A. SUB Scheduling

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

- Discussion about how the 20% reduction would impact the students. Reducing the cost would directly impact S&A funded groups that would have to pay that additional cost to cover the impacts of the reduction.
- Discussion about how there are multiple funding sources. The S&A funded areas don't pay to rent rooms but would have to pay for technology fees to gain access to technology. If there were an additional component such as equipment or a change in set up would create a fee. The rates would only be applied if the labor cost was applied. Transactions are likely just for computer equipment. Aside from the S&A funds they receive a transfer in from either the state funds or University funds to ensure that there is a Scheduling Center on campus.
- Although they've been in at a net positive over the past 3 years due to the transfer in funds, those unspent funds go back to the Student Union Building.
- A 10% reduction would be \$3K for Scheduling.
- Discussion about the high impact on students. Reducing the cost would result in students having to pay scheduling fees in addition to the technology fees. Reducing their budget would be ineffective because of the higher cost to labor and staffing.
 - It would cause many clubs to have to pay a fee, which directly impacts students.
- Recommendations
 - Leave as is, 20% reduction, or 5% reduction

RECOMMENDATION: Leave the SUB Scheduling budget as is. Recommendation Carried. 4 (yes), 2 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate for SUB Scheduling. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

B. DEC/MCC

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate for DEC / MCC. Arik seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- They recently discussed how they want to add staff. They voted (3/15) to give a 15% reduction. This gives the DEC their minimum of 2 extra staff despite requesting 4 extra student staff, so the funding request currently reflects 2 extra staff. The committee did not see the need for the 4 extra student staff.
- Discussion about how the 20% reduction may limit the number of hours available for the students and impact the number of cultural events for the students. However, they are unable to look into the future and perceive what students will

really need and whether there will be a significant impact to their additional staffing as it relates to opening later. There was discussion about whether there was a significant need to have the funds for additional staff for the new building. If there was an impact, they could always request Supplemental Funding from S&A.

- c. Compared to the amount of students impacted to the whole university, this is one of those big-ticket items that may need to be cut. If they don't reduce this cost, they would have to take the cost out of another area.
 - i. The DEC/MCC requested a 9% reduction, and the committee agreed to a 15% reduction on 3/15.
 - ii. The committee is leaning towards a 20% reduction.

RECOMMENDATION: Adjust the MCC / DEC budget to reflect a 20% reduction.

Recommendation Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate for DEC / MCC Budget. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

C. ECLC

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate for ECLC. Nick M seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. Discussion about how many students were benefitting from this. There was an estimate of 62 children at about 18 children
- b. There was concern about the impacts of a 50% reduction. The higher cost towards students may impact them higher than a faculty/staff parent. If students cannot afford that cost, they may not pursue higher education. It is unfair that student parents are paying the S&A fee and the cost to use the ECLC. It seems that it is mostly the staff that is using it and not the students.
 - i. Although ECLC could survive a reduction it may lead to more faculty and staff utilizing this resource which contradicts the intention of the S&A fee funding them.
 - ii. Discourse about the affordability to student parents as is.
- c. Discussion about requirements for the teacher to children ratio. It was noted that the student employees do not count but they have a lot of student employees.
- d. Recommendation?
 - i. Keep the 50% reduction
 - ii. Give them the full amount reduction which was the 20% reduction from the prior cycle

RECOMMENDATION: Keep the 50% reduction. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 1 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate for ECLC. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

D. ASCWU Senate

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate for ASCWU Academic Senate. Arik seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. There was a mistake for when they requested in the last quadrennium. They did not request all of their positions and only requested their vacant positions. Now all of those vacant positions are filled
- b. Discussion about ASCWU's request and miscommunications. They want to increase their budget by 11% as opposed to the requested 16.978%. They are asking for \$66,127. The 16% increase was based on a 20% reduction from the previously requested plus the supplemental request from S&A.
- c. Discussion about the impacts of a reduction of that increase. This would directly impact the senators programming budget and programming for Sweezy Day. It may also impact their programming even further when wages for senators increase, which would further cut into their programming.
- d. There was a goods and supplies expenses increased drastically in 2024 as opposed to previous years. This was due to the senators planning more post covid in-person events.
- e. Discussion about wage increases that had to happen so a 20% reduction would not work.
- f. Reasoning for the 11% increase instead of a 16% increase since SWEEZY day will be a joint event this year.
- g. Recommendation?
 - i. A 20% reduction from the requested amount
 - ii. A 11% increase instead of a 16% increase
 - iii. Fully fund their request for the 16% increase
 - iv. Neither increase or decrease and maintain their previous request

RECOMMENDATION: Reduce what they are asking to by \$63,127, which is a 11% increase instead of the 16%. Recommendation Failed. 2 (yes), 3 (no), 1 (abstentions)

RECOMMENDATION: Have them take a 20% reduction off their current request. Recommendation Failed. 1 (yes), 4 (no), 1 (abstentions)

RECOMMENDATION: Fully fund their request of \$66,127. Recommendation Failed. 2 (yes), 3 (no), 1 (abstentions)

RECOMMENDATION: Neither increase or decrease and maintain their previous request. Recommendation Failed. 1 (yes), 3 (no), 1 (abstentions)

- h. Revote of the Recommendations – Discussion
 - i. The \$63K is still above their last request but still meets what they are asking for and is right in the middle
 - ii. Looking at their breakdown, travel, supplies of goods, etc. they should take a 10-15% deduction because they have a lot of unexplainable expenses such as travel and services and goods. Reducing them a little would push them to adjust their spending on their areas
 - iii. A \$3K decrease in their ask would be substantial for what they provide. They provide involvement, engagement with students which is vital. Looking for deductions, that \$3K decrease here will hurt more than a \$3K

somewhere else. It will hurt student engagement more than other departments.

- i. Revote of the Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION: Reduce what they are asking to by \$63,127. Recommendation Failed. 1 (yes), 4 (no), 1 (abstentions)

RECOMMENDATION: Fully fund their request of ASCWU Senate request of \$66,127. Recommendation Carried. 3 (yes), 2 (no), 1 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate for ASCWU Senate. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

E. KCWU

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate on KCWU. Arik seconded the motion. c

- a. Discussion on their previous vote to recommend a 20% reduction; there was 3 (yes), 2 (no), and 1 (abstain). Although the abstain was due to an absence there was discussion regarding the votes for no. There was some overlap with the sports network since they offer similar things.
- b. Their original request was 18%. They discussed how a 20% budget reduction would cause them to attend less events. It may also impact their ability to update their equipment despite using surplus for equipment within the past two years but will need to update their equipment again. Their equipment is aging.
- c. Discussion about past expenses with the possibility of taking a reduction of what they spent instead of what they received. Although
 - i. The unspent funds were due to a vacant pro staff position that they since rehired in 2024. A 20% reduction to what they are spending may not be accurate to what they need. The past 2 years they didn't spend everything which was due to their staffing. They would have been close to spending their allotment if not for their vacant position.
 - ii. Another change is that when they did rehire, they had to rehire that position in a higher step in the range as to where that position fell which made it more costly.
- d. Recommendation?
 - i. Hold the former decision of a 20% reduction

RECOMMENDATION: Nick M made a recommendation to keep their budget as is. Recommendation Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate for the KCWU Budget. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to recess for a 30-minute dinner Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- **Eli called the meeting to order at 6:56 pm.**

F. New Docket

- a. The Observer, PULSE, Art Gallery, Career Services Westside, and Veterans Center

G. Budget Update:

- a. Option 2: reduce \$49,910, which is 0.8776%
- b. Option 1: reduce \$261,406, which is 5%

H. Observer

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate for the Observer Budget. Arik seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. Current Reduction is 35.71%, which was the third option provided for no printing in the Observer's base funding presentation - \$36,246
- b. Discussion regarding student salaries. 8 student employees were listed. Discussion regarding the requirements to take COM 444 in order to be one of the students that take on additional editorial roles for the Observer.
 - i. Discussion relating to Killian Guidelines. The students in the leadership roles are required to take COM 444 at least twice, which is an impermissible use of S&A fees as this is tied to curriculum.
 - ii. Since this contradicts with Killian guidelines there was discourse relating to further reducing their allocation versus fully denying their request.
 - iii. It was agreed that the \$1,100 budgeted for awards would be a permissible use of S&A fees.
- c. Discussion relating to their previous recommendation to reduce their funding to only include the wages, rentals, subscriptions, awards, and travel expenses stated on the Observer budget.
- d. There were qualms stated about the impact a reduction would have on the Observer. Although it may diminish the Observer and impacts students, it does not fall under the Killian Guidelines.
- e. Although the Observer addresses
- f. Recommendation?
 - i. Fund \$1,100 in accordance with their budget model to only fund their awards

RECOMMENDATION: Reduce the Observer's allocation to only fund \$1,100.

- **It feels wrong and is very sad, but this is just a recommendation and still has to be approved by the groups**

Recommendation Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Arik made a motion to close the debate for the Observer. Marisol seconded.

Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

I. PULSE

MOTION: Arik made a motion to open the debate for PULSE. Ian seconded the motion.

Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. There was brief discussion to not make any changes and close the debate.
- b. Recommendation?
 - i. Keep the current recommendation

RECOMMENDATION: Maintain their previous recommendation. Recommendation Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Arik made a motion to close the debate on PULSE Budget. Ian seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- Budget Update:
 - Option 2: reduce \$14,764.46, which is 0.2596%
 - Option 1: reduce \$226,260.46, which is 4%

J. Art Gallery

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate for the Art Gallery. Marisol seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. They initially asked for an increase but brought it down to a net 0.
- b. Discussion about expenses and revenue sources. There were thoughts shared about the consequences of reducing their budget, which would impact staffing. There was agreement to reduce their allocation due to their request being greater than their spending.
 - i. Self-support funds were mentioned such as state and foundation funds
- c. There were concerns discussed regarding a 20% and the Art Gallery's ability to adapt to that. The possibility of charging to increase self-support funds was mentioned but concerns of their ability to survive even then were mentioned. Their annual 4,000 visitors were mentioned with the surrounding notion to charge visitors.
 - i. These were just speculations and they are not saying how the Art Gallery should reproduce these funds.
- d. Discussion about Undergrad and Grad exhibits in the spring quarter and the impacts it would have on their ability to afford those artists.
- e. Discussion about the priority of the Art Gallery. Although it affects quite a few students, in reference to other organizations in other areas this does not seem as important as those areas. A 20% reduction could have minimal impact on their salaries and/or exhibits.
 - i. Concerns were mentioned relating to the impact students within the department as it relates to the impact on their skills and education.
- f. Recommendation?
 - i. Lower funding to \$28,240
 - ii. Reduce funding from prior cycle to 20% - putting their recommended amount at \$25,560

RECOMMENDATION: Reduce funding from prior cycle to 20% - putting their recommended amount at \$25,560. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 1 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Ian made a motion to close the debate for Art Gallery Budget. Nick M seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

MOTION: Nick M made a motion for a 5-minute recess. Arik seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

K. Career Services West Side

MOTION: Ian made a motion to open the debate for A. Career Services West Side. Arik seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. Discussion about their previous recommendation to do the 16% reduction versus a 20% reduction and its impact.
 - i. This is just the West Side Career Services Budget. The main campus Career Services budgets the west and the east side. Although they reside and focus on the West Side, they serve all students.
- b. Discussion about the past 2 years of unspent funds. The \$7,391 in unspent funds were due to vacancies and position changes. 2 positions are now 10-month positions, and this budget only pays for those positions. The positions are an assistant director and a career counselor but they both do career counseling.
- c. Discussion about incorporating the 20%. This type of reduction would impact their ability to meet in person for west side students as well as their programming. The Career Counselors on the West Side meet virtually and physically at the centers.
- d. There was a discussion about the positive impact this has on students. They have expert staff attending resource fairs for these students and one of their virtual employer panels is an FBI employer panel. They have 999 students that may be impacted by this. There are 36 workshops, which shows how active they are. Reducing their funding may reduce their workshops, which about 705 students attend.
- e. There was confusion regarding their ability to meet in person even if Career Services met in person. It was confirmed that there would still be support at the Centers despite S&A's recommendations to remove the funds from the University Centers (West Side) Ambassador team.
- f. There was confusion regarding their 26-29 programming budget. The actual request was for \$158,500, which did not match what was in their presentation. This reflects the original request submitted.
- g. The S&A Committee previously recommend \$146K, which is a 10% reduction in what West Side Career Services asked for.
- h. Discussion about lack of student payroll because it is on a separate budget count unrelated to S&A. The impact to students comes from the programming for students, which is a service being offered to students.
- i. Discussion about the impacts of decreasing their budget by 20%. This would impact goods and services directly by \$5K. It may also affect the cyclical employment for their staff from a 11-month cycle to a smaller cycle.
 - i. They plan during the summer so that they don't have to catch up so much at the beginning of Fall.
- j. Discussion about the impacts of reducing any further. The reduction would impact their ability to provide service students, which could impact students' professional skills, writing skills, resume, etc.
 - i. There are very few things that satellite campus students receive despite also paying for S%A fees.
- k. Recommendation?
 - i. Leave current recommendation as is at 16.15% reduction

**RECOMMENDATION: Leave the current budget at the 16.15% reduction.
Recommendation Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)**

MOTION: Arik made a motion to close the debate for Career Services West Side Budget. Nick seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

L. Veterans Center

MOTION: Marisol made a motion to open the debate for the Veterans Center. Arik seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- a. They initially approved the Veteran's Center proposed 20% reduction
- b. Discussion about their total salaries decreasing from 22-23 due to a vacancy. Staff wages only pay for one portion of their outreach coordinator. That position may or may not be new or vacant temporarily. It may be a quarter of 1FP.
 - i. A lot of the employee positions are fully subsidized by the DA, but it's complicated regarding how the Veterans Center is funded.
- c. 2022, 2023, and 2024 they haven't come back for supplemental funding. In those years they haven't finished the entirety of what was given
 - i. Up until FY 23, the rule of S&A was that anything unspent could've been rolled forward into the next year. At the end of FY 23 it was decided that everything was coming back to S&A,
 - ii. They were one of many that had gotten into the habit of that money rolling back and by the time it rolled back they had realized too late that they lost their ability to spend it,
- d. Recommendation?
 - i. Leave at the 20% reduction

RECOMMENDATION: Leave the Veterans Center at the 20% reduction. Recommendation Carried. 5 (yes), 0 (no), 1 (abstentions)

MOTION: Arik made a motion to close the debate for the Veterans Center. Marisol seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

M. Discussion

- a. Docket Recommendations:
 - i. SLICE, Campus Activities, SUB Custodial
- b. Discussion about doing a 1% reduction on the big-ticket items versus all the items to hit their budget reduction goals. They've established the big things that need to be funded. It may be more fair to do a 1% reduction across the board instead of picking off the smaller items. If they continue to go through things then they are going to fund things to the full amount versus doing the 1% across the board to meet their goals.
- c. Someone recommended reviewing SUB Custodial who only took a 5% reduction.
 - i. This was because they did not have too much wiggle room. They'd either have to cut the goods of what they use or the student hours. The SURC gets a lot of foot traffic and is a big representation of Central. The 5% was their compromise to not reducing them at all. The SURC has 1.5 million annual visitors, and keeping things clean directly impacts Student Health.
 - ii. Although they would be closer to meeting their budget goals by taking a chunk out of this budget, the impact of reducing this budget any further would be drastic.

- d. Discussion of doing a percentage reduction across the board. There were conversations about adjusting this to breakeven, but concerns were raised. The anticipated S&A budget is an estimate based on future enrollment, and there are various factors that are difficult to foresee. There is also a chance that vacant positions will affect this budget positively in the future.
 - i. A 1% reduction across the board would reduce their budget by \$56,872, but not every budget would be able to take that reduction such as the bond payment.
 - ii. A 0.5% reduction across the board would result in a \$11,286.15, which is about \$4K extra.
 - iii. Extra Funds allows for more wiggle room for minor things or a change in the allocated S&A fee total.
- e. Many prefer the 0.5% reduction across the board with exclusions.
 - i. Excluding the Bond Payment, Admin fee, Manastash, PULSE, the Observer, and SUB Scheduling.
 - ii. This leaves them an additional \$14,831.08 staying in the Reserves for supplemental, to offset wage increases, and anything else that could be needed.

RECOMMENDATION: Ian made a recommendation to apply a 0.5% reduction to all areas except for Bond Payment, Admin fee, Manastash, PULSE, the Observer, and SUB Scheduling. Marisol seconded. Recommendation Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

- N. Base funding Final Recommendations
 - a. Remaining Balance
 - i. Net positive \$14,831.08
 - b. Recommendations to Base Funded Areas
 - i. \$5,673,244.92

MOTION: Ian made a motion to approve the Base Funding Tracker spreadsheet and recommendations as they stand. Arik seconded. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

Old Business

None.

Public Comment – Second Call

- A. Vero says great job and she knows that this was a lot. They accounted for the impact that it would have on students, peers, etc. It was tough but not they will go through presenting it to their Chief Financial Officer and then the Board of Trustees, so we will see what they decide. She thanked them for all their hard work and dedication.
- B. Erin said that she is proud of them and knows that it is super hard. She doesn't know any committee that has had to make a reduction like this. She hopes that they all feel good despite the mixed feelings. If they ever want to talk to her, they are always welcome to chat with her in her Office She is proud of the thoughtfulness they put into this.
- C. Arik asked if they have motion to approve the 4% S&A fee increase.
 - a. This will come through a different route in Spring.

D. Reminder that there has to be a scheduling doodle form that Robbi sent out for the Spring. We will be able to get back to the 1-hour meetings.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Ian made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:32PM. Nick M seconded the motion. Motion Carried. 6 (yes), 0 (no), 0 (abstentions)

Our next meeting will be April 8, 2025 (SURC 301) at 5:00pm.

Check out our website at www.cwu.edu/services-activities