

Services and Activities (S&A) Fee Committee

Deliberation Day 1 Meeting Minutes

Date: March 7, 2026

Time: 10:10 AM

Location: SURC 301 or Zoom

Call to Order

Vice Chair **Ba** called the meeting to order at **10:10 AM**, marking the beginning of the **first day of S&A fee deliberations**.

The purpose of the meeting was to begin reviewing **base funding requests** submitted by campus departments and programs and to determine allocation recommendations for the upcoming budget cycle.

Overview of Deliberation Process

The advisor reviewed the **deliberation process and timeline** for the committee.

Key steps include:

1. The committee will discuss and vote on funding allocations during deliberation meetings.
2. A **draft recommendation memorandum** summarizing the committee's proposed allocations will be prepared and distributed to funded departments.
3. Departments will receive a **one-week "cooling-off" period** to review the recommendations and provide feedback or clarification.
4. The committee will reconvene the following week to review feedback and determine whether any adjustments should be made.

Following the committee's final recommendations, the proposal will proceed through the following review process:

- **ASCWU Student Government**
- **President's Budgetary Advisory Council (PBAC)**
- **Board of Trustees**

The **Board of Trustees** holds final authority to approve the S&A budget. If approved, allocations will typically establish **base funding for a three-year cycle**, though the Board may also determine a shorter cycle if necessary.

Funding Policy Overview

Committee members were reminded that allocation decisions must follow two governing frameworks:

CWU S&A Funding Policy

The university policy outlines how S&A funds may be distributed and used.

Killian Guidelines

The **Killian Guidelines**, used nationally for student funding, provide additional standards for permissible and impermissible uses of S&A funds.

Key principles include:

- S&A fees are paid by students and must primarily **benefit currently enrolled students**.
- Funds may support **student organizations, programming, publications, events, and co-curricular activities**.
- Certain expenses, such as **gifts or recruitment activities**, are considered impermissible uses.

Examples of **permissible uses** include:

- Student government operations
 - Student organization programming
 - Student publications and media
 - Club travel and group participation expenses
 - Childcare services for students
 - Liability insurance related to student activities
 - Co-curricular educational programming
-

Funding Priorities

The committee reviewed funding priorities that must be considered when making allocation decisions.

Certain expenditures **cannot be reduced** because they represent contractual or operational obligations. These include:

- Bond payments related to the **Student Union and Recreation Center**
- Administrative fees associated with facility operations
- Student Union operations and custodial services
- Recreation Center administration
- Student financial management services

These costs stem from contractual obligations established when the Student Union and Recreation Center facility was constructed and must be funded before discretionary allocations are considered.

Additional priorities include:

- Contractual obligations previously approved by the committee
- Legal obligations
- Stability of programs that significantly affect students

Review of Budget Scenarios

Advisors presented two potential budget scenarios based on projected S&A fee revenue.

Current Fee Structure

- Current S&A fee: **\$282.98 per student per quarter**
- Total funding requests: approximately **\$6.1 million**
- Projected revenue: approximately **\$5.6 million**

Under this scenario, the committee would need to **reduce requests by approximately \$450,000.**

Proposed 4% Fee Increase

If the S&A fee were increased by **4% beginning Fall 2026**:

- Projected revenue would increase slightly
- Required reductions would decrease to approximately **\$248,000**

Committee members were informed that any fee increase would require additional approval through the university governance process.

Fee Increase Approval Process

If the committee recommends a **4% S&A fee increase**, the proposal would move through the following steps:

1. Review by **ASCWU Student Government**
2. Informational review by the **President's Budgetary Advisory Council (PBAC)**
3. Final consideration by the **Board of Trustees**

Members were informed that the committee serves as a **recommending body**, meaning final authority rests with the Board of Trustees.

It was also noted that fee revenue projections are based on **estimated enrollment**, which may change depending on actual student enrollment numbers.

Additional Fee Discussions

The committee was informed of other potential fee-related proposals occurring on campus, including:

- Proposed increases to **Student Union and Recreation Center fees**
- Approved increases to **housing and dining fees**
- A proposed **Course Affordability Program (CAP)** fee that would provide students with access to textbooks and certain course materials through a centralized fee system

The CAP proposal would allow students to obtain required course materials through a shared fee structure, while still allowing students to opt out if desired.

Committee Discussion: S&A Fee Increase

The committee discussed whether to proceed with deliberations assuming a **4% S&A fee increase** or to maintain the current fee rate.

Members noted that:

- Increasing the fee would reduce the total cuts required to funded programs.
- The proposed increase would equate to approximately **\$33 per student per year**.
- Maintaining the current fee would require significantly larger reductions across programs.

Some members expressed concern that if the fee increase were ultimately rejected by higher governing bodies, the committee would need to **reopen deliberations and make additional reductions** during the spring term.

Advisors noted that historically the **Board of Trustees has generally respected recommendations made by the S&A committee**, though final decisions remain at their discretion.

Committee Consensus

Following discussion, the committee reached a **general consensus** to proceed with deliberations under the assumption of a **4% S&A fee increase**.

The official vote regarding the fee increase will occur at a later meeting.

Based on this working assumption, the committee will proceed with deliberations targeting approximately **\$248,000 in reductions**.

Initial Deliberation Approach

Before reviewing individual budget requests, the Chair proposed that programs requesting **less than \$10,000** be considered for full funding due to the relatively small size of their requests.

Programs mentioned included:

- Manastash
- Community Garden

- WSRN
- Lions Rock

Some members noted that while the amounts are small, cumulative reductions across programs could still impact the overall budget.

The committee agreed to continue discussion while also considering:

- The **number of students served by each program**
 - Alignment with **funding priorities**
 - The presence of **staffing or operational costs**
-

Staff Salary Considerations

During discussion of larger budgets, a committee member asked whether **S&A funds should be used to support staff salaries.**

Advisors explained that professional staff are necessary to:

- Supervise student employees
- Manage large-scale programming and events
- Oversee contractual and liability responsibilities
- Maintain operations of major student facilities

Therefore, certain professional positions are necessary to support student services and activities funded through S&A fees.

Beginning Budget Review

The committee then began reviewing the **S&A budget spreadsheet**, which lists all funding requests.

Advisors noted that approximately **\$2.27 million of the total budget** supports required operational obligations tied to the Student Union and Recreation Center, representing roughly **39% of the total S&A funding pool.**

The committee agreed to begin examining remaining funding requests based on:

- Funding priority categories

- Program impact on students
 - Overall budget reduction targets
-

Discussion on Staff Salary Considerations

The committee discussed how **staff salaries and benefits funded through S&A allocations** affect budget deliberations.

The advisor explained that many student-focused programs require **full-time professional staff** to coordinate activities, manage facilities, and supervise student employees. These positions are typically **state-employed staff**, meaning their salaries are contractual obligations.

Members noted that if funding for a department were reduced, those reductions would often **impact student programming or student wages rather than staff salaries**, since staff positions cannot easily be eliminated mid-contract.

A committee member suggested considering **staff salaries and benefits separately from programmatic funding** when reviewing departmental requests. Under this approach, reductions would primarily affect **operational budgets, student wages, and goods and services** rather than staff compensation.

The advisor noted that while this method could provide an approximate understanding of program impacts, it would not account for variables such as **salary savings or fluctuating operational costs**.

The committee agreed to continue reviewing budgets **holistically**, while keeping staff salary obligations in mind during deliberations.

Review of Revenue and Other Funding Sources

The committee asked clarifying questions regarding **revenue estimates listed in the budget spreadsheet**.

The advisor confirmed that:

- Revenue projections include **other funding sources identified by departments**, such as fees or external support.
- These revenue figures represent **estimates**, as departments cannot guarantee identical revenue each fiscal year.

Members acknowledged that some programs generate revenue that may **offset operational costs**, which could be considered when evaluating funding levels.

Funding Threshold for Small Programs

The committee reaffirmed a previous consensus that **programs requesting \$10,000 or less** would generally be recommended for full funding.

Programs referenced in this category included:

- Manastash
- WSRN
- Lions Rock
- Community Garden

The committee agreed not to apply reductions to these smaller allocations at this stage of deliberations.

Museum Funding Discussion

The committee briefly referenced the **museum funding request**, which had been presented during a previous meeting.

Members agreed to **postpone discussion** of this item and return to it later in the deliberation process.

Multicultural Center (MCC)

The committee began reviewing the funding request for the **Multicultural Center (MCC)**.

The MCC requested **\$476,540**.

Members reviewed the budget breakdown, noting:

- Approximately **\$30,000 allocated to goods and services**
- Increased **student employment costs** associated with staffing a recently expanded facility
- A reduction in goods and services expenses compared to previous years

During the previous presentation, MCC staff indicated that they had **reduced goods and services costs by approximately half** by collaborating with other campus departments to share event expenses.

Members also noted that the MCC's expanded facility requires **additional staffing and extended hours**, which contributed to increases in student wage expenses.

The committee discussed the staffing structure, which includes:

- Three full-time staff members
- One part-time administrative position
- Approximately eighteen student employees

Members expressed support for the program and noted that the center had previously requested a larger increase before the facility expansion was completed.

After discussion, committee members indicated support for **funding the MCC request at the proposed level**.

KCWU (88.1 The 'Burg) Budget Review

The committee next reviewed the funding request for **KCWU campus radio (88.1 The 'Burg)**.

The requested allocation was **\$451,153**.

Members referenced a **recent supplemental funding request** submitted by KCWU to address equipment issues, including:

- Replacement of aging batteries for broadcast equipment
- Purchase of testing equipment to ensure proper signal frequencies

Committee members noted that the radio station had previously operated reactively when equipment failed but is now attempting to move toward **more proactive equipment maintenance**.

The request included:

- Approximately **\$83,000 allocated for student wages**
- A small financial cushion intended to cover potential wage costs if work-study funding is unavailable

Members discussed whether the cushion for student wage funding was necessary, noting that some **student positions had historically gone unfilled**.

Following discussion, a committee member proposed a **2% reduction** to the KCWU request.

This adjustment would reduce the allocation by approximately **\$9,023**.

Members agreed that a modest reduction would still allow the program to maintain operations while freeing funds to support other programs.

The committee reached general agreement to apply the **2% reduction**.

SLICE Budget Review

The committee then reviewed the funding request for **SLICE (Student Leadership, Involvement, and Community Engagement)**.

The requested allocation was **\$448,650**.

The advisor clarified that this request represents **SLICE's central administrative budget** and does not include separate budgets for:

- Campus Activities
- Club Travel
- Publicity Center
- Student Involvement

Members noted that the SLICE budget primarily supports:

- Professional staff salaries
- Student employee wages
- Leadership and community engagement programming

The committee also reviewed additional documentation provided by SLICE in response to earlier requests for clarification regarding program expenditures.

Members discussed the possibility of applying a **2% reduction**, similar to the reduction applied to KCWU.

Some members expressed concern that reductions could potentially affect **student wages or programming**, particularly because SLICE coordinates many campus-wide events and leadership initiatives.

Other members noted that the majority of the SLICE budget supports **operational costs rather than student wages**, and that a modest reduction would likely have minimal impact on overall operations.

Members also referenced the historical significance of SLICE programs in shaping **student life and campus engagement**.

The committee continued discussion regarding potential adjustments but did not finalize a funding decision during this portion of the meeting.

Budget Balance Requirement

During deliberations, members asked whether the committee must **fully balance the budget**.

The advisor confirmed that the committee must **reach a zero balance**, meaning total allocations cannot exceed projected S&A revenue.

This requirement follows university financial policies established by the **Board of Trustees and the university administration**, which require budget parity.

Additional Budget Observations

Members noted that SLICE had already **reduced some programming costs in its request**, including decreases in leadership programming and community engagement expenditures compared to the previous fiscal year.

The advisor also clarified that the SLICE budget under discussion represents only the **central administrative structure**, which supports several additional S&A-funded program areas operating under the SLICE umbrella.

Reallocation Flexibility

The committee discussed how SLICE manages funding across its programs.

The advisor explained that SLICE may request **reallocation of funds** between its internal program areas if necessary. For example, the department recently requested permission to **reallocate \$8,500 to support club travel funding**.

Departments may also request **supplemental funding** from the S&A committee if unexpected costs arise.

Continuing Deliberations

The committee continued reviewing SLICE funding details and considering potential adjustments to its allocation.

Further discussion and potential recommendations will continue in subsequent deliberation sessions.

SLICE Budget Deliberation

The committee continued discussion regarding the **SLICE (Student Leadership, Involvement, and Community Engagement) administrative budget**.

Members discussed the possibility of applying a reduction to the central SLICE allocation while protecting smaller programs operating under the SLICE umbrella. Some members suggested that reductions to the central administrative budget could allow additional resources to remain available for smaller SLICE-affiliated programs such as **club travel and student activities**.

However, the Vice Chair noted that the central SLICE budget supports a number of **student employee positions and operational functions**, and that deeper reductions could reduce student staffing or leadership programming opportunities.

Members also discussed leadership workshops coordinated through SLICE. It was noted that many of these workshops rely primarily on **internal campus presenters** and therefore may have relatively low external costs. Other members emphasized that decisions should rely primarily on **information provided in departmental presentations and budget documentation**, rather than personal experiences with the programs.

The committee acknowledged that while it may anticipate potential impacts, **departments ultimately determine how to implement reductions**, and the committee cannot control whether reductions affect staffing, programming, or other operational areas.

After discussion, the committee reached a **general consensus to proceed with a provisional 2% reduction to the SLICE administrative budget**. Members agreed that

additional adjustments could be revisited later during the deliberation process if necessary.

Budget Reduction Strategy

The committee discussed broader reduction strategies. Some members noted that applying only small percentage reductions across many programs might ultimately require **eliminating funding for smaller programs later in the process.**

To address this concern, the committee agreed to continue applying **modest reductions initially** and to revisit allocations later if larger adjustments became necessary.

The advisor provided an estimate that a **3% reduction to the SLICE allocation would save approximately \$13,459.50**, while the overall budget still required **approximately \$248,000 in total reductions.**

Members agreed to continue with the **2% provisional reduction strategy** for the time being.

Westside Student Life and Activities

The committee reviewed the funding request for **Westside Centers Student Life and Activities.**

During discussion, members noted that students enrolled at the university's **Westside and online centers pay the same Services and Activities (S&A) fees** as students attending the Ellensburg campus.

Enrollment figures discussed during the meeting indicated:

- Approximately **450 students attending Westside center locations**
- Approximately **1,300 students enrolled in online programs**

Members emphasized the importance of ensuring that these students receive **equitable access to student services and activities funded through S&A fees.**

Several committee members expressed concern that reducing funding for Westside programming could further limit engagement opportunities for students who already have fewer on-campus resources available.

Following discussion, the committee reached a **general recommendation to maintain the requested funding level for Westside Student Life and Activities** at this stage of deliberations.

Budget Status Update

During the meeting, advisors provided a progress update indicating that the committee had **identified approximately \$17,996 in savings** through reductions applied thus far.

Members were reminded that the committee still needed to reach **approximately \$248,000 in total reductions** to balance the projected S&A budget.

Recess

The committee entered a **recess of approximately 25–30 minutes**.

Meeting Reconvened

The meeting reconvened following the break. Advisors informed the committee that applying a **2% reduction across remaining budgets would generate only approximately \$66,000 in total savings**, which would not meet the required reduction target.

As a result, the committee agreed that **additional funding areas would need to be reviewed more closely** for potential adjustments.

Music Department Travel Funding

The committee reviewed a **new funding request for Music Department travel support**.

Members discussed the purpose of the request, which would provide funding for **travel opportunities for students participating in music-related academic programs**.

Key points raised during discussion included:

- The request would primarily benefit **students within the music program**.
- The program receives funding from **course fees, donations, and community fundraising efforts**.

- The request represents a **new base funding area**, as the program had not received S&A base funding since approximately **2021**.

Some members expressed concern that the program's benefits would be limited to a **specific academic department rather than the broader student population**. Others noted that students involved in the program had historically been able to secure travel funding through **fundraising and external support**.

The Chair stated that while music travel opportunities provide valuable experiences for students, the committee must prioritize areas that **serve a broader portion of the student body during years requiring significant budget reductions**.

After discussion, several members expressed support for **not funding the Music Department travel request for the current budget cycle**.

Members emphasized that the decision reflected **budget constraints rather than opposition to the arts**, and that the program could potentially seek funding again in future cycles.

Discussion of Arts Programs

Following the discussion on music travel funding, the committee considered whether the decision might have implications for **other arts-related programs**.

Members specifically discussed the **Theatre Arts and Film program funding request**, which primarily supports **student wage positions** responsible for:

- Set construction
- Costume production
- Technical equipment management
- Other production-related tasks

Committee members noted that these positions provide **hands-on professional development opportunities** and support campus theatrical productions.

Members also emphasized that theatrical performances are **open to the broader campus community**, meaning the program's benefits extend beyond students enrolled in theatre courses.

During discussion, the advisor provided historical context, explaining that:

- The previous S&A committee had **not funded the theatre program in the prior year** due to major budget reductions.
- A **one-time donor contribution** had supported the program during the interim year.
- The **Board of Trustees requested that affected programs be reconsidered during the current budget cycle**, resulting in the present funding request.

Several members expressed concern that eliminating funding could result in **student employee layoffs or reduced training opportunities** for students seeking experience in theatrical production and technical arts.

Members also noted that the requested funding would primarily support **student labor positions rather than faculty salaries or operational expenses**.

Continued Deliberations

The committee continued discussing potential funding options for the Theatre Arts and Film program, including:

- Full funding
- Partial funding
- Applying modest percentage reductions similar to those used for other programs

Members agreed that further review of the budget details would be necessary before making a final recommendation.

Deliberations continued beyond this portion of the transcript.

Theatre Arts and Film Program Funding

The committee continued discussion regarding the **Theatre Arts and Film program funding request**, which primarily supports **student employee wages** for production-related positions, including stage production and technical support.

Members noted that the requested funding would support **approximately six student employees**. Concerns were raised that reductions could directly impact student wages, as the budget is largely allocated toward student labor.

Several members emphasized that theatre programming maintains a **visible campus presence** and provides experiential learning opportunities for students. Members also

discussed that reducing funding could result in students contributing additional **volunteer hours** to maintain programming.

The committee briefly considered applying a **3–5% reduction** to the program. However, due to concerns regarding the direct impact on student wages and campus engagement, the committee agreed to **provisionally assume full funding for the Theatre Arts and Film program** during the current round of deliberations.

Members noted that the allocation **may be revisited later** if further reductions are required to balance the budget.

Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)

The committee then reviewed the funding request from the **Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)**.

The requested amount totaled **\$349,094**, which included approximately **\$53,000 in one-time funding** for the replacement of flooring in the facility. Committee members clarified that this flooring expense would be considered separately and may be funded through **reserves rather than the operational allocation**.

During discussion, members reviewed enrollment data indicating that the childcare center serves a mix of:

- Students
- Faculty and staff
- Community members and alumni families

Members noted that approximately **18 children enrolled belonged to current students**, while a larger portion of the center's enrollment consisted of faculty, staff, or other non-student affiliated families.

The committee discussed the purpose of **Services and Activities Fee funding**, which is intended primarily to support programs that directly benefit the **student body**. Some members expressed concern that a significant portion of the center's services support individuals who do not pay the S&A fee.

However, it was also noted that the center provides **substantial student employment opportunities**, with approximately **\$400,000 annually spent on student labor**.

Following discussion, the committee considered potential reductions between **3% and 5%** of the operating request. Members noted that a **5% reduction would represent approximately \$18,000** depending on whether the flooring allocation was included.

After deliberation, the committee reached general agreement to **apply a provisional 5% reduction to the ECLC operating allocation**, while continuing to treat the flooring replacement request separately.

Discussion of Budget Reduction Limits

Members discussed the broader approach to reductions across departments.

The committee acknowledged that very large reductions to any single program could significantly impact campus operations. Several members suggested establishing a **general ceiling for reductions applied to individual programs**, with suggestions ranging from approximately **\$20,000 to \$30,000 per program**.

The committee also discussed how to balance reductions between **larger departments and smaller programs**, recognizing that smaller programs may be less able to absorb large reductions.

Members agreed that the committee should prioritize funding decisions based on **the number of students served and the overall impact on student experience**, rather than strictly on program size.

Adjustments to Student Government Budgets

The committee reviewed several budgets within **Associated Students of Central Washington University (student government)**.

Members noted that some units had requested funding increases relative to the previous fiscal year. After discussion, the committee agreed to adjust several allocations closer to their **prior-year funding levels**.

The following adjustments were made:

- **Legislative branch funding** was reduced to approximately **\$26,771**, aligning with the previous year's allocation.
- **ASCWU Senate funding** was reduced to approximately **\$66,127**.
- **Student Life and Facilities programming** was adjusted to approximately **\$29,000**.

Members noted that these adjustments would still allow the programs to continue major student events and operations while contributing to the overall reduction target.

Observer and PULSE Student Media Budgets

The committee revisited the budgets for **The Observer student newspaper** and **PULSE student media**.

Both organizations had previously submitted **alternative budget proposals** reflecting lower funding levels they believed would allow them to continue operating if reductions were necessary.

After reviewing these alternative proposals, the committee agreed to fund both organizations at their **alternative budget levels**, which resulted in an estimated **combined savings of approximately \$20,000** relative to their original requests.

Approved allocations were:

- **The Observer:** approximately **\$52,011**
 - **PULSE:** approximately **\$27,398**
-

Budget Status Update

At this stage of deliberations, the committee confirmed the following provisional adjustments:

- **A 4% reduction applied broadly across most base-funded programs**
- **5% reduction applied to ECLC**
- **Student government allocations adjusted closer to prior-year levels**
- **Observer and PULSE funded at alternative request levels**

After these changes, the committee estimated that approximately **\$24,000–\$30,000 in additional reductions** would still be needed to meet the overall budget target.

Members agreed that this remaining amount would likely be achievable through **additional targeted adjustments** in the next meeting session.

Publicity Center Discussion

The committee began reviewing the **Publicity Center budget request**.

Members noted that the Publicity Center generates revenue through printing services and media production for both **S&A-funded and non-S&A campus departments**.

Documentation provided to the committee indicated that the center generated approximately **\$35,000 in revenue during the previous fiscal year**, while projecting approximately **\$20,000 in revenue for the upcoming year**.

Some members suggested that because the Publicity Center has **revenue-generating capacity**, it may be able to absorb a **5% reduction** if necessary. However, no final decision was made during this portion of the meeting.

Remaining Deliberation Strategy

With limited time remaining in the meeting session, the committee discussed the strategy for completing the remaining budget adjustments.

Members agreed that:

- The current progress represented a significant portion of the required reductions.
- Additional time would allow the committee to **review the updated budget spreadsheet** and reconsider adjustments with greater clarity.

The committee agreed to **revisit several allocations during the next meeting session**, including:

- Publicity Center
- Multicultural Center (MCC)
- Case Management funding
- Remaining large budget areas

Members indicated that these areas may provide opportunities to complete the remaining reductions.

Adjournment

With limited time remaining in the session, the Chair thanked committee members for their work during the meeting.

The meeting was **adjourned early at approximately 1:52 PM**, with deliberations scheduled to continue during the next committee meeting.