

Student & Activities (S&A) Committee

Deliberation: Day 2 Meeting Minutes

Date: March 8, 2026

Time: 10:25 AM

Location: SURC 301 and Zoom

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair **Ba** called the meeting to order at **10:25 AM**. The meeting continued deliberations regarding **Fiscal Year 2027 Services and Activities (S&A) Fee allocations**.

2. Roll Call

Present

- Ba, Vice Chair
- Rachel, Parliamentarian
- Abby, General Member
- Aeros, General Member
- Austin, General Member
- Erin, Advisor
- Trent, Advisor
- Robbi, Advisor

Absent

- Alex M., Chair (arrived later)
- Alex C., General Member

A quorum was established.

Overview of Budget Deliberations

The committee reviewed the current allocation totals. At the start of the meeting:

- **\$5,896,000** had been recommended for allocation.
- Approximately **\$20,088** remained to be reduced in order to meet the required overall budget allocation.

Committee members resumed discussion from the previous meeting regarding possible adjustments to funding percentages across several programs.

Program Funding Discussions

Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)

The committee discussed potential reductions to the **Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)** budget.

Topics raised during discussion included:

- The number of student parents utilizing the program.
- The proportion of services used by **faculty and staff compared to students**.
- The level of **external funding and revenue generated by the program**.
- The amount of **S&A funding allocated per student served**.

Members noted that the ECLC receives additional funding sources and revenue from childcare fees paid by families. The committee discussed the possibility that programs capable of generating revenue may be better positioned to absorb funding reductions.

A proposal was discussed to adjust the ECLC reduction to **approximately 7%**, which would reduce funding by roughly **\$20,726**.

Members also noted that reductions in this area could affect **student labor positions** employed by the center.

Small Funding Requests

Committee members clarified a prior agreement that **programs requesting less than \$10,000** would not receive reductions. Programs referenced included:

- Lions Rock Community Garden
- WSRN

- Manastash

These programs were therefore expected to receive their requested allocations.

Westside Career Services

The committee revisited the request from **Westside Career Services**.

Key points discussed:

- The request included funding intended to convert an existing position from an **11-month position to a full-time position**.
- If the full requested amount was not funded, the position would likely remain at **11-months rather than becoming full-time**.

Members also discussed:

- The number of **students served on the west side and online**.
- The fact that these students **pay the same S&A fees** as students on the Ellensburg campus.

Some members suggested maintaining funding levels to ensure adequate services for regional students.

Multicultural Center (MCC)

The committee briefly revisited funding for the **Multicultural Center (MCC)**.

Discussion points included:

- The MCC allocation represented an **increase compared to the prior fiscal year**.
- The increase was partly attributed to the **opening of a new facility**, which required additional staffing and expanded operating hours.

Members noted that the MCC serves a **large portion of the student population through events and programming**, and this context should be considered during deliberations.

KCWU

Committee members also referenced **KCWU** during discussion of larger allocations.

It was noted that despite reductions applied during deliberations, the program's allocation could still represent an **increase compared to the previous year's budget**.

Arrival of Chair

Chair **Alex M.** joined the meeting later in the deliberations after being delayed due to daylight saving time.

The Parliamentarian provided a brief summary of the discussion that had occurred prior to the Chair's arrival, including:

- The proposed **7% reduction to ECLC**
 - Discussion regarding potential adjustments to MCC and other large allocations
-

Case Management Discussion

Following the Chair's arrival, the committee began transitioning discussion to **Case Management funding**.

The Chair noted that:

- Case management services may differ from other programs funded through S&A.
- Many S&A allocations are directed toward **student-facing organizations or programs**, and the committee would need to consider how case management aligns with those funding guidelines.

Further discussion on case management was scheduled to continue as part of the deliberation process.

Continuing Deliberations

The committee agreed to continue evaluating potential adjustments across programs to reach the required **budget reduction of approximately \$20,088** while maintaining fairness and alignment with S&A funding priorities.

Case Management Funding Discussion

The committee discussed the **Case Management budget request**, which would fund a **single professional staff position**.

The advisor reminded the committee that:

- Case management had previously received **two S&A-funded positions**.
- In the prior fiscal year, the committee **reduced funding by half**, leaving only **one S&A-supported position**.
- Case management also receives **state funding and mental health funding from the State of Washington**, which may provide alternative support.

Committee members reviewed the **Killian Guidelines**, which state that:

- S&A funds may support **student health and wellness programs**.
- However, **basic institutional services should generally be funded through tuition or university operating funds** rather than student activity fees.

Committee Deliberation

Members expressed differing perspectives during discussion:

Concerns about removing funding

- Some members emphasized that case management is a **critical service supporting students in crisis**.
- Concerns were raised about whether the university would **replace the funding if S&A support were removed**.

Arguments for removing S&A funding

- Several members stated that **case management is a core institutional service** that should be funded by the university rather than student fees.
- Members noted that S&A funding is intended to support **programming and activities reaching broad student populations**, while this request funded a **single professional staff position**.

The committee acknowledged that eliminating S&A funding would **not eliminate the department**, but rather remove funding for **one case management position**.

Members noted that the university may still need to provide crisis support services and could potentially fund the position through **institutional or state funding sources**.

After discussion, several members expressed support for **removing S&A funding for the case management position**.

Budget Status Update

Following the discussion:

- Removing the Case Management allocation created approximately **\$66,000 available for reallocation** within the budget.

The advisor noted that the previous committee intentionally **left unallocated funds for the following year's supplemental budget**, which provided the current committee with **\$14,000 at the start of the fiscal cycle**.

The committee confirmed that unallocated funds could similarly be **carried forward into the next year's supplemental budget**.

The committee had now **met and exceeded the required reduction target for the overall S&A budget**.

Recess

The Chair called for a **10-minute recess** to allow the committee to review budget adjustments and consider potential reallocations.

Meeting Reconvened

The meeting reconvened at **11:24 AM**.

During the break, advisors reviewed budgets that fund **full-time professional staff positions** to ensure reductions would not unintentionally create **salary shortfalls**.

The committee noted:

- **Westside Career Services** had already been restored to **full funding**.
- **SLICE Student Involvement** still had a reduction that affected funding for **two professional staff positions**.

After discussion, the committee agreed to **restore the reduction to the SLICE Student Involvement budget**, which required approximately **\$6,100**, leaving **about \$60,000 remaining for reallocation**.

Allocation of Remaining Funds

Supplemental Budget Reserve

Members discussed leaving a portion of the remaining funds unallocated in order to support **future supplemental funding requests**.

The committee reached general consensus to reserve **approximately \$25,000** for the next year's supplemental budget.

This left **approximately \$35,000 available for reallocation**.

Reallocation Decisions

The Observer

Members revisited the **Observer student newspaper budget**.

The committee noted that the organization had:

- Requested **approximately \$66,000**.
- Indicated it could operate with a reduced budget of **\$52,000–\$54,000** if necessary.

Because the organization had demonstrated flexibility and willingness to reduce costs, the committee agreed to **restore \$8,000** to the Observer budget.

This increased the allocation to **approximately \$60,000**.

Club Travel

The committee discussed the **Club Travel budget**, noting that:

- The budget recently absorbed approximately **\$40,000 in insurance costs** that were previously housed in the student government budget.
- These insurance costs support **coverage for all registered student organizations**.

Members agreed to **restore approximately \$5,000** to the Club Travel budget to support student organization participation in travel opportunities.

PULSE

The committee also revisited funding for **PULSE student media**.

Members noted that PULSE consistently produces strong programming with limited resources and represents the university through its media production work.

The committee agreed to **restore \$3,000** to the PULSE budget.

Remaining Balance

After these reallocations:

- Approximately **\$19,500 remained available** for additional adjustments.

Members began discussing potential options for distributing remaining funds, including:

- Reducing cuts to **smaller programs and departments**
- Revisiting the **Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)** reduction
- Adjusting funding for **student government programs**, including legislative activities

ASCWU Budget Reallocation Discussion

The committee discussed the reallocation of funds within **Associated Students of Central Washington University (ASCWU)** budget areas.

Members noted that if reductions occur within ASCWU allocations, it may be appropriate for those funds to be redistributed among other ASCWU programs that primarily support **student employment and student-led operations**.

Discussion included the **Board of Directors (BOD) budget**, which supports a number of **student wage positions**, including reception and administrative roles. Members noted that returning funds to this area could help sustain student employment opportunities.

After discussion, the committee generally agreed that funds reallocated from ASCWU programs should remain within **student-facing ASCWU operations when appropriate**.

Funding Adjustments Under Consideration

SOURCE – Student Research Program

The committee discussed restoring funding to **SOURCE**, the university's undergraduate research and creative scholarship program.

Members noted that SOURCE:

- Provides opportunities for students to **present research and creative work**
- Hosts **annual research presentations and recognition events**
- Supports **professional and academic development**

Committee members referenced a previous supplemental funding request related to **summer research awards**.

Following discussion, members expressed support for restoring a portion of the previously reduced funding.

A proposal was discussed to restore **approximately \$1,500**, which would bring the program close to its full requested funding level.

Multicultural Center

The committee reviewed the previously proposed **4% reduction** to the **Multicultural Center (MCC)**.

Members discussed whether reducing the cut slightly would better reflect the center's role in serving a broad student population.

The committee explored the possibility of lowering the reduction to **approximately 3%**.

Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)

The committee revisited the previously discussed reduction to the **Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC)** budget.

At the time of discussion, ECLC had received an **approximately 7% reduction**.

Members explored adjusting the reduction to **approximately 6%** while maintaining overall budget targets.

Committee members noted that the ECLC receives **additional funding sources**, including fees paid by parents and other external contributions, which may allow the center to absorb modest reductions.

ECLC Flooring Project

The committee also discussed a **flooring replacement project** requested by the Early Childhood Learning Center.

The project was identified as a **necessary facility upgrade** required for compliance with childcare safety standards.

The advisor clarified that:

- Funding for the flooring project would **come from S&A reserves**, not from the annual revenue currently being allocated.
- This would temporarily result in **over-allocation in the first year**, with the understanding that reserves would cover the expense.

Committee members expressed support for approving the project given its **safety and compliance requirements**.

Consensus was reached to support the flooring replacement request.

Veterans Center Funding

The committee next discussed funding for the **Veterans Center**.

Members noted that the center:

- Provides **support services for student veterans transitioning to university life**
- Offers programming and events that are open to the broader student community
- Assists veterans navigating the academic environment and accessing benefits

Members emphasized the importance of ensuring veterans receive adequate support as they transition from military service into higher education.

Because the amount required to restore the reduction was relatively small, committee members agreed that the **Veterans Center should receive full funding**.

SOURCE Funding Decision

Following the earlier discussion, the committee revisited the **SOURCE program**.

Members expressed support for the program's role in encouraging **student research, creative scholarship, and academic advancement**.

After discussion, the committee agreed to **restore funding toward SOURCE**, bringing the allocation close to its full requested level.

Equity and Service Council (ESC)

The committee also discussed restoring funding to the **Equity and Service Council (ESC)**.

Members noted that ESC supports **approximately ten student organizations**, each representing different cultural, identity-based, or service-oriented communities on campus.

Given the remaining funds available, members expressed support for **fully restoring funding** to both:

- SOURCE
 - Equity and Service Council (ESC)
-

Art Gallery Funding

The committee noted that the **Sarah Spurgeon Art Gallery** had not yet been revisited during the final allocation discussion.

Members agreed that remaining funds could be used to **restore previously reduced funding for the gallery**, as well as support several smaller programs.

Student Life and Facilities

A proposal was made to allocate **approximately \$400** of the remaining funds to **Student Life and Facilities**, particularly to support **flagship campus events and student programming**.

The committee expressed support for this adjustment.

Final Allocation of Remaining Funds

After the above adjustments, approximately **\$1,000 remained unallocated**.

Members discussed several options and ultimately agreed to distribute the remaining funds between:

- **KCWU Student Media**
- **Publicity Center (“Hype”)**

The committee approved a **50–50 split**, allocating approximately **\$500 to each program**.

Completion of Budget Deliberations

Following these adjustments, the committee confirmed that:

- The budget reduction targets had been met.
- All remaining funds had been allocated.

Members expressed appreciation for the collaborative deliberation process and the work completed during the budget cycle.

Next Steps in the Budget Process

The advisor reviewed the **next steps in the S&A funding process**:

1. A **draft recommendation email** will be sent to all base-funded departments summarizing the committee’s deliberations and proposed allocations.
2. Departments will have a **one-week feedback period** to respond.
3. Feedback may be submitted:
 - In writing, or
 - During the next public committee meeting.

The committee will reconvene to review feedback and determine whether any revisions are necessary before finalizing recommendations.

Approval Process

Once finalized, the recommendations will proceed through the following review process:

1. **ASCWU Board of Directors** – acknowledgement
2. **President’s Budgetary Advisory Council (PBAC)** – review
3. **Board of Trustees** – final approval

If approved, the allocations will establish **S&A base funding for the next three-year cycle.**

Upcoming Meeting

The committee scheduled a final meeting for the following week to:

- Receive **public comment and departmental feedback**
 - Vote on **final funding recommendations**
 - Consider **pending supplemental funding requests**
-

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at **12:30 PM.**