

**Minutes**  
**January 19th, 2022**

**Called to order:**

Deanna called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

**Attendance**

Björn Pellmyr, Geoffrey Odoch, Phuong Nguyen, Deanna Corsilles, Joseph Bryant, Lacy Lampkins, Gregg Schlanger, Haley Rinehart, Naif Binkassim, Andrea Gaeta, Rehan Rashid, Sean Dahlin.

Absent: Judith Brewer and Stephanie Mora

Guests: Heather Johnson

**Agenda:**

**MOTION: Björn made a motion to approve the agenda. Geoffrey seconded. Motion carried. 7-0-0**

**Minutes:**

**MOTION: Geoffrey made a motion to approve the minutes. Rehan seconded. Motion carried. 7-0-0**

**Reports:**

- a) Chair: No reports
- b) Advisors:
  - i. Lacy- No reports
  - ii. Joey- We are still waiting on one of our base funding units to make the updates as requested for the annual report. Central News Watch, we have reached out to them over the break and start of quarter, but we just now heard back yesterday. They are working on them, and hopefully we will them here shortly, so we can get the updates posted on the website. What they original sent is currently on the website now, but there were some corrections needed based on reviewing it.
- c) ASCWU: No reports

**Other Business:**

- A. Communications Received:
  - i. No communications received

**Public Comment**

- A. None.

**New Business:**

- A. None

**Old Business:**

A. Base Funding Adjustment- Sarah Spurgeon Art Gallery

Joey- The base funding adjustment is from two weeks ago, shared with you the request that Heather had put in. You all had asked if Heather could be here to answer some questions. As a reminder this is a request to make a base funding adjustment. It was the ladder that was acquired last spring, but the budget part of the account didn't hit until September. So, that fell on the current fiscal year and the current funding cycle. The request is to adjust the current base funding as a one-time adjustment for that expense.

Heather- Hi there, thank you for having me. I am happy to entertain any questions that you might have.

Björn - These ladders that had to be deferred were to come out the goods and services budget I assuming, right?

Heather- Yes, that is correct.

Björn- Thank you.

Joey- Were there any other questions? As you all have asked Heather to be here before we decided to make a motion or not. Otherwise, it would be open for someone to either make a motion to approve the base funding adjustment as requested, to deny it, or to table it to next week, for voting. So, there is one of three actions we need to take tonight, but make sure to get any questions to Heather first, because once that motion is made the only discussion is on that motion.

Björn- Can you reiterate what happened with the ladders? I am pretty sure I know, but I don't want to make any mistakes.

Heather- You may have talked about it two weeks ago. We have some ladders that we intended to purchase last fiscal year in the spring. We got the ladders from Woods ACE Hardware, and we actually acquired the ladders in hand on June 14, 2021. And we had a receipt from Woods on June 14, and fully intended on pay for those last fiscal year, Spring of 2021. However, we had a staff change over in our department and I think what happened is that the bill that pays for the Woods account did not actually get paid until September 2021. From my understanding that is from staff transitions.

Lacy- Just to reiterate as far as the accounting goes, we are not able to move the expense back to that fiscal year because we closed the

fiscal year already. We usually close the fiscal year early August, so we have missed that cutoff date in-order to do that. Because of the accounting rules that we have (of not being able to move the expense) only way we can essentially correct it is by allocating more money in this fiscal year.

Gregg Schlanger- What is the dollar amount we are talking about here? Also, for your position, are you off a certain time a year?

Heather- The amount is just under \$1,400. I believe the amount was \$1,399.59. We initiated the purchase and had the ladders and the receipt as the middle of June, but then I go on cyclic leave. I am out all of July and August. Last spring, we were all mostly online and we had a new staff person coming in. I think there was just some kind of mix-up with the Woods bill and account that didn't get paid, until September. I can request for something to be purchased, but in my position, I don't actually do the purchasing. Our department secretary usually does the purchasing. Thanks Gregg.

Björn - Since the ladders couldn't be purchased until the next fiscal year, did you all have the \$1,400 spent during the last fiscal year, for something non-ladder related?

Heather- The gallery still had money left over from FY21. That is one of the reasons we came to the committee to see if we could make an adjustment. Even though it is so late in the game.

Björn - About how much did you have left over?

Heather- It was more than the \$1,400. I would have to look back.

Joey- If you want Bjorn, it is in the annual report that is on the website, I can pull it up in the background while we are talking. If this would have been known that this wasn't hitting until after the cut-off this would have likely been a request last spring, to carry forward that amount. However, since the ladders were acquired this spring and didn't know the purchase part didn't hit until September (due to that vacancy) this is the cleaning up administratively, just needs to be requested through you all.

Geoffrey- Why couldn't you use the money from last year to clear whatever amount was left?

Heather- Lacy mentioned that by the time the ladder hit the books, it was September, which was too late to use a simple accounting fix.

Lacy- If this wouldn't have been the end of a funding cycle, we would have left the expense, because that carry forward money would have offset that expense that happened in September. The only reason we are seeing something like this is because of the fact that last year all of the funding was wiped back to the S&A funding committee because it was the end of a cycle.

Joey- The art gallery had just over \$9,000 that was swept back at the end of the base funding cycle.

Björn- Given that the expense for that the delay was unforeseeable, there is already money that came back. I am going to move to grant a one-time base funding adjustment equivalent to the cost of the ladders to the art gallery.

**MOTION: Björn made a motion to grant a one-time base funding adjustment equivalent to the cost of the ladders to the art gallery. Rehan seconded. Motion carried. 6-0-2**

#### B. Program Reviews- Finalize Questions & Determine Timeframe for Response

Joey- After jotting down all the questions we had last week and going through the recording, there were questions 2,3,4 that I put all together. I did this because when you look at them, they are all very similar. The question I have is there a need to have these separated? If so, then we will probably need to reword it. Or are these all roughly asking the same thing, and can condense them down into one?

Question 2 is asking "How are you assessing the effectiveness of your program and achieving targets?"

Question 3, "How do you assess the effectiveness of the service & activities you provided to students?"

Question 4, "How do you assess your impacts on the student experience here at CWU?"

Is there a need for all of those to be three separate questions, that need to be further differentiated? Or are we asking very similar things? I think they all seem very similar, and we will most likely get redundant answers to those.

Björn - I noticed that they came right question one, which is “How does the program support CWU students?” And I wondered if that would be tied into the learning operational objectives? Questions 3&4 seem redundant, because effectiveness is also tied in with student experience.

Joey- I feel similar. I would say we keep question 1&2 since it asks what program goals are or learning objectives, as we need to ask that (each department will be different). I think we can leave questions 1&2 and remove 3&4.

Geoffrey- 3&4 look the same, so I would take away both.

Deanna- I have a question that I believe Lacy would know. Will the budget be seen by these areas before we send these program review questions out?

Lacy- Do you mean the budget adjustments?

Deanna- Yes.

Lacy- Joseph, when are we sending them out?

Joey- If we get them finalized, we will probably send them out by the end of this week. These are questions we will continue to give this year, next year, and the year after. The question about budget reductions may be more specific. All of the base funding units about the approved recommendation with the 5% this year and 10% next year. They may not see a reduction yet, or impact to their services this year. It will be up to us when we send it out and when we would want a response back.

Lacy- Essentially, I would say the areas will be able to answer that question because there is a lot of areas that already met that target. If we are talking about FY22 the financial adjustments have almost been completely made. And they are now working on the next year of adjustments, so we should be able to answer that. There may be some questions for some areas, and they can let us know if somethings are pending as well.

Deanna- That makes sense. Thank you.

Geoffrey- I am curious about question 12.

Joey- That was one of the questions we were asked to put in there. The intent behind it was there circumstances or challenges that the

committee needs to know beyond the reductions. Let's use ASCWU as an example, is there something the committee should know that prevented you from spending the budget as you planned already? So, the committee would know why you would have money remaining outside of these other pieces. That way we have it on file. As we look through each of the four years, we can see the impacts that they are self-reporting that prevented them from spending their budget as planned.

Björn- Question 5, "What is the purpose of your program?" I noticed a little bit of an overlap with how CWU programs supports CWU students?" I just can't think of why a program would have a purpose other than serving and supporting CWU students. So those questions could be combined or left. It would be worthwhile noting a program that isn't designed to support students.

Joey- I think there is a way to word it, some of this purpose of the program is coming from what we are doing on scope of practice within the university. Ideally, supporting students is apart of that, but we may get something different. So, keep in mind how broad our base funding units are. Ideally, when we are talking about a unit like Sub-Engineering, all of them are intended to support CWU students, but they are going to have a more specific focus. It would be specific to supporting the operations and functions of the Student Union building, on the technical aspects of the equipment. So, this is asking them to define their purpose, and for us to see are their programs we are funding have an overlapping or dual purpose. That is why there is that follow-up question, "Is there a duplication of services?" The committee can go ahead and recommend or ask the questions "Is there collaboration between the two units," if there are similar answers.

Björn - I can't tell if it needs to be reworded, but I guess if it has to be reworded, would "What role does your program serve at the university," or something like that.

Joey- Part of what I can reword it with is that we could tweak it if it looks as though we are getting the same answers. But it could be, "What is the purpose or service provided by your program?" Maybe that is a little clearer to the service provided.

Geoffrey- Isn't that pretty intuitive? Let's say if it is a student government, it is known we provide service to students. I mean the service would be pretty intuitive.

Joey- You would hope that it would be pretty intuitive, but I think that's the part that we want to be clear. We aren't making assumptions on what we think the service and purpose are vs. what they are.

Björn- An update with question 7, "How does your program support the university's mission and goal?" Since the mission isn't stated, should we leave that one until the mission and goals are finalized? I think they would know where to look for CWU mission and goals, but it is currently not incredibly specific.

Joey- I am glad you brought that up. I didn't put it on there because right now, we can put the mission statement in, and the goals are a series. I know the goal is to condense it down into a clearer vision and mission statement. Given that we don't have the more refined one, do we want to simply link to where the university's mission and goals are? It is quite a bit to copy in there. So, we should have a link to the mission statement when we send it out.

I will make the adjustments that we talked about tonight and refine those. Ideally, the plan would be that we send these out by the end of the week, to give some timeframe. Knowing that we are looking at about eleven questions, individuals would need time to fill this out. I would not recommend less than a month, knowing everyone is going to be focusing on budget pieces and strategic planning for the university. That would put us in the middle of February, I don't know if we want to aim for the end of February, with a due date. So, we can look it over and start reviewing those. Any thoughts on giving them to the end of February?

Geoffrey- I was under the impression that a presentation would be around the first week in March.

Joey- And we can aim for that, as they are not coming into present, they will just submit these electronically. We have two meetings in March, before we go to finals and spring break. So, if we aim to have them to us by February 28<sup>th</sup> (that is a Monday) we should have them collected and sent out to the committee, by the meeting on March 2<sup>nd</sup>. Or realistically the 9<sup>th</sup>, so it gives you all a chance to review them.

Björn- Would the date we would be setting be the same for the next years in the quadrennium or reevaluating each year?

Joey- Are normal program reviews would be the beginning of Winter quarter, so the normal time frame would be at the start of Winter quarter, or by giving us the materials by the start of the quarter. Unless the committee decided a different time frame. So, this is just for this year, that we are looking at when would be feasible for this going out.

Björn- What if we extended the due date until the end of Winter quarter, so that we wouldn't start doing those reviews and stop for spring break. And then we can have over spring break to review them. So, I don't know if we would have time to do it all during spring quarter?

Joey- We aren't having people come in, so we would. I think that is a good idea. So, if anyone doesn't get it by the due date, it gives Lacy and I the chance to do the poking and prodding, so you all have them by the start of spring quarter. The real intent would be once you get all of these, to have you all get a chance to look through them. We will have them all posted on the website, and ideally look through and ask the departments to come in if there are questions. But it is only by invite if you all see concerns or questions that we would bring the units in. Otherwise, their program review would just be the physical responses to the questions. Giving us spring quarter would definitely be enough time, unless you all decide you want to bring in every unit. I would anticipate we would not need to bring in a lot, but again I haven't seen the answers to the questions yet. In an ideal world there would be no question and we would take it as it is, but us having it by the start of spring quarter would definitely be sufficient. And yes, we can send questions out via email, if it is a minor clarification. If there are more complex questions or we are concern about their responses, we can have them come in.

Deanna- I agree with the recommendation Bjorn gave of waiting until spring quarter to review them.

Joey, Sounds good. I will put on there to have them send it back by the end of winter quarter. That would give us a two-week period of finals week and spring break for Lacy and I to do quarreling. So, when we come back from spring quarter, you all would have the materials available. And it gives me time to post it on the website.

### **Public Comment- Second Call**

Joey - Next week we will be reviewing the ASCWU recommendations, on the policy and committee structure. This was from ASCWU last spring, so we will send it out and have Geoffrey provide any updates they may have.

### **Adjournment:**

**MOTION:** Naif made a motion to adjourn. Rehan seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m. 8-0-0

**Our next meeting will be January 26, 2022 (Online) at 5:30pm**  
Check out our web site at [www.cwu.edu/services-activities](http://www.cwu.edu/services-activities)