

**Services and Activities Fee Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**February 26, 2020**

**Called to order:**

Brandon Wear-Grimm called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

**Attendance:**

Alejandro Alcantar, Eric Bennett, Joseph Bryant, Edgar Carreno, Monica Carreno, Dane Gillin, Alex Harrington, Aubrey Heim, Martin Kennedy, Lacy Lampkins, Gregg Schlanger, Jessica Thomas, Brandon Wear-Grimm

Excused: Josh Hibbard, Chicena Mortimer

**Agenda:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Alex Harrington seconded. Motion carried.**

**Minutes:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the minutes of February 19, 2020. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion carried.**

**Reports:**

Chair – The requesters for #2047 are on the Westside. We tried contacting them about presenting remotely and we have not heard back. We may not hear that request tonight.

Advisors – The student reached out today to set up a distance presentation. We reached out with no affirmative response from them yet. We may move the request to next week.

The website is being updated and moved to the new theme tomorrow. It should look better and be more organized. Take a look at that when it goes up.

As a reminder, we are held under Public Meeting Act requirements. Every piece of business we conduct is open to the public and we have to have notice posted at least 24 hours in advance.

Any meetings and discussions need to be open and any meetings over five individuals is in violation of this. Business discussed there will be null and void. Meetings need to be scheduled in advance and open to the public. We need to be open and transparent, and also allow for public comment. There are strong legal implications.

Discussion: Did something happen? This is more just a conversation being had. I want everyone to be mindful so we don't find ourselves in a situation. I want to save us that challenge proactively.

Yesterday I presented to PBAC and they have approved all the Supplemental funding we have recommended to this point. They shared some comments regarding our budget. There are potential concerns about spring events and conferences not being funded. I wanted to make sure

to share that communication with you. They got a report that broke down the categories of our funding. As you know most of the funding does go to clubs and organizations, and mostly travel. We will be having more budget discussion tonight, but we currently have \$26,000 left in the budget for the year, and \$200,000 in requests left this quarter.

**Public Comment:**

My name is Jeff Snedeker; I am the advisor to the Horn Club. We are preparing to make a supplemental request in spring because we were told to do so then. I was watching a video of last week's meeting to see the proposals. I listened all the way through. I have a couple of questions. First, the characterization of the music department's requests in the past is incorrect. They said we wanted to go to "the root." All of our requests are not just to walk through and be in a place. They were all specific festivals or conferences that included an application and invitation. That characterization was not accurate. In listening to the proposal that came forward from ROTC – this can be hard to talk about as it can be viewed as being unpatriotic. However, in the way this was introduced it sounds like a summer abroad program. We have similar programs that have been fully funded by the students. None of these have had supplemental funding. I have questions from the Horn Club. We have been offered an invitation for an international conference this summer. We have been waiting to make the request. Does sponsorship of that ROTC program constitute a change in funding policy to visit a place and not participate or present? If this does constitute a change in policy, we have many proposals to come forward. If this funding does go forward and we are on the agenda in spring – we are requesting \$4,000 to go to Eugene – we would hate to be pushed out because the money is gone. We respect that this is your money to choose what to do with. If this is a formal policy change – then be ready.

Discussion: There is a budget discussion on the agenda for tonight, so that will answer some of these questions. We currently do not have enough in the budget to fund all of the requests we have for this quarter. There is no change in policy. Any requests that come before the committee are allowable.

I remember from previous years that this has always been a red line. If you are not presenting and this is for your own enrichment. This would be a new precedent. This will bring in a new set of requests. When you spend the entire budget and some requests won't get funding – be aware.

I am Kendal Baker from the Family and Child Life Graduate program and we have a revised budget from our request last week (Please see Addendum #1). We are only requesting \$10,368, which is about \$860 per student.

I am Bonnie Kovatch the Department Chair for Military Science. I want to thank the council for hearing our request last week. There was some concern that this is just a study abroad or a field trip. It is a field trip. It is a trip to enhance the four years of military science curriculum. They will have the field study aspect. This will be immediately brought back to the students on campus. First, at ROTC and then across the campus. ROTC is a minor so these students can share with their various major programs. I agree this is a trip. It is the field study portion of their curriculum.

## **Old Business:**

### **A. Budget Discussion**

We only have \$26,000 left in the budget for the year, and \$200,000 in requests for this quarter. This needs to be addressed at some level. Where does the committee stand? It is possible to increase – that is the committee’s vote. How do you want to move forward? I have shared PBAC’s concern about spring requests. We have had \$531,000 in requests this year. That is a lot. More than in the past. The reserve is one-time money. Our budget will be drained to zero at some point; it is up to the committee to decide when. Think about the future and what impact you will have. Be mindful. Also, be mindful of the impact on current students. I would be willing to come back to discuss raising the budget once we have criteria. I personally would not be comfortable with allocating more. \$300,000 is more than we usually budget. We should have solid criteria. I think we should stay where we are. Tonight is when the money would run out. It is intentional to have this discussion before the voting. There are options. We can keep the budget where it is, or we can increase a set amount and then discuss if we run out of funding again. This group of requests all met the deadline you set for winter quarter. We still have groups presenting tonight and more over the next two weeks. There is an option of what to do for spring. We do have most of the meetings planned with agenda items like the annual reports. There is limited space in spring. If we do not increase the budget, that may determine everything else. One part that hasn’t come up – you are responsible for ensuring that the money we have is utilized. There are concerns of the impacts if we are not funding more. You as a student group are meant to speak to the wants of the student body. The reserve balance is \$3.4 million, which is quite a bit. I appreciate you all sharing where you are coming from. Committee members should share where they are. This is an impactful and hard decision. Are we going to say no and be done at \$26,000, or are we going to eat away at the \$3.4 million? This is not sustainable and we need to discuss what to do in the future. This is the largest amount of requests we have received annually, and this all came in by January 22. The number of requests is high as well. This is not the highest amount we have allocated. The money is absolutely higher. Be mindful this is not sustainable. We would eat through the revenues fast. We cannot control or anticipate the requests that are going to come in. That is a challenge when we set the budget. This year is an anomaly, but we are seeing an increase through the years. There is no reason we would start to see that trend decline. I think the committee needs to look into a system similar to OUR where we discuss the requests received and have a set amount of money. That takes away a lot of the stress. PBAC is right, I don’t want to end funding and put the requests in spring at a detriment. I don’t want to raise the budget. I am torn. I want to send the horn group and ROTC. These are important and representative of our university growing. We have to consider increasing. That does not mean that all requests are going to come in. If we don’t increase, it will hurt our fellow classmates. I feel this should be revisited. I have a problem with starting a new evaluation method in the middle of the year. We can’t do that. The

piece regarding OUR isn't relevant to this discussion as it is a change in policy and not likely to change soon. In terms of a rubric, you are all tasked with making this decision in terms of the policy that we have today. I think we should look back at this when we have criteria. It may inform our decision. It will have an impact for spring requests or for future years. This has impacts now because we do not know how representative these requests are. I would want to evaluate after we have the metrics. We know the funding is being used by students. Putting this decision off is irresponsible. We need to take a vote. We need to be brave today, not tomorrow. If you increase the budget, you do not have to fund every request. If there is no motion, we will move on and the budget will stay the same. It is important to have evaluations and be consistent. We need to act now.

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to not raise the budget at this time. Jessica Thomas seconded.**

Discussion: We have had the most requests ever this year. We are spending more money because we are accepting food and there are rising costs. We have been evaluating critically. I don't think we should raise the budget without knowing what the committee values. We would raise the budget blindly and then allocate money just because we have it. We should look at our values first. There is going to be an impact whether a decision is made or not. Think about the impact. Do you want to answer for sitting on a chunk of money with no plans to spend it? If you do not increase, what is the plan for that money? The question may arise if the fee needs to be increased. If I know there is \$3.4 million in reserves and we did not raise the budget, I don't want to answer to the students who are asking why. If we raise the budget, we can still evaluate the requests critically. With the work that the subcommittee is doing, we can do that better. We get \$200,000 in interest every year. At the beginning of the year, we allocated whatever willy-nilly and now we are punished because we were not critical. I don't think we gave money willy-nilly. That is unfair. We are responsible and we did not come to this committee to hand out money willy-nilly. That was the wrong term. We looked at all the money we had and did not see the significance of \$1,000. The interest income is included in the money we allocate out that is base funded. Consistency has been a big topic and I have only voted to approve a couple of requests. This may be an issue for others but I have not voted to fund most requests. I agree that it is unfair to start scrutinizing halfway through the year. We need to start at the beginning of the year. We need to be more critical moving forward, not more relaxed. I appreciate your transparency. The guiding document does not have a rubric because it is intended for you all to determine what has value. There will be different values on where we are with the revenues. I have been keeping track on how each of you has voted and you have all been consistent. I appreciate your viewpoints. This piece is on the forefront. It is in the Observer. We will hear opinions on either ends. You will get feedback and you need to be clear on why you are making this decision. I appreciate you sharing your viewpoints. You all need to come to a decision, which will have an impact. Next year may have completely different criteria. For the sake of time, I agree we need to hear everyone's points. We should do that or we should vote on the motion. To clarify was this motion for the year or just at this time. At this time.

**The previous motion was called to question. Motion carried with one abstention.**

Regardless of this decision, I would like a clear outcome to share with PBAC and the clubs and orgs when we get to that point. This is why I ask for clarification. This is unfortunate that we have decided to be the gatekeeper of this money. Even if it is just for this moment – I don't believe it is. I am disgusted. We all pay these fees and should be benefitting from them.

**MOTION: Jessica Thomas made a motion to have a five-minute recess. Edgar Carreno seconded. Motion carried.**

**Meeting resumed at 6:26 pm.**

As we are listening to the requests, it is possible that we will use all of the budget. If you want to fund a request, you need to motion to increase the budget, and then motion to allocate the funding. Every group on here will have the opportunity to present, regardless of where we are with the budget.

**B. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting**

- i. #2043: ACLP Conference (Child Life & FCL Grad Club) - \$13,863.40

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2043 in the amount of \$10,369. There was no second. Motion died.**

Discussion: Feel free to refer back to the minutes.

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2043 in the amount of \$10,369. Alex Harrington seconded.**

Discussion: You all need to be sure to be consistent and intentional. Use the same criteria and same judgement for equity. Please share if you have a dissenting opinion.

**Motion carried with five abstentions.**

- ii. #2044: MPI Conference (Hospitality, Tourism, & Events) - \$2,800

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2044 in the amount of \$2,800. Eric Bennett seconded. There was a tied vote with three abstentions. Brandon Wear-Grimm voted against. Motion failed.**

Discussion: I voted opposed so that we can go back to discussion. I don't feel comfortable with what we are doing. Can you show how many requests we have denied this year? Two.

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2044 in the amount of \$2,800. Eric Bennett seconded.**

Discussion: To Brandon's point, there is a lot going on. It is helpful to discuss. There was no discussion before the first vote. I voted to deny the request because I don't like what they said about the impact. I don't see the impact. These are fair points. As faculty, and as we get to the critical point, I will abstain to leave the decisions up to the students. I appreciate those that are commenting. It is important for me to understand the committee's stance. I encourage you to speak so I can convey your thoughts.

**The previous motion was called to question. Motion carried with four abstentions.**

iii. #2045: Professional Staff Ride (Army ROTC) - \$90,011.50

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2045 in the amount of \$13,109.27. There was no second. Motion died.**

Discussion: If the metric for this is that it that this is an experience to enhance academic pursuits, then there will be requests coming through from many departments when they are not invited to do anything and are just tourists. It would enhance their academic pursuits. This will open the floodgates. We will be bankrupt before classes start. I appreciate you sharing your stance. Some of these are things that S&A has funded in the past. The Art Club has gone to San Francisco and the Fashion Club went to LA. This is allowable and there is precedent for it. It is still up to the committee. There has been a lot of scrutiny of these types of requests. A lot of requests have come through but it is not the norm. Last year when we approved the Art Club to go to San Francisco, I supported it because it is an enhancement to education to visit or show your art as much as performing. ROTC is enhancing their education. If this is allowable, we should consider it. If it is not allowable, it will not come before us. This has value. We should not determine that one thing is greater than another. I dislike what we are doing. It feels like you are quantifying this as a field trip. At the end of the day, these are all field trips. I appreciate your different viewpoints and sharing your stances. Keep the conversation specific to the request. We have three options; we can decline the request, recommend fully funding, or recommend partial funding.

**MOTION: Jessica Thomas made a motion to deny request #2045. Alejandro Alcantar seconded.**

Discussion: If this request does go through this is a rubber stamp that departments can go anywhere. The talk of floodgates opening is starting to feel threatening. That are multiple steps to vet these requests. The policy and flow of the requests will stay the same. We are going to

keep having these conversations until we hit zero so I think we need to hit zero. We will keep having these conversations past zero as well.

**Motion carried with two abstentions.**

- iv. #2046: American Chemical Society National Meeting - \$908  
Discussion: I appreciate that they did a lot of outside funding and are only requesting lodging. They are taking a redeye flight and sharing a hotel room. \$2,100 was requested from outside sources.

**MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2046 in the amount of \$908. Jessica Thomas seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.**

**New Business:**

**A. Base Funding Program Reviews**

- i. Intramural Sports and Open Recreation & University Recreation Administration  
These programs have been S&A funded for over 10 years. Recreation is the second largest employer of student staff on campus, behind dining. Recreation Administration goes to the cost for 15 pro staff while Intramurals largely goes to student wages. They employ roughly 45 students a quarter. Some funding also goes to equipment, supplies, programs, and travel. They gather feedback through comment cards, staff feedback, and annual focus groups. Through the Academic Assessment Research group it was determined that use of the Recreation Center positively impacted GPA 3/9 quarters and retention 2/8 quarters. Each demographic group never fell below 70% usage.

Presented by: Matthew Boyer

Questions: Are these retention numbers for everyone or the student employees? This is for everyone that comes in. Do you have any information about employee retention? We have grade thresholds and we offer study times and work around their classes. Many jobs in the community have set schedules but we work with the students. There is also some research on the impacts of exercise on the retention of knowledge. Is there any pressure due to the minimum wage increases? Not with the Recreation Administration, but yes for the Intramurals. Minimum wage has increased since our base funding was approved so there is that stress on the budget. We also have a new staff member that specializes in inclusion. Do you know how much of the usage is students. 90% roughly. Who else could have a membership? Faculty and staff, their spouses, and alumni can purchase memberships. Students have the best price. Faculty and staff also tend to come early in the morning and the afternoon while students tend to come in the evenings.

## **B. Supplemental Funding Requests – Presentations**

- i. #2047: NCTM Annual Meeting - \$3,791

This group will present at the next meeting on March 4, 2020.

- ii. #2048: Men's Lacrosse Competition Travel - \$6,400  
Twenty-five members of the Men's Lacrosse Team are requesting funding to attend a competition in San Diego, CA on March 20-28. They will be able to compete against other Division II teams and get a national ranking. The students hope to represent CWU on a national level and help grow the Lacrosse program.

Presented by: Ethan, Keegan, Hunter, and Peter

Questions: What will be the impact at the University after this trip? High school kids come out to watch the games. Touching other states is cool. Some clubs from the East Coast will be there. It will shine a light on Central. As we are pay-to-play, we cannot give out scholarships. We want to create the incentive to get people here. Are the whole 25 going? Yes. Do you collaborate with the women's team for community events? We did a collaboration to help a community member with yard work.

- iii. #2049: ALPFA National Conference - \$7,000  
The CWU ALPFA club is requesting funding for seven students to attend the national conference in Las Vegas, NV on August 3-6. The students would get the opportunity to network with Fortune 500 companies. They hope to bring these connections back to host various events through the campus and community.

Presented by: Ganzo

Questions: Seven? Seven students funded through S&A. Others are being fund raised. What are the requirements to go? Going to meetings, fundraising, recruiting, having a good GPA, keeping updated resumes and LinkedIn. They need to help diversify our connections. We are diverse students and benefit all.

- iv. #2050: New Position for Pierce Campus (Westside Student Life) - \$35,000  
Westside Student Life is requesting funding for a part time position at the Pierce Center. There is currently one full time staff and they are in the process of hiring another position, which has been vacant since November. This position would help students to build stronger connections and a sense of belonging on campus.

Presented by: Michelle Cook

Questions: Is this position just through June 30? We are looking to make it permanent but for now, it would just be this year. Can you give an example of the stronger connection this would build? We have events like Bounce to the Burg where these students have an opportunity to come, tour campus, and build connections with the faculty and ASCWU. We give connections to services. There is not an equitable amount of services at the centers and we try to bridge that gap. Are there salary savings in the base funding from the open position? What happens to the position on July 1? Based on the number of students and the desire to grow we are planning to approach next year to get more funding. Would it be better to request this as an increase to base funding rather than as supplemental funding? They are basically the same. This is the only process to increase base funding. Would this have to go to the Board of Trustees to approve? Yes. How did you identify the needs of the West Side Student Life and what the position would do? We met with Pierce leadership to work collaboratively. We are a one-stop-shop for involvement. This opens more opportunities for students. These are time and place bound students. They have less opportunities and time. A study came out that 1/3 of community college students struggle with resources and housing needs. This is huge. Half of Des Moines comes from Highline. This is an option to be more available to students and be a resource for them.

#### **Other Business: Communications Received**

We have received some follow up from the Veterans' Center regarding their presentation a couple of weeks ago. (Please see Addendum #2).

#### **Public Comment**

The Observer article is out regarding the S&A budget. Feel free to check that out.

I appreciate you all for your conversation. I know this is difficult but it is helpful to provide your viewpoints.

I [Matthew Boyer] wanted to correct something I had said in answer to one of your questions about minimum wage. When I started here, we knew that minimum wage was increasing. We were frugal last year and will make it work for this quadrium. We will be requesting more next quadrium.

Thank you to Aubrey for your work on the website, I am excited to see it.

#### **Adjournment:**

**MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.**

#### **Schedule for Next Meeting:**

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 4 in SURC 301 starting at 5:30 p.m.

# Revised Budget Breakdown

TOTAL COST	\$17,732.82
CLUB ACCOUNT/FUNDRAISING	(\$1,200)
STUDENT OUT-OF-POCKET CONTRIBUTION	(\$2,664)
CAREER SERVICES (FUNDED)	(\$500)
SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST (FUNDS COUNCIL)	(\$3,000)
<b>S&amp;A (REQUESTED)</b>	<b>\$10,368.82</b>
Total (per student)	\$864.07/student

## Joseph Bryant

---

**From:** Ruben Cardenas  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 26, 2020 9:06 AM  
**To:** Joseph Bryant  
**Subject:** Update

Hi Joey,

I hope I'm not sending this to you too late, but I wanted to provide a couple points of clarification on my recent S&A program review presentation for the committee.

Our population consists of student veterans, service members, and their families. I referenced some population numbers on a couple slides and it may have been perceived that those were just student veteran numbers. I wanted to make sure that this was communicated and so that it was clear for the committee members.

During the Q&A portion, there was a question on what we spend our S&A funding on. I failed to mention that our Outreach Recruiter position is partially funded at about 20% through S&A funding.

Thanks,  
Ruben



**Ruben Cardenas**  
Director  
Veterans Center  
509-963-3028  
Bouillon Hall 214  
[ruben.cardenas@cwu.edu](mailto:ruben.cardenas@cwu.edu)  
[cwu.edu/veterans](http://cwu.edu/veterans)