

Services and Activities Fee Committee
Minutes
March 4, 2020

Called to order:

Brandon Wear-Grimm called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

Attendance:

Alejandro Alcantar, Eric Bennett, Joseph Bryant, Edgar Carreno, Monica Carreno, Dane Gillin, Alex Harrington, Aubrey Heim, Josh Hibbard, Lacy Lampkins, Chicena Mortimer, Brandon Wear-Grimm

Excused: Martin Kennedy, Gregg Schlanger, Jessica Thomas,

Agenda:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried with one abstention.

Minutes:

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve the minutes of February 26, 2020. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried.

Reports:

Chair – None.

Advisors – Please get food so it does not go to waste.

We have received a memo about travel (please see Addendum #1). There is some impact here, and groups are being made aware of that. We have funded one international trip. They are in a contract. We are in the early phases of discussion what the rest will look like. No updates for now but hopefully by next week.

We have updated the S&A Funding Request Individual Assessment Tool. The format is the only thing to change so that the process and priorities are clearer. There is a guide and check box for your guidance and review. We left spots for notes. We looked at other agencies and their documents – most do not have anything. The committee created the original document four years ago and this is an update.

We have \$12,201 in the budget. We have requests that have come in after the winter quarter deadline. Do we want to see those? Do we want to implement a spring quarter deadline?

Discussion: We are pretty close to out of money. Consider investing to see the supplemental requests that are pending. It is important to consider that. Leaving the budget limits our ability to invest in current student programs or activities. I want to be able to communicate to the requestors that have been waiting. I also am presenting to PBAC next week and would like to update them. Are people in the que asking if it is worth it to present? Yes. They are concerned.

Some don't have other funding options. Requests are consistent with what we have seen. Are the majority for travel or events? It is a mix. We had a deadline of January 22 so a lot came in January and have been waiting for an update. They are all in spring or summer. PBAC wanted me to bring back the concern that not raising the budget may impact spring events. How many do we have queued up? We are pretty much scheduled out. We do have a tentative schedule. We have things on the agenda for every meeting but the last one. There are program reviews and annual reports. It depends on the time we spend on the annual reports. There is potential for some room in there. It is not just the budget. We are at capacity for spring already. Do we want to set a deadline or just close it? There are ten currently pending. Considering the time restraints. I think it negates the purpose of setting a budget if we just blow past it. I would prefer to not raise it. I agree with PBAC that to not increase would be a detriment to events in the spring. It is not our job to hold onto money. It is to spend the money for the students at the current time. I am not saying all requests should be fully funded. I am skeptical that we would not fund everything and blow through the money. If we are concerned of sitting on the \$3.4 million then why don't we just set the budget at that amount and criticize requests as they come in. We have only denied three and we have had a large number of requests. This is not how you set a budget. You factor in the expenses you have. I don't understand the point if we approve virtually everything and keep raising it. We set a budget based on the number of requests we have had in the past. We have no idea what we are going to see each year. It is not unusual to increase the budget. In the seven years I have been on the committee, I only recall one year we did not raise it. It is hard to gauge what we are going to get. We set it on historical trends. This is all a learning process. Some recommendations are based on enrollment targets. We don't always know where we are. The Funds Manager will generally let us know if it is reasonable to increase or not. Is it a mistake to assume that continuing to raise the budget will give more opportunity for requests, which will lead to a higher budget set and even more requests in subsequent years? That is not a mistake. There is also a lot of awareness out there. When the policy changed and the money was freed up, we let students know that there are funds. This was more vocalized. Last year we had the S&A fair to increase awareness. This is somewhat the beast we created. This is not sustainable. We are looking at things to be implemented. The number of requests has increased and the dollar figure has increased. This is alleviated some by external bodies that we set up through base funding. These conversations are going to be a large part of next year's committee. I don't know what will happen. Either we won't have time to review all of the requests or the money in our reserves will go faster than we want them to. We could spend \$3.4 million in one year if the committee chose. The committee has to constantly adapt. Even if there are no changes, don't expect fewer requests. We will still see the amounts grow. How you operate within that each year will be different. What amount would you want to increase the budget? My opinion is that we should not increase, but what do you think is necessary? When this has come up in the past that was posed to the Funds Manager. This usually comes up in spring and this list is as of January 22. Lacy knows what the other ten requests look like. If we increase then more spring requests are going to come in. I agree with Alex. If no one has an idea of how much to increase then we shouldn't do it. The dollar amount would be up to the committee, but it is reasonable to look in the \$50,000-100,000 range. That looks like a dramatic jump. In this circumstance, it is hitting me that there will be a negative impact to requestors in spring. There

are lots of spring events in the que. We have the funding. If the answer is no, I need to have that info to communicate out to the student body. Would \$50,000-\$100,000 cover the majority of spring? In my mind, being critical thinkers doesn't seem like it has been happening. Three out of 55 requests have been denied. My fear is that we will run out again. There is no way to say that we will think critically now. Would you want to increase or not? A lot of requests we see as consistent can be added to base funding. We would then contribute more to base funding. These groups are going to ask for base funding increases. This will lead to a fee increase. These individual requests seem one-off, but they contribute to the bloat in the fee. There are things in base funding that we should not be funding, but we spend all of our time discussing supplemental and not base. This adds to student loan debts because every committee does this and we do not look at it critically. We don't have time for those conversations. I don't think that most requests advance the student body as a whole. If we want to have these conversations then we should do that. If we are not willing to have these conversations then I am not willing to contribute to the problem. We have a proposal to raise the budget \$50,000.

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to not raise the budget and to let groups know that we will no longer be accepting supplemental funding requests. Chicena Mortimer seconded.

Discussion: We spend a considerable amount of time on base funding every four years. We have cut funding or increased it. We are one of the most scrutinized areas. The students decide if these things have value or not. That is the point of the annual reports and how in depth you want to go. Some years are diligent and some are general. There is a considerable amount of time spent. We make those decisions every four years; it was previously every year or two. Last year the committee did not spend as much time on annual reports. A lot is dependent on the committee. The challenge is that one time funding based on what you value. We don't have control over what is brought forward. If we are denying all requests, then what are we spending that money on? I cannot think of another area on campus where every four years there is the possibility that you may not be funded. I think not increasing the budget is like hurting your foot and cutting it off to heal. We are shooting ourselves. Telling fellow students that we hit our budget but we don't find value in what they are requesting. I will vote against this motion because it is wrong. I feel uncomfortable. We have \$3.5 million and we are penny pinching. Being critical does not mean denying. We evaluate, we do not have to deny each one. We are trying to evaluate how to be critical through the subcommittee. To change in the middle of the year is not fair. The subcommittee is working on new ways to evaluate requests. To not increase with \$3.4 million is not the best option. We have to support the students. The best is to increase and evaluate each request critically. If we do not approve all fully, who is to say that one request is better than another. The biggest thing is how it affects the students on campus. Not everything approved has done that. If there is a way for us to think critically on our mission then maybe we can increase. I don't think that will happen. This bothers me because it does not reflect of Central for people to go on a trip. That is the hardest thing to do – making judgment calls. I don't mean that we should cut people's funding, we should just see if it is beneficial to Central. Analyzing is the hardest thing we do. We are figuring it out. We need to figure it out as a group. If we keep going off that

idea and not everyone is on board it is detrimental. It is good to get diverse perspectives. Because this is happening mid-year, the subcommittee could make an outline for next year. It may be the fault of the previous committee that we do not have structure. For this year, we have a budget. It is not fair that when we ask how much to increase, no one has an idea.

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

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to increase the budget \$100,000. Edgar Carreno seconded.

Discussion: We can do this. I would agree with Cece that I don't know how we are going to go through \$300,000 with three denials. How many requests would the \$100,000 get us through? I cannot say. It allows us the ability to see other requests and say yes or no. What is the amount we have left? \$92,000. There is a possibility that we will not fund all of them. I am skeptical, and that leaves us in spring with \$8,000. I don't get the point. It gives us the opportunity to hear more. They are probably for travel. I don't know how that adds to the experience or benefits students at Central. People ask me why these trips are being funded and it is hard to answer that. Being critical does not mean denying everything. It also does not mean supporting everything but three. That is a big gap. If we increase to see other requests then the next step would be to increase more to see more requests. If we have \$8,000 left for spring, are we going to increase again? There is no structure at that point. I don't want to be in a space that has no structure. This motion did not address if we would be seeing spring requests. We may want that to be a discussion for next week. You have heard anecdotes asking why we are funding, I have also had people who are happy we are funding. I feel that if we continue to hold onto these funds – what is to stop the administration from spending the money if we don't? Students are being critical thinkers. I take offense to saying we are not being critical. Whether we approve is not because we have no standards. I am doing my job. I don't think fees are a bloating bureaucracy. We need to be consistent with what we have control over. We don't have the purview to decide larger questions at this time. When we look at this in isolation, this is a pot of money for a specific mandate and guidelines. It is part of a whole. They are looking for us to make these decisions. They delegate this to us. It is our responsibility to be good stewards. The question is how you are spending the money. The responsibility comes to us to view this as a whole and take into account the impacts – both long and short term. It is hard to not fund something. Our job is to make hard choices, not to please everyone. We have to answer for these things as members of a governing body.

The previous motion was called to question. Motion tied with two abstentions. Chair Brandon Wear-Grimm voted opposed. Motion failed.

I want to know if we are accepting more proposals or not. We may want to move on to the requests. We can continue later.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to table the budget discussion until after the supplemental requests and to move the Supplemental Request Presentations before Old Business. Chicena Mortimer seconded. The motion carried.

Public Comment:

None.

New Business:

A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Presentations

- i. #2055: Mariachi Club Mexico Trip - \$6,178
Twelve students from the Mariachi Club are requesting funding to attend one of the most well known mariachi festivals in Guadalajara, Mexico on August 27-September 7. The club would like to go to the birthplace of mariachi, learn about why it was formed and celebrated, see professional mariachi, and perform in the festival. Upon return to campus, the group would like to start new mariachi events and programs.

Presented by: Daniel, Yajayra, Karen, Andrea

Questions: Are you performing? Yes, and participating in workshops. How did you determine the 12 going? The skill level. We are representing CWU, the state, and the nation. It is important to have a high standard. It may exclude some, but representing Central, we want to sound the best. How many are in your club? 15.

- ii. #2053: Performance Uniforms (Mariachi Club) - \$10,980
The Mariachi Club is requesting funding for twelve matching suits to perform in. Matching suits are a big part of Mariachi culture and a sign of respect. Without matching suits, the Mariachi Club would be asked to not participate at the upcoming mariachi festival.

Presented by: Daniel, Yajayra, Karen, Andrea

Questions: How did you get your existing uniforms? President Gaudino funded them. The suits are not traditional. Traditionally the pants button down the sides, ours have embroidery. The suits are wearing and tearing. They have the wildcat logo on the back, which is not traditional. We went to make the logo smaller. Less commercialized. We plan to use the suits for the elite group. We have a plan for growth. There would be a beginners, intermediate, and advanced group. The suits would go to the advanced group. Was it accurate that you would not be able to perform at the festival without these suits? It is in the rules. They ask everyone to match. Currently we don't have that. The suits we have now are mixed and matched. Some are too tight or have different materials. If this was not funded, could you rent these? No. The rental is nothing close in quality and it is almost the same amount of money to rent or buy them. Do club members pay dues? They

do not. We try to make this as free as possible. To apply for this trip they had to pay a \$75 fee through OISP. We are trying to fundraise Thursdays at the music building. When we perform, the money we earn goes back to the group. What is the life expectancy for the suits? Ten years minimum. I have a skirt that a professor gave me that is going on sixteen years now. We want to invest in something that will last. If you can take care of the suits and store them properly. We have theatre helping with storage. In addition, they can help tailor them for different people. We can dry clean them as needed. I attended a performance last year and loved it. It was a great experience. Thank you! We have a recital tonight at 8:00 that you are all welcome to attend.

iii. #2047: NCTM Annual Meeting - \$3,159

Three students are requesting funding to attend the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 100th Annual Meeting in Chicago, IL March 31 to April 5. The students would attend keynote speeches, learn about the newest resources and technology, and network. This is the first STEM cohort on the Westside and they would like to pass down what they learn to the next cohort.

Presented by: Brittney

Questions: How does this add to your knowledge and to others in the program? This would help us through the speakers, programs, and activities. We are also doing tabling to try to recruit new people. We can share this with the next cohort.

iv. #2051: National Conference for Undergraduate Research - \$527.76

Katherine Shogren is requesting funding to attend the National Conference for Undergraduate Research in Bozeman, MT on March 25-29. She will be presenting an interdisciplinary paper on history and musicology. This will be her first national and interdisciplinary convention. She will also present this paper at SOURCE.

Presented by: Katherine Shogren

Questions: Are you going by yourself? Yes. I had an advisor and faculty going with me but they canceled. I am still really excited to go. Are you presenting at SOURCE? Yes and at Phi Alpha Theta. What is the impact to other students? I can share what I learned with the Honors College, History Department, and the History Club as the president.

v. #2052: Western Psychological Association Conference - \$2,680

Five students from Dr. Buchanan's Directed Research Lab are requesting funding to attend the Western Psychological Association Conference in San Francisco, CA on April 30-May 3. The students will present their research, get feedback, and have the opportunity for professional development and

networking. The students will also present at SOURCE. This research group has a 100% retention rate.

Presented by: Annie and Amanda

Questions: None.

- vi. #2054: National Conference for Undergraduate Research (Students With A Purpose) - \$13,066.50

Fourteen students from Students with a Purpose are requesting funds to attend the National Conference for Undergraduate Research in Bozeman, MT on March 25-29. The students would present their research on the impact of team development intervention. Only 72 out of 4,000 submitted presentations were accepted for the conference. The students will also attend keynote speeches, other presentations and network. The students will present their research at SOURCE.

Presented by: Spencer, Jayden, Leanna

Questions: Of the 14 going, how many are presenting? All of them. Is everyone in the club going? The leadership team and the most involved team members.

Old Business:

A. Supplemental Funding Requests – Voting

- i. #2048: Men's Lacrosse Competition Travel - \$6,400
Discussion: For the sake of not staying in Limbo.

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2048 in the amount of \$6,400. Dane Gillin seconded.

Discussion: I like that they are involved in the community and have sponsorships. They are sharing hotel rooms and involved in fundraising.

Motion carried with four abstentions.

- ii. #2049: ALPFA National Conference - \$6,180

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to approve Supplemental Funding Request #2049 in the amount of \$5801.27. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried with four abstentions.

- iii. #2050: New Position for Pierce Campus (Westside Student Life) - \$35,000
Discussion: Due to lack of funds.

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to deny Supplemental Funding Request #2050. There was no second. Motion died.

Discussion: From a procedural standpoint, knowing that we have exhausted the budget, if you would like to fund this you would first need to motion to increase the budget.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to table the discussion of Supplemental Funding Request #2050 until the committee has determined if they will accept more requests and raise the budget. Alex Harrington seconded. Motion carried.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to recess for five minutes. Alex Harrington seconded. Motion carried.

Meeting resumed at 7:32.

Reports (Continued):

We should revisit request #2049 if we do increase the budget to be fair. Based on where we ended the last conversation we should start with what requests to entertain. We can chose to not receive more past request #2055, we can entertain those that are already submitted, or we can entertain requests up to a chosen date. I would be willing to raise the budget \$50,000 if we do not entertain spring requests. Does that include those in the inbox, or just the ones on this list?

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to increase the budget by \$50,000 and entertain the requests that have been submitted to date. Dane Gillin seconded.

MOTION TO AMMEND: Eric Bennett made a motion to split the previous motion into two parts. There was no second. Amendment died.

Would we be approving all of these and then get the \$50,000 for spring? I do not have a specific set of things to approve in mind. I recommend that this be two different discussions to avoid convoluted discussions.

The motion was withdrawn.

MOTION: Alex Harrington made a motion to entertain only the requests received by the committee thus far. Dane Gillin seconded.

Discussion: I think we are not taking into consideration what PBAC has asked. To not hear spring requests is problematic. I fear that PBAC will not agree and do it without us. This could be out of our hands. We are all over the place and contradicting ourselves. The first two quarters we set a deadline, now we are just cutting off requests. It feels like we are taking away the opportunity. We had deadlines for fall and winter because we had money to give. Now we don't.

I'm skeptical of hearing other requests. We are basically at zero again already. We have the responsibility to use the \$300,000 and now we have to hold ourselves accountable. We have used our budget. Is there a policy that requires us to not go over budget? No, we can go over budget in theory. We are then in Limbo for the entire year. If it is a case-by-case basis, we can keep adding to the budget. This is if we do not add another \$50,000. This is my compromise since I don't want to raise at all. We have money we are supposed to use and I don't understand your hesitation. We do not have all of the numbers currently to evaluate these decisions. Right now, what we have is theoretical. If we have consistent requests then we add them to base funding as shown in precedent. That is more money being used in base funding. Areas also ask for increases to funding. It keeps going. If we do not hold ourselves accountable and keep allocating funding, it compounds and has other effects. I appreciate the direction you are going in. These are student fees so I didn't feel comfortable speaking up. I have never met a student that did not want to go to Central because they don't think their trip will be funded, but I do see students who don't want to go because it is too expensive. We have the money, but we need to think about the big picture. I appreciate your thought on that and would lean that way.

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

As we move to the budget piece, from a financial standpoint, this money is leftover and not coming out of current student fees. This is money that has not been spent, not revenue being allocated into base funding. Be intentional not to sit on the money. The big point is to avoid a fee increase. Be mindful to give an answer to students that we are not sitting on this money. The reserve can only be used for one time funding. If we are not using it for supplemental funding, then what are we using it on? I think the subcommittee could lend a lot of direction. I don't want to raise the budget until we have a clear direction. Since we only have the room until 8:00...

MOTION: Dane Gillin made a motion to table this discussion until next week. Alex Harrington seconded.

Since you haven't yet processed the requests, can we have a rough dollar figure? Roughly around \$63,000. I can add those requests to this list for next week.

The previous motion was called to question. Motion carried.

Just so we know, the discussion of the subcommittee is not germane until it has been approved by UPAC. We are not able to use that information until it is approved. I agree depending on what it is the subcommittee comes up with.

Other Business: Communications Received

We received a thank you card from BSU.

Public Comment

I appreciate your discussion. These are tough decisions. We will have more discussions in coming weeks.

Mariachi Club has invited us to their performance tonight at 8:00.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Schedule for Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 11 in SURC 301 starting at 5:30 p.m.



LEARN. DO. LIVE.

The health and safety of our students, faculty and staff are Central Washington University's highest priority. After careful consideration, CWU has decided to cancel all education abroad programs and university-related international travel until the end of Spring Quarter 2020 and request all students (undergraduate and graduate), faculty and staff currently studying or working abroad return to the United States.

In addition, the University requests those returning from international travel self-isolate for 14 days within their homes before returning to campus.

New guidelines issued on March 1 by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), encourage higher education institutions to consider these measures given the speed of spread and number of countries experiencing human-to-human transmission. We understand the inconvenience this creates and ask for your patience as we work through challenges related to this request.

Any member of the CWU community who chooses to disregard university recommendations for international travel must understand they will do so at their own risk and may face difficulties in return travel to the U.S. and/or possible restricted access to the CWU campus.

We are in the early stages of notifying students and faculty who are currently abroad or scheduled to travel abroad in the next few months, as well as our international education partners, of the international travel suspension. CWU is evaluating alternative ways for students to complete their courses and educational requirements.

CWU is collaborating closely with state and local public health agencies to stay on top of best practices for limiting the spread of COVID-19. Additionally, we encourage you to bookmark the website CWU has developed to keep you informed of the latest information regarding Central at cwu.edu/respiratory-viruses. Additional reliable information about COVID-19 can also be found on the Washington State Department of Health website: doh.wa.gov/emergencies/coronavirus.