

Services and Activities Fee Committee
Minutes
May 6, 2020

Called to order:

Edgar Carreno called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

Attendance:

Alejandro Alcantar, Eric Bennett, Joseph Bryant, Edgar Carreno, Monica Carreno, Dane Gillin, Aubrey Heim, Josh Hibbard, Lacy Lampkins, Gregg Schlanger, Jessica Thomas

Excused: Brandon Wear-Grimm, Chicena Mortimer

Unexcused: Alex Harrington, Martin Kennedy

Agenda:

The agenda was amended to indicate the next meeting would take place on May 20, rather than on May 13.

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to approve the agenda. Alejandro Alcantar seconded. Motion carried.

Minutes:

MOTION: Dane Gillin made a motion to approve the minutes of April 29, 2020. Eric Bennett seconded. Motion carried.

Reports:

Chair – None.

Advisors – I appreciate everyone’s adaptability to this modality. Does anyone have feedback or recommendations? I think things are running smoothly.

Thank you, Aubrey for getting the annual reports and questionnaires on the website.

Public Comment:

None.

New Business:

A. Sub-committee

i. Review/Update

The subcommittee met yesterday. What we need from the committee is to approve the KPIS which were presented at the last meeting in winter (see Addendum 1). Additionally, we have created a document which at this stage is just an idea (see Addendum 2). This would change the process for supplemental requests to resemble that of OUR. There would be two deadlines in the year to

submit requests, which would be decided on based on our rubrics. We have discussed different spending limits for different kinds of requests. The requests would need: an abstract, a statement about professional development, a statement about how it would be brought back to the school, a budget, and a letter of support from an admin or club advisor. SURC Accounting would still check what is allowable. We also want to look into helping to fund the resources for areas to track usage numbers. This could be a joint project with the Tech Fee Council.

Discussion: With the current circumstances, the way we have evaluated things may not be feasible in the near future. We are still discussing what fall will look like. KPIs may not be best method for making decisions because we don't know what fall will look like. If we can pull back up the KPIs at the next meeting to go over them, that would be good. I like where we are going. A lot of this is based on concerns about number and size of requests. For the immediate future, there is no travel. I don't know how long that will be – it may be through the fall. There are two points here: KPIS for the base funded groups, and identifying a better process for reviewing travel supplemental requests. What is proposed would require a change in policy. Is the thought process to change all supplementals to this route? Special circumstances will change some of these. For travel do we want to set up a protocol which would require changes in policy? This would not go into effect until part way through next year. There are some base funded groups thinking about changing their base requests to have all travel requests funneled through other areas. Is this for supplementals in general, or travel more? We don't get a lot that aren't travel. Brandon and Lacy have data to share. Are we looking at all requests together, or travel as separate? This document was to get the conversation started. I think it is mostly travel. I included events because we get inundated with travel. We are considering large events and how to weigh the value. Travel is the most important part of this. It would change from requests one week and voting the next, to 2 deadlines for submitting requests and the committee reviewing them. Then we can do other things as a committee. Does that eliminate presentations? The presentations would be gone, and the abstract would take its place. They have to have in depth descriptions. The committee would have to look at them and formulate questions for when we get together. Can these be suggestions to a future committee, rather than a policy change. Can we have the subcommittee document as a reference tool? The committee can look at it and vote accordingly. These could have more parameters versus a policy change. That would be my recommendation. I do not recommend putting any funding caps into policy because that absolutely limits us. We can recommend this as a funding model at the beginning of the year. That gives us the flexibility for special circumstances. Supplemental was intended to be additional funding for special circumstances for base funded areas. It has grown into a travel fund. That is not most the effective. I recommend we set aside a travel specific process, regardless of size, so all travel is looked at together. Events are more individual and are harder to quantify. Travel is more uniform. Let's look at creating a template for travel. If we are moving travel funding elsewhere, this may cut down on the amount. We may be able to review them all in one meeting a quarter. It is more consistent that way. The only change is that in the policy it says all supplemental requests follow the same model as base funding. They have the opportunity for a 10-minute

presentation and 10 minutes of questions. Supplemental requests for travel would be on a different model. I recommend we don't put any dollar amounts or caps on it as it is hard to change the policy. We can give the KPIs and recommendations to next year's committee. Maybe we can get a document similar to what we put together and present it to the committee next year. They can use it as a tool when going through requests. I feel like next year will be the same as always. Special circumstances will make it the same as ever. If this is only a recommendation, there will be things that cost more. Those that can't afford it won't be able to go. This doesn't serve everyone. I don't want to cut out those with need. Travel has been a struggle for many of us. How do we justify supporting one request and not the other? This is just suggestions. I don't want to leave out students. I like the idea of creating a guiding document without caps. That is where we can spend some time. It is helpful to plan before the year gets started. We can give recommendations. We might decide on x amount per student. The ideal situation is moving travel out to base funded areas. I am trying to have those conversations with the units. They would get an extra piece of funding. Some of these pieces should be handled at those levels. I saw some of this trickle over from last year. We might give club funding more money and they can handle requests. We are in a situation right now where we have the ability to look at our process and start from scratch. These recommendations will go out as groups are submitting their base funding requests and they may want these requests going through those groups.

ii. Next Steps

We will touch base to fine tune and tweak the proposal. We can discuss at the next meeting what we want to put forward for next year and see if any policies need to change.

Old Business:

A. Base Funding Program Reviews – Updates

We have most of these turned in. The plan is to send them all to you at once. I will give them to you to look at in advance. We are not meeting next week, which gives you the opportunity to look over these. We will go over them at the meeting on the 20th. These groups can choose to sign in, but it is not required. I will send these to you in one email so you can look at them all. They answered the six questions we always ask, and they can give a brief description of their program. The plan is to look over these before the next meeting. We will pull them up so if you have questions, we can ask the program managers. They are all really brief. Please go through and jot down questions you have.

B. Annual Report Review Plan

On the website you can see all of the reports. If you go to annual reports, each unit is on there. It has the base request, the report from last year, and this year's report. Also uploaded is the questionnaire. The reports have a narrative at the start and financials at the end. They have fiscal year 18 and 19 actuals, 20 actuals as of the time of the report, and the forecast for the rest of the year and for next year. Your homework while we are not meeting next week is to go through and review these for any questions. We don't want to go through them all individually. We will have you all look through them and

submit discussion points or questions you have. Ideally you would submit these by next Friday, so I can get the questions to the program managers. We do have another meeting after the next if we need to have someone come in to answer questions. I want to make sure we are spending time answering the questions you have. Thank you to Aubrey for posting those reports.

Discussion: Those financial reports were populated in December. A lot of the forecasts have changed dramatically since then. I want to remind the committee that we are looking at fiscal year 19. We can ask questions about the projections, but things were different 6 months ago.

Other Business: Communications Received

None.

Public Comment

On one of the lists for requests was iPads for the committee. I know there is no spending right now. Could we get an exception, or do we need to wait? With the current situation I can reevaluate and see if there are savings. I wouldn't say it is 100% off the table. I can see a justifiable case if we continue in this manner. I want to point out that with the policy that is in effect this year, if we have need for S&A to come together over the summer, Student Government has the ability to form a temporary committee. They may be able to come together and have this ready for the fall. It may not be in the same fashion as a supplemental request, but it is not off the table. It would be great for reducing paper.

Adjournment:

MOTION: Eric Bennett made a motion to adjourn. Dane Gillin seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Schedule for Next Meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 20 online starting at 5:30 p.m.

ADDENDUM #1

The purpose of this document is to inform the Services and Activities (S&A) Fee Committee what the Services and Activities Subcommittee has found from the supplemental annual report questions as well as to share potential Key Performance Indicators.

To begin, quantifiable data that can be gathered from areas is something that is lacking from the data gathered, the impact on students cannot be measured in numbers. It appears that all departments do not have a streamlined method of gathering this data. The question of whether areas with individuals or groups (such as underrepresented groups) should receive a “pass” at this data, meaning that information about the amount of students that use this area or the types of students that use this area should not be collected as it could potentially endanger the privacy and well-being of the students that use this area. The question of whether or not the data from areas already collecting this type of information is accurate also comes into play. If a student just needs to swipe their CWU Connection Card (Recreation Center) to access an area, what’s to say the data that we get is multiple students swiping their Connection Cards multiple times (e.g. 200 students visit an area in a day but 50 of them visit the area 2-3 times).

An area/topic that the S&A committee tends to focus on in regard to supplemental funding requests is the potential impact on current students. Below are areas that I believe could be KPI’s.

- Number of students that utilize the area (if applicable).
- Staff to student ratio.
- Retention rate (if applicable).
- Amount of pro-staff or faculty and their cost.
- Amount of student staff and their cost.
- How active are students in this area?
- What practices are set in place to promote the growth of students (professionally, personally, and education wise)?
- Types of student lead initiatives (events, programs).
- Amount of student lead initiatives.
- How is feedback from students gathered and is it taken into consideration?
- How does this area connect with other areas? (e.g. ASCWU partnering with CWU Wellness)?
- How does this area grow CWU’s relationship with Ellensburg or its respective University Center community?
- What impact does this area bring to the CWU Community as well as the outside community (Ellensburg, University, and University Center areas)?
 - Including minority and underrepresented communities.
- What value does this area bring to CWU students (self-evaluation)
- How do you encourage student involvement?
- Define issues that your area tries to address at CWU

ADDENDUM #1

- How does this service improve students' experience at CWU?
- Will this provide a service or activity that has not been provided before?
- What would be the impact if this area was to not be funded next year?

My recommendation for the committee is that if student demographic/population data is important, the committee should consider investing in software and hardware to help areas track this data.

I also believe that funds and the way areas use their funds need to be more transparent. There is no excuse for areas to not provide sufficient detail when it comes to their budget. It feels that some areas either did not see the importance of answering more than half of the annual report supplemental questions or simply forgot (which I don't believe is the case). This makes it hard to consider all of the data to create "criteria" that could be applied to all of the areas.

I believe that the committee sees two different values when it comes to requests that happen on campus versus off campus (travel). From what I have observed and have personally used as the deciding factor in voting for some supplemental funding requests is the impact that would happen to students on campus, especially with requests that pertain to travel.

S&A Sub Committee on Funding and Review processes for discussion

May 6, 2020

Changing the process for supplemental funding requests

- Creating a more uniform and fair process to review and select supplemental funding for Service and Activities fee supported student travel and events
- This is about shared responsibility between the student and the school
- Using the office of Undergrad Research process to determine supplemental funding
- Having uniform funding levels for requests that come to the committee for recommendations of support
- Levels of funding that could be requested:

Travel up to \$750 for 1 student

Travel up to \$1500 for 2 or more students

Events up to \$2500

Large Events and Special Circumstances TBD

- Each request would have an application and complete budget with all pertinent information and justifications
- Each application would have an abstract.

From OUR's website for an example:

An abstract or creative statement for the application: This should describe your project and the context for it in a way that is understandable for a committee of faculty from across the university. It's possible that your abstract could be the same thing you submitted to the conference as long as it falls within the length guidelines (250 words maximum), but you may need to modify it if it is highly specialized. The committee will be looking for a realistic project that is well-described within its context. Note: If you are applying for a group travel grant, you only need a single abstract or creative statement.

ADDENDUM #2

- Each Application would also have A professional development statement.

From OUR's website for an example:

A professional development statement from each student: *This is your chance to describe why you want to go this particular conference or performance and how it fits into your academic or career goals. The committee is looking for thoughtful, specific reasons—avoid describing generic benefits like "it's a resume builder" or you will get public speaking practice. Who else goes to this conference? Are there particular people or events that you will seek out? Talk to your mentor about what you might expect to do there. Show the committee that you have done your homework. Note: If you are applying for a group travel grant, every person in the group should prepare a professional development statement.*

- Each request would have a letter of support from a faculty advisor or club/organization advisor
- Requests would have a deadline of the first Wednesday in November and February
- SURC Accounting would review each application for the required sections and that they were allowable requests
- The committee would meet after the application deadline ended and review and choose the requests for support or denial

This is a basic list of how supplemental funding requests were requested in the future. If we all think this is a good idea we would like to work with Joey and Lacy to come up with a proposal to forward and recommend a policy change for this process.