**Western Washington University**

**Services and Activities Fee Committee   
Meeting Minutes**

**Friday, May 28, 2021; 2:00-3:00 pm**

**Teams Virtual Meeting**

**Present:** Michael Sledge, Eric Alexander, Noemi Bueno, Raquel Vigil, Steve Card, Emma Duff, Danil Sonjaya, Adam Leonard, Caitlin Summers, Travis Cram (recorder), Kevin Harris, Ichi Kwon, Rebecca McLean, Evan Shuster

**Absent:** Debbie Curry,Ranulfo Molina

**Guest:** Megan McGinnis, Linda Beckman, Jack Herring

**Agenda Items:** 1) Approval of Minutes, 2) Initial Decisions, 3) Allocations, 4) Future Considerations

Evan Shuster called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

Evan stated the committee had made significant progress and that today’s meeting would conclude all final business. Evan encouraged the committee to keep conversations out of the chat, utilizing the raise-hand function instead, ensuring a coordinated flow of communication, and asked student reps and budget representatives to help ensure the day’s business is completed.

**Approval of Minutes:**

Evan asked if there were questions or amendments to the minutes of the May 21, 2021 meeting. There were no amendments requested to these minutes. Evan Shuster made the motion to approve the minutes as presented. Danil Sonjaya seconded the motion. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

**Initial Decisions: Type of budget/Starting line assumptions:**

Evan stated that the committee needed to decide the type of memo to send to the Board of Trustees. Last year’s committee used allocation percentages, leaving final budget numbers undecided. Because the committee is operating under so much uncertainty again this year, Evan suggested it made sense to follow the same line of thinking and proceed with percentages this year as well.

Emma seconded Evan’s recommendation stating it made sense to proceed with percentages for the memo, given that was the approach used last year.

Michael added he and Evan had worked on the first stages of the memo and have recorded the initial budget requests; this information will be retained and forwarded in the memo.

Danil echoed Emma and Evan, agreeing percentages might be the best way to go forward.

Kevin agreed, especially considering the lack of information and time the committee has, Evan’s recommended approach should be used.

By affirmation, the committee decided to use percent allocation only.

**Allocation, Allocation, Allocation:**

Evan recommended FY22 percentages based on requests as the better starting point.

Steve argued that there needed to be a recognition for what was agreed on for the COLA increase that was approved. If that was the intent, the committee should use the FY20 budget, because that would align with the COLA increase that was approved prior by this committee.

Raquel extended Steve’s thinking. The FY22 percentages do not align with the reasons we raised the fee, and recommended the committee start with FY20 funds and then shift percentage allocation based upon who needs to share in the COLA increase.

Caitlin called attention to Adam’s concern that Campus Recreation will be doubly punished, resulting in a potential $60K deficit. Campus Rec wanted to again raise that point.

Eric asked about a formula difference in the effective rate versus the proposed rate. He sought to clarify that it is the housing and dining bond coverage, which Linda confirmed was the case. Eric asked why in revenue calculations that housing and dining is taken away later, suggesting the committee multiply revenue off of the 1.25 figure rather than the 1.07 figure. Linda was not clear on the significance of the difference and believed the current projection is accurate but will look into this with more focus.

Evan asked Steve how to change the approach to percentages based on COLA; Steve responded that his point was to make sure the amount the committee agreed to raise goes to those programs who are impacted by the raise. When you add COLA increases, it changes percentages slightly, but results in a fair reallocation if the committee wants to ensure the COLA increase is the only thing covered.

Evan asked if programs did request greater amounts for new programming; Steve indicated that Associated Students COLA increase is smaller than their overall request with a $45,000 difference. DRAC’s COLA increase is -$6,000 which would move DRAC from 1.17 million to 1.124 million.

Evan indicated he was hesitant to accept these new percentages, recommending moving forward with the established starting point of FY22 and looking for the best equitable way forward. Eric clarified the proposal Steve is putting forward reflects what Evan is suggesting. The advantage of this proposal is it is more equitable. Eric indicated that FY22 percentages are thrown off by people requesting larger amounts. The whole committee ends up eating all of DRAC’s requested increase. Steve’s approach seems more reasonable as an approach given the decision made by the committee. Rebecca agreed using the FY20 percentages and amending with COLA would be most equitable; DRAC does end up losing a little bit, but that is ultimately manageable, adding Steve and Eric have raised good points.

Emma and Evan agreed that FY22 makes sense and is a good path forward. Evan requested the new percentages, FY20 plus COLA amendments, be uploaded into the master spreadsheet for the committee to review. Linda updated the document. Eric highlighted that the modified spreadsheet focuses only on the percentage allocations and not to be thrown off on how it affects the initial numbers request for budgets.

Evan asked How Campus Rec’s deficit interacts with the carry-forward they indicated they had; where does that carry-forward go? Adam responded the carry forward covers everything from sport club allocations, subsidies, staff costs, etc., and will be used to absorb costs across the board.

Evan suggested the next step for the committee was to approve the allocations; Kevin and Danil both agreed.

Evan moved revenue allocation percentages should be approved as follows:

Associated Students 44.3%

Athletics 32.3%

Campus Rec 6.9%

DRAC 16.5%

Emma seconded this motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Noemi revisited the memo topic asking if the group would be able to see the memo prior to it going to the Board. Michael indicated that the majority of the memo is boilerplate or a translation of the spreadsheet into narrative form. And because the memo is so far past the deadline, it will be a rapid turnaround which is Tuesday by 3pm. After that time the memo will be a public document and can be seen at that time. Noemi indicated she wished to provide feedback, but trusted that it may be too far past the deadline to really affect any change.

**For Consideration Next Year:**

Eric suggested it might be good to talk about items for consideration next year; it has been a challenging year and that needs to be acknowledged. However, he felt it may be worthwhile to look at the S&A Fee process in general, suggesting perhaps a taskforce could be formed to review this and look into the fall. There is capacity to convene the board earlier next year to hash out some of the concerns that have not been addressed. It may be time for a reboot and relook.

Some lingering concerns Eric mentioned:

1. The distribution of representation should be analyzed and perhaps rethought.
2. The chairperson role is compromised by being a voting member and participant, which can put people in a tough position.
3. How to engage faculty representation.
4. Who makes up the committee itself and should it be broadened?

Noemi commented that Eric touched on key issues and she desires to continue this work into the summer.

Campus Rec, Athletics and DRAC will not know who their representatives will be until the fall.

Travis counseled against rushing the process given how hard the past year has been.

Evan suggested a first step might be finding out whether/how to modify the committee at all in terms of what authority exists. Linda indicated that there are RCWs and some guidelines that could be a starting point.

Eric added there is still work to be done, such as some legwork to explore the process and that other students might want to use their time this summer to do that work, such as setting up a framework to propel the work forward.

Evan asked if there were volunteers for that taskforce to do some exploration. Michael indicated that future decisions are not possible without full representation, but he will explore the way to launch the process. All are free to take a more serious look into the process. Linda also agreed to look into the legal parameters. Evan agreed that any future decision-making should be done in person rather than online to ensure better deliberations.

Evan thanked the committee for all their hard work and called the meeting to a close at 2:57 pm.