****

**AS Finance Council**

February 19, 2020 2:30 p.m. VU 460

**Members: *Present:*** Nate Jo, Chair (AS Business Director), Seome Zerai (VP for Activities), Nicole Ballard (Student Senator), Corey Griffis (student at-large), Kennan Kaemingk (Activities Rep), Rachel Walsh (Central Services Rep), Christina Ngo (Resources Rep), ***Late:*** Adah Barenburg (AS Student Senate Pro Tempore) ***Absent:*** Lani Defiesta (AS President)

**Advisors:** Leti Romo, Asst Director for Representation & Governance

**Secretary:** Cindy Monger, Dean of Students Unit Fiscal Specialist

**Guests:** Moya Lojewski, AS ESC Club Programming Manager, Karen Deysher, AS Student Advocacy and Identity Resource Center Coordinator

***Nate Jo, chair, called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FC-20-F-01** | Approval of the minutes of February 12, 2020. ***Passed*** |

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of the Minutes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *MOTION* | *FC-20-F-01* | | *by Walsh* | | | |
| Approval of the minutes of February 12, 2020. | | | | |  |  |
| Second: Kaemingk | | Vote: 5 - 0 - 1 (Zerai) | | Action: Passed | | |

**III. Revisions to the Agenda**

1. **Public Forum**

***Barenburg joined the meeting.***

1. **Training Modules**

*First Look at the FY 2021 AS Budget*- the committee reviewed the base budget requests. Significant changes are mostly from an additional minimum wage increase anticipated in January 2021, a cost of living increase at 2.7%. The WWU Student Employment Office will set the wages in October 2020 and the AS Wage Schedule will change at that point. Additional changes of significance are: the OC has made their revenue more realistic which has resulted in a slight increase, AS Pop Music programming has significantly changed in revenue, AS Review has reduced printing and adding an additional writer, AS Employee Development Fund and the committee will review the salary percentage splits. All Xerox money has been removed from individual accounts and moved into a centralized budget FXXCPY. In the future this should allow for more accurate budgeting for the whole AS. The committee was encouraged to review the budget and come next week with questions.

*Deficit Budgeting & Historic Trends*-In past years the AS hasn’t spent all of the money in the budget, in the last few years the AS has been budgeting in a deficit model. Next week: discuss deficit levels.

*Rubric for Evaluating Decision Packages & Grant Proposals*-Jo is suggesting that the Council create a rubric to help guide what the Council is looking for in Decision Packages & Grant Proposals. They are looking for input into what might be in this rubric. Barenburg suggested, does the proposal seek to support students historically not supported by the AS? Zerai suggested, does the proposal positively impact Western’s Community? Jo added, does the proposal demonstrate pathways for achieving outcomes? Ballard added, how many students is this impacting? Barenburg said that money guide was helpful in terms of the guidelines it laid out for sustainability and perhaps this could be added. Ngo asked, does it shift the burden away from students: providing resources and offsetting personal monetary costs? Zerai suggested looking at cost per student and if is it being brought back to the campus community. Griffis suggested, is the proposal the most effective way to achieve its goal? Does it align with the AS and office Mission Statements? Jo will give Budget Authorities the opportunity to rewrite their decision packages with this rubric in mind.

*Recap of Previous Training Modules*-there were no questions on past trainings.

**VI. Information Items**

A. ESC Club Programming Decision Package- Lojewski said that the programming budget hasn’t been reviewed from the last few years. When she started two years ago there were concerns about there not being enough money for clubs to put on the events that they wished to host. Therefore clubs weren’t accessing the resources because they didn’t feel that they were available.

Lojewski gave three different examples of how the funding might be distributed to each club, just an example. The justification for the budget at its origin was for each club to receive $2,000 for event planning, this is when there were 15 clubs (there are now 19). This is not how funding is distributed, instead it is first come first serve based on need. However, she used the same ideals to create this decision package. The first level would fund smaller events like Bake Sales, T-shirt Sales, and fundraisers. The second option would allow clubs with large scale events to not feel like they are taking too much of the pie. Option 3 would fully fund at the $2,000 ideal level. Heritage dinners don’t typically start until winter quarter. Typically clubs request about $2,000 for large scale events like a heritage dinner. January 2018 there were 4 heritage dinners because the Multipurpose Room was offline. There was a decrease in the amount of dinners happening. 2018-2019 there were 8 dinners. This year there are 8 heritage dinners scheduled. If more clubs wanted to put on more large scale events they would have to scale down their events. She believes they may not be able to have full scale dinners. Lojewski did not ask AS ESC Budget & Programming Committee to participate in the creation of these decision packages. She went based on the feedback from past years.

Jo asked if because of the community feel of the ESC students may not want to have a feeling that they are taking the last of the money. Lojewski said that is a feeling because students don’t want to ask for the same money as people earlier in the year, since they see the money that is left. They are given the reports on how much is left in the budget. There was a grant for an additional $3,000 per year for FY17 & FY18. Based on the usage, they did not request this funding to be operationalized. Jo asked if they increased the funding, would there still be the same feeling of not wanting to use all of the funding. Lojewski said that clubs feel that even though it is not given equally people feel like they can’t ask for $1,500. She believes that having it be close to $2,000 would help eliminate the feeling of scarcity of funding. Zerai asked how much of the funds weren’t spent. Monger said it was around $3,400. Lojewski said that typically people are asking for $2,000-2,500 for the dinner and typically a dinner costs about $3,000. There are 13 clubs that are pretty consistently asking for funding for large scale events that are targeting the public and not a fundraiser. Some non-heritage events are: The Low Rider Show and the FASA Tea Party. Jo said that for bake sales and the tea party are they getting seed money and then paying back to the account? Lojewski said that they typically don’t ask for money for just fundraisers, only for events. Lojewski said that if clubs had more access to money they have to spend their time on handmade decorations, fundraising, or finding other fundraising amounts. Zerai asked if there has ever not been enough money to put on an event. Lojewski said that has not happened since she has worked here. Jo said that the decision packages will have action taken at a later meeting.

B. WIRC Advocacy Coordinator Decision Package is to operationalize a Grant that has been funded for the last three years. Every office in the SAIRC has 2-3 employees. Advocacy, Education, and Community Engagement. They restructured the offices to allow employees to focus on these three areas. The current world includes sexism, cissexism, trans-antagonism, etc. exists, therefore having a position work on advocating on behalf of students that identify as womxn is important. This would also continue the work that this coordinator has been doing. Ngo said that the advocacy position typically sits at the table with administrators when they want to have a student on the tasks forces, committees and they look at broader systematic things. Ngo said that currently the position has been vacant for a quarter and without this position the two other coordinators have had to pick up this work when they are supposed to be programming. The position also helps students navigate university services (a specific example was given). When there was an increase in sexual assaults on campus and this position was asked to work with the university to decide on a response. Barenburg clarified that all of these positions are paid for only the academic year. Ngo said that total for the SAIRC there are 60 hours of time over the summer for planning for two positions. Jo said that this will also be an information item next week, it will be an action item later in the year.

C. OC Trip Leader Training Decision Package

Ballard is a little concerned about the cost of the program for how many students it impacts. She thought it was way more students than are actually allowed on the trips and there is still the additional cost to each student. Ngo asked if the $36,000 is just to train the students. Jo said the funds are for training and the certification fees that are required to lead the trips. Zerai sees the value of the training directly impacting the students who undergo the trainings. She wants to know more about how it impacts the students who attend the trips. Her brain often goes towards the AS Activities Council way of reviewing where they think of dollars per person. But she realizes there is not a real per person cost here. Jo said they can get the number of students directly impacted by trip leaders. Zerai is also concerned about ensuring their safety of the students and sees that importance. Ngo thinks that certifications should be funded. She would like to see more information about how the training has impacted students. She wants to make sure that they are getting things out of these trainings and not just checking a box. Ngo askes specifically about the social justice trainings and what is the impact on the trip leaders, what did they get out of the training. She said they can’t control if everyone is white-cis, but they could ask them to go deeper. Jo said that they want to move away from this just being rich white men, but they also don’t want to have targets that would end up in tokenization. Walsh feels that they should hear more on these topics. Griffis has a concern that this program is aimed at people who are being employed by the OC, but he is not sure that directing such a large portion of money towards the employees, versus the participants in the Outdoor Center. For example, they should make trips free, before certifications can be free. Jo said this is a conversation that could be even at the Services & Activities Fee level. Jo asked if we want to make activities truly accessible, what programs should be subsidized and which programs should be free. Is it worth making everything free if we ask each student pay more in Services & Activities Fees? There is inconsistency in funding, for example some DRAC committees have all of the travel paid whereas some sports teams have to pay out of their own pocket. This is a bigger conversation being looked at about what is free on campus. Barenburg said that there is only one option on this proposal, versus other proposals with a few options. Jo said the committee could fund at a lower amount. An idea from last year was to slowly operationalize the program. For example putting in a few required trainings to the AS Operating Budget and leave the rest in AS Reserves, then the next year they could add a few more trainings. Jo said what the AS invests in staff development (in terms of wages, etc.) is more per person than the OC spends per person in this proposal. Romo asked if there is data on a national level about involvement in these types of programs and they are positively impacted by the programs. Romo said this could help to show potential as well as what they have currently been able to accomplish.

**VII. Other Business**

**VIII. Adjourn**

***The Meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.***