



# AS Finance Council

March 4, 2020 2:30 p.m. VU 460

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

**Advisors:** Raquel Vigil, Business Manager

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

**Guests:** Dr. Joanne DeMark, Leadership Development Specialist

## MOTIONS

**FC-20-W-05** Approval of the minutes of February 26, 2020 with the change of committee to council throughout. *Passed*

**FC-20-W-06** Adopt the Rubric for Evaluating Funding Proposals. *Passed*

*Nate Jo, chair, called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.*

### I. Call to Order

### II. Approval of the Minutes

*MOTION FC-20-W-05 by Ballard*

Approval of the minutes of February 26, 2020 with the change of committee to council throughout.

Second: Ngo Vote: 5 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

### III. Revisions to the Agenda

### IV. Public Forum

- Spring Quarter meeting times will be scheduled soon with meetings starting the first week in April.
- In Services & Activities Fee Committee in terms of the philosophy of distributors of student fees. Mandatory increases is used in terms of things like minimum wage increases, benefits that we are required to do. But sometimes they get in the habit of saying that the programs they fund are mandatory and there is no real discussion about them. Jo said, to be clear none of the things that the AS decides to fund are mandatory, they could decide to cut a program. If it is no longer serving students and is taking student money, then they should cut that program. The council should be mindful of this and not get into a pattern of looking at what was done in the past or this was approved for the last twenty years. They should open to being creative about finding sources to fund new programs and not just default to increasing the budget. Having the perspective of it is ok to say no to things and it's ok to cut things. The Council is here to represent the interests of every WWU Student.

### V. Action Items

#### A. Rubric for Evaluating Funding Proposals

Jo added demonstrated need, environmental impact, and adding WWU Mission. Griffis would like to add "is the proposal monetarily efficient?" under feasibility. Jo and Griffis wordsmithed it

to be “effective and efficient in achieving its goals”. Effective gets to accomplishing the purpose and efficient accomplishes the purpose efficiently. Jo said that this will not retroactively apply to proposals already submitted, but will be implemented for use with future proposals and can be used as a point of discussion.

*MOTION FC-20-W-06 by Walsh*

Adopt the Rubric for Evaluating Funding Proposals.

Second: Griffis           Vote: 5 - 0 - 0       Action: Passed

*Barenberg joined the meeting.*

## **VI. Information Items**

### **A. MCC Programming Grant Proposal**

Jo said that Romo is out of town, therefore Jo will present and will send out questions. There was a lot of intentionality that went into the space in the Multicultural Center (MCC). However there was not a lot of information about how programming would happen within the center, there was no money allocated for MCC wide programming. At this point the funding has been taken out of various offices budgets. This is a proposal for an AS Grant for \$18,000 that would provide funding starting in spring through the next academic year. The Budget Authority would be Eric Alexander, Fund Financial Manager, and the Budget Coordinator would be the AS VP for Diversity. The goals are to create programming events around specific identities to create community and more collaboration. The justification is there is more traffic and engagement due to the new building. There have been challenges for people who have identities that fall in the different areas in an intersectional way that would be covered more fully by collaborative events. Kaemingk clarified that right now the programs came out of the funding for the offices, but this was not budgeted for last year. Jo wondered if there was more collaborative programming, would there be less programming in the operational budgets in the future? Jo said that it is also bigger scale programs. This will be an Action Item next week.

### **B. AS Executive Board Travel Decision Package**

This is funded as the AS Board Discretionary budget currently, they are asking for an increase of \$5,250-7,000 in funding for professional development because AS Executive Board Members are not eligible to apply for the Employee Development Fund. Romo said that it is important for them to attend conferences to be able to engage in best practices, create contacts from other institutions, and learn new skills and perspectives to achieve their goals in their positions so they can better serve the WWU students. They are requesting funding for travel for conferences for Student Government, diversity, sustainability, etc. Jo believes that in the past the AS Board had access to more funding. Jo’s idea is to make the Employee Development Fund larger and add it to the AS Reserves Policy. It would then be available to the AS Board and the AS Student Senate. Vigil said that there were years that the fund was not used at all. There has been more interest in travel in the last few years and they are out of funding this year. Vigil said that the VU Reserve is set up for travel and it is at \$75,000. Walsh thinks that if they do merge these things then she wondered if approval would remain with the AS Personnel Office because currently the AS Board and Student Senate is not governed by the AS Personnel Office. Jo would like to move away from the status of the AS Board and Student Senate from being outside of other rules, as their roles have changed. In this case it would still make sense to Jo to have the AS Personnel Office to review their travel. Barenberg asked if there were other areas that have pots of money that they can spend. Jo said that there are a couple of places where there is funding for training, but not to send people to conferences. Jo said this is a potential area for savings if they can satisfy this need in the AS Reserves policy with the inclusion of the AS Executive Board and AS Student Senate in the AS Employee Development Fund.

### C. LEADS Decision Package

This budget is a bit like the Child Development Center in that the whole budget is not in the AS Budget, but a portion is given to the program. Student Leadership and Community Engagement will be moving into the old Ethnic Student Center space along with Off Campus Living. Historically, 13 years ago there was no Student Leadership program, in spite of the vibrant student leaders across campus. DeMark has been here from the beginning and looks at programs across the nation for best practices. The bulk of the budget was to pay for the one full-time staff. Other institutions typically have more staff. The staff is paid by University Residence, Family Fund at the Foundation and the Associated Students. However the amount from the Associated Students has been the same for years. This year they are asking for the funding to account for the increases that are awarded to staff of 4%. This will prevent them from using program money to pay for the staff. Instead program money pay for student employees, two graduate assistantships, and events. The request is \$1,466 to cover the AS portion of the increase. They are adding a co-curricular certificate for folks who volunteer off campus. There are leadership learning badges for training, working with career services (resume clinic, info fairs, interview sessions, etc.), and service on campus. These match with career readiness goals. Students lead in many ways, the four strengths needed according to research are socio-cultural conversations with Peers, Mentoring Relationships, Community Service and Memberships in Off-Campus. Organizations. This request is basically to maintain programming. Barenburg asked what percentage of this budget the AS Funds. Vigil said the AS funds \$36,000, Family Fund is about \$50,000 and Residence Life funds \$25,000. However none of the sources of revenue has asked for the cost of living increase. Vigil thinks that the institutional support for this program may decrease and the AS may take on more because of their value of student leadership and community engagement, this program also reports to Eric Alexander. Jo said that student leadership is a core value of the AS.

### D. ESC Retreat Decision Package

Monger included parts of the assessment from the 2019 ESC Retreat. There is a question about financial barriers of the \$40 Registration Fee. Only 17% of students said it wouldn't be a barrier. Barenberg said that there were also some comments about not being able to go on a Friday. She remembered that Zerai had expressed concern about students not being able to attend due to classes. Walsh feels like the opportunity might be available for more students if it was only one night. Jo thought that having the dinner on Friday night was good because people got to connect before going to the Conference. Ngo said that if they are outgrowing Camp Casey then it would be best to be on campus on Friday night. Ngo also said it is hard to get to the buses in the afternoon on Fridays, she was a facilitator and was almost late. She also feels it is good for people to be in the Multicultural Center Space. Ngo also felt that it would have been better when there was the storm, because they could have left on Saturday and not had to cancel the trip. Ngo said that Camp Casey is run by Seattle Pacific University and so sometimes it is a shared space so she doesn't think they could have over 150 attendees. Vigil didn't get a chance to look at the ESC Budgets. Jo said that Alexander approved a revised budget the last two years and the base budget reflects those revisions. The AS Budget approved \$15,500 for this year. It was increased based on the actual cost of the Conference the year before and increased costs to \$24,170. Vigil wondered if they had reduced in one area and that is why they were asking for this increase. Jo said that the council is looking at individual budgets, not an office as a whole. The other budget was approved under special circumstances. The base budget for funding the conference for one night. The decision package is to increase by \$4,180 to increase to two nights. If the council does not approve the decision package to two nights then the proposal would be for one night only. The criteria for a base budget is only the true cost of programming and maintaining services, this can include increased costs. If budgets are adding something new and it's more than \$500, then a decision package is needed. In Jo's opinion the amount passed last year at \$15,500 is an error and not considered to be the base budget.

E. ESC Admin Decision Package

This is the request to have an additional non-work study student to be able to open the program.

Walsh said that this impacts hiring that starts today. She would like a decision on this to be known before they make offer calls. They are hoping to have the whole budget approved by approximately April 10<sup>th</sup>. That would allow for the hiring two people from the pool.

**VII. Other Business**

A. WIRC Coordinator Decision Package

Walsh said that if this doesn't get funded, is that an issue because she already posted this job and people are applying. Ngo had to do two emergency hires for this position and feels there is a need. Jo has two thoughts about how to make funds available possibly by looking at some of the proposals for next week to hire staff in new positions.

B. Jo would like to send out more information on the OC Trip Leader Training. So stay tuned for information.

C. There will be no meeting during finals week, so the next meeting will be the last for the quarter.

**VIII. Adjourn**

*The Meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.*