



Services and Activities Fee Committee Meeting

April 19, 2024 | 1:00 PM | Husky Union Building 303

MINUTES

Call to Order

The Services and Activities Fee Committee Meeting was called to order at 1:20 PM on April 19, 2024.

Roll Call

Lincoln Johnson – Present

Kristian Wiles – Tardy (Excused)

Nick Juno – Present

Alec Solemslie - Present

Jon Choi - Present

Maleen Kidiwela - Present

Raj Dewangan – Present

Mitchell Klein - Present

Haley Chee - Present

Sophie Arons – Absent (Excused)

Annie Chen – Present

Melody Fung – Present

Olivia Horwedel – Present

Approval of Agenda

The agenda for April 19, 2024 SAF meeting was approved. Motioned by Melody Fung, Seconded by Maleen Kidiwela; unanimous vote to approve the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

The approval of meeting minutes is postponed until next meeting.

Public Comment [5 minutes]

New Business

1. FY25 Allocation and Fees

This discussion is partnered with Budget Allocations so it's best to read over "Budget Allocation" section first.

2. Partnered Discussion

Old Business

Discussion

1. Budget Allocations

Mitchell showed everyone how the allocation form works. **Mitchell** checked with each of the SAF Committee members on their allocations to each units to catch any noticeable error, such as a negative number or large discrepancy like entering in \$2000 vs \$2,000,000. Members whose names are called out should check the Unit associated with that allocation to fix these errors. **Mitchell** notes that any parentheses will output as a negative number in the spreadsheet. Furthermore, the way that each member chooses to round to different place values (e.g. nearest hundred vs nearest thousand) won't affect the budget given how large the proposals are.

After reviewing the allocations, **Mitchell** goes over the different sections of the spreadsheet so members are familiar with them. He notes a significant variance in allocated funds across all units. This is reflected as a numerical average (in \$\$) and in the form of a disagreement percentage through the coefficient of variation. A higher coefficient of variation will be marked in red, indicating significant disagreement, while a lower coefficient, shown in green, reflects general consensus. The goal of the budget allocation is to achieve a general consensus among most or all of the Committee.

Mitchell will be frequently updating the spreadsheet throughout the meeting. He cautions that if someone is actively making changes on their individual part of the spreadsheet that they let Mitchell know. The new total table has been added which is affecting the changes on everyone's pages. It will be common for everyone to change their answers as the Committee goes through each unit.

Mitchell plans to start with units where the coefficient of variation is green or low (i.e. closer to 0%) to speed up the budget process. This allows for the Committee to spend more time focusing on the larger budgets where tends to be more disagreement. Throughout the process, **Mitchell** will give a general idea on the direction that Committee is leaning towards. In some extreme or at a deadlock cases, **Mitchell** can specifically give the floor to members who want to elaborate on their reasoning or perspective, with their consent.

Melody shared her updated budget allocations for ASUW with the whole committee so they can manually change it on their individual spreadsheet as directed by Mitchell.

Unit Allocations

Mitchell started off the Unit Allocations with the units the Committee is initially in total agreement of approving. Note that one of Mitchell's main roles in these allocations is to review details and ideas initially discussed by the Committee during individual Unit's budget presentations.

- CAP
 - **Alec** explains how he appreciated how well CAP maintained their budget increases. Some members of the Committee also agreed.
- CSF
 - **Raj** mentioned how last year, CSF had made some monumental changes. A few Committee members notes that they appreciated the changes made with CSF's leadership, especially with Tatiana Brown's work.
 - Adding onto Raj's point, **Mitchell** mentioned how CSF had lots of aspirations that weren't fully fleshed out which initially concerned the Committee.

- CSF is advised not to assume that the current Committee is aware of continuing discussions from last year's Committee since that creates a lot of confusions with miscommunication.
- D-Center
 - **Raj** is surprised how the D-Center didn't implement their plans and aspirations from their previous proposed budget.
 - **Lincoln** and **Olivia** suggested these plans may not have been implemented because of staffing issues and turnovers.
 - **Mitchell** notes that there might be units that requests a lot of change one year but request fewer changes the next year, this might be a cause of concern or of celebration.
 - **Raj** sees a lot of potential with the D-Center with how niche their target population is and their purpose of the good cause. He hopes the D-Center will be able to expand and implement some of their aspirations as provided from last year's conversations.
- STLP
 - **Maleen** agrees to fund almost everything with the STLP's budget except for fully covering the staff benefits. **Mitchell** clarifies that the staff benefits are a requirement so benefits and wages are usually tied in as one category.
 - **Mitchell** suggests if Maleen still feels strongly about his opinions, he can always propose to partially fund STLP's Wages & Benefits.
 - **Raj** elaborates that the Committee can't dictate how Units use their allocated funds. So, if the Committee gives x money towards a Unit for temporary staffing, the Unit isn't required to entirely use x money for that purpose. For example, the Unit may only utilize x money for 2 months instead of the expected 6 months, resulting in leftover money can be redirected to fund other areas of the Unit's budget.
 - **Annie** argues to give STLP their full request. STLP is a small unit that has made consistent, large impacts to UW campus. They provide technology that are very accessible to students and their proposals mainly focus on inflations. **Raj** agrees.
 - **Mitchel** reminds that a budget priority discussed earlier in the year was for the Committee to assess the amount of people under payroll when not considering funding Wages & Benefits increases. For example,

consider a 300-person unit that doesn't need to hire an additional person vs if a 5 person unit. Furthermore, it's the discussion that prioritizes one day of a week not offering a single service vs closing the entire operation for a day.

- **Mitchell** checks with whether the Committee has agreed with the current full funding of STLP.

Notes to consider for next section of Unit allocations:

Mitchell notes that it's important to voice out your opinions, even if it's against the majority. Everyone's perspective has the potential to influence others and the whole Committee can come to a consensus that way.

Raj says that the Committee should consider the Unit's current balances and Reserves as a parameter during budgets discussions. **Mitchell** recommends everyone to have the "Budget Priority" document opened.

Mitchell asked the Committee if they'd prefer to deliberate until reaching a general consensus, or going with the majority decision even if it results in some people still in disagreement. **Raj** says they should. **Nick** notes that if the committee is arguing over \$50,000, it shouldn't take too much time to find a consensus. The Committee agreed that they should deliberate until there is a consensus as long as time permits.

Mitchell concludes the Unit allocations above have the most consensuses among the Committee. For the upcoming Units, the Committee will spend more time deliberating due to increased funding requests, leading to more disagreements, compared to the previous allocations.

Mitchell asked if the Committee wanted to move forward with going over Units that have a huge or small difference in budget agreements first. **Raj** suggested going over units that have smaller monetary amount but with bigger changes in their budget. Some members agreed.

- SLS
 - **Maleen** says they're only asking a 0.73% increase which is small change.

- **Mitchell** says that SLS is a small unit in terms of number of employees but did have some complications with personnel staffing which affected their proposal.
 - **Mitchell** explained that SLS was given an increase last year where some of the amount was towards filling in a temporary staffing position for a maternity leave. Therefore, their cost this year has decreased since they don't need the increased funding for that reason anymore. Overall, SLS's increase this year is similar to a lot of small Unit's increases (~\$5,000). The only difference is that SLS has the added benefit of last year's extra funding to cover the maternity leave.
 - **Olivia** mentions how the overall change is less than \$2,200 on the individual sheets. Essentially, the Committee disagrees because the number is so small.
 - **Raj** mentions that SLS is one of the units that always advertises everyone about SAF and their contributions on campus.
- **Intellectual House**
 - **Alec** mentions that he didn't fund the new position but is open to be persuaded otherwise for the Intellectual House. In general, he is refraining from funding new positions due to future recurring costs, rising inflation, and other unexpected factors.
 - **Nick** liked Alec's logic since he was also debating on funding the new position for the same reasons.
 - **Haley** also agrees with Alec's disagreement to not fund the new position but is open to be persuaded otherwise. She reminded that the Committee should consider the Unit's impact vs the percentage of the student population it's affecting in the Budget Priority document. In this case, the Intellectual House's current program only reaches 25 students.
 - **Mitchell** clarifies this bullet point from the Budget Priority emphasizes the Committee's prior agreement when making crucial changes that will make or break a student's college experience. Every Committee member needs to consider the

number of potential students this will affect or **how** it affects their experiences.

- **Annie** agrees with Haley's point about the amount of students the Intellectual House would be impacting. She didn't get the impression that adding this new position will make a drastic difference to how much more new and current students this will reach, especially with the other services already being offered in place. She would love to hear from someone else in the Committee who is for funding this position though.
- With the disagreement that is being seen with funding a new position, **Mitchell** wanted to open the idea of partial funding for this new position.
 - **Melody** agrees not to fully fund the position. She is uncertain about partial funding since the Intellectual House has other sources of funding outside of SAF. This could be an indicator of they are preparing to reach a larger audience with the program. Melody wants to see how much of an impact the addition of a new staff position to facilitate this new program and how the unit will gather more outside funding to achieve this.
 - **Olivia** shares her own experience as someone who has been positively affected by the Intellectual House. Based on her personal experiences, she believes the Intellectual House has a huge impact on newcoming and first-year students who may need a lot of support to adjust and navigate to a university as big as UW. Olivia believes it's crucial for those types of students whose never been to this kind of schooling to have the academic and community support. With a good strategy in place, she agreed with other members in the Committee for the Intellectual House to postpone adding new positions this year until they reach a more stable position to revisit this option. She is up for fully funding the positions or partially funding the positions, especially since Intellectual House does have other avenues of funding outside of SAF. However, she hopes the Intellectual House will develop a more efficient strategy moving forward to reach a broader range of students and make a greater impact.

- **Raj** suggests putting a hold on coming up with an exact number to fund the new position.
- **Maleen** changes his original stance on funding the new position to partial funding.
- Result: Committee is all for fully funding for the 3 existing permanent staff positions, but temporary leaving the new position blank to revisit.

Note: Mitchell reminds everyone that some of these discussions can be revisited so decisions are not finalized. There are some units which the Committee has strongly have a consensus on which won't need to be revisited.

Melody motions to take a recess until 2:45 PM, seconded by **Maleen**. There is unanimous vote to take a recess until 2:45 PM.

Mitchell calls back to recess at 2:54 PM.

- UW Food Pantry

- **Mitchell** believes the disagreement with Food Pantry among the Committee is between partial funding to full funding.
- **Raj** reiterates the average visits to the Food Pantry was ~700 visits a week, which has skyrocketed from last year. He reminds that the Food Pantry is solely ran by students and doesn't have any professional salaried staff. As an international student, Raj wants to fund units that value student employment. The Food Pantry doesn't have any Reserves, only relying on donations and some funding from SAF.
- **Olivia** mentions the Farms and other resources providing supplies and donations to the Food Pantry are already understaffed, and the Unit benefits from receiving these items at a discounted price.
- **Haley** supports partial funding for the Social Media position. She questions how this new position is any different from existing roles and how much it will really impact the program.
- **Melody** recalled asking a question regarding the Housing & Security and getting a response that the Food Pantry wanted to reach out to more people – hence why they're advocating for this outreach position

- **Nick** reminds that the all-time total of the most visits was in winter quarter with 817 students a week. The Food Pantry is only going to continue to grow. He also points out that the Food Pantry has a unique student employment population with mostly graduate students.
- Result: **Mitchell** suggests coming back to staffing current and old positions.

Notes:

Annie questioned whether the Committee should consider experiences beyond those of a SAF role. For example, if a Committee member visits or utilized a Unit's resource independently (i.e. outside of a SAF representative role) and shares their experiences, should their inputs be taken into account? The Committee agrees that these unique experiences are what makes each Committee member's opinions valuable; they should be voiced. It's also important for the Committee to interact with Units as students outside of SAF.

Raj asked if Mitchell could ever be used as a tie-breaking vote.

- Mitchell mentions that some members Committee is already vacant so there shouldn't ever be a need for Mitchell to make a tie-breaking vote.
- Student Publication
 - **Mitchell** summarizes that the Committee initially seems to be set on not giving the full funding for increases.
 - **Olivia, Maleen, and Raj** advocate for partial funding, particularly focusing on printing costs and media compared to online alternatives and newsletters. Annie and Melody agrees with some supplement funding for \$10,000. Olivia notes that she can be persuaded to go lower.
 - **Annie** feels comfortable with where the Student Publication's Reserves is at, especially considering that the current amount was all added last year. She also pointed out how their projected revenue increased from 2024-2025 was about \$3,500. Whether this number is due to external factors or a typo, she feels there's room for growth. Overall, the Student Publication has proved they can generate enough revenue, with their Reserves and projected increase, to supplement or offset these costs so she's in favor of partial funding.

- **Mitchell** reminds that a Reserves account is for emergencies or any other high-cost priorities that happens during the year (operation or personnel-wise). In this case, **Mitchell** clarifies that the \$100,000 on the budget is what the Student Publication has recently added to the Reserves from the past year.
- **Lincoln** explained the organizational structure of the unit and the role of an Editorial Advisor, which is hired by the Student Publications.
- **Raj** said he is comfortable to give \$22,000 or \$23,000 while giving half of their supplemental funding.
 - **Alec** agrees with the range but would be more satisfied if this number was lower. Regarding operational funding, he doesn't agree with the current amount.
- Result: The Committee members are divided, with some fully supporting full funding while others are entirely opposed. The Committee will revisit this Unit.

Note: Mitchell emphasizes that the Committee should treat every unit the same. In particular, a unit that separates their staff's salaries and benefits into individual sections shouldn't get a higher or lower priority than a unit that grouped all of their staff's salaries and benefits.

- SVL
 - The Committee agrees on giving full funding for Salary & Benefits and the first 3 items under Staff & salary.
 - Raj asked what the gap pay was. If the gap is slowly increasing every year, wouldn't there be bigger gaps over the year? For example, if it's \$1,400 this year then the following year's gap is expected to be about \$5,000.
 - Regarding Bof Funding for SVL, **Mitchell** believed the gap increases but not at the same rate. **Lincoln** explained this process more in-depth for the Committee.
 - **Maleen, Raj,** and **Annie** doesn't want to give full funding for "Supplies" line item with how high it is.
 - **Annie** points out that the increases in Personal Services Contracts and other contract services are because of inflation. She also notes that SVL doesn't have a Reserves, so she supports increasing SVL's budget. **Raj** also agrees with this thinking.

- **Mitchell** reminded the Committee of their reactions and feedback based on the summary from SVL's budget proposal presentation.
 - SVL will incorporate more SAF logos on their materials and hold less expensive events.
- Besides travel, **Mitchell** notes a lot of the line items are very interchangeable. For example, supplies and contract services are usually different “types of supplies.” In this case, one is a service supply and the other is a physical supply.
 - Kristian explained that since SVL didn't specify how they will use the supplies, all items in which SVL categorizes under “supplies” can be viewed broadly, allowing for flexibility in funding allocation.
 - Adding onto what Kristian and Mitchell have said, **Alec** noted that this is a special circumstance where the Committee can compare funding a section that groups specific line items, like UW Recreation, against a unit like SVL, which itemizes each expense. By providing everything line by line, it makes it easier to nitpick and scrutinize the Unit having all these smaller line items. Overall, Alec agrees funding half the Supplies amount.
- **Raj** is supportive of funding a little more towards SVL's budget.
- Result: Two of the biggest disagreeing amounts are not present today with the Committee so SVL will be revisited next week.

Notes

Mitchell wants to emphasize that the Committee shouldn't focus too much if a Unit has a Reserves or not. The amounts within the Reserves can fluctuate because of reoccurring costs, necessary emergency spendings, or unexpected financial obligations. The Reserves is like a safety net that gives the Unit additional emergency funds. Therefore, any increase given here is an expansion of a Unit's operations.

Mitchell notes that the absences in today's meeting are also affecting the average amount and percentage in the budget spreadsheet.

- UW Recreation

- The current initial average for UW Recreation is \$166,354. This number may change next week.

- With the large number of student staff positions, **Raj** points out that UW Recreation would be barely affected by losing two positions, unlike the Food Pantry, which has significantly fewer total staff.
- **Maleen** opposed the funding of the new custodial position. If Recreation wants to maintain its current staffing positions while adding a new custodial position, they are at a better position to consider cutting down on operating costs or reducing other staffing positions.
 - **Mitchell** agrees the Committee will revisit UW Recreation with SAF's new, needed discussion to revisit whether to fund positions based on the Budget Priority document.
- **Olivia** notes that one of the main goals of this unit is to benefit students, so she is reluctant to cut the Student Wage and Benefits Increase.
- **Mitchell** notes that the "Shell House" shouldn't be considered in the current FY25 budget since this is a place that's not going to take effect until three or four years in the future.
- **Mitchell** reiterates that UW Recreation has less flexibility with their capital budget versus student wages. They can always cut down hours for student wages but Recreation needs their capital requests.
- **Lincoln** suggests the Committee focuses on a broader consensus rather being overly specific about capital or student employee fundings.
- **Alec** supports allocating \$300,000, aligning with Mitchell's earlier points about Recreation's flexibility with Student Wages. He believes this amount would help support an overall 40% increase.
- **Olivia** agrees with Alec and Lincoln, noting that the student wage portion of the budget was intended to address the minimum wage increase, not to expand funding further.
- **Mitchell** emphasizes that Recreation has around 400 student employees. If they cut down their budget to \$338,000, it'd be like cutting down on an hour of each student employee.
- **Annie** supports the allocation of \$338,000 for Student Wages. She notes that in a worst-case scenario, cutting hours for each student position would not appear to have a significant impact on paper.
- Result: Mitchell is going to keep the request for \$126,000 total increase

Note: Mitchell emphasizes that the 8% is something that SAF Committee imposed on ourselves.

- Q-Center
 - **Nick** mentions the Wages & Benefits are full-time positions.
 - **Raj** is in favor of giving more funding on professional development but is okay with giving
 - **Olivia** reminds that regarding the funding for the “Non-Academic Graduate Student,” the Q-Center has mentioned they try to employ 2 positions for graduate students
 - **Annie** would argue that the “Non-Academic Graduate Student” position wasn’t something SAF has funded before so now that SAF is funding this position next year, it should be treated as a new position.
 - **Olivia** agrees that this position should be revisited. However, when the Committee considers funding, this position should be prioritized and funded fully, rather than treated as a new position. **Maleen** also concurs.
 - **Mitchell** notes that the \$370.00 is an amount that Mitchell had input to make the math of their expense makes sense of the spreadsheet

Summaries for This Meeting

- Need to revisit and finalize allocations:
 - Food Pantry, Q-Center, Student Publications, SVL
- Have not started:
 - LiveWell, HUB, Hall Health, GPSS, ECC, Counseling Center, ASUW

2. Marketing Materials

These materials were postponed until next week due to time constraints.

3. Updates & Information from Units

These materials were postponed until next week due to time constraints.

Announcements

Mitchell is on the university task force for artificial intelligence. **Mitchell** is tasking the Community to come up with a way that can theoretically be solved using AI can be solved for a report.

Adjournment

The SAF meeting was called to adjourn at 4:32PM. Motion to adjourn by Annie Chen, seconded by Raj Dewangan; unanimous vote to adjourn.