



Services and Activities Fee Committee Meeting

October 18, 2024 | 1:00 PM | Husky Union Building 303 | [Zoom](#)

MINUTES

Call to Order

The Services and Activities Fee Committee Meeting was called to order at 1:05 PM on October 18, 2024.

Roll Call

- Present
 - ASUW: Haley Chee, Khushi Loomba, Annie Chen, Aiden Reeder, Crystal Tran, Jack Prichard
 - GPSS: Ryan Wicklund
 - Advisors: Lincoln Johnson
- Absent
 - GPSS: 4 positions yet to be appointed
 - Advisors: Kristian Wiles (Excused)

Approval of Agenda

The agenda for October 18, 2024 SAF meeting was approved. Motioned by Ryan Wicklund, Seconded by Aiden Reeder; unanimous vote to approve the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from the 10/11/24 SAF meeting were approved. Motioned by Khushi, Seconded by Aiden Reeder; unanimous vote to approve the minutes.

The meeting minutes from the 4/19/24 SAF meeting were approved. Motioned by Annie Chen, Seconded by Aiden Reeder. 5 votes were abstained, resulting in a 2-0-5 vote.

Public Comment [10 minutes]

There are no members of the public in attendance at this time.

Discussion

1. Attendance/Stipend Policies and Expectations

Haley reminded the Committee that all voting members hold stipend positions. In comparison, all SAF Staff hold non-stipend positions.

In regards to attendance, members are encouraged to keep open communications with Haley if they anticipate not being able to attend a meeting. Each member of the SAF Committee is permitted one unexcused absence. An additional 2 unexcused absences will result in the termination of their position.

Lincoln suggested reviewing the meeting minutes and going more in-depth into policies and expectations for members who were not on the Committee the previous year. He believes reviewing previous materials will improve the application process to get on SAF Committee for everyone, especially for those applying through GPSS.

2. Budget Priorities

The "Budget Priorities Document" can be found through Committee > Materials > SAF Budget Priority 2024-2025. The SAF Budget Priorities document is a collaborative document with ideas from the Committee and their expectations for Units. During deliberations, the Budget Priorities document serves as a reference alongside the budget packets and other materials. **Haley** wrote down some examples from last year's Committee to give the current Committee a better idea of what this may look like. She recommends looking at the materials from the previous Committee in the SAF Committee 2023-2024 folder for a better idea of what a Unit budget packet would look like.

Haley reviewed last year's allocations and highlighted how Units were limited to an 8% request increase for the next fiscal year. **Lincoln** shared the history of the percentage limit, which started two years ago. Before its implementation, there used to be no limits on requests, allowing Units to easily request significantly high amounts. Theoretically during that time, a department ask for \$2 million. In comparison, implementing a percentage with the fee alongside a capped 4% increase each year, helped narrow down requests from departments and clarified the budget process.

Haley opened the floor for any suggestions to be added to the document.

Haley asked whether the Committee agrees to keep the proposed budget increase capped at a maximum of 8% for all Units, or if there are instances where this percentage should be increased.

- **Aiden** believed that any increase should be justified by a valid reason, along with supporting trends to provide a reasonable basis for exceeding the 8% maximum.
 - **Ryan** also agreed with this logic.
 - **Khushi** questioned how the Committee would define what constitutes as a "strong" cause. While circumstances do arise, it is important to standardize criteria across the board. She emphasizes this point since SAF already supports so many different entities.
 - **Lincoln** agrees with setting a standard and maintaining consistency. Especially from his previous experiences with related issues where there was a lack of a standard.
- While Units should not be explicitly encouraged to go past the 8% increase limit, this is always an option.
- **Aiden** believes the Committee should focus on past trends to understand the reasons behind what each Unit is specifically seeking out of the budget.
- **Jack** suggested the Committee come up with a consistent list of variables that can always be taken into consideration, especially since an 8% increase alone is a significant increase for all Units.
 - **Annie** agrees.
- **Haley** pointed out that the max percentage increase has been 8%, where the max of which SAF will increase is by 4%. During deliberations, the Committee can always revisit these priorities and have another conversation.

Haley asked whether the Committee believes it is important to consider a Unit's historical records. Does the Committee solely want to evaluate a Unit by their performances and results within the past year, or should they also consider records from the past 5 years? For example, would the Committee feel differently in their decision if a department which has historically asked for a 1% increase each year, suddenly asked for a 10% increase?

- **Khushi** believed the Committee should evaluate historical records on a case-by-case basis. Overall, the Committee needs to have a strong justification for any significant changes and work towards finding a middle ground.
 - **Lincoln** agrees. He doesn't want to penalize any Units for any changes that may have occurred within the year. There might be changing factors such as shifts in leadership, fluctuating cost of Goods & Services, or variations of other outside funding sources. It is best to consider these factors to ensure a fair evaluation. As a manager of several departments, **Lincoln** always encourages Units to take advantage of their full budget requests.
 - **Haley** emphasizes almost all Units will ask for the full percentage increase so the Committee should keep in mind there will be difficult discussions and decisions to be made during deliberations.

Haley asked whether the Committee feels it is important to factor in Unit staff size. For instance, would a 2-person staffed Unit receive a higher priority in decisions than a 200-person staffed Unit? She notes that most staffing positions within a Unit consist of student employment and student wages.

- **Annie** pointed out that while some Units might be smaller, they can have a greater impact on the student population. She suggests the Committee look more closely at the scale of impact and the Unit's targeted student population, particularly if there are certain student groups that can only access these types of support services from a specific Unit.

Ryan suggested the Committee consider adding provisions for experimental or innovative ideas that Units have already done or are planning on doing. While these initiatives might be lower on the priority list for allocations, he believes this will be a valuable insight into future goals and vision. He recommends the Committee first examine one or two projects, reviewing their potential scale of

impact, especially more so for smaller Units who may be able to implement these projects more easily.

- **Lincoln** strongly supports Ryan's idea and wanted to add on with incorporating some experimental questions to ask Units during Unit presentations:
 - If funding wasn't an issue, what innovative new program or service would you want to implement?
 - What new vision or end goal do you hope to see for your Unit?

Y asked Haley about the process the previous Committee used to decide which topics to include in the Budget Priority Document.

- **Haley** explained there was never a formal plan, but new initiatives tend to be held at a lower priority. SAF would rather the Unit prioritize their existing services and make improvements over implementing new ones. This kind of thinking carried over to adding new positions since a Unit would rather prioritize retention of their existing positions before adding new one.

Haley asked the Committee for their thoughts on funding new positions.

- **Ryan** pointed out new staff positions can be funded in certain circumstances depending on the scope and stakes involved.
 - Adding onto Ryan's point, **Annie** believes that without seeing all the Unit proposals first, there will always be situational circumstances to consider. Thus, she emphasized the need to establish standard guidelines to ensure the Committee doesn't approve every proposal indiscriminately. The Committee needs to decide and align their values early on while the Committee isn't biased towards any Units or persuaded by any Unit proposals. After that, Annie believes the Committee could then start considering new positions as an add-on. Overall, she would want to focus on funding current programs and positions before adding new ones, given that both programs and positions are an ongoing cost.
 - **Aiden** thinks that new positions could fall under the new "innovative idea" initiative that Lincoln mentioned earlier.
 - Since last year's deliberations had many disagreements on the addition of new positions, **Y** suggested we can require Units to give a numerical data of theoretical scenarios (i.e. how would adding a new

position affect the unit's current funding in terms of each staff's weekly hours, total number of staff working at a time, operational hours, etc.) to make final decisions of adding a new position for a particular Unit or not.

Haley noted it might be beneficial to review whether Units are effectively making good use of the money they were allocated. **Aiden** pointed out that a Unit's current fiscal budget should include the funds given by SAF as well as any other sources of funding.

Haley concludes that the Committee will continue reviewing and making changes to the Budget Priorities, and revisit this document again later in the year.

New Business

1. SAF Policies

Haley gave an overview of the SAF policies and best practices document. This is a document that the Committee will need to approve.

The Committee had several questions regarding the wording of the document to ensure clarity and understanding. **Y** says she will make new edits to the document to fix these concerns for the Committee to approve later. However, the Committee can choose to approve the current version for now.

Ryan Wicklund motions to approve the SAF Policies and Best Practices document, Khushi Loomba seconds; unanimous approval 7-0-0.

2. Vice Chair Nominations

Haley gave a general description of the Vice Chair position as well as her personal experience in that role from last year. The Vice Chair will work about 8-12 hours a week. The position will not be stipend but the Vice Chair does get paid around \$23/hour. Those who are already employed on campus with other jobs might face difficulties with going over the 19 hours per week limit given that the Vice Chair hours may fluctuate at a given week. Haley clarifies that this week is just for nominations.

In the SAF guidelines, there is no requirement to have a Vice Chair on the SAF Committee but **Haley** believes it would be extremely helpful for her, as SAF Chair, to have support in managing meetings and help with internal matters. Most of the

Committee agreed to wait for further discussions about appointing a Vice Chair position until the rest of the GPSS positions on the Committee are filled.

Haley made a final call for Vice Chair nominations. As no nominations were received, the nomination period has closed for this week.

3. Office Technology

The computer in the SAF office is 11 years old, nearing the point of being non-functional. While there's enough money in the SAF's budget for a replacement, last year's Committee didn't specify the exact amount. It's important to replace the computer, especially since the SAF Technology Coordinator relies on it to upload materials to the SAF website.

Lincoln also reiterates to the Committee that replacing the computer is not a funding issue because SAF has the budget. However, the issue is that the funds are not technically designated for this purpose.

Lincoln asked if SAF Staff could use the money allocated under office supplies line item but realizes that doing so might not leave enough money for when the Staff needs supplies. This could potentially cause SAF Staff to repeatedly come back to the Committee for small amounts, like \$2 for a pen.

Annie strongly believes SAF Staff need a computer to continue the work that they do. However, she questioned if SAF Staff had researched what type of computer they wanted (i.e. any special functions the computer needs or what brand they wanted to use) since the initial proposed \$700 seemed low.

- **Haley** explained that she initially proposed \$700 based on a range that Trevor suggested he could buy for SAF. The computer will not need anything specific as long as it works.
- Many members of the Committee suggested Haley to increase the initial \$700 amount just in case the computer ends up being more expensive. The new suggested amount is \$1500 to get a new computer in the office.

Jack Prichard motions to approve up to \$1,500 for SAF Staff to purchase a new computer for their office, Khushi Loomba seconded; unanimous approval.

Old Business

Announcements

Adjournment

The SAF meeting was called to adjourn at 2:19PM. Motion to adjourn by Ryan Wicklund, seconded by Khushi Loomba; unanimous vote to adjourn.