



# Structure and Program Advisory Committee

Friday, February 6, 2015

12:00 p.m.

VU567

- Members:** *Present:* Matt Smith (AS Assessment Coordinator, Chair); Hayley Trageser (Student-at-Large); Elspeth McGlocklin (Student-at-Large); Jaqueline Blacker (Student-at-Large); Nidia Hernandez (AS Outdoor Center Marketing Coordinator, AS Representative)
- Advisors:** Lisa Rosenberg (Assistant Director for Student Activities); Chelsea Ghant (AS VP for Business and Operations)
- Secretary:** Emma J. Opsal (AS Board Assistant for Internal Committees)
- Missing:** Jonathan Franklin (Student-at-Large); Mirabelle Blech (Disability Outreach Center Coordinator, AS Representative)
- Guests:** Brian Bates (AS Excursions Coordinator); Peter Dykes (AS Excursions Assistant Coordinator); Andrey Williams (AS Queer Resource Center Coordinator); Coco Dunbar (AS Queer Resource Center Education Coordinator); Casey Hayden (Coordinator of Student Activities)
- Motions:**
- SPAC-15-W-3** *To approve the second recommendation from the QRC through the SPAC process requiring specific education for the coordinators about queer issues. Passed*
- SPAC-15-W-4** *To approve the first recommendation from the QRC through the SPAC process with the stipulation of the addition of possible ways to fix the issue in the short term as well as continuing to explore options in the long term. Passed*
- SPAC-15-W-5** *To approve the third recommendation from the QRC through the SPAC process to increase the budget with the stipulation explanation behind the revenue decrease be added. Passed*
- SPAC-15-W-6** *To approve the QRC recommendations with the stipulations the first recommendation be reworked to include both long-term and short-term options for improving the space, that the third recommendation have more explanation behind the need for the budget increase, and that the 6<sup>th</sup> be refocused to include reasoning for inclusion efforts and knowledge gain behind the increased awareness of budget tracker, and the office's mission statement be reworded to reflect the ideas expressed above. Passed*
- SPAC-15-W-7** *To approve the recommendations for the Outback Farm. Passed*

*Smith called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.*

## I. Approval of the Minutes

Minutes were not approved at the meeting due to the absence of the secretary.

## II. Information Item – Outdoor Center Excursions (excursions)

A. Dykes and Bates were present to discuss the recommendations for the improvement of the excursions program. Dykes explained the first recommendation, which was to expand the storage for their equipment. At the time, the office shared the space with the equipment rental shop. They stated there was an issue of moisture, as there was no specific area for the program to dryly store their equipment, or hang the equipment to dry it out. He discussed an outdoor space, where due to the climate, the equipment would get wet again. He also had an idea to enclose and heat the outdoor space, so it could remain dry. Bates explained in prior years there was storage under a neighboring dorm, however when renovated, the storage was lost and replaced with less useful storage. He stated the equipment was building up in the storage space, creating a mess. Smith explained this was a departmental and management recommendation, and was to encourage discussion in the coming years about the need for the space. He asked if the new storage had existed before it was given to excursions. Bates said yes, but it was hard to use, as it did not lend well to storage. McGlocklin suggested adding some data so it would be clearer what the office was asking. Smith thought giving an estimate for closing the current space would be a good way to solidify the recommendation. The second recommendation asked for vehicles to be added to the AS Motor Pool, some being specific to excursions. Bates stated in another process the issue was being explored, but it would be solidified with a recommendation with SPAC. Bates stated every weekend there was some conflict with vehicles so either excursions or the other program would have to rent vehicles for use. This was a problem because excursions' was not large enough to consistently rent vehicles from outside sources, but they did not want to cause any issues for other offices and programs. Bates felt it was an unfair monopoly. He stated the growth of the Western Outdoor Orientation Trips (WOOT) also created issues for them, as they would also need the vehicles for similar trips. Bates also explained the use of rentals drove the costs of the trips up, making them less accessible to students. Bates stated there were other schools with 15 person vans, which they would like. Ghant stated it was not an option, as there was a safety issue with them. Bates asked for 2 8-person SUVs, which would fit plenty of students and the trip leaders. Smith stated it would be good for this to be articulated in the recommendation, and tie in with the rationale he felt was already well explained. Ghant interjected there regularly was a 14 person waiting list for each of the trips, so the more vehicles available, the more students could be served. Blacker wondered if 2 SUVs were the ideal, was it a possibility to expand to 3 SUVs to allow for more students to attend the trips. McBride said yes, but was unsure of what would be granted to excursions. Ghant stated there were more fiscal implications for the expansion other than the cost of a vehicle, and that for the time being they AS was only prepared for 2 new vehicles. However, Ghant felt this was a possibility of expansion in the future. Smith asked if there was an issue for the amount of students able to attend, with such a long waiting list, why not include a recommendation advocating for a greater awareness of the program and the amount of students able to use the program, and ways to rectify the long waiting list situation. Bates stated there was a recommendation for more outreach, however for certain groups, splitting up the students was not a possibility, and there was a need for both the current AS vehicles and to go to Enterprise for rentals. He also stated only the AS vehicles could be used for towing. McGlocklin suggested adding the numbers to the recommendations, to solidify the reasoning behind the recommendation, and to tie in the direction of accessibility within the AS as a whole. Smith suggested with so many numbers for

each of the recommendations already, why not attach a fact sheet to the recommendations to solidify the ideas. Ghant asked if excursions was granted two of their own vehicles, would they want to reserve the AS vehicles as well. Bates stated they would try to when they had a larger trip they would try, however if there was already a group using them they would not fight and go to enterprise. Additionally, each of the trips was already within the range of students 2 vehicles could serve. Smith moved to the third, which he felt was an internal recommendation. He explained it called for more outreach from the office, to raise awareness of the programs offered. Dykes felt the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> recommendations blended together. The fourth was to allow for more planning of their own trips by students. Dykes stated there was a process in place at the time, however wanted it to be more accessible to students, and have a more institutional process for creation. Rosenberg asked if one of the opportunities highlighted in the analysis of the program was to expand the diversity of participants, if that would tie into the two recommendations. Bates thanked Rosenberg for the idea, as this was not explicitly stated in the recommendation. She also suggested giving an example of a private excursion, to clarify what was meant by the recommendation. Trageser asked if what was recommended was trying to expand the program, what issues of space could arise in the future. Bates stated there had always been expansion, such as WOOT starting as a program from the office then expanding into its own department. He felt all the recommendations were within the current means of the office, and expansion could be considered moving into the future. As a follow up, she asked if planning the private excursions, what would be done for the training and safety of the trip leaders. Bates clarified that the private trips did not use their own participants as trip leaders, instead using the trip leaders from the office, and they had the same safety training as the rest of the office. McGlocklin asked what ways the office was currently advertising. Bates said he was unsure of what the marketing was at the time. He stated there was outreach from Hernandez that was effective. McGlocklin wanted to know what changes would be made. Bates was unsure. Smith moved to the 5<sup>th</sup>, which wanted a change to the mission statement. He stated it would be difficult to look at, as there was not a draft of the proposed changes available. He asked for a rough draft for the following week.

### **III. Action Item – Queer Resource Center (QRC)**

- A. Smith explained the use of the space, and that the data was not accessible to see who was utilizing the spaces due to an internal issue. Williams stated there was available numbers for the dance. Smith some wording changes, which was good. He asked to see the draft for the mission statement. He thought the changes were well edited. He asked for any comments or questions. Ghant asked about the second, which wanted to explore funding sources for the conference the office wanted to attend. In a meeting with the advisor and director, it had been suggested to explore the funding during the internship through various committees, so the incoming staff members would have the option to attend and seek funding. Smith stated from experience from the previous year, the QRC had issues finding funding outside the Personnel Committee. He stated there was a weak amount of local support for queer advocacy, and there was little funding to be found outside that source. Ghant suggested a pilot program, to see what benefit could come of granting the funding. Dunbar stated the fees were relatively low, so it was a possibility. Smith agreed it could be very affordable to send multiple

members to the conference, as Williams stated the registration fee was \$200, and roundtrip between Bellingham and Seattle was not too inaccessible. Smith asked about the revenue issues behind the increase of budget. Williams stated it was difficult to discuss the funding, as there was a differing demographic in the QRC and the ROP, with Smith stating there was a drop in attendance. Dunbar stated there was also a difference in counting the attendees, and there were so many variables in attendance, so it was not a great idea to consider the drop a correlation. Smith also explained there were various ways to determine the attendance, and it was relatively Hernandez entered during the discussion. Ghant asked for clarification of the increase. Dunbar explained \$300 was to make up for the loss of the revenue from the dances, and the \$1,000 was to be added for the speaker budget, totaling an increase of \$1,300. Smith suggested making this explicit in the recommendation. McGlocklin suggested a footnote to explain the accuracy of the accounting, and to add the percentage change of students in attendance. He moved on to the 6<sup>th</sup> recommendation that asked for access to Budget Tracker. Hayden stated the access had already been granted, and wondered if it still needed to be on the document. Dunbar stated it should remain, so it would institutionalize the learning of how to use the budget tracking software. Smith moved on to the final recommendation, which changed the mission statement of the office. Dunbar explained they had shorthanded the changes, and asked for feedback. Ghant suggested they discuss the changes with the ROP Director, to get feedback from that source as well. McGlocklin stated it was a very inclusive mission statement. Smith suggested phrasing the end so it would be more synthesized. He felt it was a good reflection of the current QRC. Ghant asked how often the office networked with queer clubs. Williams stated at the start of the year there had been no queer clubs on campus, but there were 2 at the current time. The first was a non-exclusive club that came to the office when having internal difficulties, and feedback had led the office to believe it was mildly trans-phobic. The second was one for Queer People of Color, which had started two weeks prior to the meeting. Dunbar stated both clubs had come to the QRC on their own for guidance. Smith stated there was a stronger queer club presence on campus, but at the time there was a lull in involvement. Smith asked Williams and Dunbar step out for committee to have discussion, and he would send the email detailing the decision of the committee. William, Dunbar and Hayden left. Smith asked what the committee felt about the recommendations. McGlocklin was concerned over the 3<sup>rd</sup> recommendation. Although the reasoning to her was valid for the increase, she wondered if the need was really there. She asked if there was one section in particular she was concerned over. She stated more so the increase of \$1,000. Blacker asked how someone would know if the increase was feasible. Smith stated that was more up to a later committee. Ghant stated \$1,000 was small in the grand scheme of the AS budget, and would be critically looked at by both the Budget Committee and the Board of Directors. She stated it was a good idea, as there was an issue of not having any queer speakers, which could potentially be marginalizing to that community. Her main concern was the 1<sup>st</sup>, which called for more space. She thought it was unreasonable in the current state of the VU, where everyone seemed to need more space, for one office to request something that substantial. Smith suggested reworking it to reflect his idea of it being a long term strategic goal. Ghant said yes, this was the way it could go, however there were other offices with similar needs the same could be said of. She stated it was important for it to be included in such space talks. Smith stated that was exactly the way he thought of it, and not as something that

could be done in the following year. Hernandez suggested the committee recommend an alternative to the recommendation, perhaps to rework the space to better fit the needs of the office. Although not long term, there were alternatives for rectifying the problem in the short term. Smith stated if an alternative was suggested, the conversation would need to include the office. Rosenberg suggested the short term ideas be implemented, but also the idea to explore the options in the long term be included. Hernandez was in support of the 3<sup>rd</sup> recommendation, so the office could meet the needs of their office better while costs increase. Smith stated it could be better worded to reflect the internal changes of the department, different to the strategies of the ROP, which treated all of their events as resources, and tried to have small or no costs attached to the programs. He felt it needed to be better articulated. There was discussion of how to divide the recommendations for vote and approval.

*MOTION SPAC-15- by Hernandez  
W-3 To approve the second recommendation from the QRC through the SPAC process requiring specific education for the coordinators about queer issues.*

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

*MOTION SPAC-15- by McGlocklin  
W-4 To approve the first recommendation from the QRC through the SPAC process with the stipulation of the addition of possible ways to fix the issue in the short term as well as continuing to explore options in the long term.*

Second: Blacker            Vote: 4-0-1            Action: Passed

*MOTION SPAC-15- by Hernandez  
W-5 To approve the third recommendation from the QRC through the SPAC process to increase the budget with the stipulation explanation behind the revenue decrease be added.*

Second: McGlocklin    Vote: 4-0-1            Action: Passed

*MOTION SPAC-15- by Smith  
W-6 To approve the QRC recommendations with the stipulations the first recommendation be reworked to include both long-term and short-term options for improving the space, that the third recommendation have more explanation behind the need for the budget increase, and that the 6<sup>th</sup> be refocused to include reasoning for inclusion efforts and knowledge gain behind the increased awareness of budget tracker, and the office's mission statement be reworded to reflect the ideas expressed above.*

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

#### **IV. Action Item – Outback Farm**

*MOTION SPAC-15- by Hernandez  
W-7 To approve the recommendations for the Outback Farm.*

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

**V. Adjourn**

*The Meeting was adjourned at 1:36 p.m.*