

**Western Washington University Associated Students  
Green Energy Fee Committee Meeting**

Wednesday March 14, 2012

VU460

**Committee Members Present:** Sara Richards, Chair (AS VP Student Life), Fabiola Arvizu (AS VP for Academic Affairs), Nicole Brown (Faculty Senate Representative), Grace Wang (Faculty Senate Representative), Kevin Majkut (Director of Student Activities), Kathryn Freeman (GEF Grant Program Coordinator), Seth Vidana

**Sara Richards, AS Vice President for Student Life, called the meeting to order at 1:14 p.m.**

**MOTIONS:**

**GEF-12-W-06** Approve the Minutes from February 15, 2012 *Passed*

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. REVISIONS TO AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

***MOTION GEF- 12-W-06 by Wang***

***Seconded by Arvizu***

Approval of Minutes from February 15, 2012

Vote: 6 - 0 - 0    Action: Passed

**IV. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. Conceptual Stage Project Application**

Kathryn Freeman handed out two documents to the committee, one outlining the application process the other was the application itself. This document has an overview of the process and provides applicants with the information that they need in order to apply for funding. Freeman said that all the questions and information are in the application instruction. The other part is just the form. Vidana asked if the documents were still separate. Freeman said that they are but the new versions allow for less back and forth between documents. Vidana asked if the committee would be passing the documents today. Freeman said that they could since they have quorum. Wang suggested having Freeman send out the final documents via email and just discussing the documents during the meeting. Freeman offered to bring the final documents to the committee today. Richards and Majkut approved of the email vote. It was decided that the vote would be emailed to Richards by Friday at 4:00pm. Freeman explained some of the changes she had made. She said that the questions got moved under project details. She also said that there were changes made to the team headline information.

She asked for the committee's input on the team number maximum and the team membership maximum. Right now the maximum number is three allowed per team and looking at four to five teams. Freeman said that looking at the timeline, if the applications were chosen in a staggered fashion it would allow for another

funding cycle to happen early next year. Wang asked if the three member limit included the professor. Freeman said no. Vidana asked if there was any comment on the team limits. Majkut said that operationally it is better to have smaller teams, but it means fewer students could be involved. He said that he felt that five didn't seem that large, but he understood that there would be a greater chance for confusion, making that large group harder to work with. Freeman said that with internship there will be regular meetings where all of the project teams will be together to use Freeman. She explained that the larger team numbers would reduce the needed face-time that the students may need. She said that it was hard to gage. She thought that a group of 12-15 would be reasonable. She said that when the work gets up to 18 people it becomes too much. Vidana said that it could be opened up to more teams, but challenges would arise and could delay another RFP. He suggested starting smaller and then opening it up for growth. Majkut said it was worth giving it a try. He likes the idea of more teams and an earlier second round. Wang wondered if the application language would state that teams are capped at three unless exigent circumstance with paperwork. However, she didn't want every group to say that they absolutely need four members. She wanted to respect the time and efforts of Freeman, but she didn't want to feel like the committee would have to turn away a project idea that needed a larger group to implement. Nicole Brown said that she was having a hard time understanding the benefit of having a team of three instead of a team of four. She wondered if the teams would then split and try and propose similar projects. She suggested using the term of three to four team members. She said that this may allow for some flexibility, but a problem may arise when there are five teams of four members each chosen, bringing the headcount up to 20 rather than the manageable number of 15. Brown said that class standing might harm a smaller group. Richards said that she liked the idea of having a cap on team members. She thought that other people can help with a project, but don't have to be documented and held responsible for the project. Brown suggested the use of "primary teams members." Wang and Vidana thought that this might be confusing. Vidana suggested teams of two to four. Wang, Majkut, and Arvizu agreed. Freeman said that they should select fewer projects than what was proposed.

Freeman directed the committee to item number four. She said that the general requirements that the applicants are asked to adhere to were pulled straight from the Rules of Operation. The issue of graduation was also brought up. Last year, a team member must be there for the entirety of the project. It was added this year that at least one member needed to be present for three stages of the project. If the applicant is graduating, they must identify their successor.

Vidana asked about the General Requirements item. Freeman added that GEF "is not intended to fund any proposals which were previously required by state or federal law, university policy, or contractual agreement. Freeman recommended via Vidana to remove this so students are not provoked with asking a number of questions. Vidana said that he doesn't want to spend student money to meet a law, which is why that piece is in there. He said that this begs the question of what are students spending money on that the university should be spending

money on. Majkut said that the group might have to go back to the original discussion about this. Vidana said that he felt like this group has interpreted the fee as finding the minimum amount of money necessary to pilot an idea so the university looks at it, and says that they want to do that idea themselves. Brown said that she would like to see the groups talk about how they could see their project helping to reach the goals of the University. Freeman said that she hopes to come up with an overarching strategy for the program and provide more guidance, to allow students to translate this into program. Brown suggested asking the student groups: Does your project relate to larger changes that the University is making, and if so, how do you see your project being used to encourage changes being made on campus on a larger scale. Vidana said that there is a piece missing. He explained that these projects, through student funds, are helping meet internal and state/law requirements. He hoped that the university would start to recognize this investment. Arvizu said AS President Ellermeier would be able to find out which Vice President this concern should be brought to. Vidana said that this conversation might be important to have, even if the university thinks the credit is given through other means. Brown said that this could be important feedback to the student groups. Brown says that she could see this being great advocacy for the fee. Majkut this would most likely be when a project comes to fruition and actual data is collected and analyzed. Brown asked if the teams write a recommendation to the university once their project is complete. Freeman said that they haven't gotten that far. She said that she was not sure if it would be possible because it takes at least two years to collect data from a project. Vidana wants to give proposals to stakeholders to ask for a response. He wants this information to be published online. Majkut asked if this recommendation to Facilities Management would come from the committee or the Office of Sustainability. Vidana said that having such a recommendation coming from the committee would hold more weight. Brown said that this might justify how groups state the intention of their projects. She was not sure how much work it could create for Freeman to introduce the students to those properties. Freeman suggested in this case making a document spelling out the logistics. She also suggested bringing in experts to explain the issues. Brown said that students could do their own research. Freeman asked if the committee wanted to add the question at hand. Brown said that she appreciates the rhetorical content. Vidana liked the idea of adding something on how the groups will advance larger university goals. The committee agreed with this idea. Freeman asked if the committee wanted it in a certain section or its own section. Brown suggested it as a second part of number five. Brown suggested adding how the project would fit in with or forge new goals to keep from limiting projects to existing goals.

Freeman said that she combined questions 4 B and C, and she combined the word count to accommodate. She explained that the essay part is approximately three pages. She asked if this sounded like a realistic workload. Freeman said that the application will be due May 3, 2012. Majkut asked for more time limitation options (less activity involvement) to be added to the question of member commitment rather than just taking fewer classes. Richards asked Freeman to send the updated documents via email and the committee would need to vote by

Friday. Freeman asked the committee if they wanted to include appendices. The committee was in favor of this.

## **B. Next Steps for Logistics**

### **a. Scoring Metrics**

Richards said that she was not sure how well this scoring metric worked last year. She explained that last year's committee main objective was to spend all the money. She explained that because of way the application has been changed, metrics 2-1, 2-3, and 2-4 will be removed. She asked for any suggestions for additions to the scoring metric. Freeman said that metric 2-2 would have to be removed as well. Freeman said that this committee has really focused on the project relevance to the mission of the program, but also how the program is intended to fit within the universities intent. Freeman wanted to potentially include something that relates to the concept of proposals beyond the mission statement, and how does it supports/furthers the program? Brown suggested using a purpose-needs statement, asking if the proposal shows clear purpose and clearly identified needs. She added "Does the proposal offer feasible solution and does proposal lend itself to applicable and measurable outcomes?" Freeman asked if case studies and stakeholders should be applied to the scoring. Brown thought that the inclusion of case studies could really be beneficial to addressing the feasible solutions. Freeman was not sure how to include stakeholders into the scoring metrics. Richards sees that information more as support. Freeman said that, for now, these items will be identified, and these will be attached so that the committee can review them. Brown said that this could apply under measureable and applicable outcomes. Wang and Vidana agreed. Freeman asked what was important to include in the last questions about the team. Richards said that she though it was important for the learning process but she was not sure how important. Freeman said that the metric does not have to stay with the 100 point total. Freeman asked what the action on this should be and when. Brown said that she feels that everything is in this document. She said that some things might be considered in more than one category. Freeman asked about the weight of questions. Vidana said that he found it interesting that the environmental impact was scored less than the educational aspect. He said that both educational benefits should be equal in standing. He said that metrics 1.2 and 1.3 are very similar. Freeman said that the first section is focused on the students and the second one is focused on the campus. Arvizu asked whether if new ideas are valued over ones that integrate into mission of the university. Vidana added to Arvizu's comment, does the proposal create new goals. Arvizu said that she supported having something like this but she wasn't sure if it was appropriate to say one was more important to another. Freeman wanted to receive some feedback on weight. Brown asked Vidana if he though 1.1 should 30 points and 1.2 and 1.3 should both be worth 15 points each. Arvizu said that she holds 3.3 in high regard, and so it should be a little higher than 3.1 or 3.2. Freeman asked about the new section. Brown said that the applied section could be a little lower than others. Brown said that the purpose, needs, and solutions, would

be worth 20points, 20 points, 10points, and 10 points, making it similar to section one with 60 points total. Freeman addressed that section three is only worth 15% of the total. She wanted to know if this made sense. Brown asked what the difference between 3.2 and 3.3 is. Freeman summarized the difference being completion and how well the application is it filled out. Wang suggested a 60/60/30point breakdown. Freeman encouraged there to be more than just the project included like project management experience. Brown said that if section 3.1 changed to 10 points, 3.3 to 10 points and 3.2 to 5 points, to add graduation/successor continuity as a 5 point item. Freeman asked Arvizu what her idea behind innovation was. Arvizu said that she was thinking of including language of 'improving access to,' 'representative,' and 'attainability.' Freeman said that the multiplier effect could be brought out. She will draft the additions up to be reviewed at the next meeting.

**b. Partnership Statement**

Richards said that the partnership statement could be sent out electronically before the next meeting to be reviewed. Freeman said that one person last year was concerned about the committee trying to define the relationship between project members and advisors. The discussions intended by the creation of a form for structure did not happen. She wanted to stress creating a formula for this working relationship. She said that she could draft up any changes that she was thinking of. Brown asked when the members would do this. Freeman said they would be submitting this when submitting the consensual application. Freeman clarified that having an advisor is a requirement. Richards agreed at Arvizu's suggestion to add examples in order to generate thought process on advisor-team partnership. Brown suggested translating this to a form of a job description for sake of value.

**V. NEXT MEETING DATE: TBD**

**VI. ADJOURN**

**VII. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 3:06 P.M.**