

Western Washington University Associated Students
Green Energy Fee Committee Meeting

Wednesday May 16, 2012

VU567

Present: Sara Richards, Chair (AS VP Student Life), Iris Maute-Gibson (AS VP for Governmental Affairs), Kevin Majkut (Director of Student Activities), Nicole Brown (Faculty Senate Representative), Grace Wang (Faculty Senate Representative), Rick Benner, Kathryn Freeman, Neil Baungard (Student-at-large)

Absent: Evan Fowler (Student-at-large), Seth Vidana, Jason Austin, Sarah Phillips

Sara Richards, AS Vice President for Student Life, called the meeting to order at 03:08 p.m.

MOTIONS:

GEF-12-S-08 Approve the minutes from May 2, 2012

Passed

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. REVISIONS TO AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION GEF-12-S-08 by Wang

Seconded by Maute-Gibson

Approve the minutes from May 2, 2012

Vote: 5 - 0 - 0 Action: Passed

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Project Proposal Updates

Freeman reported that eight out of ten project proposals were submitted. One proposal was given an extension until today at 5:00pm. She anticipates there being nine proposals. Freeman showed the committee the technical feedback form. The technical feedback form will be filled out by members of the Office of Sustainability, Facilities Development and Facilities Management, as well as Student Recreation Center representatives and Viking Union management. This feedback will be included in the proposal packet when it comes to review. Benner suggested that it would be beneficial to know if the questions were being asked from the standpoint of the position answering the questions. Freeman said she would be including directions to make the expectation of answers more clear. Wang said she was not sure if questions one and two on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal are relevant to their role. She thought that might be the role of the committee. Benner said that it would apply to the expertise of the position holder. Maute-Gibson said that it might be useful to add that the review is in the perspective of each department. Brown suggested better language to clear the issue up. Brown suggested "What are the strengths of the concept introduced in this project?" and "How will the activity proposed impact your department?" Brown played around with word choice to figure out the clearest language. The refined questions were changed to: What are the strengths of the proposed project, what are the weakness/challenges of the proposed project, how will the instillation and implementation of this project impact your department, is the proposed project feasible from your perspective, and are there any changes and/or suggestions you would make to strengthen the proposed project. Freeman said that she would clarify this language. Majkut asked if question number four was a good question; it asks if the proposal is feasible from the evaluator's perspective. He is not sure if this question should be asked directly. Freeman said that in the past, work with Facilities was done beforehand to work out feasibility issues. She asked if the question was too broad. Majkut said he was not sure if yes or no answers were good at this stage in the p. Maute-Gibson said that keeping the students connected when receiving the feedback will be

important. Freeman agreed that question number four might be a premature question. Benner said that since the concept is not as developed, it will be hard to answer that question until there is a more technical concept created. He suggested adding to question two if the weaknesses are insurmountable. Freeman said that number four would be removed and that question two would be changed to ask for an explanation of any insurmountable challenges. Maute-Gibson suggested adding to the top of the form that the questions should be answered from the scope of the evaluator's position on the project. Maute-Gibson also said that it would be beneficial for the students to know if there was a change that could be made to strengthen their idea. Benner said that he would add "significant" changes to the question for clarity. Freeman read question five as "From your perspective, are there any significant suggestions or changes you would make to strengthen the proposed project?" Majkut asked if the scalability question should be asked here or later in the process. Freeman said that she thought that question would be answered later.

Freeman explained that she allowed students to write up to 250 words for question 4a in the proposal. A shorter answer was expected, but there was a significant positive impact of increasing the answer length of this question. She said that on May 25th the proposal packets will be sent out as early in the day as possible. On May 29th the individual reviews will need to be sent to Richards by 5:00pm. On May 30th, the committee will meet from 3:00-5:30. On June 4th the presentations will take place between 5:00-9:00pm. The June 6th meeting is from 3:30-5:00pm. On June 7th the deliberations are from 12-3:00pm as necessary.

Brown reported that she has a conflict of interest as there is a grant proposal being written by students in her class. Brown said that she does not want to give feedback on the project. Richards said that it will be fine to have an abstention vote. Freeman wondered what the final score was that was given, whether it was an average of all scores or if a group decision was made. Majkut did not think that the group gave scores, but the individual scores guided the decision. Freeman said that one number was given to the project team as a score. Brown explained that she thought it would be decided by ranking. Majkut asked for clarification. He asked if voting members fill out matrix and then those ranking numbers are included or does the scoring matrix drive the ranking in deliberations. Richards said that her idea was that the ranking would drive the conversation. Brown asked if she would pull out of the process at a certain point. Brown said that a new policy should be made to handle this issue in the future. Majkut said that to some extent Vidana will have a similar problem but he is not a voting member. Majkut said that staying out of the vote and ranking on the proposal of interest will be the best option. Brown said that it will be important to specify to that the professors cannot work on projects as they are involved with the committee. *(Baunsgard entered 3:54)* Majkut suggested having the GEF Education Coordinator come into relevant classrooms and provide information on the GEF rather than have it addressed by the professor. Brown said that she might leave the room during the presentation. She said that this process should be documented. Maute-Gibson said that it should be reflected in the fairest way. Brown said that she could abstain as well. Freeman said that coming up with the process for the ranking will have to occur after the ranking has already been done. Majkut said that Richards can make the decision as the chair. Benner may be late to the presentations due to travel. Richards said that it should be fine if Benner misses the first presentation or so because the presentations will be videotaped. Maute-Gibson agreed with Richards.

Freeman will send out a Google document to the applicant teams to pick their times. Freeman said that there was a need for 10 minutes between presentations. Richards asked when the dinner should be. Majkut said that there should be 20 minute presentation time slots and the committee would eat at 6:30 for 30 minutes. Freeman said that she would send out the timetable of the events.

V. NEXT MEETING DATE: May 30, 2012

VI. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY ACCLAMATION AT 4:13 P.M.