

**Western Washington University Associated Students
Sustainable Action Fund
Wednesday, April 20, 2016 VU 567**

Present: Emma Palumbo (ASVP for Student Life), Hannah Brock, Brian Rusk, Anna Kemper, Ed Simpson. Nate White (Non-Voting Member).

Absent: Sam Potts, Meghan Demeter, Seth Vidana (Non-Voting Member), Ryan Peterson (Non-Voting Member).

Advisor: Greg McBride

Secretary: Bryce Hammer

Guests: Octavia Schultz

MOTIONS

SAF-16-S-3 Motion to approve the minutes from 4-6-2016. **Passed.**

Emma Palumbo, Chair of Sustainable Action Fund, called the meeting to order at 8:03am.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA

- A. White said that Vidana would not be able to make it to the meeting, because he's busy, so Vidana will not be talking about OHSEC.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. SAF-16-S-3 by Simpson

Motion to approve the minutes from 4-6-2016.

Second: Brock Vote: 4-0-0 Action: Motion Passed

IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Annual Budget Report

Palumbo said at the end of every year the VP for Student Life gives an annual report and, recently, they've had discussions about who would be the best person to give that report, which will be determined by what the committee wants to know. Simpson said a brief summary of the status of projects and a balance of where the fund is. McBride said he has a previous year's summary and he can send that out to people, it usually includes a budget report and a project report. Octavia said a budgetary breakdown of what happens with the student fund would be nice. Palumbo asked if White wanted anything else. He said no.

B. Scoring Rubric

Palumbo said they currently have a scoring rubric that does not really get used and she's attached rubrics from five other programs that seem good. She gave

everyone time to look through them and make notes about what would be helpful for the SAF to include in their own rubric. She asked for thoughts. Simpson said Western's is the easiest to start with because it was written with the values of the GEF in mind. Palumbo said some of the values they decided to focus on this year are included in the current rubric but not all are. Brock said she liked the OSU one because it was simple and accessible to students. It has a section on the three areas of sustainability, there was also an area for sustainable travel, which are two things missing from Western's rubric. Palumbo said it was for staff development. Octavia said she like the Southern Illinois one because it lays out what each score means and it allows for a more specific scoring for the three areas. Palumbo said she also liked that one because it had a section for ethical projects. Rusk said he liked the current one and the modifications could be useful. One thing to change would be the current rubric has multiple questions for every category. The SIU explains what each score means. Another thing to be improved is, we have a multiplication system and OSU has one that's just a single category which makes it a lot clearer. Octavia said if they stick to a multiplier system they need to clarify and explain why each category is weighted the way it is. McBride said the New York one and the Nevada one both have scales instead of solid numbers so it allows for flexibility. Palumbo asked if anyone saw values or scoring criteria in the other rubrics that they liked. Kemper said they don't include the three areas. Rusk said the taskforce came up with values and they could look up those conversations. Octavia liked the lasting impact and the duration of impact that was included in the third one. Rusk said in some of their conversations they considered making a special category for pilot projects to lift the total score. Pilot projects could be boosted but not required. White said defining project ownership would be good because that helps for the long term durability of a project. Palumbo asked what the project ownership right now entails. White said it means that after the funding runs out from the SAF the project owner is required to take care of it and keep the project running. White said that takes a while for team because it has consequences and the people signing need a lot of information, which can lengthen a student project. Rusk said that the current rubric does not currently include a section about economic viability. Sustainability versus economic input should have some kind of balance and be put in the rubric. White said OSU has total cost and cost effectiveness, though it is not weighted very heavily. Octavia said some of the rubrics have a section on feasibility, which she liked. Kemper said there are sections in ours that has multiple questions. Peterson said we should define what each score means. McBride said one rubric broke out the values from the impact and he wanted to know how to evaluate two different kinds of applications. A bad application but sustainable project or good application but not a sustainable project. OCC has a list of values and then has an evaluation. White asked what an example of a good application is that has low sustainability. McBride said the window one could be that because it was a good application but had low environmental impact. Simpson said our rubric starts that way. Rusk said the OCC one gets very specific but ours doesn't and so it gets buried because they don't have to address it

specifically. White said ours makes sense conceptually but he has no experience with it, because it has not been put into use yet. Octavia said adding a section about fundraising might be good. Hammer mentioned having a continual source of funding would be good. Palumbo asked for other business. There was none. Palumbo adjourned the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:36 am.