



# AS Student Enhancement Fund Committee

*Date: October 16, 2018      Location: Club Hub*

**Members: Present** Tyler Andrews (SEF Facilitator), Ally Palmer (AS Business Director), Ikenna Onukwufor (AS Clubs Business Director), Soumya Ayelasomayajula (AS ESC Assistant Director for Club Logistics)  
**Absent:** Student-at-large (not yet appointed), Student-at-large (not yet appointed)

**Advisor:** Raquel Vigil (Business Manager)

**Secretary:** Nate Jo (Board Assistant for Internal Committees)

## **Motions:**

**SEF-18-FA-1** To amend funding consideration rules to allow all requests over \$250 to be approved in one SEF meeting. *Passed.*

**SEF-18-FA-2** To amend the SEF rubric. *Passed.*

**SEF-18-FA-3** To approve \$1265 in funding to Kristin Thomas. *Passed.*

*Tyler Andrews called this meeting to order at 12:00pm.*

## **I. Approval of Minutes**

No minutes to approve.

## **II. Revisions to the Agenda**

Tyler Andrews suggested adding discussion of last year's rules for funding request. Previously the SEF facilitator could approve funding requests below \$250, requests between \$250 and \$750 required one meeting of the SEF committee, and requests over \$750 required two SEF meetings.

Andrews suggested changing these rules so that the SEF committee could approve all funding requests in a single meeting.

Raquel Vigil agreed that this was a good idea. She said that the student's trip could be over by the time the committee has time to meet twice. Last year nothing changed in between the two required meetings and this change would help expediency.

Andrews called for a motion.

*MOTION SEF-18-FA-1      By Andrews*

*To amend funding consideration rules to allow all requests over \$250 to be approved in one SEF meeting.*

Second: Ally Palmer      Vote: 4-0-0      Action: Passed

## **III. Information Items**

### **A. Committee Introductions**

Each committee member introduced themselves and their positions.

### **B. Explanations of the Purpose and functions of SEF**

Andrews explained that purpose and functions of the Student Enhancement Fund Committee. He said that this committee approves or denies requests for funds intended to enhance students'

experiences at Western. Fund should also bring attention to Western and the applicants' experience should build the Western community.

### **C. Explanation of SEF Guidelines and Standards**

Andrews explained the routing of funding and the conditions for the applicants. He said that applicants are expected to present at the AS Opportunity Fair on November 27<sup>th</sup>. Andrews stated that applications must fall in the categories of conferences, workshops, retreats, or competitions. Vigil said that the opportunity fair was a showcase of how students used the funds and was a good opportunity to advocate for the continuation of the Student Enhancement Fund. Andrews said that Eric Alexander stated that the SEF has been a very successful fund.

Vigil mentioned that all of the policies are on the SEF page of the AS Business web page. Vigil said that the committee members used to have notebooks with the rubric. Andrews said that the committee opted to use digital documents. Andrews said that the past SEF facilitator created a rubric for evaluating applications.

Andrews read the SEF evaluation rubric.

Vigil suggested that the committee review this document as housekeeping. Vigil mentioned the requirement the stipulation that AS employees cannot apply for funding in their official capacity. Andrews asked about members of clubs requesting funding.

Vigil stated that clubs were not prohibited from applying for funding but that SEF should be the last resort. Vigil suggested changing the wording to say 'WWU Club'. Palmer suggested adding language to steer clubs to apply for other funds first.

Vigil clarified that members of a club could apply for SEF outside of their membership in their club as long as they are attending events as an individual and not as a member of a club.

Andrews continued reading through the rubric.

Vigil stated that last year personal enrichment was considered justification for funding but mentioned that the University questioned if this type of award was actually a gift to students. If it was considered a gift, it could affect a student's financial aid award. Vigil recommended looking critically at the personal enrichment applications. Students should be able to justify an educational benefit or benefit to the Western community.

Andrews asked about the difference between education opportunities, personal enrichment, and benefit to the Western community. He gave the example of a geology major wanting to do the wilderness first aid training through the Outdoor Center. This applicant wanted to get a medical certification and was not a health science major. However since the major was geology the skills could be applicable. Andrews asked if this would be considered an educational opportunity or personal enrichment.

Soumya Ayelasomayajula questioned whether it was educational in the way that they were gaining skills applicable to working outdoors with teams conducting research or if it was more like a personal gift.

Palmer asked if the applicant expressed these things in their application. Andrews replied that in going over the applicants answers the narrative was present that they intended to use this as an opportunity tied to their education and community improvement.

Ikenna Onukwufor suggested that if the applicant can significantly justify the impact that the opportunity will have, even if it is not specific to the major, it would be good grounds to count it

as an educational opportunity. Some majors may not provide opportunities, such as outdoor experiences.

Vigil said that one of the beauties of this committee was that each member could articulate their viewpoints and produce good conversations and productive disagreement.

Andrews continued by reading points 4 and 5 on the SEF rubric.

Onukwufor asked how physical evidence was defined.

Andres responded that if some evidence exists that is physical digital, or searchable it qualified that the event was tied to WWU. Word of mouth does not qualify.

Onukwufor asked if social media posted linked to Western counted. Andrews confirmed.

Vigil explained that a research is good evidence. A student might be invited to present a research poster at a conference and thus would be representing Western and having a visible impact on WWU. Andrews mentioned Kristen Thomas who went to a snow algae conference along with a western professor and gave a presentation, which would count as physical evidence.

Palmer said that for applicants claiming benefit in terms of personal development, the experience should also be connected to a career or degree and be connected to Western.

Vigil mentioned removing the personal clause from the rubric. If the applicant only scored on the personal sections, it would be hard to justify funding to WWU as not a gift. Vigil suggested that the applicant in question had enough to tie it to out of the classroom learning, enrichment, professional development. However, if an application had nothing to do with a degree it should not be considered for SEF.

Onukwufor asked for clarification on the distinction between AS Clubs and WWU Clubs.

Andrews answered that a sports club would be a WWU club but not an AS club.

*MOTION SEF-18-FA-2 By Andrews*

To amend the SEF rubric by:

- 1.) Clarifying that an AS employee may apply outside their official capacity in section 1.
- 2.) Change "AS Club" to "WWU Club" in section 2.
- 3.) Remove the personal clause from section 6.

Second: Palmer                      Vote: 4-0-0                      Action: Passed

#### **IV. Action Items**

##### **A. Application of Kristen Thomas**

Andrews explained that background of the conference that Thomas wants to attend. It is a snow algae conference. The study of snow algae is important because it increases snowmelt. The conference is important and anyone studying snow algae will attend it. The applicant is requesting funding for lodging and transportation. They are requesting \$1170 at minimum. Andrews stated that partial funding would be acceptable since the Biology department should provide some of the funding.

Onukwufor asked about the status of the Student Enhancement Fund. Andrews stated that unspent money from last year rolled over and that the committee had approximately \$35,000 to award this year. Onukwufor asked if there was a maximum award amount. Andres said that there was no maximum but partial funding was favored over full funding in order to spread the money to more students. Vigil said that the Activities Council had a similar approach.

Palmer suggested that SEF pay for the full registration, ¾ of lodging costs, ¾ of transportation costs in total of \$1265, pending the award of funds from other sources.

Vigil mentioned that the committee usually goes through the rubric before awarding funding.

Onukwufor said that application looked good in terms of the rubric.

Ayelasomayajula said that the applicant would have a strong impact on Western and would bring a lot of visibility for Western.

Vigil mentioned that she would check on rules for international travel. She also said that the committee should fund up to \$1265 pending departmental support.

*MOTION SEF-18-FA-3      By Palmer*

To award \$1265 in funding to Kristen Thomas pending departmental support.

Second: Andrews      Vote: 11-0-0      Action: Passed

**V. Other Business**

No other business.

*The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 1:05pm.*