

SEJF rules of operation amendment proposal 2019-2020:

Amendment one: Conflicts of interest

“In the event of a project proposal of any tier where a committee member is a project owner and/or directly benefits members of the SAF Committee (including ex-officio members), the application will automatically be brought to the committee for approval. This includes, but is not limited to, the Environmental and Sustainability Programs, the AS Board of Directors, The Office of Sustainability, and The Viking Union. The committee member(s) will be asked to abstain from voting. Projects in the small grant tier with a conflict of interest with the Director of Sustainability will not require approval from The Director of Sustainability and will be sent directly to the committee upon approval from the SEJF Program Grant Manager.”

Why: This year I have witnessed multiple instances where small grant teams that needed to present to committee due to a conflict of interest were significantly delayed by this step in the application. The office of Sustainability has been steadily growing in recent years, and with it so have the responsibilities of the Director of Sustainability. When asked, the primary reason the Director of Sustainability had for not reviewing these application materials in a timely manner was that they did not have enough time. With the increase scope of possible purposes for SEJF funding, as well as the increase of available funds from last year, it is clear that the number of projects seen by the SEJF will only be increasing as well. This will place additional strain on the Director of Sustainability and slow down this process even more. To make matters worse, speaker series and other event style grants that are time sensitive most often fall within the small grant range. From what I have experienced as an SEJF Project Coordinator this year, it is clear that as these programs continue to grow the current system will not be sufficient. By removing this small and ultimately redundant step in application approval for small grants, hopefully we can reduce inefficiency in our system and expedite the approval of projects that fall within this category.

Amendment two: Compensation – additional subsection to Program Oversight

Option 1: “Students at large and committee members who are paid salary wages will receive compensation upon the completion of their responsibilities. They will receive two hours worth of Washington state minimum wage per each hour of committee meeting they attend. Reporting attendance will be the responsibility of the Committee chair. Committee members may choose to reject compensation and return the allocated funds to the SEJ funding pool. *Pilot stipulation:* this amendment will be re-visited in the spring of 2020 to evaluate the success of this amendment in improving committee attendance, interest in Student at Large positions, and compensation for labor. The AS board may vote to remove this amendment, continue it for another year of testing, approve it for permanent implementation in the SEJF Rules of Operation, or do any of the aforementioned with a new amendment with this same pilot stipulation.”

Option 2: “Students at large and committee members who are paid salary wages will receive compensation upon the completion of their responsibilities. They will receive \$250 upon attending every scheduled SEJF meeting in a quarter. For every meeting missed, this compensation will be reduced by $\$25 \times X^{1.5}$ where X is the number of meetings missed. Reporting attendance will be the responsibility of the Committee chair. Committee members may choose to reject compensation and return the allocated funds to the SEJ funding pool. *Pilot stipulation:* this amendment will be re-visited in the spring of 2020 to

evaluate the success of this amendment in improving committee attendance, interest in Student at Large positions, and compensation for labor. The committee may vote to remove this amendment, continue it for another year of testing, approve it for permanent implementation in the SEJF Rules of Operation, or do any of the latter with a new amendment with this same pilot stipulation.”

Why: Another issue I witnessed this year in the SEJF committee was an inability to fill the student at large positions. Considering this is a two-hour commitment for every week with no compensation, it isn't hard to see why the position would fail to garner much student interest. In fall quarter of 2018, the committee only met one time because it couldn't find student's for the Student at large position. As a result, the committee was extremely delayed and has not been able to catch-up and fulfill some of the duties assigned to it. Additionally, while the AS and SEJF staff positions receive fair hourly compensation for their labor in the committee, other committee members that are paid salary do not receive compensation for the additional responsibilities required by the committee. Lastly, by incentivizing attendance we can hopefully improve reduce the number of meetings that fail to make quorum. Currently, the SEJF sees the majority of its project proposals in late spring as students rush to complete their grants before the end of the academic year. Wasting even one committee meeting at this time can be highly detrimental to these projects. The money to fund this amendment could be taken directly from the SEJ funding pool as an operational cost, but some other university function may be a more appropriate source. This proposal also includes a pilot provision so that the amendment can be easily removed or altered if it is found to be ineffective at accomplishing its intended purpose.

Why Option 1: Option one provides two-hours of wage per an hour-long SEJF committee meeting to compensate for the time of the meeting itself and the time committee members spend reading the grant materials. The compensation could be distributed either through a stipend or as a new job position. The stipend would be easiest, but I have heard the university is trying to remove stipends from its' employment model. Creating a new position within Western would not be ideal since it would mean Student's at large could not be employed elsewhere, and there would be a lot of additional work created in the application process. I did not write this information into my proposal so that this committee can make a decision that is most appropriate for the situation.

Why Option 2: Option two is similar to option one in that it provides roughly two hours-worth of compensation for each meeting (at 8 meetings per quarter) but increases the potential earnings slightly (\$15.75 per hour) and penalizes members more for missing meetings. This option was developed in response to the concerns brought up by my supervisor, the SEJF Program Manager, that committee meetings have a cumulative value; the more meetings a committee member misses, the less context and therefor knowledge they will have in order to make their decisions. Many of the discussions brought up in the SEJF committee are ongoing, and require in-depth understanding to make an informed vote. By using a diminishing rate of return model for compensation, this will provide more incentive for committee members to miss as few meetings as possible. For example, missing one meeting would incur only a \$25 deduction, missing two would result in roughly \$70 in deductions, missing three would result in a \$130 deduction, etc. After missing 5 meetings, members would receive no compensation.

Commented [CC1]: Would you agree with my phrasing of this comment? I want to be sure I am interpreting your words correctly.