



Western Washington University Associated Students

AS Student Enhancement Fund Committee

October 11, 2019

VU 567

Board Members: *Present:* Rachel Zamora (AS SEF Coordinator), Nate Jo (AS Business Director), Soumya Ayelasomayajula (AS ESC Assistant Director for Club Logistics), and Alicia Prokopenko (AS Assistant Director for Club Finances)

Absent:

Advisor: Raque Vigil (Business Manager)
Secretary: Elaine Morado (AS Board Assistant)

Motions:

No motions were made at this meeting.

Rachel Zamora, SEF Coordinator, called the meeting to order at 1:05pm.

I. Approval of Minutes

No approval of the minutes due to this being the first meeting of the 2019-20 school year.

II. Revisions to the Agenda

No revisions to the agenda.

III. Information Items

A. New Policies and Procedures

Vigil suggested adding “as applicable” to the additional policy regarding SEF funding being funding of last resort, encouraging applicants to first apply for departmental funding.

Jo provided context on the document, informing the committee that this document serves as a summary of several other documents in hopes of increasing the accessibility of the information to students. Each of the other funds should also be creating a similar document to then be posted on the AS website.

Prior to the committee meeting, Jo and Zamora changed the amount that the SEF Coordinator (Zamora) could immediately approve from under \$250 to under \$300.

Jo also noted that applicants must submit individual applications, no longer being able to submit on behalf of others and encouraging each applicant to explain their own personal reasoning.

Vigil asked whether this document was indeed about the policies and procedures or whether it is a guiding document. The committee agreed that "Guidelines" would be a more appropriate title.

Vigil brought up a concern with SEF applicants that are graduate assistants, seeing as to how they are university employees, but still students who, in the past, have successfully been granted SEF funds for projects that closely tie to their professional development.

With regard to AS employees, Jo stated that AS employees can apply in their individual capacities and that their AS position should not influence the committee's decision. Due to the proximity that AS employees have to the fund, they tend to apply more than the average student and Jo recommended increasing marketing efforts toward the student body.

Jo asked the committee to review the document as well as the original documents to have further discussion next week.

B. Application of Brahm VanWoerden

The applicant is seeking reimbursement of \$284 (attended the same event as Nancy Brill). The new policy for immediate approval under \$300 was added right before the meeting and is yet to be voted on, therefore this still would need to be approved by the committee under existing policy.

Ayelasomayajula asked if the committee knew what the department's funding went toward, stating that in the future, it would be beneficial to know which components are being paid for by whom.

C. Application of Nancy Brill

The applicant is seeking reimbursement of \$284 (attended the same event as Brahm VanWoerden). Ayelasomayajula brought up that by the time these applications (VanWoerden and Brill) are Action Items, the new policy of immediate approval for items under \$300 would be in place, meaning Zamora will be able to decide without a vote of the committee.

Jo suggested that for future meetings, it is the expectation that each committee member will have reviewed the applications and would be more familiar with the funding requests. Zamora added that in the future, the rubric will also be viewed by the committee to determine eligibility.

Vigil echoed Ayelasomayajula's recommendation for finding out what the department believes they are funding to make sure there is no seeming overlap in what parties believe they are covering.

Ayelasomayajula recommended that the committee be made aware of the approvals Zamora has made so everyone knows where the budget rests.

D. Application of Kristopher Aguayo

The applicant is seeking funding of \$1,025 for a diversity in STEM conference, located in Hawaii. Zamora brought up that Aguayo requested

funding by October 6, 2019 but did not submit the application during the suggested time frame of 5 weeks prior to needing funding so this applicant would be requesting a reimbursement. Zamora spoke with Aguayo and he stated being okay with receiving a reimbursement of \$1,000 even.

Vigil asked Zamora if she knew if the applicant was sharing lodging accommodations with other students. Zamora did not know and would be asking the applicant on the lodging arrangement.

Vigil also asked Zamora how the applicant had answered on being able to pay without SEF funding and Zamora stated that he would be able to pay and then be reimbursed, but it would be a hardship without any funding.

Jo suggested considering a partial reimbursement for the applicant, noting that the SEF seeks to provide funding to many students, but as little as necessary to each student. If a student can get by without SEF funding, partial funding should be considered. If a student is unable to pay without any SEF funding, the amount granted should be determined by factors such as whether they have sought other funding opportunities and the strength of their application.

Zamora will be meeting with the applicant again to assess how much Aguayo should be reimbursed.

IV. Action Items

No action items for this meeting.

V. Other Business

A. Application of Rachel Walsh

The applicant is seeking funding of under \$250, but Zamora wanted to gather the committee's thoughts.

Ayelasomayajula asked if there is any relation between the conference and Walsh's AS position. Jo answered that the conference's benefits would not directly overlap with Walsh's duties as AS Personnel Director and seems directly related to Walsh's minor of studies as an individual student.

Ayelasomayajula asked the committee how strict they should be on asking applicants to submit their application 5 weeks before needing funding. Vigil suggested having the 5-week deadline as a recommendation instead of a strict cut-off.

Vigil asked the committee on return applicants. Ayelasomayajula recommended carefully assessing the applications of return students, making sure there is a new opportunity with a new purpose each time.

Vigil recommended that Zamora provide partial funding, possibly just for the registration, to the applicant, but Zamora will be making the final decision.

Zamora adjourned this meeting at 1:56pm.