**SUSTAINABILITY, EQUITY, AND JUSTICE**

**COMMITTEE**

May 6th, 2020 9:00am Microsoft Teams

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Present: | Trever Mullins (ASVP for Sustainability); Kelsey Leppek (ESP Director); Emily Gerhardt (ASVP for Student Services); Christina Ngo (SAIRC Marketing and Assessment Coordinator); Soumya Ayelasomayajula (ESC Assistant Director for Logistics); Grace Wang (Environmental Studies Chair); Grace Wang (Environmental Studies Department Chair); Leigh Chaffey (Student at-Large); Alexis Blue (Assistant Director for Facilities Development); Shannon Sandberg (SEJF Project Coordinator); Turner Campbell (SEJF Project Coordinator); Johnathan Riopelle (SEJF Program Coordinator); Kamea Black (SEJF Project Coordinator); Greg McBride (Assistant Director of Viking Union Facilities) | | Secretary: | Jude Ahmed (Executive Board Assistant) | | Guest(s): | Lindsey MacDonald (Sustenance for a Resilient WWU Representative) |   ***Mullins calls the meeting to order at 9:04am***   1. **Introductions** |
| 1. **Revisions to Agenda** |
| 1. **Discussion Items**    * 1. **Sustenance for a Resilient WWU Grant**   This grant recognizes that food insecurity is a major issue that students on campus face and that food insecurity is further exaggerated by COVID-19. The goal of this grant is to give students access to food at this time so that they are able to be more present in their studies, stay healthy, and stay aware of food systems. This grant wants to provide multiple methods for students to acquire food since students face different circumstances and may not be able to easily get to campus or may live in different cities. The methods include a pop-up food pantry and providing gift cares for grocery purchases. These two options are already available to students but need more funding to continue providing these services. Another method is the free farmers market. The Office of Sustainability has contracts with six different farms to deliver produce to multiple locations for staff, students, and faculty to come get free fresh produce on a weekly basis to supplement the pop-up food pantry which is non-perishable food items. The pop-up food pantry serves 150 students for 8 weeks through $10 meal kits. This estimate is based on how previous pop-up food pantries served about 140 students. They also want to provide 50 gift cards, print materials to get the word out to the community. The free farmers market is also $1500 a week for 8 weeks. The grant is requesting $26,650. McBride asks how they navigated the issue of gifting of public funds with the funding of the WHOLE. MacDonald was not involved in that process but it aware that there was a grant in the past which was similar and sought to give students access to food and collect information about food insecurity. Blue asks how dining services is involved in the grant. MacDonald says that one of the challenges that has risen in that the dining hall is super limited staffing due to social distancing. Dining services has available staff and expertise around food purchasing and are able to support this distribution because their usually swipe out program is not working well. Blue asks what personnel is needed to distribute food and how it will be funded. MacDonald says that currently employed staff deemed as essential workers are able to assist in the distribution and so the budget does not include this. Leppek says that the staffing and packing of the bags is a low time investment for the current available staff. Wang says that the Environmental Studies Department wanted to grant gift cards to students-in-need, but were told they couldn't use Chart 1 funds and asks how these funds meet the criteria. Riopelle says that this grant has been vetted by Brian Burton and they will work together to maintain the prudence of this grant and make sure is an appropriate use of funds. MacDonald says that if they are unable to do the gift cards, they will move that money over to the other two routes of food distribution and seek other mechanisms to provide gift cards. Ayelasomayajula says this reminds her of the ESC community cabinet grant that used some of the funds to buy gift cards each month but it acted as an incentive to fill out the surveys that would act as feedback to better improve the services provided by the cabinet and suggests that as an option. Blue asks how long they plan to continue this program. MacDonald says that the office of off campus living and other offices around campuses have extra funding and are able to redirect it to this need to cover parts of the pop-up pantry and gift cards. They would like to use this other funding until it runs out and adjust the amounts, they spend to make it work as long as it can. MacDonald says they are considering that it could continue all the way into the fall. This group did form previous to COVID and was meeting for a while but their response has changed due to the pandemic to find more avenues to support students. The pop-up pantries are in higher demand than programs like swipe out hunger. Ayelasomayajula asks if this is connected to the work of the HIA committee. Mullins says that the HIA committee consists of pro-staff that came together to find ways to support students. Mullins heard from Romo that HIA was told not to continue work that they were not going to operationalize and so the working group took the lead on it.   * + 1. **Waste Sorting Expansion Grant**   The grant team is scheduled to come in next week to go over more details about the Waste Sorting Grant since the committee wanted to table the grant until they could hear more about the involvement of stakeholders. Riopelle wants to know what in particular the committee wants to know about the grant so he can pass that information on to the team representative. Riopelle also says that the large grant does not require stakeholder engagement or support and is just a value judgement. Leppek states that they had some more questions about installation costs and  Ayelasomayajula would like to know how this timeline may shift or how it may shift with all the changes due to COVID and they are uncertain if students will return to the fall. Riopelle says that the program is looking to understand how things will move forward and how different incoming grants or grants that are in place are going forward. Riopelle also says that the author of the grant has graduated and the representative that comes in did not write the grant and may not have answers to all the detailed questions. McBride suggests that since the program has decided this grant is ready and a presentation is not required for large abstract, it may be worthwhile for the committee to consider the grant just on its value, with the finances as an important aspect of the decision. McBride suggests the committee keep pathways to approval consistent with large grant abstract. Wang and Blue would be interested in still meeting with the project team and Leppek says it would not hurt to see the team first to ensure they have done their diligence, but recognized that they want to be consistent with current politics and would feel comfortable going forward with the grant as an action item. Since it is a public meeting, the team is still welcome to be present during the discussion and speak on their grant or any points they would like to clarify.   * + 1. **SEJF Feedback Survey**   Mullins provides his plan for reviewing the feedback from the survey and asks the committee for input. The survey responses were compiled into one document which summarized the key points. The full results and responses could also be provided to the committee; however, they would be available to the public as well and Mullins wants to respect the privacy of the committee members who honestly voiced their thoughts. McBride adds that he reviewed the responses and the key points document and felt that summary reflected the concerns and input of the committee members. |
| 1. **Adjourn** |