Voting Members Present: Amy Liu, Shilin Qiu, Serena Hou, Matt Murphy, Nishant Makhijani, Grace Kyung, Olivia Webb, Catherine Kemp, Meghan Killinger, Julie Honegger, Michael Lapelusa

Voting Members Absent: Noah Feingold

Ex Officio Members Present: John Prince, Warren Lavey, Lowa Mwilambwe, Brian Deal, Ben McCall

Meeting called to order at 5:02

1. Approval of the September 8th Minutes
   1. Matt moved to approve.
   2. Olivia seconds.
   3. Approved without dissent.
2. Working group updates
   1. Class presentations/ meeting scheduling
      1. Five minute presentation to sustainability related classes, project management classes, etc. Everyone should tell Amy which class they’ll speak at.
      2. Let Micah know about scheduling WG meetings by September 24th if possible.
   2. Student RFP
      1. Funding mechanism for student-led projects less than $5000—easier for students and less pressure.
      2. Only requires step 2 of the funding process.
      3. Amy: we should mention this when speaking to classes.
   3. Scope Change vote next meeting
      1. Haven’t received Bridge to China scope change yet, but we will soon.
      2. They used half of their funds by the spending deadline, but now want to use the rest of the funds for plantings.
      3. Amy: generally, it’s bad practice to deviate from our agreement, but we never specified that we wouldn’t allow a scope change after the deadline, so we’ll allow this one.
      4. Nishant: we should specify that in the new funding agreements.
3. Farmer’s Market
   1. Micah: as we look to promote SSC, we should try to get SSC more involved with the SSF farmer’s market. We can bring in people from other sustainability related groups and take advantage of the Quad as a programming space.
   2. SSC, as a neutral body of sustainability, would coordinate a larger farmer’s market event—not necessarily closely manage it. Could be a smaller scale event in fall with a larger event in spring.
   3. Olivia: food & waste WG could be involved; she wants to increase retention.
   4. Question: what is typical farmer’s market attendance?
      1. Maybe 75 regulars
   5. Nishant: likes idea of collaboration. The committee is too busy, but food & waste WG and marketing could be involved.
      1. Suggestion: October 23rd is the day after campus sustainability day and during homecoming week. Weather is important consideration—keep in mind South Lounge or I rooms.
   6. Olivia: would it just be food and waste related groups or sustainability groups in general?
      1. Overall consensus: should probably be more related to food
   7. Warren: that weekend would be a football game with a push for recycling, so this event would fit in.
   8. Grace: October 24th is Food Day and Prosperity Gardens usually gets involved.
   9. Micah will draft email for Matt, Amy, and Olivia to send out this week.
4. Hiring a minute taker
   1. Issue: Communications Coordinator can’t be as involved with discussion and notes aren’t consistent year to year.
   2. Minute taker would take notes and track funding. Job description: roughly five hours a week. CC could evolve into more of an external communications person
   3. Nishant: it wouldn’t take more than 5 hours a week so we shouldn’t tell them that. Also, we wouldn’t want them to organize funding applications.
   4. Lowa: could we have the same IUB person who takes minutes for SORF?
      1. Matt: It would be similar to the situation with our webmaster. There have been some concerns in the past about division of responsibilities.
   5. Lowa: There isn’t a lot at stake for the secretary if they only work a few hours a week. Also, student employees aren’t always super consistent.
   6. Grace: I’d rather see the $2000 go toward projects.
   7. Olivia: advantages would be consistency and less workload, but teaching them about SSC business would take too long.
   8. Catherine doesn’t mind taking minutes.
   9. Shilin: Maybe we can reconsider for next year, but it doesn’t matter right now.
   10. Basic agreement: money could be spent on something more meaningful.
   11. Note that minute-taking has been problem in the past and it’s been hard to put together things for project reporting. We need a better record of what happened, better consistency of quality and level of content.
       1. Amy: this proposal is in response to what happened last year, which was in a different context [no program advisor].
   12. Grace: minute taking is very important for organizations. It can be our responsibility as committee to point out if minutes aren’t good and give Catherine comments.
   13. Nishant: let’s table the issue until the future if necessary.
5. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
   1. Independent study (Warren Lavey)
      1. Last semester’s course: 10 students chose an SSC funded project, evaluated return on investment, LCA, case studies, brought in Morgan and Zack Grant and other guest speakers, emphasized the importance of monitoring.
         1. Students did a lot of research—weren’t just working from final report. Did background research on actual project, interviewed staff members, made presentation and ten-page report.
         2. Was separate from SSC—they weren’t members. NRES juniors and seniors got field course credit.
      2. Warren has proposed a working group or ad hoc subcommittee looking at major ($100K or more) proposals—maybe 3 or 5 or something per semester
      3. Learn about methodologies, payback periods, energy cost savings, return on investment, examine other programs, etc.
      4. Idea was to offer students credit for making the additional effort. They would write up reports in addition to making comments on proposals.
      5. Nishant: would it be under NRES?
         1. Warren: could be NRES, SESE, College of Law, independent study
   2. SSC course (Ben McCall)
      1. We want a way to incentivize quality/consistent student involvement; class credit is good way of doing this.
      2. Ben McCall: idea came from previous SSC members and faculty
      3. In order to have a course approved for next fall, we need to apply by the end of September.
         1. Students would get credit for being on the committee (2 hours) or in a WG (1 hour). Grading would be satisfactory/unsatisfactory. Class would be offered in fall and spring. Syllabus is not bound in stone though.
      4. Nishant: Likes that WG members can take the class and get credit.
         1. Question: Would WG chair be like a TA?
         2. Ben: Kind of. Class could encourage cultivation of ideas and proposals.
      5. General consensus: make it optional for the first year, perhaps make mandatory in the future
      6. Faculty advisors for SSC would be instructors of record
      7. Ben: Morgan and Stephanie suggested that putting together a proposal would be a required part of the course for WG members.
         1. This could be a deterrent for some people or just result in a lot of subpar proposals.
      8. Nishant: seems similar to CEE 398. The WG could make a whole group project.
         1. Ben: The class could be refined over the year—doesn’t have to be in immediate proposal.
      9. Micah: would you advertise for fall WG class in March?
         1. Could late add a course after WG starts, not a big deal.
         2. Idea: students could join class, and then decide later which WG they like the most.
      10. Would facilitate meeting scheduling if it was required—could be powerful motivator for students.
          1. Brian Deal: having a set time would be good.
      11. Meeting place: due to Union’s Auxiliary status, we would have to pay to meet in the Union, but can reserve any general room on campus for free.
      12. Nishant: designing the class could be a project for education WG or marketing.
      13. General consensus: the class would be good. Everyone should look over proposal and send comments to Ben.
   3. Comments
      1. Grace: could we have both courses?
         1. General consensus: the courses aren’t mutually exclusive.
      2. Micah: M&E should be more “selective” than Ben’s course--people with background or prerequisites.
6. Internal Funding Application staff/faculty review
   1. Need another faculty member to review internal funding applications, which are pretty rare
   2. Brian, Michelle, Warren, and iSEE should review proposals.
   3. Not in bylaws—“Marika’s law”
7. General Comments
   1. No working group meetings yet—we only have two proposals so far.
   2. Can be tough to get rooms—let Micah know as soon as you have a time for WG meetings.
8. Meeting adjourned at 5:58pm