

iCAP Working Group
5-2-2017

1. SWATeam Clerks and Organization

a. General Remarks

- i. Morgan – While the SWATeams are overall very successful, there have been some issues affecting their functioning to date. We've had a hard time retaining faculty, student members are hit and miss, staff have to be careful to make sure their SWATeam service remains balanced with their other work, and clerks probably need to be paid.
- ii. Ximing – one thing we need to do is enhance the importance of faculty. If we could have them directly appointed by Deans or the Chancellor, that helps to present the service they provide as important.
- iii. The group discussed what the protocol would be for requesting a nomination for the SWATeam. Ximing would make an initial inquiry to deans or department heads to assess interest, with a formal request to follow from the Vice Chancellor for Research or higher.
- iv. Joseph – Can we clarify the exact role of faculty on the SWATeams? At least on the ALUFS SWATeam, there's a bit of a breakdown between faculty (who have subject matter expertise) and staff (who know the university well enough to get things done).
- v. Morgan – that's something we're trying to address. We need to be careful with staff time so that departments don't start to have concerns about allowing their staff to serve on SWATeams. Letting faculty serve to bring students into the conversation should be a major priority moving forward.

b. Paid Clerks

- i. Presently, SWATeam clerks are only compensated for their service with a single credit hour of ENV5491 Course Credit and are expected to do a relatively narrow scope of work.
- ii. Instead of having six student volunteers receiving course credit, the proposal before the iCAP Working Group would be to have three student employees, each working ten hours a week, to clerk for the SWATeams.
- iii. In addition to the current basic scheduling and clerical work that clerks do, the paid clerks would take a larger role in maintaining current information on the iCAP Portal, scheduling webinars and other professional development opportunities for SWATeam Members, and following up on ideas mentioned at SWATeam meetings.
- iv. The cost for this proposal would be roughly \$8,000 per year, exclusively in student wages.
- v. iCAP Working Group tacitly supports a pilot of this approach, as long as there is enough work for the students to do that would justify their salary.

2. Re-Review of ECons004 (Green Labs Coordinator)
 - a. Ximing – we are still in the process of evaluating costs and benefits, but have some time. We're not at the "Hire Someone Now" stage of the process yet.
3. SWATeam Recommendations
 - a. ECons005 – Continuation of Illini Lights Out
 - i. The Illini Lights Out program has been very successful so far. The SWATeam is proposing continuing ILO under iSEE coordination and funding.
 - ii. Robyn – there definitely needs to be more of an educational component so it's not just turning off lights, but also educating occupants on how to be safer.
 - iii. Joseph – we should also look at ways to add in more of a competition element. Maybe it's building vs building, or maybe it's student organization vs student organization, but there should be something there.
 - iv. iWG favors the project; formal recommendation included in draft assessment
 - b. EGen007 – Second Solar Farm
 - i. We will likely need to increase our on-campus solar generation significantly to meet our 2020 milestone goal for renewable energy.
 - ii. There was some disagreement within the Working Group as far as the best means to accomplish this goal.
 - iii. Scott is going to talk to the SWATeam for more ideas and clarification to make the proposal more broadly appealing; no action needed at this time.
 - c. PWR008 – Battery Recycling
 - i. Battery recycling on campus is very important and an issue that needs to be addressed.
 - ii. One of the SEE Fellows capstone projects may involve reviewing current campus battery recycling plans.
 - iii. Rather than formally adopt a recommendation now, the recommendation of the iWG is that a more detailed policy be developed in conjunction with the efforts of this student researcher.
 - d. PWR009 – Paper Policy
 - i. Campus doesn't currently force departments to purchase 30% + post-consumer recycled content paper, and many departments still buy paper from virgin timber because it's cheaper.
 - ii. F&S Campus Stores already offers discounted rates for recycled content paper, and this is one option departments could consider instead of going through Officemax.
 - iii. The iCAP Working Group recommends that the CAM Policy should be updated to increase usage of recycled content paper, and that more information should be provided to departments on where to purchase recycled content paper economically.

e. PWR010 – Ethics Video

- i. All staff and faculty at the University of Illinois are required to recycle per state law. To help educate people about this, Compliance has prepared a video about campus recycling.
- ii. This video omits certain pieces of information including how the sort line at the Waste Transfer Station works and why that impacts what does and doesn't get recycled.
- iii. The PWR SWATeam recommends that the Ethics Compliance Video be published more broadly, including a paragraph summary of campus efforts.
- iv. The iCAP Working Group concurs.