Recreation and Wellness Committee Meeting Minutes for May 25th, 2012

I. Call to Order: Chair Davis calls meeting to order at 10:38am.

* indicates members present at the start of the meeting

II. Roll Call

Members Present
* Tenaya Davis
* Mark Weisbecker
* Camille Gonzalez
* Jessica Ousley
* Katherine Read
* Kyle Lewis

Absent Members
Christopher Prado
Krista Smith

Guests
Raphael Jemmott
Danielle Sage
Jared Green

III. Action Item- Approval of the Agenda

Motion: (Ousely) to approve the agenda.

Motion Carries.

IV. Action Item- Approval of May 18th, 2012 Minutes

Motion: (Weisbecker) to approve the May 18th, 2012 Minutes.

Motion Carries.

V. Public Comment

Public Comment is intended as a time for any member of the public to address the board on any issues affecting ASI and/or the California State University, East Bay.

No Public Comment

VI. Discussion Item – Student Certification Assistant Policy and Procedure

Chair Davis indicates that she would like the minutes to reflect that it is a $250.00 reimbursement. Also the Outdoor Adventure program may not be passed by the board. There are a significant amount of cuts being made in ASI. Bypass the Wilderness Responders for now that’s in the policy but there’s always room for improvements and provisions. Katherine Read has stepped into the meeting.

Chair Davis clarifies that the RAW Committee will be accepting the applications from people who will be applying. The people that can apply for these positions are the Recreation staff.

Danielle Sage recommends that fall quarter will be the application process and come winter the winners will be announced.

Chair Davis agrees to Mark Weisbecker’s suggestion about the scholarship applications being open until the 7th week of school. From that point on the committee will have time during finals week to make a decision.
Chair Davis states that before they get into the specifics what are the general guidelines and things that we are looking for in the application? Jessica Ousley mentions that the students should have at least three more quarters. Chair Davis modifies the mention that three quarters should be changed to two quarters. Mark Weisbecker mentions that in order to receive student funds they should be a student. It should be students helping students. Chair Davis asks if they want to make it for any raw staff that could apply. Does it have to be that you're a recreation staff as a student in East Bay? Does it have to be that you're a recreation staff as a student in East Bay that has two quarters left in their degree? Jessica Ousley asks why does it have to be two quarters?

Chair Davis states that at least two because if someone is a super senior and they're graduating they're going to apply for this but if they're graduating in the fall. So they're going to get it right when they are on their way out. So they are not going to have any reason to coming back to the university and showing what they have done. So what do we want to say on this?

Mark Weisbecker suggests that it should be for students. Part of the reason is that it should be something that we are getting a benefit from as well which is part of the reason for the two quarters. So we're not just giving it to students and then it helps them but it's also we're giving it to students and we also get some benefit from them. Two quarters is enough to justify $250.00.

Raphael Jemmott asks are two quarters of being in class. Or being employed at the RAW because let's say you finish in the winter and you're allowed to stay a quarter after in the spring. So is that two quarters of employment at the RAW? I do agree that it should be students as well.

Mark Weisbecker indicates that what we're really focused on is how long we can assure that they're going to be here. We can assure, hopefully, they're going to be here for their degree plan. But I do not think that this should be factored in. I think it should still be two.

Chair Davis states that in general, the first rule of thumb is that you have to be a recreational staff at least two quarters left in your degree at CSU East Bay. Chair Davis and committee indicate what the other criteria should be:

- A cover letter
- A resume
- Three reference letters (optional)
- Degree
- Academic standing of 2.0 GPA
- Ask questions as of why they would be the best candidate for the scholarship

Mark Weisbecker suggests that the 2.0 GPA should be moved up to 2.5.
Chair Davis agrees that it should be moved up to a 2.5 GPA
The committee discusses rather the program options should be narrowed down to a specific few or if the option should be open to students.
Chair Davis indicates that each position doesn't have to be subjected to different requirements.
Questions the committee has come up with:
1. What is your Future Career and how will this certification benefit it?
2. Why are you the best candidate?
3. How would this certification benefit the position at the RAW?

Chair Davis exits the meeting.

Jessica Ousley states that there a list of five things that the committee believes is most important. When the proposal is put together along with the guidelines, this will give the committee a starting point. We can come up with fifteen suggestions on what we would like to see.

Mark Weisbecker indicates that at the next meeting there will be some suggestions.

VII. Adjournment
Motion: () to adjourn meeting at 11:32am.
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