 

**MEETING MINUTES**

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Date: 9.10.2021**

**Topic: Public Meeting**

**Present:**

* **Voting Members**: Erin Boas, Noah Robertson, Sean Terrey, Claire Kelling, Megan Minnich, Latisha Franklin, Xiaoru (Tony) Shi, Warren Sipe, Jake Snyder, Nora Van Horn, Schönn Franklin
* **Non-voting Members:** Yidi Wang, Alexa Clayton, Barry Bram, Jolinda Wilson, Gabby Triolo

**Absent:** Najee Rodriguez (excused), Erin Boas (excused- half meeting)

**Action items/Next steps**

**Agenda:**

1. **Call to Order and Opening Roll Call**

*Meeting called to order at 8:01 AM*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Kelling- Items C and D will be moved to next week, motioned with no objections to remove items C and D from agenda*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (Sept 3rd, 2021)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*No public comment.*

1. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**
	1. **Vote on Handbook Changes**

*Kelling: We will vote on changes to handbook from last week. We talked about adding language to fund more than one project, so I added the spending of reserve and to be able to fund more than one project. Hopefully that clears up any new items with the Sustaibility fund. The only other change was about the UPAC funding. We will vote on this today, and after we vote it is sent to steering committee, and they need 10 days to vote. If we get this in before the hearing starts, we will be able to have them this year.*

*Vote passes unanimously*

* 1. **Vote on operating Guidelines Changes**

*Kelling: No changes from last week, or any discussion. As a reminder the director of comm will be appointed by the first meeting of fall, not at. And adding that as a subcommittee to fee board so we don’t have to make the committee each year. Is there a vote for operating guidelines as slate?*

*Vote passes unanimously*

1. **Topics of Discussion**
	1. **Standing allocation material review**

*Kelling- we are finalizing materials to send to all offices. Some offices in past have sent us 99 pages docs and others send 7. A variety of info and overwhelming. Issues in past where offices spend lot of time at start of presentations with fluff. It’s important but the more important part for us is very detailed info about proposal especially if it’s for increase. Document to make it more standardized document across the board. I a=added some talk point suggestions.*

*S. Franklin- WE create hardline for each section and created a max for each section. Originally it was its own stand-alone suggest, because covid was such a big thing we made its own suggestion to talk about what it has affected. It’s a max of 3 pages, the budget is max of 2 pages. Gives example of what to do and not to do whether to include it. Justification has 2 sections: why you are requesting aid, and how your goals play along with our values. Post for usage section, need more info. Max 2 pages for conclusion to wrap up how much you are requesting and why. Appendices for what you couldn’t include in document. Second part of materials is the presentation, guidelines for how you present and wants standardization committee to standardize it. Presentation about 30 minutes and 15 for questions. 5 days in advance for chair.*

*Terrey- Do the length of the proposals match up with the size of the org we are funding?*

*Kelling-No related to complexity of the proposal, depends how many things they fund.*

*Sipe- Any template, or is this just the guidelines for this?*

*Kelling-These are the guidelines and what they will use. The assessment is supposed to be spending history doc. Later on, we will discuss student’s gov’t and see how far back they can go for funding. Shows post fee usage assessment for performing arts center. Different categories for funding, and how much they spent. Projected for current year. Covers last couple of years.*

 *S. Franklin-At very bottom we have presentation 15 to 15, is that okay?*

*Kelling- We have usually done 20 minutes and that leaves 0 minutes for all other reports, so it leaves us scrambling at the end to fit it in. Zoom was easier but now we have classes right after the meeting. I think the proposal is to have 15 for presentation and 15 for discussion. Leaves more time at beginning for public comment and at end for committee reports. With every office that comes in we establish that you should be here for questions after the hearing is over.*

*Kelling- Start at top, call this cover page instead of cover letter. Not really a letter. The max length of 15 pages, if you are new hard to tell if that’s enough or not. Personally, I think 15 pages is reasonable, given what we’ve seen in the past*

*Terrey-Are the mini section maxes hard deadlines as well as 15 pages?*

*Kelling- We need to talk about if this is suggested or not*

*Van Horn- Certain font we should get them to use, say our guidelines are referring to this font and they can change if they want*

 *Sipe- Add line space as well*

*Kelling- Do we want to add specific font and point rec?*

*Van Horn-Arial*

*Kelling- I will change it to Arial, any thoughts whether or not this should be a suggestion? Word suggestion hasn’t worked in past*

 *Shi- there should be minimum, as much detail as 12 pages and max of 15 pages. People wanna sell as much as possible for funding. A range should be fixed.*

*Kelling-Other thoughts?*

*Bram-Run this by other units to see how they react to it.*

*Sipe- we can say its mandatory but with excepting of contacting chair if it won’t work*

*S. Franklin- Can use appendix, and set hard line so we have all info we need before more detail.*

*Shi- Student activities from last year, their narrative was 28 pages w appendix. The actual hearing was 33 slides.*

*Kelling- I wonder what tit was before appendices, since we are allowing appendences. Seems to be 11 before appendices*

*Sipe- Maybe have total page have required max and have individual Suggestions be up to them. Need different lengths for different sections.*

*Kelling- I like that idea a lot. As a summary on page count: make it required , exception if needed, page lengths by section optional but suggested. Make sure they know they have an appendix.*

*Terrey- Would we change actual language for each section*

*Kelling- I might put it on all of them, but def on top since it’s new.*

*Kelling- COVID changes, last year mattered a lot. Not sure if we want it included as last year, or change for this year. Last year is vague and might want to be more specific this year. We will look it over and see if we want to change it at all.*

*Van Horn- We can change rhetoric only if they have been heavily impacted by covid. Some were and some were not as much.*

*L. Franklin- I thought of it as what changes has your office had to make or foresee to make. A lot of hybrid things, and people still have covid impacts. Covid still has some impact.*

*Kelling- Change to would you use all the funds in normal circumstance*

*S. Franklin- We wanted some section in there to talk about this,*

*Kelling- Instead of will be spent it can be having been spent. SO, we get prediction from last year*

*Kelling- Spending history doc important for utilization, future fee boards will need to think about that year for sure.*

*Kelling-Whether or not we want more definition for our 7 values. Most are undefined, and it’s only a s light help with what we mean. No definition for offices to determine them for their own context. But offices want to know what we mean, well some. We got wide range of responses to these values. Do we want to add more detail? Somebody has to do it if we want to add more detail*

*Van Horn- For context why we decided to not add it, is we spent a lot of time on them. We thought of justice as social justice. Some offices didn’t give us what we were looking for. We talked about equity for resources, and I think some offices didn’t give that point. I’m willing to take a crack at it, and I think we should define it*

*Sipe- why do we have them address all values? I feel it is excessive, because not all values will always align*

*Kelling- The thinking is every office should incorporate these in some way, even if it isn’t the focus.*

*Wang- Wondering about if we can add value of diversity*

*Kelling-We talked about diversity last year and added equity, but we can add or change values*

 *S. Franklin-I agree with Wang. I think some of their values are very closely linked. I think we should narrow down our values and define them for us.*

*L. Franklin - I agree its important to define them, because they are similar values*

*Kelling- Saying you agree is helpful, so we know in the room who agrees or does not. It sounds like the consensus is to define, and there might be overlap. We need these done relatively soon. Anybody volunteers for first go: Van Horn, Snyder, Shi, Clayton*

*Kelling-We can discuss more next week. The other thing is the presentation part. 15 minutes for presenting and 15 for discussion is new. Any feedback?*

*L. Franklin- Comment about appendences concerned me. I think it should be decided whether it is required or not*

*S. Franklin- Should there be a page limit on each appendix? So, if we include them and you are required to read it, it can go back to 99 pages. Thought/?*

*Sipe- I think 15 pages Is a lot of space to work with and appendences doesn’t have to be essential*

*Erin-In our committee we talked about appendices as separate doc, for flexibility.*

*Kelling- Shows examples of older proposals. We can’t read too many pages; 99 pages actually has happened.*

*S. Franklin- What funding was received can be used as appendix, and condense to a page. Appendices are reviews and examples of what they have done*

 *Terrey- Would it be possible to use a past proposal as reference doc alongside of guidelines*

*Kelling- Yes, we have done that in past*

*Kelling- I’m hoping to get more definition whether optional or required to read, or separate doc.*

*L. Franklin- Subset group of people, maybe expert for units can encourage them to not have as many pages. If they would be the ones to read it, or be well aware of what is in the appendices*

*S. Franklin- T think that’s good idea. If it’s a lot in appendices, I wouldn’t mind as subject matter expert summarizing for the body if it becomes too long. I think It should be required for SME’s but communicate we aren’t putting as much weight on appendices as we do actual 15-page doc*

*Kelling- What about separate doc or same doc. Are there strong opinions on that?*

 *Terrey- Organization wise makes more sense to have them together*

*L. Franklin - I agree*

*Kelling- We can come back to other thing, just wanted to say what stuck out to me .Never had presentation guidelines. Area that needs a lot of improvement. 15 minutes for presenting and questions. Any comments? I will say w already have had 6 hearing scheduled for end of fall. On 40-minute timelines because that’s what we used last year. Spring hearing would adopt this timeline.*

*Van Horn- Some people run over, and no question time. Hearing should be 15 minutes. But. I like this change*

*Kelling- I think number of slides was before I talked about time for each hearing. I think 1 minute per slide is standard. How many slides? People have different presentation styles*

*Shi- Should fix how much work people put in each slide. Some offices scramble all text info and make text small. We should require font size or word limit for each side so we don’t have over detailed slides*

*S. Franklin-IN our meeting the max slide length was suggested. But I don’t know what everyone style is.*

*Kelling- My personal preference is to not micro manage slides given different presentation styles. Some people are to the point and other aren’t. I like the suggestion, but this is my personal thought*

*Terrey- Say things that should be included so they can put these things where they, want but tells them what we want to see*

*Van Horn- We should also add justification as requirement.*

*S. Franklin: breakdown of allocation should come mi the beginning.*

*Kelling- emphasize we need details, if there’s an increase what is it for. Need a lot of detail why increases are needed. Other thoughts on if we need suggested maximum.*

*Sipe- I agree with slide number, we have time limit that they can follow, I think it’s the bigger limiting factor*

*Bram-There have been presentations where they just talk without slides too*

*Kelling- Do we want a slide requirement?*

*Terrey- I think it’s a handy reference for them to highlight how long their report is so we have a visual*

*Robertson- I think for accessibility its nice we have slides, having something to look at and refer to*

*Van Horn-I think them putting up their document first is really helpful too. I like that style of presentation and it minimized fluff.*

*L. Franklin-I agree*

*Kelling- Takeaways: not do anything about formatting the slides, or required maximum. Required to walk through proposal, have topics that need to be included. Breakdown of allocation coming here at the beginning.*

*S. Franklin- I think we should remove the suggested max for all slides*

*Robertson- I agree with that.*

*Minnich- i agree*

*Clayton- I agree. As many slides as possible would make me more comfortable*

*Snyder-I agree*

*Kelling- I removed it. Brief discussion next week before sending to offices. Any other major changes in content that should be discussed*

*S. Franklin-Move covid, did add B which says if you request same amount provide info. Should we just shift over the request of increase? We did change language of appendices a little bit. Which says they don’t count towards page unit. Appendices were at first together, so now that we put them together we just need them labeled.*

*Snyder- For covid 19 changes can we include that you are using these funds aligned with state policies. Can say please define the state of covid in PA and how you will use these funds to mitigate it*

*S. Franklin-Important to confirm they are following the guidelines.*

*Kelling- Simple and important enough to say you are following the guidelines. I don’t mind asking this in hearings instead of doc. I think it’s important to use the stamp, I wonder if we can also just add a brief thing they says to confirm you are using the stamp confirmed with the materials. Decrease time.*

*S. Franklin- I think it should go under background and history.*

* 1. **Student Government Material Requirements**

*Kelling-In the past, we have just required showcase budget, a brief statement and presentation. I can pull up examples, these are very brief, and it makes it hard to see if student govts are using their funds form year to year. Might require spending history up to 6 years. Don’t know what record keeping is like. Might ask them to provide as much as they can. I wanna hear your thoughts on what we might require from student govts. A showcase budget is different than budgets for offices. Student govts have no control, this is how historically how funds are spent by student govts. Give brief presentation then give brief statement for funds. Intro, description for use, and major events that were funded.*

*S. Franklin-As it stands, student govt orgs don’t have to have the history*

*Kelling-No, they need to present their funding every year, but amount is not up for review, we will hear justification of funding unless student govt makes appeal for at large members. Those appeals can come in before their hearing, we won’t be reviewing their amount unless they ask this year.*

*Robertson-Fixed allocation difference than other offices we fund*

*Kelling- Amounts haven’t changed in long time. Even after 3-year period they haven’t changes. That fixed nature of it. Whether we should require funding history or other detail should be funded for their request.*

*S. Franklin- Require we show 3 years and continue out to 6 years isn’t a far ask*

*Kelling-Just require amount spent, not detail on the breakdown. Last couple years on the breakdown*

*Van Horn- We shouldn’t do full length, but I think values and spending history should be incorporated. Analysis for student govt impact in qualitative and quantitative numbers.*

*Kelling- Recommend they start keeping this info. Don’t require that from any offices and we don’t require impact numbers*

*S. Franklin- We should at least have that background history as well as justification section to make sure we are following are values as well.*

*Terrey-Is there reason why student govt have3 year delay*

*Kelling- we don’t want one administration to come in and request twice as much. This year’s admin has no control over next year and how they spend their fund. Not coming into effect till next year. Hearing spending history is important, 2 year of detail spending and adding some detail on their impact with description of values would be valuable. Make draft for next meeting. Important to get this more right for next year for amount decision*

* 1. **Facilities Reserve**

*Kelling facilities reserve slides:*

*Kelling- SO in 21-22 recommendation. Basically, fee board is continuing on with the reserve. We will be hearing from all these projects in October, but this is the official voted on recommended statements voted on by last year’s board. We have about 30 mil in facilities reserve to be spent on facilities. The rationale intent behind allocating the 9 and 8.5, was basically we created our rec for all offices and units and filled to keep fee flat. Reserve is balance to keep fee flat for future facilities projects. We do have certain debts that are ongoing. This allocation year is out last year contributing to debt. If you want any other info let me know so I can get that for you*

*Kelling-when we decide fee we decide what we want to do with those offices. After that was all done we made contribution for facilities reserve. That was remaining portion to keep the fee flat, and that our facilities reserve. Will likely be spent on these 5 projects and a few more.*

*S. Franklin-ant space to increase our contribution to the debt*

*Kelling-don’t allow this structure anymore state limit on debt is 5 years.*

*Sipe-can we use reserve money to pay off*

*Kelling-Have to increase fee for other projects, can ask if we can increase contribution*

*Sipe- Break the expense down makes sense so whoever is using it is paying*

*Kelling- Hesitant about funding projects we won’t experience, students ay for things we now enjoy.*

1. **Subcommittee Reports**
	1. **Facilities**

*No report.*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*Van Horn-bump the emails*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin-the material were covered, also another draft for student govt materials for next week.*

* 1. **Communication**

*Robertson-Plan on meeting bi weekly, and make sheet for short term and long-term goals. Continue work with gabby.*

1. **Chair Report**

*Kelling-No dress code for meetings, with understanding you are representing students. Reach out to your offices, encourage you to copy me so I can help wit questions. Remind them to use the stamp. Remind fee funded offices to use our stamp, encourage you to reach out to them directly. It is now required. Hold October 11 at 6 pm, working on focus group planning working to find dates. Schedule for next week, presentation from council, UPUA legislations, and proposal presentations finalized.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Clayton-Allocated 18,000 dollars*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*No report.*

1. **Comments for Good of the Order**

*No comments.*

1. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:44 AM.*