 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 9.17.2021**

**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, Jolinda Wilson

**Absent:** Najee Rodriguez (excused), Barry Bram (advisor)

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 8:09 AM*

*Kelling- General Counsel is absent, could consider moving the General Counsel discussion during Adoption of the Agenda. Could move to early October during a 30-minute free period.*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motion to strike Viewpoint Neutrality with General Counsel, seconded, no objections.*

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (Sept 10th, 2021)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*No public comment.*

1. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion**
   1. **~~Viewpoint Neutrality with General Counsel~~**
   2. **UPUA Bill #05-16: Renewing Penn State University Park’s PLAN (Post-Landfill Action Network) Membership and Endorsing Director Anne Lai’s Recommendations**

*C. Kelling- Introduces the Bill. Heard from Barry that a zero-waste guideline is not against viewpoint neutrality. Wanted clarification on requirement vs. guideline. Any threat on fee funds (given a requirement) could be controversial. Open to questions?*

*W. Sipe- Any Precedent for things like this, external to what we’re doing?*

*C. Kelling- The last section in the Handbook is about things we can/cannot do with Fee funds. This does not fall under limitations of fee use.*

*C. Kelling- Moving into discussion. Think about next steps, deciding to move forward or not, developing a proposal or a general direction.*

*S. Franklin- I think this is a great idea.*

*N. Van Horn- I agree with bringing Anne into SFB, and we should focus on the spirit of the legislation. Next steps, create an ad hoc to develop the recommendations, include Anne Lai, work with General Counsel.*

*E. Boas- Will bring to the Cabinet meeting on Monday.*

*S. Terrey- I think this could impact the university in a positive way.*

*L. Franklin- If it is a requirement, will there be pushback? Offices might be behind in thinking sustainably.*

*C. Kelling- Could be expensive to move toward zero-waste. The legislation*

*W. Sipe- I think the spirit is important. Requirements might be unenforceable (e.g., waste audits).*

*C. Kelling- I think penalizing offices might be detrimental.*

*X. Shi- We can ask offices to report their estimated waste for their events. We can then ask offices to apply for additional funding to decrease their waste.*

*J. Snyder- Can we do a preliminary waste audit? Also, can we publicize data?*

*S. Franklin- Can we do a trial run for a few offices?*

*N. Van Horn- I agree in principle, but offices might feel targeted or feel like a requirement.*

*S. Franklin- Offices should probably have a seat at the table.*

*C. Kelling- We can invite the group that put this together, along with some offices, to a meeting to hear about the thought process. We can assess a plan and hear feedback.*

*C. Kelling- Any other thoughts? We could motion to make a subcommittee on October 1 in new business.*

* 1. **Standing Allocation Material Finalize**

*C. Kelling- Made some changes based on discussion last week. Added changes to the allocations request proposal. Required 15 page maximum, and suggested section maximums. Added language about Covid-19 changes in funding. The values were defined by a working group of members. SMEs for each office will read all appendices in detail, but all SFB members will not be required to read all appendices in detail. Also finalized the allocation request presentation requirements/guidelines.*

*E. Boas- Can we bold “appendices do not count toward the page limit”?*

*C. Kelling- Change made, any other discussion before values? Looking at the values, let’s go through one by one. Some values were grouped together, like accountability and transparency. Last year we decided not to define these. Starting with Accessibility.*

*Nora- Can we reformat the examples of accessibility to make them grammatically consistent?*

*W. Sipe- Add “can” reach all students.*

*C. Kelling- Change “work” to “initiatives”. Any other thoughts on accessibility? This is probably the last time we will look at this document this year. Moving into discussion on accountability and transparency.*

*L. Franklin- Previously there weren’t any definitions, I think adding a question into the definition might be confusing.*

*W. Sipe- Do offices share material with students or just with us? Might change “share this information with students” based on the answer.*

*C. Kelling- The stamp is a way to share the use of fee funds with students.*

*N. Van Horn- The advisory boards are what I think of in terms of accountability.*

*S. Franklin- I’m not sure the question Is necessary, but what do the authors think?*

*N. Van Horn- The question helps distinguish between accountability and transparency. I think we could remove the question and add “how students participate” into the value to capture the participatory process.*

*C. Kelling- Other thoughts on this draft. Moving onto environmental sustainability.*

*Nora- Explaining why it is “environmental sustainability”. The SDGs are really broad, and offices might leverage this. The social and economic aspects of sustainability are addressed in our other values, and I think it makes sense to focus on environmental sustainability in this value to make sure offices focus on it.*

*Y. Wang- Can we ask how environmental sustainability fits into each office’s mission?*

*S. Franklin- I agree with that, add “future goals” to capture the mission.*

*J. Snyder- Can we add something to ask offices how they not only reduce their negative impact, but also increase their positive impact on the environment?*

*N. Van Horn- Add “and/or enhance current environmental sustainability efforts”.*

*C. Kelling- Other thoughts? Moving onto Equity & Inclusion.*

*L. franklin- I think “outline” imply much longer than 2-3 sentences.*

*E. Boas- Can we add “diverse inherent identities”*

*N. Van Horn- I agree, and we could add something in “fairness” about student identity.*

*S. Franklin- Also add “protected classes”. Should we strike fairness?*

*N. Van Horn- Fairness includes unbiasedness, as members discussed last year. Potentially strike “race” from fairness to keep the focus on viewpoint neutrality, since race is covered in equity & inclusion.*

*X. Shi- I don’t think Fairness can be combined with Equity & Inclusion because I think Fairness is more about opinions.*

*C. Kelling- Add “protected classes without bias” and “amongst protected classes without bias”. Strike “Fairness” as a value.*

*J. Snyder- Add “cultural competency” to Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion.*

*C. Kelling- Moving onto Justice. No comments. Moving onto general discussion on values.*

*S. Franklin- “Great job everyone.”*

*C. Kelling- We could consider adding these into our governing documents. I’ll be sending this document out to offices in the next few days. Moving into the next item in our agenda.*

* 1. **Student Government Material Requirements Finalize**

*C. Kelling- This document mirrors the allocations document. I’ll copy our definition of values to this document as well. Any comments on this document? This will be the final time we review this document.*

*E. Boas- Do we want to include spending projections?*

*C. Kelling- Typically that is not included, and I don’t think we need to include that. Moving on.*

* 1. **Review of Facilities Schedule**

*C. Kelling- Not meeting next week, so our next meeting is October 1. First, we’ll hear from Damon on Fisher Halls. This is brand new to me. I anticipate we will have agenda items that come up in the next few weeks but will keep everyone updated. Will discuss the facilities master plan overview, from Student Affairs. After that, we will get specific project presentations (including budget, timeline). On our off-cycle meeting, we will meet to discuss the proposal approval process. On October 15, we will hear the natatorium and tennis center and the building development and completion process. Later October, we will have our facilities focus group and begin deliberations. The facilities committee will be integral to this. These are all public meetings, and there will likely be a press release in the coming days about these projects. Any comments/questions?*

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

*No updates.*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*No updates.*

* 1. **Standardization**

*No updates.*

* 1. **Communication**

*No updates.*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling- Reminder of the October 11 6:00pm off-cycle meeting. Excited for the facilities projects.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*A. Clayton-Distributed nearly $900,000 of student fee dollars.*

**Communications Intern Report**

*No report.*

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

*No comments.*

1. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 9:37 AM.*