 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 10/29/21**

**Topic: Public Meeting**

**Present:**

**- Voting members:** Erin Boas, Najee Rodriguez, Noah Robertson, Claire Kelling, Jake Snyder, Warren Sipe, Xiaoru (Tony) Shi, Latisha Franklin, Nora Van Horn, Sean Terrey, Megan Minnich, Alexa Clayton

**- Nonvoting members:** Alexa Clayton, Yidi Wang, Kate Rutter

**Absent:** Schönn Franklin (excused), Noah Robertson (excused), Barry Bram

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 8:02 AM*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (October 15, 2021)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*Public Comments submitted by email. (two emails)*

*Claire: Expressing concerns about CAPS services from those who could not attend the event last Friday. “Students would be discouraged by the consolidation of CAPS. Lack of focus on the full range of wellness.” Fee Board should think about funding Covid-19 safe space outside (air filtration, heaters, etc.). Should increase funding and staffing for CAPS*

1. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion**
	1. **Facilities Focus Group Reflection**

*Nora: “I wrote the main takeaways. Construction space for student works, study places and infrastructure. Natatorium was very unpopular. Offices being moved to Fisher Hall makes them inaccessible. Concerns with expansive and affinity group space. Doubted need for spaces like gym and kitchen in the Wellbeing Building.”*

*Sean Terry: “Fisher Hall was ranked first in being run down but would be great for NSO and other freshman room. Affinity group was ranked second. Not initially understanding of why the affinity space was there. Natatorium was ranked high up, felt the building needed more attention. Well-being building is a great space for CAPS. Finally, Stone V alley was ranked at the bottom. HUB has been renovated twice already. Not sure how many students would actually use Stone Valley.”*

*Latisha Franklin “in favor in a HUB expansion. In favor of a wellness center. None of them visited the natatorium but liked a renovation of it. Fisher Hall is good for first year students, but her group lived all off campus. A lot of questions surrounding Stone Valley. Accessibility. How would students get there? Is it accessible to students with disabilities?”*

*Tony: “Wellness center was ranked first. CAPS is in three different locations and freshman don’t know where the CAPS resources are. Won’t have enough money for HUB expansion. Natatorium is a priority but not a lot of people will utilize it. Stone Valley was ranked last. Not as necessary as a wellness space. Group thinks Fisher Hall have to walk all the way to the fields to access it.”*

*Najee Rodriquez: “Opposed to the natatorium (his group never used it, more for the IM recreational swim teams). Opposed to Stone Valley, more likely to be in support is there was transportation to get there. Liked the centralized location for CAPS. HUB was popular because it was tangible and it wouldn’t be completely out of commission during the expansion. Confusion over the affinity spaces. More effectiveness after it was explained why it was needed on campus”*

*Erin Boas: “Loved Stone Valley. A lot of them had been to Stone Valley before. Concern about transportation to there. Concern about the construction with the HUB. Prioritize the affinity spaces and room for school groups. Natatorium was ranked third for better recreational opportunities. Unsure whether or not the outdoor pool was essential. Liked the kitchen of the wellness center and keep recreational activities in the White Building. Liked that CAPS is spread out for accessibility for students downtown. Liked Fisher Hall in East but felt it was catered toward administrative support. Can’t understand the benefits of Fisher Hall even though it is accessible to all students. Doesn’t directly impact students.”*

*Warren Sipe: Most popular was the HUB expansion. Everyone interacts with the HUB at Penn State. Natatorium was the second most popular. Needs to be redone. Number that were in the middle about affinity group space. Understood importance but wouldn’t go themselves. Fisher Hall not needed for students. One of the participants worked with Stone Valley for three years. She talked negatively about transportation, used by public, and administrative issues.*

*Alexa: Liked the idea of the HUB expansion and that it was central to campus and spaces for affinity groups. Affinity group was ranked second. Expressed the groups that requested the space needed it. Liked that CAPS was in one building with a kitchen and yoga space. Some people felt the natatorium needed some updates. Fisher should be closer to first year students. Last was Stone Valley because its far from campus.”*

*Yidi: “Fisher Hall doesn’t benefit the majority of students, especially those who live off campus. Need more transportation to Stone Valley. Many students have never heard of it. Liked the phase two for the natatorium for renovation. Water polo team has a hard time to finding times for training. Liked the HUB expansion: great resource for all students. Good to promote diversity.”*

*Megan Minnich: “HUB expansion was a top priority, wanted studying and eating spaces. Wellbeing area was also a top priority but had concerns about demonstration kitchen as they thought it would mainly target on campus students that don’t typically have kitchens in their dorms so they’d be learning skills they can’t implement easily. For stone valley, they wanted an area for leadership retreats but didn’t want all of the upgrades like the wellbeing area. For the natatorium, my group support the renovation and mentioned several different times how they wanted money to go there to show support to other athletics besides football. They had concerns about Fischer hall with accessibility as they thought it would primarily benefit east hall residents. For the affinity group space, my group was relatively strongly against it, as they felt it wouldn’t be that beneficial, didn’t want to have to move affinity group space twice, and thought any issues could be fixed in the mean time by working on the 25live system.”*

*Jake: “Breakdown at all the statistics. Total of 44 responses. They would favor the HUB expansion most. Tie for wellness space and affinity spaces.”*

*Latisha: “Addressed the open response questions. Searched for specific word and pulled out the responses. 8 of the responses said there should be more focus groups. Suggestion was that they are held annually but understanding there is a need for money for these events. Needs better advertising. Email a monthly news letter and posting in the IM building, giving presentation during NSO. Comments that this was a great event. There should always be breakfast. Certain subgroup of people at breakfast. Try to host at different times. 9 responses aid sustainability should be a priority in all the projects. 4 responses said there should be information sessions about the student fee board. Some students didn’t know was the student fee board does and how it interacts with students and the university. 4 responses said improving housing. More staff in the dining. Some responses said renovation should be done to some of the housing. 2 responses said there should be better outdoor seating and gathering space. Next slide were comments made in feedback. Surveying more students should be done. Have someone stand in the HUB or downtown to ask questions to gage information. Accessibility fund for students with disabilities (paid interpreters, etc.). Move disability resources to the HUB from Bouke.”*

*Claire: “Should we do this event again/annually. Should the student fee board have a budget?”*

*Nora: “Wondering what kind of opportunities for the fee board to give feedback on funding (talking about Stone Valley)”*

*Latisha: “It was good awareness of the student fee board. In my group it seems like everyone were in favor of the projects but wouldn’t use them outside of the HUB.”*

*Sean Terry: “My group was focused on one thing, sparked them all to say the same thing. When coming who is in what focus group, try to get diversity in each pairing. Conversation wasn’t as productive as wanted. How is this going to affect other people in the student body. More diverse group within our collaborations”*

*Najee: “Incorporating a mass survey for more feedback. Ways to expand in the future.”*

*Sean Terry: “Time was a little restrictive. 8 am isn’t a thing for everyone. Maybe a lunch time focus group for the future, 12-2 area. Would allow more representative sample.”*

*Claire: “Not permitted to send a mass email but were able to. Can’t depend on it. 1 time thing. Challenge to get the word out. Thoughts on sending out a survey to the student body.”*

*Warren: “Focus group went well. It was clear was stretching to peoples understanding. Throw in a survey further abstracts from what’s going on. How comprehensive the information is. Answered based on uninformed people.”*

*Nora: “send out a survey with the understanding that the information might not be full comprehensive. Reaching out to the student body to share their opinions will be effective. More interaction with eh student body the more feed back for the student fee board”*

*Yidi: “Put the introduction link on the survey form to learn more”*

*Nora: “One thing I’ve noticed that during the presentation that the projects were prefaced that the projects were great. Waited for some students to share opinions for others to open up. More detailed concern list provided to students. “*

*Claire: “Bias toward the HUB expansion. Little time on the natatorium, lots of time on the HUB expansion. Add a video at the beginning of the broad survey? Too many details to have all in text.”*

*Sean: “Not a good description of where the funds go from the student fee board. Funding from Penn State athletics.”*

*Latisha: “One of the questions in the focus groups was about funding long-term things. Can you explain to me how this would be funding over years. Doing a video would be great advertising for the student fee board (conversational way). Two people or multiple people in the video. Different people talking about different projects in a conversational way”*

*Tony: “people are not sure how the funding works in the long-term. Does money go to one project or multiple.”*

* 1. **Facilities Deliberations**

*Claire: “Next topic on the agenda. How to proceed with the conversation over the next couple meetings. What we want to prioritize. Start with Fisher Hall”*

*Nora: “Major concern is location. Making it accessible to first year students.”*

*Latisha: “Are you wanting to discuss concerns from the focus group or more generally. “*

*Claire: “We can move to broad discussion now.”*

*Latisha: “Is it only a resource for undergraduate students?”*

*Claire: “Natatorium would like us to contribute a third. They might do it without the contribution. Concerns: locations and resource only for undergraduate students. Benefit is that it has a low price. Any concerns about Stone Valley”*

*Warren: “What’s the transportation plan. How are different resources going to allocated? Concerns about how it is being managed and the plan moving forward. More color with what actually is going to go on. Danger of us building something people won’t use.”*

*Tony: “For us to fund the project, we need the answers. How are we going to advertise for people to use these projects.”*

*Latisha: “how will Stone Valley be accessible to students with disabilities?”*

*Nora: “If we do fund Stone Valley, we should not fund the entire project. People saw merit from the retreat because of the financial intensive.”*

*Najee: “ New point of accessibility for students but don’t feel there is any concrete plans.”*

*Warren: “people speak highly of the natural space. Buildings need more renovating. Some of the projects are good to fund. Agreed with Nora”*

*Jake: “How will they be minimally invasive to the environment?”*

*Megan: “If I can comment, I had a concern during the presentation with how much it was brought up that stone valley would be so unique from other universities; it began to feel like it was being advertised more of a bragging right/potentially for rankings than coming from student needs, though I do see that students are interested in a retreat space.”*

*Sean Terry: “Did seem like they were trying to get a dual purpose. Students and other people in the community.”*

*Claire: “Paying the university rather than external things. Technically closer and maybe more cost effective. University would be paying itself rather than other people. Any other questions or concerns about Stone Valley? Concern it may not be utilized and used for advertisements. Concern for student access and university paying itself. How is can be made available to students with and without disabilities and how to advertise it. Natatorium”*

*Najee: “Overall, not the most utilized facility on the campus. Incentive for the student population. More advertising and programming if funding for students who wouldn’t normally use that space. 1/3 of the funding.”*

*Claire: “Note: funding what the recreational pool would cost. 20 million dollars which is less than a third of the current project”*

*Warren: “Not universally ultilized by the student body. Would go up if it was a better facility. 1/3 of the budget was off hand.”*

*Nora: “One concern that prior advertising and outreach needs to be better. Haven’t seen any outreach from the natatorium.”*

*Erin: “Would a renovation increase student use? Used it for leadership retreats sophomore year. Not offering it due to the state of the natatorium. Ask the natatorium to provide extra space for things like leadership retreats.”*

*Claire: “Why don’t you fund the amount of the recreational pools and athletics will take the rest of the costs”*

*Yidi: “Is it open to individual students”*

 *Claire: “Certain hours”*

*Sean: “Facility was so run down that intramural events cant actually happen in the building. Is it just Penn State trying to fund another statistic?”*

*Claire: “Not much current outreach. Benefits: for athletes and recreational swimmers. What is the minimal contribution? Plan for outreach? Extra space for a leadership retreat?”*

*Najee: “Need to have more programs for student swimmers”*

*Jake: “What is the predicted revenue to host the NCAA? Used as bragging rights or actually source of funding?”*

*Najee: “Downtown leasing space-large amount of money to maintaing those spaces. Step in the right direction for the wellness center. Lions Pantry as an expansion.”*

*Alexa: “Concern with the level of noise. Nature of CAPS conversations are personal. Sound proofing rooms.”*

*Nora: “Talking about efforts but not following through. Creating a wellness building means the university needs to have a long-term investment in CAPS.”*

*Warren: “Wellness building is aspirational to me. Really none of the services are new other than the kitchen. Relocation of other services. Not providing anything new.”*

*Latisha: “In terms of consolidation: will there still be connections in other places? Possibility of programming still being placed in other places on campus?”*

*Najee: “A lot of these resources have long been ignored. Sees opportunity in CAPS. Leveraging student necessity. Workshops for learning how to cook. Expanding food insecurity. Not exactly how we can extract certain demand. Almost vital that there’s more student involvement”*

*Sean: “Tactic to better the Universities marketing. How does it look if the student fee board doesn’t fund student wellbeing?”*

*Nora: “why are we building a gym in the wellness building. Increasing the capacity of CAPS is a big benefit. University intentions with the wellness building.”*

*Unknown: White building is being dedicated to athletics and kinesiology*

*Warren: “who paid for the white building? Did it come from student dollars?”*

*Claire: “Concerns: consolidation of resources, used for marketing, seems aspirational, using existing services. Benefits: concentration on well-being, kitchen. What else is being done to improve wellness on campus? Concern with the level of noise. How much does this expand resources such as CAPS? What are the intentions? Who paid for the White Building? Any more concerns? Talking about the HUB expansion. Will be utilized by a majority of students”*

*Nora: “Questions of consolidation of resources. Can you relocate other student spaces to the HUB during the expansion?”*

*Sean: “Concern: how will the current space in the HUB be affect by a construction of this size? Taking out a third of the HUB might cause some issues.”*

*Nora: “How students are being integrated into the planning process. For example: new study spaces. Plan to get student feedback. What students’ organizations is it going to?”*

*Sean: “How they plan to move the affinity spaces?”*

*Claire: “Other concerns, questions or benefits”*

*Warren: “Timelines are shorter than I was expecting. If the full expansion is going to take place it cuts the 10-year time in half”*

*Sean: “Important to note that the HUB has been expanded. Necessity of expanding at this moment. Showy space they can market off”*

*Latisha: “Need for more space. Is there a tangible measurement of this need of more space? (for students)”*

*Alexa: “A lot of members of UPAC don’t have storage space.”*

*Claire: “Concerns: can’t use current space during renovation, already expanded. Benefits: need for more space, storage space. Questions: can gender equity be relocated to the HUB. What organizations are being incorporated. How can you move affinity groups? What is the time frame of the renovations? Main concern of affinity groups is the overlap of the two projects”*

*Latisha: “Personal concern: is it necessary now?”*

*Nora: “We are not doing investments in other ways. Clear in PSU news statements that there is a lack of tangible policy changes. Not a long-term investment. Different between advocacy groups and affinity groups.”*

*Najee: “architectural question”*

*Warren: “What is the money being used for. What is actually being built? What are we actually funding?”*

*Claire: “planning to gut the entire space.”*

*Sean: “Will this move create more generalized space? Will that increase some capacity in the short term for generalized use? After the third floor.”*

*Latisha: “In remodeling the third floor space, will it be modeled in a way with future intentions in mind after the move or the expansion? What is going to happen In the space? Is there a need to remodel the space? Can we allow the third floor to be a affinity group space without spending 10 million dollars. Can you move the offices out of there now? Can the affinity groups take over that space”*

*Claire: “space is not community oriented. Concerns: overlap between the two projects. Advocacy vs affinity groups. Benefits: send message we support affinity groups, expansion of PRCC. Questions: What is the money being used for? What is the spacer being used for? Is the remodel necessary? Will the move create more generalized space? Next week we can dive into more detail about the financials. Think about how to structure these conversations.”*

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

*L. Franklin: No report.*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: Met Monday to finalize the final application, in the Google Drive. Used the template created by Standardization and modified it for ESF needs.*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: No report*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: Plan to schedule meeting soon.*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*Nora: “subcommittee to send out a questionnaire. Going over email and questionnaire to get to Claire”*

* 1. **Equity Fund**

*Najee: “meeting this Friday. Completing the proposal.”*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: “In the Steering Committee, all of the edits to the governing docs made by the UPFB a long time ago have been approved. Updated Steering Committee on the equity fund and zero waste. First year they have had access to student legal services. Large conversation about fundraising and ticket sales. Will revisit that conversation (steering committee). Intended to be short term funds. Next meeting: report from zero waste committee. Hoping the equity fund committee will report to the fee board. Hearings start December 3rd through March. Any questions?”*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Alexa: equipment: $9,000, media: $4,000, operational: $950 programming: $300,080 $631,000 travel: $54,000 TOTAL: over 1 million dollars*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*C. Kelling: New Communications Intern introduced. Motion and second to appoint communications intern. No objections.*

1. **Comments for Good of the Order**
2. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 10:01 AM.*