 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 11/12/21**

**Topic: Public Meeting**

**Present:**

**- Voting members:** Erin Boas, 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, Barry Bram

**Absent:** Schönn Franklin (excused), Najee Rodriguez (excused)

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 8:04 AM*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (November 5, 2021)**

*Motioned to add complete Q&A to previous minutes, even those given after 11/5, to make the Q&A section complete. Seconded, no objections.*

*Edited minutes adopted: Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*Public Comment: Carter: Support of the equity fund. Students who are left out of the conversation and undermined by the University. Showing full support for the motion and students*

1. **Old Business**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion**
   1. **UPAC Presentation**

*Mike: The reason why the how is important. Impact it has on the student body and how the student fee dollars work at University Park. Shortest amount of time for students to see their student fee dollars working. General operational fund for office supplies, advertisement, etc. December 10, 2021, deadline for the UPAC organizational operational funds. UPAC cap is $5,000 per organization/per academic year. As long as it’s in line with the mission statement. Whether it comes it software or a tangible equipment. Two types of media, cap of 10,000 for more of the print and digital side of media. Can be utilized from a student organization publication for example. Same deadline being December 10, 2021. If an organization wants to start a podcast and needs the supplies, they can do so through UPAC broadcast media request. Programming is any event you host on campus. Deadline is 40 academic days before the start day of the experience. An academic day is not a business day (like a mental health day when you don’t have classes). Programs can utilize the honoraria cap (20,000 per academic year) but can be utilized amongst multiple individuals or one person if desired. No overall cap to program funding. Fosters community, fosters inclusivity here at University Park. Things like name tags, decorations, door prizes won’t be funded or are set at a lower cap by UPAC. Has to be open to all UP students and students have to be the lowest ticketed price. Greek life and club sports are not typically funded by UPAC because they get their funding elsewhere. If you are in an organization for travel you get $5,000 per academic year while an independent can get $500 per academic year. Travel can be domestic or international, however not this or last year due to travel. Students receive %75 of the funding of each expense. Example: If the ticket is $500, UPAC will fund $300. Maximum of $50 per night for lodging fee. Registration fees are capped at $100 per student.*

*Sean Terry: if your apart of the organization that gets $5000, can you independently apply for the $500?*

*Mike: Yes. We fund on per student transportation, per lodging, per registration. When it comes to the same event you can’t apply for individual funding in addition to the group funding. If they go with the intention to present their work, good example of an independent and organization request. Important to see how the Student Fee Board effort are showcased on a plasma level. If you have any questions please reach out to Alexa, our chair or me or visit the UPAC website.*

*Nora: Looking back at UPAC statement, curious about students opting out of paying the student fee. How can UPAC educate students on rhetoric of UPAC statement?*

*Mike: What are the consequence of violating the funding? Putting statements out online, maybe hosting a seminar for that clarity. When it comes to the community at large its difficult to engage with them. Maybe a workshop with the other team members.*

*Nora: See an event like this go on when UPAC funds it can be confusing. Help organizations understand the process not just the privileged organizations*

**b. Equity Fund Committee Discussion**

*Claire: Decision to defer to the committee about the initiative of the equity fund due to Najee’s absence.*

*Noah: I’m comfortable giving the presentation and coordinated with Najee.*

*Noah: The framework set the ground. We must be attuned to the needs to students who can develop the social and cultural capital necessary for success. Second paragraph is how we are references DEI: inclusion refers to the respectful treatment of all people with recognition […]. Dr. Marcus WHITEHURTS (VICE PROVOST FOR Education equity, idea that came up that student fee board could provide such funding for DEI-relation projects. Need for further support to fund projects. 4.5 million dollars are for DEI work across campus. Najee pitched a hypothetical equity fund, seeing if the fee board can help fund them. Presentation about the IPSA: hiring of two staff members to support indigenous programming and activities ACCESS CLUB & SDR: staff member to coordinating programming for students with disabilities and allies. Gender-neutral bathroom: student-led project in collaboration with OPP to place plaques outside binary-gender bathrooms. Outreach to broad list of people ranging from president of lion’s pantry to president of the black caucus. Considerations for a rubric- DEI focused planning assessments. Talk about DEI is for this specific proposal (highlighted embeddedness, communication, reasonableness, and assessment). Talking about the proposal’s language, how reasonable it is and focus on DEI objectives. We would want proposals to be student led and engage students. Wanted to prioritize alternate funding, doesn’t only pick up reoccurring projects. Questions and feedback.*

*Nora: Have you considered doing a checklist?*

*Noah: Good idea. Have these 4 different domains but something to consider. Also, framework to foster diversity has not been updated at Penn State since the 2010-2015. A lot of the language in this framework is in the new strategic plan. Matter of them have it separated out.*

*Latisha: Is wheelchair accessibility something the University should be doing rather than the Fee Board.*

*Noah: Funding doesn’t exist, considered different funding resources. The money doesn’t exist right now*

*Claire: Has DEI asked for increases. How is the budget spent right now? Is this information publicly available?*

*Noah: Operating budget but did not see any line items on the website. A lot of units have expressed interest in DEI work. Desire for seed money for those projects then budgeted in each office when the seed money runs out.*

*Nora: The ESF process has a student run initiative with 5 demands. Increase pressure put on admin if the student fee board gets involved. University should be investing but is there a way to leverage on UPI. Student support for equity related project so the university has an incentive to invest in the projects. 4.5 million is inadequate. Wheelchair accessibility should be funding by the university not by making the student fee board a pot.*

*Noah: In the case of the ESF, UPUA is trying to build from the student side.*

*Claire: I don’t think this can be done in isolation. The idea of seed funding, without collaboration, a project will die unless theirs extensive collaboration in advance. Know the possibilities for expansion and if they are open to the idea if they will give additional money or expansion in the budget because if not the student fee board will have to take it on. University should support these expenses.*

*Noah: Find ways to write into the rubric to increase university buy in for the projects. In the assessment domain, we are hoping that if a project is made in collaboration with the university, hope for buy in and have an office contribute funds in the long run. What happens when the 5 year ends? MOUs are a part of the equity fund, only an initial seed funding to try out new services.*

*Nora: Conversation last year, much better to have a sustained long-term investment. Better to increase a sustained investment opposed to a fund doing facilities projects. Allow for increase for matching investments and less anxiousness coming out of it. Environmental sustainability in comparison to overall sustainability can be resolved in the equity fund but worried it will be leverage to we have this instead of increasing investments with these organizations*

*Noah: Orientation programs. Don’t have the money for it. A way for the office to test the program and make us a part of the allocation in the future. Way to almost the funding right away and test it for the office.*

*Nora: Should we be funding any salary in the first place?*

*Noah: I don’t want the equity fund to fund 10 salary positions who are going to ask for more funding every 5 years. With meetings in administrators, they have a desire to bring these people in but can’t find the money to do so. Work in funding and buy out in the proposal, sift thru the projects with the greatest potential to be picked up by the university in the future*

*Nora: Move to state college with you family, in 3 years they could decide its over. Advocacy for increasing salary positions would be more effective in that the University picking it up. Standing allocation.*

*Noah: Need for new staff positions but the funding doesn’t exist. Could eventually be picked up if we can get the original funding to pick it up. Test the position.*

*Claire: standing allocation is an appropriate venue from a student fee request. Ongoing initiatives, ongoing programming. They can do new/more student fee requests. Show we have another avenue for long-term funding. They can go through the new fee request process. I would try to stay away from salary positions. Going to be hard to find support for new staffing. Might be a good idea to test out a position, in terms of logistics of support the person, it would be hard.*

*Barry: Working with other administrators to get more funding (in reference to CAPS) Working through student advocacy programs for that funding could be a good model to support that. It can anyone within the student government to secure long term commitment from the fee board.*

*Noah: How we wanted student engagement. The offices don’t have money to fund project entirely. Collaboration with OPP. Give students the power to develop a project with one of the offices. Work toward a more sustainable cost.*

*Nora: Considering what the structure should be. Student fee board and university should be investing in equity. Don’t want it to dissolve to university responsibility.*

**c. Facilities Deliberations Continuation**

*Claire: What is the goal contribution of the student fee board? (Answer) 4.75 minimal contribution to make that happen. Move OSMPR to Fisher.*

*Can other resource be made for grad students? Better access the needs of grad students. Would consider space in the HUB.*

*\*Natatorium: Sandy Barber: minimal revenues from NCAA swimming events.*

*\*Stone Valley Transportation would be a priority*

*Claire: 6 years ago Campus Rec promised not to raise their allocation. Mentioned that it was a potential misunderstanding but wasn’t what was said in the minutes. Facilities committee met last night but will visit it next meeting. Wants to focus on the prioritization of projects for today’s meeting.*

*Warren: Put together a quick model to what we can actually spend. Blue and yellow mean they are inputs, green pulled from somewhere else in model, black is the calculations. Control sheet will what we will mostly be working with. Portion of fee available to no facilities % growth sheet is the control. Want to keep it above 2%. Will be sent out for everyone for further examination.*

*Claire: There are some things we know. HUB expansion will need to be 100% financed the fee. With the Natatorium, we will supply a number amount rather than a percentage.*

*Noah: How can we utilize this in our conversations?*

*Warren: When we start coming to priorities, this is a check on what x,y,z of what the fee needs to do. Make the conversation easy and accessible without having to do all the math in the backend.*

*Claire: For necessity that the Natatorium is the administrations more urgent project. Fisher can’t happen without 4.75 from the fee board. The affinity group space can happen sooner at 10 million. General thoughts on a project that sticks out to you*

*Sean T: Inclusion of student fee dollars would be beneficial in \_\_\_\_\_ building.*

*Claire: With the Natatorium, it needs to happen and have support. As a member of the fee board, it would cost 20 million to build a recreational pool. Asked to contribute a third of 80 million for the Natatorium. Damen has mentioned 20 million as being a fair number given its falling into the ground*

*Jake: Making the contribution to the Natatorium relatively low. It needs to be renovated but holding larger meets would bring in larger revenue. Make a minimum contribution to the Natatorium. I think 20 million is reasonable because we can fund the pool but not everything that goes into it.*

*Xiaoru: If we can get an ideal amount of money, get it down in two or three years of funding would be ideal. After you can put more money into future projects*

*Latisha: Feasible idea. Support the idea of contributing to the Natatorium because it can service all students*

*Erin: Not ultilized by students because of its limited hours. Might see a shift with the longer hours and public access. With these new features and function there might be more students using it.*

*Megan: Focus group supported the idea because funding would go to other sports rather than football, hockey, etc.*

*Yidi: In our focus group, it was mentioned that a lot of swimmers don’t come to Penn State because of the pool. Personally support the Natatorium because it is helpful or students to train better*

*Xiaoru: Old swimming pool in the white building. Can use this space for the wellness building if the Natatorium is built. New indoor swimming pool.*

*Claire: Pool is in the part that would stay. 20 million contribution. About 6-7 million dollars less than what the fee board is being asked*

*Nora: Don’t think we should be funding 20 million. The university should be allocating more of the money toward the projects.*

*Fisher Hall*

*Claire: Need 4.75 million dollars to fund the project. Fisher Hall isn’t falling to the ground, but it isn’t the best space. Don’t feel we have the same pressure with Fisher Hall as we do with the Natatorium.*

*Latisha: None of focus group would use Fisher Hall. As a graduate student, have not been taken in consideration for most of the projects. If we had to choose 4 projects, I wouldn’t choose Fisher Hall*

*Sean T: Were going to move offices into Fisher Hall. Why make it a temporary band aid rather than make a long term space for these offices?*

*Nora: We should consider funding the 4.75. Likes the idea of taking a resident hall, renovating it for making it things like offices. In support of the 4.75 million*

*Claire: Small compared to the Natatorium but might affect our funding toward affinity spaces in quicker amount of time.*

*Jacob: Don’t think a renovation is necessary for it to be functional. Is it possibility to decrease our contribution to the Natatorium to get the university to allocate more funds.*

*Claire: Asked for 26.6 for the Natatorium, plan is already planned for 20 which would be hard to go lower from. Don’t know if there is another option. Its falling into the group, something needs to happen. Natatorium is how it student money should be funded but the dynamic with the project is different*

*Sean T: It doesn’t seem like the Natatorium was popular amongst the focus groups. It would be because people don’t use the space. Question us putting that much money in.*

*Noah: What happens in the case we don’t recommend that $20 million? Still offering money but not what was asked for.*

*Nora: All of these entities lacking office space. Providing office space at a non-substantial cost should remain on the table.*

*Claire: There is a different between student facing and non-student facing the dollar amount spent on that.*

*Erin: Fisher Hall wasn’t ideal in focus groups but not as important is they aren’t student facing. Location might be less of a factor.*

*Noah: I would rank the HUB expansion and wellbeing building toward the top and Fisher Hall lower on the list. I think it could be useful to have it in the middle of campus. Sounded like the project is a way to rearrange campus. It might have cascading effects that could be beneficial*

*Xiaoru: Fisher Hall isn’t ideal. We don’t have a final plan other than a few offices moving to Bouke. A lot of the offices are not student facing, the university should be more investing rather than the student fee board which is directed at student facing projects*

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

*L. Franklin: No report.*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: No report.*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: No report.*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: No report.*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*Nora: Email will be sent out next week.*

* 1. **Equity Fund**

*Najee: No report.*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: Talk with Damon next meeting from 9-10. Talk about facilities from 8-9. Presented to GPSA. Enthusiasm about the wellness building and Natatorium*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Alexa: Another affinity session on Monday. Damon Sims came in on Tuesday.*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*No report.*

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

*Meeting adjourned at 10:01 AM*