 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 03/18/22**

**Topic: Public Meeting/Deliberations**

**Present:**

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

**- Nonvoting members:** Yidi Wang, Alexa Clayton, Barry Bram, Jolinda Wilson,

**Absent:**

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 8:02 a.m.*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (March 14, 2022)**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

Zion: This is an extremely important issue. We have done a lot of work with administration about how to go about how poverty is seen in this Penn State community. I have experienced poverty and I don’t think anyone else should have to deal with especially at a university like this. This is not only a problem at this unversity but others and worldwide.

Emily: I am president of Lion’s Pantry. I am on the student advisory board for student poverty. There are a lot of resources but not enough comfort around using them. We have a great platform and responsibility to be proactive about it.

Morgan: I pledged to be a member of the student advisory board for student poverty. We have enacted initiative to help students in poverty and other universities. With our recommendations, students will be able to focus more on their education. We want future students to also get the support they need.

Anton: I am here to echo what everyone has said so far in urging the SFB to take action with student poverty. Putting the initiative to help fellow students is paramount.

Janiyah: I urge to support the work that has been done and urge you to continue to support the world of student poverty.

1. **Old Business:**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

1. **Topics of Discussion:**
   1. **Deliberations**

C. Kelling: Start with Facilities discussion, then go into standing allocations later.

**Student Poverty Pilot Program**

Claire: We heard about this around the new fee request deadline but provided an extension. We are considering this on a short timeline. It goes to the new fee request committee then to the board to be voted on. We want to be on the same page if we want them to have a hearing. Our terms this year ends on April 1 which I wouldn’t consider to be flexible. I want to focus on basic eligibility and if we grant a hearing.

Najee: Prioritizing of student input has only been put first. Deliberation every week and subcommittee meetings. This office is to better students’ lives in every realm. This unit can help cut down costs, seek regular assistance, have someone there with you from start to finish, and can provide programming for students. Relied heavily on data that President Barron assembled, and we held a student focus group. Our hope with the lateness, that is done to the best extent it could be. We want an ultimately greater payoff. I think this is a great look into the future of what Penn State could be.

Erin: I want to expand on the level of student involvement within this specific proposal. These 15 students look so much hard work, had willingly to reach out and partake in focus groups. While the recommendations have been sent for review, they still are in that review process. This will art least be considered in the grand scheme. Students are facing a lot of financial issues especially during the pandemic. I think having this consideration this year would speak to the mission of the fee board.

Nora: Because it has been in the works for 8 months, how long has the idea of being a part of the SFB taken place? And are there other sources of funding?

Erin: We tried to get it in within the deadline. The project moved along quicker than anticipated. We were prepared in December but wanted the recommendations first. Those recommendations were finalized at the end of February. About cost sharing: there have been verbal commitments because the recommendation has been finalized. The vice president said he would secure some funds as well. We don’t have specific dollar amounts of funding but student affairs has asked for a minimum of $80,000 from the fee board.

Claire: If the new fee request approves it and the vote will be pretty quick within the SFB tomorrow.

Latisha: I think the proposal is solid. What difference would it make being on this cycle vs. next years cycle?

Najee: The ultimate idea for it to be in this cycle, with the transition of the president, this has solid institutional commitment from Barron and people of the president’s council. A new president would impede this into future years. We want to keep the momentum so we can use the familiarization of the budget.

Erin: We wish the university had this years and years ago. The need has always been there especially with the pandemic. I think delaying it a year would be consequential.

Nora: Is the $80,000 a pilot?

Erin: Even having the board commitment to the $80,000 of a pilot for the next 2 or 3 years we hope it would become a standing allocation.

Noah: On the question of the timeline, we are still having a turnover. Would you expect a delay in implementation?

Najee: They were ready to move on this last month in terms of implementation. This will probably be propped up quickly.

Erin: We made sure to send it over the president and his committee before the new president comes in. If we are able to put it in right now as is, there can be implantation this semester even.

Yidi: Is the $80,000 only for this year or a couple years? What will the cost be over the next few years?

Najee: It would be this year for the initial pilot. We don’t know if the pilot funding will need to continue. We know the $80,000 is necessary for this year. The entire budget is over $300,000 (tentative budget)

Nora: Why was there such a delay coming to the SFB? I wish the board would’ve been notified earlier.

Najee: Students themselves can only do so much. Our priority was to have the primary recommendation solidified. We were told it was best to hold off. We didn’t know the exact nature of what to expect from the student fee board. There is now a sponsor, and it is ultimately green lit to move forward pending the vote of the SFB. It’s hard to communication with administration sometimes

Claire: if this is not fee board funded, will it be able to move forward?

Erin: Without the finalized report back after recommendations, the conversation this week said there needs to have some kind of funding from the fee board. With the current staffing, we proposed it dependent on fee board contributions. We had to shorten down what we originally wanted. I don’t think its possible without contributions from the fee board.

Najee: This is on the direction we would’ve gone as just students, but we have to follow what the administration says. This is why we are advocating from the student perspective.

Schonn: For the $80,000 that is not specifically allocated to one line up?

Claire: Yes, but potentially not unless the budget is approved. Both timeline and basic eligibility need hearing. We will need to meet again if we want to discuss this in full. We could meet the week before April 1st. I don’t think we can delay the fee recommendation. This proposal is going to take a long time to consider. We need to talk about the actual merit of the proposal, so I don’t think we have time this year to consider funding. I have concerns over basic eligibility. I hope the fee board understands that this may vary from student group recommendations. There are no line items being asked for. I am concerned for the support of the out of class experience. There are profound concerns and I don’t know if we can get it done.

Warren: If we approve it, who would be proposing?

Claire: Natasha?

Schonn: I am concerned about the timeline but not he basic eligibility. Personally, I am fine with finding a time to meet and maybe extending some of the meetings we are already having.

Najee: The point of the SFB in terms of funding something like this was to boost student control. I think this was very consistent and I would hate to see a hesitance for consideration from administration matters outside of our control. This impacts basic well-being in every facet especially in the out of class experience.

Claire: There needs to be a vote today by the new fee request committee. There won’t be a lot of time to have polling. Is anyone not available to have a longer meeting tomorrow? (no objections)

**Student Farm**

Nora: I think they said they wouldn’t get funding from HFS, but I pushed for the Student Farm to have this as a prerequisite.

Barry: The student farm is getting funding from HFS for a different job and that may be why they are hesitant to ask for more.

Schonn: If we grant it can we propose they can get funding from other places as well?

Claire; We need to decide if we want to fund the extra 25% or not. There are soft funds that can cover this for context.

Warren: There is no solid barrier from this 25% to the other.

Claire: They aren’t honoring a relationship with the SFB after abandoning this position and getting funding for another position from HFS

Schonn: If HFS says no, they are back at square one. I would like to see that position funded but as a criterion for next year, we want to review whether or not you went to other sources.

Najee: I support what Schonn said

Tony: We can fund it this year, but we leave a note for the next fee board for them to seek external funding to cover this position.

Claire: There is one possibility of funding his year and not next year or another possibility of finding more funding with HFS.

Schonn: Does HFS have the funding for the additional allocation to the student farm?

Nora: (going to ask) With the other position they are asking, it is aligned with what HFS typically funds and this one is not. HFS doesn’t have a track record that doesn’t exactly align with their processes. Student requests are supposed to be student led. The initial recommendation wasn’t talked about through the farm (regarding cost sharing).

Warren: If the ask is we eventually fund this position, I would like to see them come back with a clearer presentation (next year)

**Center for Performing Arts**

Sean T: I decided they should have flat funding and not accept heir request. Their utilization is not where it needs to be to merit this request. There is more work that can be done before there is an increase in funding matters.

Claire: They were proposing a reallocation

Warren and Najee: I agree with Sean

Sean: Maybe we could put in a note and try to get it as close to $0 as possible. Why can’t the CPA pay for a student ticket?

Claire: They talked about special events for Broadway shows which is a possibility with ticket subsidy. We can’t pay off student tickets. We want to keep the leaves where they are now and getting the ticket prices to be as close to $0 as possible.

**Gender Equity Center**

Erin: They are doubling their previous allocation. After working with them and hearing their proposal I think their increase is justified. There are 3 staff members and 1 graduate assistant. It is incredible the work they can do with the staff they have. They are limited on what they are able to do with the number of staff they have. There is a lot of potential to fulfill campus need. One is that could use discussion is marketing materials with a 150% increase. It is important we dedicate some money to staff but with marketing specifically, it has a little bit more of an outreach at a lower cost. I think the large increase is justified.

Schonn: I think a stronger equity center will make Penn State stronger.

Latisha: I also support the increase

Erin: Can we expanded the conversation around marketing materials? Any recommendations? I can ask what plans they have with the marketing materials. I don’t have concerns that they would fully utilize it.

Claire: They do line item? (condoms, pens, notebooks, etc.)

Nora: I am supportive of the marketing increase. It is hard to each the people who assault people. Increase marketing materials would directly address that phenomenon they face

Yidi: In the past several years, they didn’t spend all of the money for marketing materials. I would be comfortable having the flat funding they had in the past.

Erin: I would like to see the full request

Warren: I would like to talk about the speaker/honoraria, and I think there is better was to spend the funding. I would like to see discussion around flat funding in the years to come

Schonn: I don’t know if the honoraria is necessary. I trust them to use it effectively if they have used all their funding in the past.

Erin: They want to get some more recognizable speakers which costs more. I have full confidence if we give them the funding, they have multiple plans on how to use it.

Nora: I think DENI staff can’t critique the institution, the staff in the center can draw closer to what sexual violence is. I think it is important to bring in more national speakers for students. They can’t do system-based critiques by themselves.

Erin: They don’t have a lot of office space but in the future, they want an increase in office space weather it comes to the SFB or other sources.

**BJC**

Schonn: I recommended flat funding. They have a history of spending the money. This year for the first time in 3 years, they anticipate using all of their allocation. They plan to bring back events and diversify the talent who comes here.

Najee: I think it’s pretty cut and dry. I know a lot of students use the BJC.

Claire: They have not been successful in creating an advisory board and we would like to see that

Latisha: I remember how an attempt was made but it didn’t work out. In the past, has the fee board provided specific things they could do?

Claire: They reached out twice, months apart and didn’t get a good response. They did provide recommendations for the advisory board.

**\***I made slides for the new fee requests. I only put discussion points other than UHS

**ESF**

Jake: The first proposal is student farm for the final design phase for the engagement space. It allows them to have an office to seek donor funding, give them a permanent space, etc. Another project is Lion’s Pantry to bring aspects of the facility to PSU building standards and having more security measures. Another project is the Creamery’s pilot program to switch to compostable materials. Finally, there is Eco Action to replace high maintenance landscapes with low input ones and provide environmental and student benefits.

Noah: The committee met to prioritize projects. One was the Phase 1 Eco Action implementation plan and project 2 is lion’s pantry renovations. An alternative project was the student farm space. SFB could give designating funding to the Lion’s Pantry space. ESF for the project 1 is requesting $75,000. There are environmental benefits such as decreasing heat island effects and gives students more outdoor space. We also have a recommendation $165,855 to the phase 2 of Lion’s Pantry renovations which contributes to all facets of sustainability and promote multiple SDGs and is a student-driven project proposal. They say the project can’t be delayed for this project. In the case we don’t fund the Lion’s Pantry, we would recommend funding the design for a sustainable multi-use engagement space for $200,000 which includes an outdoor kitchen, meeting space, solar power and decreasing food miles.

Nora: I put together a list of what is successful and what is not for the ESF committee in the future to get them started. We need to update a list of community contacts. We did a good job of reaching out, but we need more community context especially with students. One of the things that worked well, there is a section to elaborate on project weaknesses.

Warren: How much do we have to spend and talk more about the timeline issues with the Lion’s Pantry?

Claire: There is an annual commitment of $250,000 and what isn’t spent goes into a reserve. We have $80,000 from last year on top of the $250,000. This is not in agreement with the fee board timeline. People can start spending in July. There is talk about holding the bills. We should talk about how it has started before the SFB recommendation has been approved.

Alexa; Are they taking funding out of their ASA account?

Claire: Yes, which is financed through donations.

Najee: I think they are really good projects. This is a good year for student involvement with ESF. I like scenario 2 and there has been tentative discussion. Even if we disperse money in October, I do see some validation in funding Lion’s Pantry regardless.

Claire: Do we want to vote on the equity fund or ESF fund first

Warren: I think my vote would be for the second scenario. There are significant issues with funding the Lion’s Pantry after it has already begun. I think it’s just a bad idea on their behalf if they don’t get approved for funding. I don’t think it fits for us.

Claire: This project is happening either way from their ASA account. In moving forward, it would be helpful to get more clarity about the Lion’s Pantry for either the equity fund or ESF.

Najee: I think it’s very fair to go with scenario 2. All of these projects should be funded either way. The Lion’s Pantry would be a good initiative to begin with for the equity fund. I think they should be funded 100%. Students depend on this pantry. If they are going to take it from their ASA, I say go for it for the SFB.

Schonn: Can we grant them partial? Lion’s Pantry gives a lot to those who need it. I would like for us to be at least partially involved in this allocation.

Claire. Yes.

Najee: I don’t want them to use their ASA even for half. I don’t think they have enough in their ASA to procure more food, its capacity and holding food. Going back to what Barry said, even if the money is dispersed in October, it’s not binding.

Latisha: With the two scenarios, would that mean we aren’t funding the Creamery? We are focusing on these 3 projects? In terms of the Lion’s Pantry, to be in align with our guidelines, I agree with what Schonn said, that whatever funds are needed after July 1st should be our partial funding.

Claire: The ESF recommendation doesn’t include the Creamery in any way. Lion’s Pantry won’t be running on empty

Najee: I really don’t think it matters. If they need it, we should be able to give it to them if they are within the board’s approval process.

Schonn: I don’t think they should be using funding for food on renovations. There are other avenues to raise funds.

Alexa: We can’t fund retroactive expenses. By the time money is available, we can’t cover the April and May expenses.

Warren: I think the grant after July is complicated which leaves us between being able to fund the engagement space or not. Would people want to give a smaller amount to the student engagement space?

Najee: Is that putting in the equity fund idea too?

Claire: No.

Latisha: Eco Action, that is a student club with the advisor from OPP? I think the implementation of the project didn’t seem to come from a diverse place.

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

*L. Franklin: No report*

* 1. **Environmental Sustainability**

*N. Van Horn: No report*

* 1. **Standardization**

*S. Franklin: No update*

* 1. **Communication**

*N. Robertson: No update*

* 1. **Zero-Waste**

*Nora: No report*

* 1. **Equity Fund**

*Najee: No report*

1. **Chair Report**

*C. Kelling: We are going to move onto the rest of the deliberations. I would like each committee to take notes on what they accomplished this year and what they would like next year’s committee to work on. Only the 6 standing committees need to do this report by April 1st. Applications are open. It will be on our social media later today. It is important to get people with many different and diverse experiences. Reminder, please let me know if you have any edits. We are in 229 HUB tomorrow. Monday 4-5 and next Friday from 8-10 in 102 HUB.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Alexa: 92 requests in house and handful in summer allocation requests.*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*Kate: No report.*

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

*Schonn: Adding a standing governance or internal development committee.*

1. **Closing Roll Call**

*Meeting adjourned at 10:02 a.m*