 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 03/19/22**

**Topic: Public Meeting/Deliberations**

**Present:**

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

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

**Absent:** Jake Snyder

**Agenda:**

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

*Meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m.*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motion was made to amend the agenda to add the vote on the hearing for the Student Poverty Unit New Fee Request. After further discussion, not enough detail was given for the vote and the agenda was reopened. The vote on the hearing for the Student Poverty Fee Request was removed from the agenda.*

*Motioned to adopt the agenda, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (March 18, 2022)**

*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. **Deliberations**

**ESF**

Nora: I am uncomfortable with this retroactive to start funding it in the middle.

Claire: Is that not funding the Lion’s Pantry at all

Nora: Yes. If there was a willingness to push the project, then funding the project would have been easier

Najee: If we start funding in July, I support funding it from there for renovations (July-September)

Nora: Would we just fund those two phases? I feel like the phases would’ve started which doesn’t go in hand with the fee board guidelines.

Claire: In UPAC guidelines, you can’t do anything without being approved.

Nora: I think that we kept asking, can you push that the project? They said no. If they were in a tough financial situation, I think they would move it to go along with our funding

Najee: OPP doesn’t work like that. The timeline is hard to change. Even if they are able to pay until June with their ASA, I am comfortable funding the rest of the project from July to September

Barry: They want to do it in the summer to not disrupt the pantry during the school year.

Claire: They should have come last year which would have no problems with timeline.

Najee: They have been fluctuating with leadership, so we don’t know exactly why it came this year.

Schonn: For materials invoicing, is that when they get the bill? Is our standard for eligibility, if they haven’t received the bill, we don’t retroactively pay?

Claire: Holding bills is unethical.

Sean: We are funding the ASA account as well (potentially), is there any way they can repropose what they need for this funding for regular expenses that the ASA would have? Could this proposal get changed for costs all after July? That way we don’t set any new precedent of the board. I think we should try to go on that path if we can.

Megan: Instead of having it under the ESF, it would be a new fee request.

Claire: It sounds like reimbursing retroactive.

Najee: There is bias in what I am pushing for, but there are benefits in future investment.

Nora: I was more comfortable with the ideal from going from ESF to the equity fund. We moved things around last year which is not explicitly against the rules

Najee: I think in the best interest of the board that the funding is approved. As far invoicing goes, I don’t know when that would have been delivered, but it could be beneficial. I think it is in our best interest to support what we can.

Latisha: The standing allocation is $100,000 is for years to come?

Claire: It is just for this year. One comment on the idea that you spent out of your ASA, but we want to replenish that to make it somewhat okay. I am uncomfortable with the precedent that set. We either vote on July and after or not fund them at all. We can talk about whether its ESF or Equity Fund.

Sean: If they don’t get the funding and they go ahead with the project, they are still going against it. What does that set our precedent with the Lion’s Pantry in the future?

Najee: Am I allowed to call for a general consensus for funding for July to September?

Megan: With UPAC if someone is requesting a trip and they want reimbursement for the hotel (even if they have to book the flight before the hotel), any action taken before is not okay?

Schonn: I think that we all agree to varying degrees that this is a project we should be involved in some extent. July- September is a happy medium.

Najee: This doesn’t happen again; we make that clear. July-September there are active things happening that aren’t’ retroactive. They have endowments from alumni and their ASA fund from donations. ESF has the potential to find the projects it wants to. I would be a healthy first pilot project.

Latisha: I think the ethics of this suck. But I say we don’t fund it.

Nora: I agree that we don’t fund it. If we do fund it, there needs to be a more formal process and how this infringes on the rules. It should be marked that there was a major exception made and the rationale should be documented.

Warren: I am in favor of funding the July-September and agree it should go to the equity fund.

Claire: I think saying this doesn’t happen again, makes it clear that this is ethically problematic. I don’t understand why making a major exception needs to be made. Even though the work is happening after the funds are available, we are screwing over UPAC in the future because contracts are signed.

Sean: What is the ethical concern of giving money after something is already booked?

Claire: Something needs our approval before they can send funds. It goes against our policy

Schonn: Are there areas that have not been agreed to at this point for the entire project? If we are able to fund what is already approved, it is still within our guidelines. It should be a conversation to either ben we fund July-September or not at all.

Najee: I retract my it doesn’t happen against statement. This should’ve been dealt with in some way before. There was a lot of miscommunications. For me, July-September there is active labor going on there, even if we give them $100,000, it wipes out their ASA if it’s not used for this project. This project allows for more space and a welcoming environment for students. This is food security, and this is their mission in supporting that. Any amount would help them and start them off with a healthy ASA balance. It should’ve been done before but it wasn’t. I agree with Nora on a detailed explanation on why it was done this way.

Noah: I am leaning toward not funding this with ESF or Equity Fund. We are assuming that their ASA funds need to be replenished from donations even though we give funs to their ASA. We know the project is going to be caried out either way. Even though the costs are occurring after July, they committed to these costs in March.

Nora: I do think this doesn’t align with the handbook. We are breaking the rules for this student need if we go forward with funding. Setting this precedent allows for overuse of the fee board in the future. It can allow for exploitation in future fee boards. Mary knows how the fee board and she has ignored that in the past with the HUB renovations.

Schonn: Are they using funding for this year for this project? They are not solely relying on our replenishment of ASA. Does it wipe out their funds for this year? With that I don’t think we should fund it at all if they have the ASA funds. Are we going to fund it and find a way to break the rules? Can we do an informal vote after we exhaust the list?

Claire: They have the ASA funds already which does not include the $100,000. Our options are breaking rules or not is a big part of the discussion.

Nora: If the majority thinks they are not breaking the rules, I think they should still acknowledge that rules are being broken.

Alexa: In terms of this not effecting UPAC, any precedent that the fee board sets, UPAC has to follow so it doesn’t affect us.

Tony: The Lion’s Pantry has its merit. Funding it leaves a large loophole in our processes. That leaves too much extra effects to clarify our choice. If we fund from July-September, we have to write. A large exception in our actual funding documents. We can put a note in the standing allocation for the next fee board.

Najee: With this exception the ambiguity makes it difficult on our it reflects on other organizations or even this one in the future. It leaves their AS funds with $63,000 plus the $100,000 we give A healthy split for the July-September is what I was going for. The more money they have in their ASA could be used for something else important.

Megan: In the new fee request they save $65,000 for food a year. We are giving $100,000 which is an excess for %35,000 for food a year

Erin: Are we leaving them if we don’t fund it? Just working with the Lion’s Pantry this year, especially with Covid, students are using the pantry much more. Even though they spend $150,000 on food supply, they stated that it’s not sufficient moving forward with an increased need. They want more health options in refrigerators. It’s not enough money to leave in their account to fulfill that. If we do fund July-September, we need to be concise and exploit in our vote on why we did this and that this shouldn’t be set as a precedent moving forward. I believe as a group that is supposed to be making decisions based on student’s needs, this is one of the highest students needs especially coming out of the pandemic.

Warren: I think before I was aligned with what Erin just said. I find it difficult to deny this request based on principle. What Alexa said is important about implications on UPAC and other bodies. For me I am much more in favor of not funding it at this point.

Yidi: I do believe it is essential for students. Considering other projects, it is hard to make the right decisions in the future. It will happen either way and we need to have a consideration of the changes on UPAC. My opinion leans toward no funding at this time.

Claire: I want to clarify; the governing docs have real ramifications and future impacts.

Megan: I don’t support funding it under the ESF. They budget for $65,000 and they are requesting $100,000 (without what’s in the ASA account) after the pandemic.

Najee: I don’t think it would cost a shortage; I think it would cause a shortage in what the Lion’s Pantry is able to do. If they did it before it was approved, I see the implications of that. I am going to vote yes for July-September. I understand the issue of approved the OPP contract before the fee board. They had to because they wouldn’t be able to evolve without this project. It allows them to expand and grow. I don’t think the spillover will be too changing in us s discussing a university contract.

Claire: It might make sense when we come back to the vote, we need to tin k carefully about the order of voting and putting people in a comfortable place

Schonn: Maybe we could do an informal vote to see where we stand.

Noah: I would be in support of the second project. If there was a way to combine the projects under ESF, that would be preferable to me.

Claire: Where are people as on scenario two of ESF? I am comfortable with scenario two and both of these projects have a lot of merit

Megan: I would love to hear more thoughts on the EcoActions project

Latisha: I think it is a very white centered project and I would like to see more diversity

Nora: I think that everyone being white is a larger structural issue within these projects. The fee board could do a better job at looking at groups with greater diversity. There seems to be a lack of interest and lack of participation. I think those concerns have merit

Megan: If we voted for, would you want to ask for more diversity within the projects?

Latisha: I am in favor of the projects but in the justification letter, I would ask for more diversity.

Sean: I think this is a great project. I think maybe a lack of that right now that the club isn’t very well-known, but it is always important to emphasize diversity

Claire: We want to strongly encourage other funding sources like donations.

Nora: This piece of the project is essential to seek donors.

**UHS**

Alexa: They are asking for funding for STI testing (500 tests in the fall and 500 tests in the spring) Each test is 42 and they want 10,000 total tests fo a total cost of $420,000. This helps mitigate the cost and spread of the disease. As of February, students have used 374 tests. I recommend full funding.

Claire: Our proposal is for gonorrhea and chlamydia.

Sean: It didn’t look that utilization was at full capacity and now they are asking for more.

Claire: Future boards can increase it but I would like to get this from a pilot to a standing, but they were open to another pilot year.

Nora: I’m in support of another year of pilot. Cost sharing and external grants should be emphasized to UHS.

Claire: I think it is a little more than 2021 but not substantially more which was 3,135 tests

Latisha: They are projecting for the entire year that there would be 10,000 tests but this year they have had 3,300 tests so far.

Sean: If you decrease it to 7,500 tests, it frees up $100,000. We can offer by doubling the number of tests without going into excess. 75% of where they are at right now.

Erin: I think that is a good compromise. In the last 2-3 years, in the pilot program has been a part of Covid where students weren’t in as much contact with one another. Prior to the program there being 5400 tests, people might be more willing to get tested now. I would be concerned that we would be meeting the need they might have in the next year.

Claire: Having another pilot year would be ideal. But 7500 tests could be a good use of the pilot before going to 10,000. The fee board needs to interrogate that number again, but UHS agreed to another pilot year.

**Lion’s Pantry**

Claire: I noted that they had matching funding from the university. This was formally funded by ASA but is okay because it’s not a university fund. One of the big things to talk about is the food and supplies expenses for $100,000

Sean: can they use this money toward construction if they wanted to?

Claire: These things cannot but they can use their ASA balance and donations toward construction.

Megan: Personally, I think that I really like if their food and supply purchases go up. some sort of language about reevaluating it if that number goes up

Claire: A way of doing that is making it a pilot account.

Latisha: I agree with making the food and service purchase a pilot amount. (general support)

Noah: Can you explain more about the annual endowment group?

Barry: I believe endowment is something people can keep giving to help expand the pantry.

Noah: I think we will see less food waste and see more saved money on that end.

Sean: From personal experience, I had to throw perishables out, so I think refrigerators more valuable.

Barry: They have volunteers at the pantry.

Claire: I would like to flag that although the communications intern as funded by ASA, I would like to acknowledge it by the fee board. The Lion’s Pantry does a good job of holding paycheck donations automatically. I think encouraging them to pursue donations would help our emphasis known that we support that effort.

**OGEEP**

Claire: They are requesting $181,807,92. They are adding two more positions. We should talk about their ask for their ask for the maximum salary band, the out-of-class experience, and the two experience.

Yidi: It is not open to international students

Alexa: Looking at the bullet points about the manager position, seem to be focused on academics.

Claire: We need to talk about if this impacts the out of class experience.

Tony: If everyone is not included, that is a big problem which would make be uncomfortable funding this.

Latisha: They have strictions that you can’t put down an international student as receiving these funds but it doesn’t ask a student where they are from

Sean: Could we say that we hope there is an added emphasize on international students?

Latisha: Having a program specifically for professional development would be super helpful

Yidi: I feel like we are funding the manager salary, I would like to see what they could improve on the international student status.

Schonn: The money was airmarked to domestic students previously. This funding would give them the bandwidth with international students and more out of class experiences. I think we should fund it.

Latisha: Can you expand what out of class examples are (that aren’t academic)?

Barry: Funding research opportunities for any student has been within the fee board and UPAC for years

Schonn: Expanding the reach of OGEEP expands what the university is trying to do is assist underrepresented groups. We are trying to solve a problem which is not enough out of class experiences and professional development opportunities for graduate students. I didn’t think about international students, but it makes a lot of sense. They have to come back and show us how they have expanded out of class experiences.

Claire: We never funded career services or anything like that.

Nora: I see career services being parallel to this project

Schonn: Sitting governments, we do professional development funded by student fee board. There is a lane where they can get funding.

Erin: Test prep distribution every year is direct graduate involvement

Sean: A lot of the things you can do can add to one’s professional development.

Claire: Do people think grad school prep is out of class

Sean: It is heavily tied to what you do in class, but it’s not directly tied to it because there are non-academic things that are outside of the academic/classroom standards

Erin: Academic is pertaining to your major and minor degrees. Out of the classroom is not exactly pertaining to your major or degree

Alexa: In the handbook is it a non-credit bearing experience.

Claire: Would you be open to funding career services if they came in?

Sean: Yes, in a pilot program

Noah: Some of the manager position deals with both out of class and academic experiences

Claire: We should talk about recruitment. In the handbook says that the fee board can’t accept recruitment efforts. Which is difficult when a portion of the position is recruitment efforts

Schonn: It seems like it is not an overall goal so I would be in favor of supporting it. If there is a recruitment tool, it is not within our handbook.

Sean: Can we ask OGEEP if that is a vital aspect of the manager?

Barry: You can look at how Stephanie plans to write this job (it’s percentages)

Latisha: Do we have the option to partially fund to the aspects that fit the fee board handbook?

Claire: I could ask for the GRW.

Schonn: I agree that this is in the weeds. We need to make it clearer that we don’t fund recruitment. If we decide to fund, we can confirm that we can bar you from doing recruitment.

Noah: On partial funding, maybe we can do the midpoint of the salary which saves around the midpoint of $45,000.

Sean: If the position is a majority of working on that, then is there really a reason to fund this position?

Erin: It would be good to know what is being passed over to this person and the different tasks that they will have

Claire: I think another thing to talk about that filling university expenses. These are new programs with the new SDR position while these are some existing projects too

Latisha: If we can’t fund recruitment things, that kind of rules out the conversation about the open house. In terms of the salary, I think it would be important to see who they are targeting.

Warren: I think we are dealing with a stack of compliance issues and combining them is hard to justify funding

Schonn: I think we know what the rule is, and I don’t think we should reach out to them other than the breakdown of the position. For the annual stim open house, it is already running through a person in the office. They would assist who already is doing it. We need to have a discussion about the merits of everything else

Sean: Personally, we would be putting $91,000 toward a person who (if we take this element away) only has three things to work on.

Claire: Can I propose we get an updated GRW and then we can have a more informed conversation on another day of deliberations. I have mixed feels about the administrative support assistant position.

Erin: I think the second point of the job responsibility, I think that is very student facing. I see it as a really important for the office

Schonn: I agree. I think that there is nothing in the handbook that says everything we fund has to be completely student facing. I would recommend funding it but next year we off the expense if there is concern

Latisha: From my experiences, none of it is credit related.

Megan: I feel conflicted on the whole proposal. Maybe my issue is the definition of in-class versus out-of-class. I don’t know if I see enough distinction to support

Schonn: If there is concern, could OGEEP request two interns (one grad, one undergrad)

Claire: I don’t know given our timeline.

Barry: We can always go back on their proposals, but the key issue is timing

Claire: We should talk about the rate.

Schonn: I support the midpoint. If we fund it, they have to come back next year and justify the increase

Barry: Other than GSI, the fee board can’t give a raise

Claire: If we hire them lower, can we hire them on something else? The answer is no unless they come back with a different proposal. We have a hiring point for these positions.

Latisha: Where do negotiations play in? The office would like to have people in higher education in the office.

Barry: You can through human resources to negotiate. It might have happened in the past. Sometimes the university will pick up the difference.

Schonn: With the office wanting someone with a higher degree, can we work within the midpoint and the request? How does $75,000 sound?

Claire: It is all up for discussion.

Erin: I agree. My thought process for the first position depends on how much of the position is recruitment.

Claire: The position can’t do things that we can’t fund. I would like to get a consensus on the funding level.

Yidi: Do we fund the midpoint this year, can they request a higher salary next year?

Claire: You can get small GSI increases over time.

Latisha: What happens if the university says no to extra money?

Barry: It comes back to the fee

(general liking of $75,000)

Latisha: Can we inquire that one be a student roll?

Claire: Yes. We are going to ask about interns

Schonn: Would it be cheaper to have a graduate assistantship?

Barry: Sometimes it’s not much difference. Sometimes it’s better to get a full time staff.

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: I need to know your conflict of interests as soon as possible. Next meeting is Monday 4-5 and Friday 8-10.*

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

*Alexa: No report*

1. **Communications Intern Report**

*Kate: No report.*

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

*Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m*