 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 03/27/22**

**Topic: Public Meeting/Deliberations**

**Unit Allocation Votes**

**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 12:06 p.m.*

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

*Motioned, seconded, no objections.*

1. **Public Comment**

*Claire: I want to make a pitch to you all as a fellow student. Can we please not leave the humanity out of this? I would be worried if we agree on everything and if students didn’t come to our process. That would mean we weren’t doing our job and that we or they weren’t paying attention. But please remember the humanity of everyone else in this room. Everyone in this room wants to do the best but we just don’t agree on how to do that all the time. Owning up to being wrong is a powerful skill. Moving forward, I hope we can take a thorough approach to our process. Emotion plays a role in all of this. But please just don’t forget basic human decency to each other. I know that not everyone likes everyone in this room. I hope we do the best to apologize when needed. We have a common goal for doing better for students and I hope we focus on that.*

1. **Old Business:**

*No old business.*

1. **New Business**

*No new business.*

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

*Claire: We are talking about what the facilities concepts are. The feasibility student is a part of the wellbeing building. I would like to get more firm on the Natatorium and Fischer Hall and talk about the level of funding for facilities.*

*Schonn: I don’t support funding for the natatorium or Fischer Hall this year.*

*Noah: I agree with Schonn*

*Latisha: I do not think we should fund the natatorium or Fischer Hall.*

*Claire: The original budget for the wellbeing building is $200 million. We can’t afford a $200 million building. We can’t make a commitment other than the feasibility study*

*Schonn: We are discussing the $350 thousand for the feasibility study? Would it be a good idea to set the next student fee board up with options?*

*Claire: We don’t know if the wellbeing building can even happen. If the wellbeing building is possible, the $350 thousand for two feasibility studies is a waste*

*Warren: We would be throwing away $350 thousand but I am in support of a feasibility study. The impact has over the next 30 years, it really needs to be compared with what those dollars can do.*

*Schonn: we are setting up the next student fee board to make a decision. Attempt to give them more than one option. If there is hesitancy toward the wellbeing building, I don’t think it’s necessary*

*Nora: I would be in support of not funding the study*

*Latisha: Is this where our money should go?*

*Nora: I am not in favor of funding the wellbeing building. I don’t think its going to bring much tangible benefit. I am in support of keeping the fee low and finding another way to support wellbeing*

*Claire: SDR is now incorporated. It’s funded from the reserve*

*Tony: If we don’t fund the wellbeing building, is the same $150 million or so feasible for the HUB expansion?*

*Claire: I don’t know*

*Schonn: With the HUB expansion, you get spaces for DEI and student organizations. With the wellbeing building we are expanding what we already have. If we centralize CAPS, it could create a larger stigma about getting help. I don’t think we should fund this.*

*Sean: Is the university using this as a showcase for themselves? This can be said for any of the facilities projects on this list. There is no reason why CAPS can’t keep their off-campus offices*

*Claire: Damon has made it clear he wants to reduce paying for spaces. We have input in whatever it decided for sure*

*Nora: I’m thinking in terms of the increase. Increasing services, funding and staffing has more of a benefit to students even if it’s not as shiny*

*Latisha: is there money left over?*

*Claire: There is. It goes into the reserve. The next fee boards cannot commit to projects of this size if we decrease facilities*

*Erin: it’s not the physical look of the building but the services that would be inside it. They are spread out over so many locations. They cant really centralize. We should be priiotzing the standing allocations but even with these physical locations, we are doing them justice if they don’t have the spaces and staffing*

*Schonn: CAPS is struggling. I think the university has two buckets of issues: how do we expand and how to we address it. How can we make sure we focus on what we neglected to? I don’t think have a central location could create a stigma which could lead to a decrease in utilization*

*Warren: My concern comes with the $200 million which is right on the edge of what we can afford. We would have to increase the fee. $100 million instead of $150 million opens more money to fund projects in the future*

*Claire: I am not sure anymore on whether the Board is leaning towards the HUB Expansion or the Wellbeing Building. Do we want to do an informal poll?*

*Najee: I agree with funding the feasibility study. The wellbeing building does have merit. Do you have more insight into the master plan?*

*Claire: There is a plan for what they will fund over the next 5 years from central funding. That does include some student affairs units but not many. Student Affairs relies on the student fee.*

*Najee: Bouke won’t get a major renovation over the next 5 years*

*Claire: It is a $20 million project but this may just mostly be limited to HVAC*

*Warren: If we commit to the wellbeing building, the board won’t be able to commit for to other projects for 20 years.*

*Claire: That is the place the fee has been until recently. We have had a luxury of extra funds the last couple of years. If future boards want to fund additional projects, could be from returns to the fee or fee increase.*

*Schonn: My proposal is to: hands up if you prefer the wellbeing building over the hub expansion? If you want to long-term fund the wellbeing building through the student fee? If we fund some of these facilities projects now, future fees will not be able to fund major projects.*

*Claire: Do we want to give capacity to future fee boards?*

*Erin: Do want to do a feasibility study on both?*

*Latisha: The next concern with committing to the wellbeing building, is committing for the next 20+ years. Are we deciding on is as a fee board in the future, should we ever take on projects that large?*

*Claire: We can say, yep go for it with the smaller ones. We have never done this full facility process before. Previous fee board we were paying off debt, in the last couple years we have been struggling with these decisions. Central funding is not going to fund the bigger buildings. They can only get funding from the student fee.*

*Schonn: We are done with the HUB? Are we done paying it off this year? I think we are set on the feasibility studies for both.*

*Noah: I would also support doing both. Would it be an option to get cost sharing on the feasibility studies? I support the feasibility studies in addition to all the smaller projects*

*Claire: They think this is a fee board responsibility because it’s a part of the funding for the building.*

*Schonn: Could we consider contributing to the reserve fund?*

*Claire: we either are funding the reserve or the building*

*Nora: If there is debt and we put money in the reserve, does that lessen the time we pay off the debt,*

*Noah: Everything seems like it costs more right now. The cost overall might go down over time.*

*Warren: Unfortunately, probably not.*

*Meghan: I am a bit concerned about time. I am in favor of the feasibility studies. But we should leave it to the next fee board*

*Sean: I don’t think the studies should be on the student dime. It doesn’t make sense to me to fund them if we may not even fund either of the projects. If we are concerned about spending and lowering the fee, I think it’s unfair it’s on the student’s dime to have to be able to do that.*

*Claire: We cannot have interest on any fee board money, even the reserve.*

*Najee: I think the studies are fair and unbiased. I think it’s important we highlight the key points we talked about today for future student fees. The studies give a fair and equal chance of more knowledge which will help maximize the out of class experience for students*

*Warren: Is the feasibility study a thing? Are we giving them a $350 thousand check?*

*Noah: I’m curious why we didn’t start with the idea of the feasibility studies?*

*Claire: They are the first step no matter what. We have also done more research. It seems like folks are supportive of the two feasibility studies. Which do you want first?*

*Schonn: I support the HUB over the wellbeing building. I thought they hired a firm, and I am curious to see if that’s possible for it not to be the case*

*Claire: I can imagine a feasibility study is based on time. I don’t think it’s just a yes or no. If they see very early on that’s it’s a $250 million project, they might just stop instead of going into more detail. They should be able to tell if we are massively out of reach or not.*

*Schonn: I am pretty sure we are asking for a consultation on a number*

*Warren: If they start the early stages of it, I don’t want them looking into the plumbing and electrical lines. I think it’s important to ask*

*Sean: Did they fund their own feasibility study for those?*

*Claire: They don’t have to do the study because they know it’s feasible*

*Noah: Was is possible to fund the smaller projects?*

*Claire: Yes but they change the capacity for the wellness building. We seem pretty firm against the natatorium and Fischer Hall*

*Noah: I would be in favor of funding a partial amount to the natatorium.*

*Sean: I don’t think this should be on us or out of the student’s pocket*

*Schonn: I see why they want us to fund the study because it’s a part of the total price of funding the building. One thing that stood out to me is that Damon said that the intercollegiate athletics use money for the things they need so why not pay for the natatorium. I don’t think we should be funding the natatorium.*

*Claire: I get why they said no about cost sharing. We have to remember that they spent a ton of money on their student affairs master plan. It gave us a good idea of what the price is. Us wanting to go way underneath that leads to a feasibility study.*

*Sean: The feasibility study is to see if we can fund the building in our price range?*

*Claire: If the answer is no, don’t go into the other details the feasibility study would bring. It’s not just a yes or no*

*Sean: I think it’s unfair for us to commit money to something we don’t know. It should be given to us instead of us funding on the student dime*

*Noah: Do we know if the amount of debt we can take out in the future will change from the feasibility study? Does it give us leverage to go to the board of trustees?*

*Schonn: I have been concerned about the longevity of the fee board. I like the idea that we can get a feasibility study because we are interested rather than them choosing what they do studies on.*

*Noah: Do you think there will be more buy in from student affairs if we know the results of the feasibility study? Considering it’s a part of their long-term master plan*

*Claire: Maybe. Can we move on? Support feasibility studies, we want a MOU on both and if the project is on reach. Are we ready to vote?*

***VOTING***

*Claire: Starting with GPSA, UPUA, and CCSG*

*Noah: I would like to see more participation from GPSA student members*

*Claire: Not anticipating an increase for the 2022-23 year*

*Schonn: We write resolutions to recommend to the university, but we are not in direct control. I want to know our role as with ADA accessibility. It’s putting more on us than we can control.*

*Alexa: We are supposed to write two sentences for each value.*

*Jake: I can explain to why I mention ADA accessibility. The second sentence is about promotion but there needs to be more on ADA accessibility in the proposal*

*Schonn: The board wants to see how they can increase accessibility.*

*Claire: \*edits were made to the UPUA recommendations slide\**

*Erin: I really love our values. It would help people coming in with proposals.*

*Claire: Every committee has to give a written report on what they did and what needs to be done.*

*Nora: I remember that we were very ambitious at the beginning of this cycle. We rearranged them changed them a little bit. We did vote to add the definition.*

*Claire: It was not a unanimous vote on CCSG. They have said they would let us know if they could move things around.*

*Latisha: We were told that it wasn’t even an option. (about retreats)*

*Warren: Does UPAC allocate for retreats?*

*Alexa: It currently is covered by student activities*

*Barry: UPAC is a student organization, all offices pay for the retreats for the student governments.*

*Claire: Athletic engagement is allowed, and we said no to that.*

*Alexa: Do we have to give rationale in the fee board?*

*Schonn: We can’t just say no if it’s allowed even for the golf event. We can make arbitrary rules?*

*Claire: That’s not true. We have said no on SOTP stuff even though it’s allowed. Our rationale can be “this is not a good use of student fee dollars”*

*Erin: How much is the CCSG allocation from CFB?*

*Barry: $28,000*

*Erin: 71% of the proposal is the retreat and if we don’t fund that its name tags, etc. They have a centralized place to go back to. If we don’t fund the retreats but it opens up the door down the line, should the SFB be funding anything for CCSG? The only thing that makes sense to fund is the retreat*

*Noah: Can we open up as a motion to add language about how we don’t support funding the retreat. We will still get back the majority of the money.*

*Claire: They refused to move things when we asked. I think that’s an appropriate budget item especially transportation. Discussion is fine.*

*Erin: Is there reasoning why they are moving the line item around for the retreat?*

*Noah: The board wants to remind the CCSG to use the funds to the matter they are allocated.*

*Schonn: Do we just want to say that the board does not support?*

*Sean: It might be a good idea to say we know its eligible but that we don’t want it to be done.*

***Vote on GPSA, UPUA, CCSG recommendations***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | GPSA | UPUA | CCSG |
| Warren Sipe | y | y | y |
| Nora Van Horn | y | y | y |
| Megan Minnich | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |
| Latisha Franklin | y | y | y |
| Erin Boas | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |
| Jake Snyder | y | y | y |
| Noah Robertson | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |
| Xiaoru Shi | y | y | y |
| Najee Rodriguez | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |
| Sean Terrey | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |
| Schönn Franklin | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |
| Claire Kelling | Conflict | Conflict | Conflict |

*Claire: GPSA vote followed by the Student Legal Services Vote (no objections to Barry calling the vote). Moving on to the Student Orientation and Transition Programs. We can consider asking them to reach out to the graduate organization at the starting point. Next up, CAPS. We have said we are supportive of the general salary increases and new positions. We recommend continued efforts to recruit and retain BIPOC and multilingual staff.*

*Schonn: I think the position is necessary, but I would like to see a request to inquire about cost sharing. (added to slide)*

*Claire: We want the wording to be as good as possible in our recommendation.*

*Nora: We should add multilingual to the last line.*

*Latisha: I don’t think we should be paying for this. I think the University should be paying for this.*

*Schonn: You end these resources, most of the time and people can’t afford it. It doesn’t make sense to make them pay more to get services. I would love for central funding to support it. I am worried about cost*

*Claire: I say this with respect, maybe there should be a motion to vote no. If we have issues with this being funded by the student fee, we should talk about it.*

*Schonn: I will withdraw my motion to vote.*

*Megan: I would also vote no. The focus should be improving CAPS first before adding another administrative position*

*Alexa: We are going to fund other position. Campuses rationale can be used for any other person*

*Najee: I will personally be voting yes for this. There is a lack of communications for internal contributions. To be told by the CAPS that this position won’t exist without the student fee is frustrating. The payoff would be enormous. It is a step in the right direction*

*Warren: I vote also yes. CAPS is one of my number one priorities. If you asked students what they want to see improved, I see this being the answer out of most of their mouths. This si an area of focus that this is a good vote.*

*Schonn: CAPS needs to increase diversity. I would be all for it if this position was from a diverse or bilingual person. I do not believe the student fee should be paying for any position at all. I would rather fund critical staff*

*Claire: I am conflicted on it. My priority is diverse counseling staff. I think it will help but I wonder if there are better ways, we can state our priorities. It will take years to get this off the fee board if we go this route.*

*Latisha: Getting CAPS to bring in more diverse people. They bring in people, they come and they can’t keep them and end up leaving. Even if they are state college, my insurance cant afford their increased fee.*

*Sean: Would is possible to say, we would prefer that someone in the clinical setting can fill a leadership position and training for being able to support staff to eventually hire*

*Najee: I think this is the first step in ensuring who will be leading CAPS in this position. There can be a lot that is gained and retaining positions. They are responsible for coming back next year and explaining the results.*

*Erin: We already pressed CAPS on having more counselors that are multilingual. That is their endgame. You can get them here but there’s nothing to keep them here. Penn State staff is mostly white dominated. There is a national shortage of counselors. This position, while it doesn’t immediately hit what we want, it is a step to get there*

*Yidi: I understand the concerns, but I support to fund CAPS because they are student facing directly. They are trying to add diversity and inclusion.*

*Claire: I wonder if we can add that the student wants to urgent addition of cost sharing. We think it is a good step forward. Are people interested in that?*

*Latisha: I would be okay if it’s within the Duty of this position that they cultivate a community of staff. The director wants to do that but it’s different than it actually happening*

*Schonn: If we are going to move forward, if they are having someone come in, they should have a community focus which can be moved to a different kind of position which costs less money. I understand why it is necessary but again, it’s a huge price tag for a position that half addresses half of our problems. There needs to be a justification to why this needs to be funded next year too without the idea of cost sharing.*

*Warren: In terms of discussion, I trust the CAPS staff on how they should run*

*Nora: I think we should switch the language. To say we believe this so please do this.*

*Noah: I would support the recommendation, but we should say that future positions should be student facing*

*Schonn: We should open up to other offices to ask for funding for administrative positions.*

*Claire: Call for CAPS vote. Moving on to the CSGD. We fixed the typos. The revised request is pretty small. The initial recommendation is that the fee board supports the increases in student wages, educational engagement, and programming.*

*Schonn: It says it’s a decrease, but it was never $14,000 used right?*

*Claire: It is a decrease from the typo last year.*

*Noah: I will make a simple notion to round up or down.*

*Claire: Vote for CSGD. Next up is Campus Rec. The request is flat due to savings on salaries during the pandemic. Vote for Campus Rec. Moving onto the Paul Robeson Cultural Center. The fee is supportive of the decrease and to the pilot program of food funding to co-sponsorships with student organizations. Vote for the Paul Robeson Cultural Center. We will come back to the office of student activities. Next up is the HUB Reserve. We support funding the flat funding in full at $200,000*

*Noah: I remember the lack of involvement of the student HUB advisory group.*

*Claire: They don’t vote and that’s the problem. Vote on HUB reserve. Next up is UPAC. The fee board is supportive of flat funding an suggest future boards closely monitor the variances and continued needs of UPAC. Vote on UPAC. Next up is the Child Care Subsidy. Vote on Child Care Subsidy. Moving onto the Student Farm.*

*Schonn: I support the increase*

*Claire: Vote on Student Farm. We won’t close this vote. Moving onto CPA. We do not support the reallocation of funds. We recommend keeping the following distribution. Vote on CPA. Next up, Gender Equity Center. Vote on Gender Equity Center.*

*Nora: Why are you abstaining?*

*Schonn: I think the allocation increase, makes me nervous about the cost of it.*

*Claire: Bryce Jordan Center. We support flat funding of $200,000.*

*Najee: I will be voting no on this. I think we need to reconsider what we allocate to.*

*Claire: I agree. I will be voting no on this. It is very popular amongst students but not enough benefit for this amount of money for concert tickets.*

*Schonn: I agree that this is an interesting position. We could motion to reduce the allocation.*

*Sean: It is heavily utilized so I think there is merit. If we reduce funding substantially that might reduce the push to use the student advisory board.*

*Latisha: I do think this is a lesser importance on what we are funding. The fee board is paying for things we shouldn’t have to pay for. Concerts are a perfect example of the out of classroom experience.*

*Najee: For me, there is a clear benefit directly to students. I’m not opposed to lower the amount.*

*Claire: Ticket subsidies don’t reduce the cost for students that much. I get their reasoning but doesn’t improve accessibility by that much.*

*Nora: I am in favor of reducing the amount*

*Alexa: One of UPACs largest events costs over $600,000. The reason we fund that due to the amount of people who attend the events.*

*Schonn: I was thinking we start small with $150,000 and future fee boards can reduce. We should also specify subsidies for tickets. As it relates to student activities, we have to remember that we are here for the out of class experience.*

*Noah: I am sympathetic to what you said Claire. Going from a high cost to a slightly less high cost, I would vote no on it overall.*

*Sean: I think it is importance to emphasize the student advisory board for events.*

*Nora: I think it being $150,00, if we reduce again and again, it’s worse than reducing substantially.*

*Najee: I think its super relevant for me. It’s incredible to see direct student engagement with UPAC.*

*Latisha: Some students may be in favor of the hot wheels. It has some merit. I agree with Sean’s point about emphasizing the use of the advisory board.*

*Yidi: If we decrease the recommendation, what will happen for the prices in the future? If we decrease the recommendation, does this mean that students get less of a discount?*

*Claire: I’m not sure.*

 *Erin: $150,000 based off their spending history, is what they spent in 2019. I would be comfortable reducing it.*

*Claire: Student governments are not allowed to change by more than 10%. I am willing to say that students will get a lower discount or events won’t have as big of discounts.*

*Noah: If we go toe route to working with the student advisory board, we might want to add in that we encourage that the board is a diverse group of students.*

*Schonn: We should decrease their allocation as a statement. I am also fine with a 25% decrease.*

*Claire: You are voting on what’s on the screen.*

*Noah: I guess I would add in language about a potential decrease.*

*Sean: I wasn’t aware that the allocation hasn’t been fully used. Maybe $175,000 shows a decrease but not enough to effect things too much.*

*Claire: (Making edits to the fees recommendation) Call for a BJC vote.*

***Votes on all other standing allocations considered on 3/27/22.***

***Each vote was called immediately after discussion of the unit.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Student Legal Services | SOTP | CAPS | CSGD | Campus Rec | PRCC | HUB Reserve |
| Warren Sipe | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Nora Van Horn | y | y | n | y | y | y | y |
| Megan Minnich | y | y | n | y | y | y | y |
| Latisha Franklin | y | y | n | y | Conflict | y | y |
| Erin Boas | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Jake Snyder | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Noah Robertson | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Xiaoru Shi | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Najee Rodriguez | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Sean Terrey | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Schönn Franklin | y | y | n | y | y | y | y |
| Claire Kelling | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | UPAC | Childcare Subsidy | Student Farm | Center for Performing Arts | Gender Equity | BJC | UPAC |
| Warren Sipe | Absent | y | y | y | y | y | Absent |
| Nora Van Horn | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Megan Minnich | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Latisha Franklin | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Erin Boas | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Jake Snyder | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Noah Robertson | y | y | y | y | y | n | y |
| Xiaoru Shi | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Najee Rodriguez | y | y | y | y | y | n | y |
| Sean Terrey | y | y | y | y | y | y | y |
| Schönn Franklin | y | y | y | a | y | y | y |
| Claire Kelling | y | y | y | y | a | n | y |

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: See you tomorrow morning, please also continue to hold Tuesday.*

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 3:58 p.m*