 

**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 8/26/22**

**Topic: Public Meeting**

**Present:**

**- Voting members:** Lawrence Miller, Xiaoru (Tony) Shi, Jada Quinland, Noah Robertson, Yidi Wang, Brian Johnson, Conor Kelly, Ava Philips, Najee Rodriguez, Sydney Gibbard, Dallas Zebrowski, Cierra Chandler

**- Nonvoting members:** Alexa Clayton, Zander Golden, Jolinda Wilson

**Absent:**

**Agenda:**

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

Meeting called to order at 8:00 a.m.

1. **Adoption of the Agenda**

Motioned, seconded, no objections.

1. **Adoption of the Minutes (April 29, 2022)**

Motioned, seconded, no objections.

1. **Public Comment**
2. **Old Business**
   1. **Establishment of Committees**

Lawrence: Committees needed to be established are from last year, including UPAC of Appeals Committee, UP Internal Development Committee, Environmental Sustainability Fund, Communications Committee.

Motion, seconded, no objections. Committees approved

1. **New Business**
   1. **Appointment of Director of Communication**

Motion, seconded, no objections

* 1. **Establishment of Other Standing Committees**
     1. **Equity Fund**

Najee: Equity fund started last year. Rubric and proposal created. Cohesive with ESF - initial and final applications. Established because of exigence for equity-related projects with DEI projects University hasn’t taken on. Funding for university and students to create a more diverse and accessible college life. I Attached example of first application in email sent out earlier.

Motion, Seconded, No Objections

* + 1. **Internal Development**

Lawrence: Internal Development for fixing and evaluating operations within SFB.

Najee: More comprehensive direction or objective for committee?

Lawrence: Standardization committee function but broader definition

Barry: Wouldn’t meet regularly, just opens up chance to bring up operations improvement

Motion, Seconded, No Objections

Lawrence: ID and EF now standing committees. Language in handbook will be updated and presented in the next meeting.

* 1. **Committee and Subject Matter Expert Sign-Up**
  2. **Phil From BJC - Student Advisory Panel Info**

Lawrence; BJC received reduced allocation last year. Student advisory panel suggested as a way to increase student oversight over student funds. In current state, certain price of tickets (~$20) for students; but want deeper discounts for certain shows, and fewer discounts for a wider range of shows. Panel would be made up of leaders from over 20 different organizations. But 2 issues: trouble getting in contact with student leaders, confidentiality. Proposed Phil would come next week to receive guidance from SFB on creating Student Advisory Panel.

Brian: was the panel created after reduction of funds?

Lawrence: should have already been existing, but hadn’t been for aforementioned reasons; like lack of response from student leaders. Do we want to hear him come out to speak with us next week or the week after?

Najee: will he pursue creating this panel this year?

Lawrence: yes, but he wanted extra guidance on how to run advisory panel due to current problems with lack of transparency and responses

Najee: could we share information about hub advisory board?

Barry: we could share what other facilities are doing. Also, hope would be that this panel would be a more broad representation of general interest. There are other concerns with costs and diversity with some shows.

Noah: it would be worthwhile for him to come in. we could bring recommendations and brainstorm through solutions related to other advisory services: legal services and hub.

Lawrence: I’ll find out when and what his hearing was last year, and send out application on why BJC’s money reduced last year. Will set aside 20 minutes after meeting next week.

Motion, Seconded, 1 opposition, 1 abstention, majority favored, approved

Lawrence: Main ticket master site has only email input - ease of use. Not going against allocated budget, so I approved.

* 1. **Handbook/Operation Guidelines Changes**
     1. **Change length of Hearing Times**

Lawrence: previous hearing committee found success with 15 minutes. Proposal for 15 minutes of hearing, 15 minutes of talking.

Barry: These should be referred to internal development committee, which can write up language. ID could officially bring up suggestions to wider SFB

Tony: We would have more time to review as well.

Najee: Last year, were we doing 15 minutes?

Tony: 15 minutes presentation and 15 questions

Najee: This would be a codification of that then?

Barry: Yes

* + 1. **Start and End Dates of SFB Terms**

Lawrence: Claire asked: do the terms start when GPSA elections end? Could it be on the first meeting, to provide a transition time to create committees? Should we add past chair as nonvoting member to keep things moving?

Brian: What are current start and end dates?

Barry: None currently in handbook

Lawrence: We should also codify language of motioning in handbook. Also, moving term date after GPSA elections would make the most sense as it is the last election.

Jada: Is this to make sure everything is taken care of before people come in?

Lawrence: this would be so UPUA and GPSA would run on the same time with SFB

Barry: Might make sense to let previous SFB continue to have authority until end of April.

Sydney: Does this mean SFB would only have two members? Would UPUA be able to select at-large members before fee board is finalized?

Jada: Think it’s best to have 2 members on SFB (UPUA president and chair), new people should make new appointments

Najee: This would be a larger discussion in internal development committee.

Barry: Model after idea of appointing own cabinets before taking office.

Brian: Wouldn’t this model be the recommendation instead of actual interviewing process?

Cierra: Does Barry have any comments during the selection process?

Barry: Yes, but more to answer any questions.

Lawrence: ID will have more conversations on this.

* + 1. **Value definitions in the Handbook**

Lawrence: Proposing adding definitions to values in the handbook (e.g., equity, accessibility, accountability). Think this makes sense because these words can have a broad definition.

Brian: If SFB previously worked last year on this, would this be to reevaluating those definitions?

Noah: Yes, plus these definitions would be codified.

* + 1. **Deadline and Process for exceptions**

Lawrence: There are a few places in the handbook around exceptions, but there are no examples or deadlines. This year, I want to make handbook clearer and to be elaborated on. Exceptions are one area of this.

* + 1. **Funding 8.2 Changes**

Lawrence: 8.2 are items that will not be funded. Internal development to fix spacing and wording. 8.2.16 and 17 could be consolidated to “illicit substances including ….” Widen to mention marijuana as well. 8.2.12, take out everything after Penn State faculty or staff as “speaking about his/her area of expertise” could be narrowly defined.

Najee: I would motion this to be for the ID committee.

Noah: One thing we talked about last year in professional development was credit-bearing, so we could have a discussion around the definition of “academic” vs not. Bring this to ID.

Lawrence: Right, as we do not operate in fees regarding academics. Want to codify that language around “academic” as well. 8.2.9, consolidate to “membership dues” in general, then combine with 8.2.8. Want to specify what sororities and fraternities mean as there are national and professional ones?

Zander: So whether to include them in the fee?

Barry: Do we pay for individual or institution for membership?

Tony: I think institutional would be okay as that would guarantee everyone would have access to fraternities/sororities.

Noah: Relates to conversation of how we fund academic events. I don’t think funding national membership fits well into current funding categories also.

Lawrence: ID seems to be taking bulk of conversation.

Najee: Think it would be best to defer these conversations to the ID committee, which would filter.

Barry: All these changes need to go to Commonwealth and then SFB. Don’t want too much work to be done to then be shot down by Commonwealth.

Jada: Don’t same topics have to come back to SFB? May want to talk about it somewhat as a group to give guidance to ID.

Najee: Any member could bring forth legislation or change in SFB so ID could vet it, especially with written concept proposal.

* + 1. **Addition of Definitions in Operating Guidelines**

Lawrence: Want to make sure definitions are understood the same across the board.

1. Topics of Discussion

Currently have 7 committees, including standing, and 4 committees from last year.

Brian: Do we have a facilities committee?

Lawrence: Yes. ESF? Noah and Tony.

Brian: Should we discuss how many should be on a committee?

Sydney: Also include a description, that way everyone gets preferences around committees they better understand.

Noah: Especially for equity and ESF, it would be important to have more members to vet projects and add more viewpoints.

Lawrence: Ok, so currently, we just want to get an idea of interest across the committees. We’ll later release a form to sign up for committees. Want to discuss current interest and maybe how many people should we have per committee.

Noah: I think at least four, based off of workload.

Brian: For ESF, they will specifically hear information to equity-related or student-run equity-related projects?

Noah: Would be environmentally-related projects. These would be recommendations to the board, but not official.

Barry: Subcommittees reviewed all hearings and requests, then made preliminary recommendations.

Brian: Would propose a cap on all committees regardless of topic. Don’t think need 4 on ESF.

Najee: Think we should defer to ID and go from there.

Lawrence: Equity? 5 ID? 8 UPAC appeals? 4

Barry: handbook states 3 are on UPAC appeals committee. Yidi should be involved as she is already in UPAC

Lawrence: Communications? 4 Facilities reserve? 2 Last committee? 7. I’ll write up thought and recommendations on how to go from here. Google forms will open up on Monday. It’ll be a ranking system.

Cierra: Do Zoom meetings count toward attendance?

Lawrence: ID will discuss. But as it currently stands, if you are sick, let me know as soon as possible and join Zoom. Zoom has inefficiencies when in it comes to meetings.

Najee: ESF had news go out in July. Want to propose if outreach can start and embed info in handbook for equity fund.

Cierra: What would this look like?

Najee: I would send out emails to administrators and facilities - to notify services and field requests.

Noah: Discuss subject matter experts as well?

Lawrence: I’ll have that be a separate form. Going back to equity fund, I think that would be fine with “tentative” language (e.g., equity fund is a tentative committee, here are tentative requests). To get word out.

Cierra: Recommending to send a draft?

Lawrence: Since this would be a 10 day, 10 day process as it would go into the handbook, I recommend Najee stresses how committee is tentative.

Najee: Wanted to add, funding has already been charged from students. Now it’s a matter of getting money utilized, so something has to go out soon.

Sydney: Wanted to add, Najee and I’ve switched positions. I’ll be UPUA president, Najee is UPUA vice president.

1. **Chair Report**

Lawrence: any questions or comments, let me know

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

Alexa: allocated 1.4M dollars. Already allocated to Movin On ($700,000), among other things.

1. **Director of Communications Report**

Kacey: Currently developing SFB’s social media calendar

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

Najee: for anyone selected on ID committee, consider allocation and ways to entice public to come (e.g., food costs)

1. **Closing Roll Call**

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.