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**MEETING MINUTES**

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

**Date: 9/9/22**

**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, Barry Bram

**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 (August 26th, 2022)**

Motioned, seconded, no objections.

1. **Public Comment**
2. **Old Business**
3. **New Business**
   1. **Vote on Handbook Changes**
      1. **Addition of Section 2.5 - Special Funds**
      2. **Addition of 2.5.1 - Environmental Sustainability Fund**
      3. **Addition of Section 2.5.2 - Equity Fund, Internal Development, Communications as Standing Committee**
      4. **Removal of Section 5.1 - Environmental Sustainability Fund**
      5. **Removal of Section 1.5.2 item 9 - Director of Records**

Lawrence: Any changes we’ll be working on will be in Google Drive under Handbook Guide’s operating guidelines. We have an addition of special funds, and we also moved ESF from 5.1 to 2.5.1. Additionally, we added wording for allocation of equity fund. Lastly, in section 1.5.2, item 9 would remove director of records, which is consolidated with the Director of Communications

Najee: Just to give some context, ESF was under facility, butwe decided to have it’s own categories. This better organizes them, when discussing funding. Wanted to put equity fund somewhere other than facilities. Put in chronological order. ESF first, equity fund second.

Lawrence: All those in favor to then go into steering committee to be discussed.

All in favor, no objections, no abstentions.

1. **Topics of Discussion**
   1. **Speaking with Phil from the BJC**

Najee: The BJC added SFB’s stamp for student ticket sales.

Lawrence: For the BJC’s student advisory panel, we’d like Zander to be the chair, as he is already the subject matter expert.

Phil: Thanks for putting BJC on the agenda. Lawrence and I met and had a discussion about the student advisory board recommended for the BJC. Completely open to it, but make sure that I’m creating it the right way, while conveying to the SFB BJC’s challenges. Lawrence previously explained that I speak with representatives on SFB, then they come back. But this timeline doesn’t fit with BJC’s schedule. I further have had issues with getting student interest for the panel.

Cierra: Can you explain why there is a strict timeline in selecting the act? Is there a possibility to have it scheduled out from the beginning?

Phil: Sometimes, it’s months before. Others change dates, creating a short timeframe. The issue is the Big 10 basketball schedule. Until then, we can’t free up and finalize the schedule.

Zander: Are you concerned about the confidentiality of shows impacting profitability and the BJC?

Phil: Part of my concern. Not against the student advisory panel, but confidentiality is a big concern. For example, we don’t want to hurt relationships that BJC has due to a leak.

Zander: Has that happened before, with a leak to a show?

Phil: Yes, it came from a former intern, who also worked with Onward State. We didn’t lose the show, but it took much effort to keep it and steady BJC’s reputation.

Najee: I think we may want to look into fail safes, such as confidentiality agreements, to protect the BJC.

Barry: I’m not sure we want to go that route, in terms of potentially referring a student to Student Conduct. In terms of its role, this board would help determine how discounts work and choosing artists.

Noah: Last year, we had a vote on the allocation for the BJC - narrowing the number of events ticket subsidies are applicable to. I think this is a discussion that could come from the student advisory board vs. coming from the SFB. I’m thinking there could be other relevant tasks for the student advisory board. Can you think of other ways to engage students throughout the process, aside from scheduling artists?

Phil: Operationally, don’t think so right now. Could have a focus group advised by student advisory panel to field student interest (e.g., do you know SFB funds ticket subsidies, which artists do you want to see?). If student advisory board is where I can bounce ideas off of, I’d be for that. With the recommendation of narrowing scope of funding application for events vs. spreading it out - this may alienate more possibilities for students (e.g., reducing discounts for one show, but not having any for others).

Noah: Last year, we were curious about the average discount. How much of the subsidy goes to each show? $5-20 off one show wouldn’t make quite the difference to make the subsidy a bigger deal for students. With fewer shows and a greater subsidy, that may make it more of an incentive to attend.

Najee: Also agree with that mentality, especially when it comes to student-oriented artists. If there could be more of a difference of cutting costs for these artists vs. miscellaneous events that have less of a student attendance recorded for those.

Phil: We’ve done that to a degree historically. If tickets are $30, we may only do a $5 discount. For example, with a student ticket that’s too cheap, they may not attend. Previously, we used to have $10 tickets, which were pushed for student-oriented shows. But due to issues with student attendance, we started pulling back and spreading it out. We also have to hurdle over how student discounts must be approved by the tour. Some artists say they don’t want a student discount.

Lawrence: One of the things discussed last year was the idea of a public forum - which goes back to not getting a great response rate from the organization you reach out to. This would be a way to field feedback to then connect with the student advisory panel further.

Phil: Public opinion of general student body?

Lawrence: Yes. And I’d like to see more active, intentional between students and BJC, which I think is a reason why heavy discounts were conducted in first place. This forum could be a presentation as well as a survey at the end.

Phil: Would you have to be at the event to ask questions and fill out the survey?

Lawrence: Yes.

Najee: We have higher ed professionals in Student Affairs that have developed ideas about developing student advisory boards. Are there documents that exist we can look at?

Barry: Student legal services may have constitution. I can try to pull those together for Phil.

Najee: Student legal services may set up a quick meeting to go over how they can leverage the student advisory panel - on communications and how to get students involved. Potentially an increase in subsidy can be validated by that increased student input.

Zander: I don’t think it’s smart to have students involved in process of picking shows because of confidentiality issues. But it probably does make sense to have a general overarching student review - genre, type of artist.

Phil: Yes, this sort of focus tool could be helpful. However, if some student interests don’t line up with feasibility, that could be an issue with the student advisory board.

Sydney: Wanted to emphasize Student Legal Services is good place to look. Also agree with not having students making approval decisions in 48 hour time window. But other concepts I’ve seen are student advisory boards talking about guiding principles and values about types of artists. From another perspective on recruitment for advisory board, it’s helpful to let students know the time commitment and meeting schedules. Being more clear will help students understand what they’re committing to.

Brian: From my understanding, if there were to be an advisory board, it may be somewhat futile (e.g., BJC says “this doesn’t align with what we can do at this time”). Is that correct?

Phil: This was part of my fear. Students bring list of top artists, but for a secondary market, this may be unattainable. Yes and no. I’m open to suggestions; my interns do go out to the student body. My hope is that the student advisory board will see nitty gritty education of how BJC truly operates. Again, I think there’s validity in creating the advisory panel, but I want it to be created properly: feasibly representing student interest, while in line with SFB expectations.

Brian: I think the greatest concern then is confidentiality. This could have a huge effect on profitability, which could affect how the advisory board is set up.

Phil: Yes, I originally thought that this advisory board would approve or disapprove decisions in individual show decisions. But from what I’m gathering from this conversation, the advisory panel could be leveraged differently in getting general input on what artists students want to see, while also understanding how much funding/marketing effort is being consumed.

Cierra: Setting realistic expectations is important, but that may be mitigated by talking to Student Legal Services.

Phil: Yes, and I think I can start laying some of those deadlines/outlines.

Lawrence: If you could draft up an overview, we can talk next meeting and make sure we’re all on the same page.

Sydney: Student Legal Services’ advisory board has their outline on their website. They also only meet about twice a year. Student legal services will also set up tents, and I know that’s another way that students will be involved.

Najee: Thanks for coming in and discussing with us. Hope we did our best to convey a potential draft for an advisory board. And in the future, I think we should offer student advisory panel guidance more universally.

Lawrence: We’ll be discussing that later, especially before hearings. Motion to strike meeting minutes from public spaces.

Motioned, no objections.

Lawrence: I do agree that it’s important to be realistic, but ultimately, we are a huge part of the BJC’s funding, so we want to accurately represent student interest.

* 1. **Standing Allocation Material Review**

Lawrence: These are the same documents from last year. Only thing that’s different is that in first paragraph, instead of “contact the SFB chair,” it’s “contact the University Park SFB Chair.” At the very end for the allocations request process, it says 15 minutes for “hearing and fielding questions.” Now, it’s “answering” questions. Everything else is fairly the same, except for minor grammar shifts. These materials should start being sent out by student matter subject experts.

Tony: Typically, our first contact is around now based on the previous timelines.

Lawrence: All this information is in the Google Drive, and please contact me or Barry if you need contact information.

Barry: New fee allocation proposal requests should go on the website.

1. **Standing Committee Chairs**

Lawrence: One thing I’d like to change is formalizing the process of choosing committee chairs. For communications chair, Sydney. For ESF, Noah. For equity, Najee. For Facilities, Cierra. For ID, Tony. For New Fee Request, Dallas. For UPAC Appeals, Brian.

With that taken care of, I’ll be reaching out to all of the chairs. I recommend the chairs reach out to the rest of the committee. For ID, I will reach out to Tony to work through the differences between ID and larger SFB.

1. **Chair Report**

Lawrence: Later today, I will speak with the Gender Equity Center. We may also walk over to the GEC in the next meeting or the meeting because they want us to take a tour.

1. **UPAC Chair Report**

Alexa: Uncensored America meeting minutes will be posted later today.

1. **Director of Communications Report**

Kacey: No update this week.

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

Cierra: is there a directory for subject matter experts. We’ll put that in Teams underneath Files.

Lawrence: we’ll have the contact information. In terms of the timeline of introducing yourselves, please get the first emails out by the end of next week.

Zander: So we’ll send out information on making new fee requests?

Lawrence: Yes, and the documents walk them through much of the process.

Barry: Before people contact their offices, normally the hearings start the Friday after Thanksgiving break, and we’ll schedule the hearings throughout the spring.

Zander: Suggestion: have a scheduling tool like Starfish in figuring out hearings.

Najee: I can start sending out emails for equity fund announcements?

Lawrence: As long as no changes, you should be good to start sending it out.

Najee: For the ESF, what was the intent for the second application after the initial application?

Noah: First application was general vetting of project. Second was more in-depth and provided more narrative.

Lawrence: If you do more drafting, send it to me. Then you can send the announcements out.

1. **Closing Roll Call**

Meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.