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05:55

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, Good morning. I have to use my bigger voice today. I call this meeting to order at 9:06 am...

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

\*Conducts opening roll call, quorum is met\*

06:52

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, so the next item in our agenda is the adoption of the minutes. Yes, Representative Miller.

07:06

**Representative Miller:**

Lawerence Miller. I move to strike a line in the minutes from the UPFB board meeting on Friday, 1/26 and specifically, the line is on page 21. It's highlighted in teal and the line is, "and quite frankly, I believe that at this point GPSA voices are being over-represented, given the amount of undergrad students who use the services we are actually here to represent.” I have moved to strike that line. This shouldn't be something that's coming out of the Fee Board. I understand that a lot of opinions, but it can't be something. So I just wanted to strike that.

07:41

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Is there a second?

**Representative Concepcion:**

Can I object that?

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes. Okay, thank you. I believe we can move into questions now. \*Pulled up the meeting minutes\*

08:24

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

It's different on each computer.

**Representative Miller:**

Yea, so the timestamp is...

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

You actually have to keep going. It’s 55:27.

08:39

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Again, are there any questions for Representative Miller? Seeing that there are no questions we move to discussion. Is there any discussion? Yes, Representative Concepcion.

08:55

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA appointee. I don't see any need to strike this from the record. I said that. And I stand behind what I said. I back the conversation. And quite frankly, throughout a lot of conversations that UPUA and GPSA have had, GPSA has been overrepresented. There are 20,000 undergraduate university students who are represented by UPUA. And there was a lot of discussion about things, and particularly the graduate experience being framed as the most important topic of conversation when we're having this discussion. I don't see any need to strike this from the record, as I said, I stand behind it. It's not coming out of the Fee Board. It clearly says Representative Concepcion.

09:37

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Representative Miller.

09:39

Lawrence Miller GPSA president. Just as a thing. It is just frankly incorrect that GPSA needs are over represented in this board ever. Point A has a minority of GPSA representatives compared to UPUA representatives, and then compared to the At-Large delegates, we are the smallest audible voice on the board. Additionally, because this language is coming from University Park Fee Board, which is seen as more than just a student organization, it is a University entity, or a university entity and a student representative, and a university entity may say that one of the government's one of the two governments that make up the board is over-represented is simply incorrect, and it's a dangerous precedent to set. I think we just keep saying this in context for what would be spoke out around it, it was never that GPSA. First of all, it doesn't matter that there's 42,000 grad students, 6000 or 42000, undergrad students and 6000 grad students, because University Park Fee boards, one of our values is equity. And that is equity between both governments that is not equity based off of which government is what the voices of the graduate students who I had stated later in that time, are both. Like, if I don't want to, like just do the measuring contest. But if we're going by the numbers, the graduate students who are going to be here and by their numbers paid more in tuition, then that is just that definitely do. But that obviously, that didn't bring us doesn't really matter. Also, at the same point, the but while it's completely fine for a representative standby of the decisions in this motion said somebody is going to read this and say, Oh, actually, in the future, I think that GPSA is over-representated which sets a precedent against grad students, and nothing that either representative from the GPSA had said on Friday, or any of our amendments that we made, either on Friday or last Thursday, were against or were either pushing strongly for solely GPSA representation, or were against the university undergraduate association they were solely to make sure that it was equitable, ensure that the Graduate Professional Student Association had a voice at the very least having equal and equitable voice on this process because of how this entire process works. Otherwise, we wouldn't be at this table. And as I also said, on Friday, GPSA is at this table. And the reason why everybody's at this table is because of an equal force of work between the president of the GPSA and the president of the University Park Undergraduate Association.

12:09

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you, Representative Miller. Then representative D'Elena. I mean, Johnson.

12:19

**Representative Johnson:**

I would first like to say that while I am an undergraduate student, I am really indifferent to the contention that could exist between both forms of government. I don't have any stake. So I'm not aware of any contentions that existed. But I will say, given an outsider's perspective here, because I will say I'm a relative outsider. The contentions were promulgated for absolutely no reason. To reiterate what Representative Miller stated, I didn't think anything warranted certain comments. And altogether, I would say, the comment should stay frankly, if there could be additional evidence to suggest why it was it was sufficient, sufficient evidence to suggest why should have been made in first place. Other than that, I have no other opinion.

13:03

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. We will continue Representative D’Elena and then Representative Nevil and then Representative Concepcion. And then I will move to close the session,

13:10

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena UPUA Appointee. I think the comment should say for a matter of two reasons. The first being that I don't think it's officially coming from the Fee Board, it says Representative Concepcion. At the beginning of every comment it opens with UPUA Appointee, for example. So therefore, this isn't the Fee Board saying this is not our newsletter, it certainly is not going to be publicized. As a matter of fact, I think Second of all, the fact of the comment in another example, is an opinion, not a fact. It's an opinion stated by a representative in her capacity to do so and represent the University Park Undergraduate Association. She stands by this opinion, and I don't think I think if we were to strike this from the record, we're setting a dangerous precedent that just because we disagree with statements, opinions that were supposed to elicit a sense that it might go on to say are wrong message for the future.

14:06

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Representative Nevil.

14:08

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. My perspective is this should change we should say and probably outside of like Representative Johnson and whatever this like, argumentative nature between UPUA and GPSA is that needs to be settled outside of this environment like this is a the Fee Board is not the place for arguments and battles, and it's something that I've noticed a lot of things throughout our discussions. The Fee Board is not a place for these arguments to exist the Fee Board is the place for us to determine what the financial decision that is in the best interest of all students on this campus. And I think this continuing argument is just like not beneficial to the student body here. Like touching this or not touching this, this, this argument needs to happen outside of these meetings needs to happen between Student Governments outside of their own settings.

15:10

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much. Representative Concepcion.

15:15

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I know, according to the previous comments made, like I like, like Representative D’Eena said, just because I'm stating my opinion, and then we strike it from the record because the rest of the Fee Board doesn’t agree with it. And second of all, like I there's plenty of things I could have said in striking the record to antagonize the GPSA, but I chose not to do and I am not doing anything other than stating the opinions of the UPUA when I'm speaking in discussion, because I do not think it’s an appropriate place to pick a fight with either student government. However, if my words are going to be striken from the record, I have tried going by myself and statements that I made. I don’t think it’s appropriate to try to do this type of thing, by bringing motions that don't necessarily... And as far as I'm concerned, it says my name and my position so it isn’t coming from the Board.

16:05

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much. I have I am moving to close discussion on this motion. Is there a second? Thank you so much. We can make it a form, thank you. There'll be a form in the team's chat. Thank you. Can you put your thumbs up when you have completed voting?

17:07

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

We have eight responses... has everyone voted? Okay, the noes have it 5-3-0. We will not be striking those meeting minutes.

17:29

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much. Okay, moving on to our next agenda item the adoption of the agenda. Motion or a second to that motion. Thank you. Is there a second? Thank you, Representative Johnson. And now we are going to public comment. Is there anyone here for public comment? Seeing as there's no one here for public comment, we can move on to old business. There is no old business other than congratulations for the work that it took for us to again collaboratively approved the recommendation document throughout even last semester was a lot of work and I do want to share that congratulations that we should be proud for working together and approving a document such as that. Okay, new business. Okay, we are on to the 24-25 Budget Modification requests review. If you open the folder, the meeting folder, there should be a link to a folder that says 24-25 Budget Modification. I'm going to make sure I share my screen shared.

19:12

Okay, so if it’s fine, I will drive this presentation from the seat. But today we are going to be talking about the 24-25 budget modification requests for the University Park Fee Board. I thought it would be important to ensure that people understand the board understands what a two year budget cycle will entail. Our previous budget cycle required us to set appropriations for the immediate next fiscal year and set the fee rate for the immediate next fiscal year. And for example, it would require us to set the appropriations due to the requests that we would receive from units and that could total to 28 million for that fiscal year 24-25. And then we would set the fee rate to ideally $286 to match the appropriations for fiscal year 24-25. In this current budget cycle, we set the appropriations for the next fiscal year as the fee was set for us from the previous year. And then in this current year, we set the fee rate for the fiscal year for two years from now. For example, we deliberate on how to appropriate approximately $28 million in fees with the budget modification request that we will be discussing today. And then we set the fee rate for the next following year, which is actually incorrect on here. It's not $289 because that is for fiscal year 25-26 But for the fee rate next year, two years from now. I hope that makes sense. If you have any questions, please let me know. Okay, thank you. Okay, so just to provide a fiscal year overview for 23-24. This is generally largely how each student pays into these categories for these units for units that request money. So largely, we each student pays $78 for infrastructure and facilities, approximately $75 for student programming and involvement, approximately $62 for recreation and entertainment $56 for basic needs. Approximately $12 for diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging, $8 for student government and wholly fee funded entities and approximately $3 for environmental sustainability. And their total appropriation per student per semester is $295. And we typically run that up to $296. But this year, we only are charging $281 with the student initiated fee for fiscal year 23-24. So that means that we are required to subsidize the fee by our appropriations reserved by approximately 14, well, exactly $14.63. So that is our current landscape for this year.

The following presentation is what units have submitted to modify their request in their budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Okay, so we call them standing funding appropriations, and how we will generally go through this presentation, there'll be the office name, we're going to show how much they were appropriated and the 23-24 fiscal year. We're going to show there 24-25 requests. And thanks to the great work from our Chief Budget and Planning Executive and our Chief Operational Executive. They have provided a condensed and distilled recommendations and review, and they will provide their overall recommendation for the board. Again, we are not voting on anything. This is purely informational. If you have questions for individual units, please feel free to ask. But there are also a document in the forum for each unit in the folder that is in the meeting folder where you can submit your questions and then we can submit them to the units. Please. Are there any questions about this? Yes, Representative D’Elena.

23:28

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. Is there a partial...\*indistinguishable\*

23:32

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, there are recommendations for how and how to appropriate funding. You’ll see. So our first section is for student programming and involvement. We have UPAC one of our largest units that replaced many. Our executive has recommendations that they strengthen their forecasting methods to better anticipate and budget for growth in student organizations and engagement that they review financial controls of and basic ensure that surplus funds are allocated in a manner that supports UPACs strategic objectives and maximizes the benefit of the student body. They were appropriated 4.6 million this current year, and they're requesting flat funding. And the executive recommends to approve 4.5 million to match historic variance due to requested carry forward. So you see here, they requested approximately 300,000 carry forward in fiscal year 22-23 And that remaining balance is carried into 23-24. So I believe the thought process is that if there’s still remaining balance that they can use whatever's left from that 336,000 to subsidize the request the 100,000. Are there any questions? Yes, Representative D'Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

\*Indistinguishable\*

25:16

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I believe that is a question for our UPAC chair so we can definitely send that over. If you do not mind, can you make sure you document that and the UPAC folder for their requests, so we can make sure it's addressed. Thank you so much. Any other questions? No. Okay, thank you next student orientation and transition programs. So in the previous year, they presented in a large proposal with the other units, and this year they're isolated. So their total appropriation is 100,000 for the 23 and 24. Year, the requesting 130,000 for the next fiscal year. And our executives recommendation is that they essentially enhance their budgeting forecasts to minimize the variance. And in this case, to clarify the variance would be the difference from what they requested, and what they actually spent. And, yeah, Representative Miller.

26:22

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. Where has the money for the class photo come from in the past?

26:31

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

My understanding is that this is a new thing. This is okay. They've never done it. Yeah. So this will be the first project like this. And so again, factors to consider they want to do this 30,000 increase would be to post and organize the class photo for a class of 2028. And they said this rate is competitive with the other big 10 universities. But the executive recommends to approve 120,000 and provide an additional 10,000 If there's a demonstrated need for expenses. Any questions, concerns, comments thoughts? Okay, thank you. So we can now move on to recreation and entertainment. We have the Bryce Jordan Center so in this current... Sorry about that. Thank you for your patience with technical difficulties

29:54

Okay, and then now we're going to present and let me know if you see that. Yep. Oh, I don't know if you see that so frustrating. I think you only see the presentation. Okay, sorry. Okay. Okay, so I thank you for your patience with these technical difficulties. Again, they're requesting flat funding. The executive recommends that they develop a reserve fund too as they see more additional shows, such as Travis, Scott and Drake, come to BJC as an opportunity for students and as an opportunity for concerts. The executive thinks it's ideal and recommended to develop a reserve fund just in case and also that we should consider or BJC should consider external tracking methods outside of Ticketmaster, a little bit more about this, the BJC has only seen requests and increases and mid year increases when they feel student in the end is for their event is rising. And they've stated that over the 18-year partnership with the student funding boards, the BJC, has asked for an increase four times and have has requested decreases over the years as well as the end as well, when the industry was not turning out as they currently are. Representative Zebrowski.

31:35

**Representative Zebrowski:**

I just wanted to ask in the past, do you have any issues kind of kind of strange issues of like communication and things like that? And following the the strings attached to the recommendation? Are there any updates on this as this been resolved? Or are we kind of in that same spot?

31:54

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I believe that those explicit because they in a sense, the BJC has been punished for quote unquote, for not developing a board or student board to organize and organize and collect student input for upcoming shows that was suggested by the Fee Board. At this moment, I believe that that has not resolved. But I believe that's something that we can address and make a point to require them to address in our documents. If that's fine. Okay. Representative Miller.

32:38

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. For the second point about on your third slide about developing reserves funding for events, who will have control over that reserve fund the BJC can pull from or it will be a fund that we just have as a reserve.

32:52

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I believe the intention behind what this executive is suggesting that it would be a reserve that the BJC would be posting within the BJC not within the Fee Board for just the BJC related tickets, ticket subsidies for concerts. But we could always clarify when that executive returns next meeting or throughout next week. Yes, Representative D’Elena.

33:18

**Representative D’Elena:**

My understanding 100% of programming has a separate fund for facilities contract. Is it a concern that if we ask them to explore tracking methods outside of typical, that they might have to enter into a contract... \*indistinguishable\*

33:42

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yeah, so they are currently in a contract with Ticketmaster, we do not contribute any funds towards that. I believe what was suggested would be like a separate smaller scale metric tracking that doesn't depend on Ticketmaster, but relevant data that will be supplied that's relevant to the Student Fee Board and how students and students engage with the ticket subsidies specifically. So we would not need largely all of their ticket data that we would get from Ticketmaster. We would only be interested in how students engaged with the tickets subsidies. I hope that clarifies. Thank you, yes, Representative Nevil.

34:34

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Appointee. \*indistinguishable\* We enter into a dangerous area, we can say that we have set up some oversight with them when it comes to their selection process because the way with the Bryce Jordan Center gatherers it's unlikely not the same way as any other organization that you find and gathers talent when it comes to the organizations on campus or other, every other entity that deals with that when they get talent, they reach out to that talent and say, come to perform. The Bryce Jordan Center does not. The talent comes to them... they say come to the Bryce Jordan Center and here are our artists that we want to potentially procure the Bryce Jordan Center... So I think that us getting into a role that says, we want a say in that would potentially jeopardize anything we give them and I think we have a...\*indistinguishable\*

35:33

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. I’ll go to Representative Miller, Representative Zebrowski, Representative Kelley, Representative Concepcion. Okay.

35:44

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. And just for everybody know, the way that the Bryce Jordan Center uses their appropriation isn’t for talent, it’s for student sale tickets. And so what we had to ask them to build, like four years ago at this point, was a student passport to say, hey, which of the students which which of the students show that shouldn't be a nuisance appropriation find on so that some of the conversations that we had last year, we were asking the fact that should we have fewer shows that are subsidized, that are subsidized by this fun, but have deeper discounts? Or should we continue to do this wide breadth of shows at a lesser discount? And so that's really what the question is, the one thing I do disagree with is developing that reserve fund. Because of the fact that as we've seen in the past, we're going to be running into like the fourth year that we've asked the Bryce Jordan Center to say, Hello, let us be a part of this process, develop this fund, do something for us, please so that we can have a look the same as we believe it's important for students to have a say about these which concerts are important to us. And I think that it really doesn't hurt us to have to come back to one meeting in the fall to say, Okay, Travis and Drake are coming, are we going to give them giving them extra money because they think it's important as is obviously, if they have a reason we want to create a reserve fund, I think that would have to be dependent upon them actually doing what we've asked for the past half decade.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, Representative Zebrowski GPSA Representative. My understanding of this and just to clarify a little bit, that this board isn't like almost picking individual artists. It was dieting, like Representative Miller said, I guess you could say the trends that students may want to see so rolled into that, if I remember currently. It was like the not so much the types of shows and we want specific artists but like, more Monster Trucks or more like country shows or and it was very vague. It's not like picking specific artists. And then the BJC is trying to like wrap them or reserve them.

37:49

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you, Representative Kelley.

37:53

**Representative Kelley:**

Representative Kelley, At-Large Rep. Speaking from my role, and then President Miller's and my experience from last year. I can't really touch on the reserve board. But I do recall that advisory committee was something we tried a lot to do. And I forgot the individual, but I haven't really dealt with him as a person. He doesn't interact with students directly that it's super, super difficult to get people's involvement, not only reserves, I think in all sense, you'd know that last year, but just having the kind of input. They did try and we kind of felt the tone of the conversation last year came to the conclusion of like, we saw that we tried, we're still trying, but we kind of see that there were still difficulties here. We see that he put in effort, and students just weren’t responding.

38:45

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, thank you, Representative Concepcion.

39:10

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I’m curious to know about the branding of the student fee. I don’t really know if there was “student-initiated fee” on any of the materials...\*indistinguishable\*

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

That is important. I do want to address that for the Drake and Travis Scott. We were adamant that we did have this student fee or UP student fee branding on those promotional items, but I do think that's a point that should be emphasized in the future. I think it's Representative Nevil and then Representative Zebrowski, then Miller, then close.

39:33

**Representative Nevil:**

At-Large Representative Nevil. \*Indistinguishable\* I know that I can since the concert... \*indistinguishable\* Before they never had that stuff and from a general perspective, which in which this this out, and the ability to use it. And that's something that should have had conversations between how we can do better with the branding on there...

40:24

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you, beautiful. Representative Miller.

40:29

**Representative Miller:**

I know one concern that we had last year was how they, how can we ensure that the student tickets are actually just going to ensure that the students using things are actually students, and obviously was made to it was brought to my attention that they check the student IDs whenever they go into the arena or something. And if you're not a student, typically, you'd have to pay the difference of the discount and not at the very least from my experience, it's not happening at all, especially for Travis, and I know it’s a hell, a lot of people. But like, I do think that is something important to harp on that this isn’t just a way for people to sell opportunity looks like full price to nonstudents.

41:12

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Can you please make that note in the document for BJC? Thank you so much. Okay, we are moving on to campus recreation. So, in this current year, Campus Recreation is appropriated roughly 5.1 million. Our executive recommends... they're asking for an increase to 5.3 million for the next fiscal year. The executive recommends a finely detailed project completion timelines to reduce carried forward requests that they continue to assess facility maintenance on a regular basis, and then increase transparency in financial transactions using student-initiated fees. And then factors to consider are whether the validity of same shifts employee responsibilities, and I believe this just means like the density of how many students are how many employees are on the same shift during a time but again, we can clarify that following this meeting, and then injury based metric data which will make sense I'm sorry, in the next slide. So the overall recommendation is to either approve the request of 5.3 million or to approve 91,000 In addition to this 5.1 million for one additional athletic training position and subsequent equipment to make this all relevant and understandable. So in this request, over I'm going to read explicitly over 202,000 Penn State student students participate in club sports annually. The nature of clubs sports has the potential to have various injuries occur and a need for athletic training support is evidenced by the number of participants and the lack of athletic training resources available, the two areas will share a common workspace and that this one would be room nine in IM building in an additional 21,000 for athletic training equipment and office supplies. So to reiterate, the executive is recommending that we approve only one position and then approximately $10,000 in equipment and equipment in office supplies. Any questions, concerns, discussion Representative Nevil.

43:55

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large. I know we don’t talk about this but if like a student twists their ankle, they’ll see UHS tomorrow morning is not worth 183,000 for us to fund an athletic trainer that might step onto a flag football field once a month... \*indistinguishable\*... but this just feels like like I understand the background... just there's so many that just doesn't necessarily in our purview and for some of us to fund on our end like if they want to do this figure out how to make it work to have a boo boo doctor.

44:58

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, thank you for your comment. And I just wanted I didn't complete the presentation, but I'll get to your point. Johnson, but campus rec requested 1.1 million and carry forward for 23-24 fiscal year. And this was to bill for projects that were not completed. Largely facility-related projects, such as the EA Sports room, audio visual enhancing current facilities within our IM our recreation facilities. And since we are still in this fiscal year, we don't know exactly their current spending. So those haven't been reported. But again, it seems to be on track. So I guess to further provide context to what Representative Nevil has shared, that there may be potentially money that they can use in their carry forward in the following year to find for these positions. Representative Johnson if you still have your points?

46:02

**Representative Johnson:**

Absolutely. I'm actually very glad you continued with that presentation. This helps frame my opinion a little more clearly here. I think Representative Nevil’s comments and hesitations are incredibly warranted. As someone who's worked at UHS over three semesters, I can tell you, they are well equipped to handle plenty of people who've been injured the day prior and can see them if it's an acute injury. Forbid it be chronic, you know, they obviously go to the necessary ancillary services at a nearby hospital. There was no amount of, to use the term boo boo doctor that can handle the issue, should such a severe injury their circumstances. But altogether if they're able to they being Campus Rec if the table to cover it the expenses without our additional input per se, I think it's perfectly fine. Otherwise, I think we should be hesitant, because I think I should have same level.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, thank you. I forget is it representative Miller then Zebrowski? I don't know, and then D’Elena.

47:10

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. One thing that the first being is there, is there a way that we can send a request out to all of the fee modifying entities just to see how much money they have spent?

47:22

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, we could double check out they in the review, they probably they may have reported that already. But if they haven't we can.

47:30

**Representative Miller:**

Yeah, that would be great. And then the number two, just as they know, for everybody, I know that the the Fee Board next year, specifically that number is set. But a lot of it is offset by I think some of it is offset just by the reserves. So you don't have to approve everything to get a few $189. Technically, but it technically would be like proving to the per student rate of 300 something dollars, and then minus in the reserve fund. So it's better for us to save money, then its less of a strain on reserve funds. And that's where the differences are being. So I also agree look at what the means voiced by representatives Neville and Johnson, this does seem a little bit excessive, and it seems like a great way for us to be stuck with an athletic training forever.

48:19

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much Representative Zebrowski.

48:22

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So do we have any information. First, these athletic trainers, are they only available to participants from sports? Or are they available to like any student who walks in their office?

48:34

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

We can clarify that. But I believe the intention is that they would be dedicated to supporting club sports, which is a large population of students. But then we could always if we are interested in funding these positions, we can suggest and make a stipulation that they will be available for all of the students within who engage with Campus Recreation.

49:01

**Representative Zebrowski:**

I guess what I'm concerned about and I think you might be valuable to describe what an athletic trainer does, because what I'm concerned about in these discussions is that the pre-emptive like pre-practice or pre of then work of an athletic trainer is not being done for club sports. But the problem is, is that we have so much medical staff here that it could probably be subsumed by somebody else. I just say this, this is somebody who never did like college sports but have done like fighting and stuff. Like I've been dealing with like witch doctors and all sorts of weird people because I can't get that I cannot get an athletic trainer unless I'm gonna pay out of pocket. So I think there is an issue but I don't know if we're using our resources the best way possible.

49:53

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Can you please be sure to put that question in the document. Thank you, Representative D'Elena and then over to Johnson.

50:03

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena UPUA Appointee. But one of the biggest differences that I noticed, I don't think is projected is student wages. Everything else is pretty much either on track, or we've mentioned before it happened. And that was explaining why that kind of explained. Do you know why this is happening? Is it a, you know, declining trend of employees maybe as many hours. Or is it a low wage, as I know, some offices are lowering wages for students? So do we know why this is, and this is what we...

50:41

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

No, we can also look to verify the data to ensure because... we will just look to verify the data. Thank you for your comment. We’ll go to Johnson and then Representative Scaccia.

50:53

**Representative Johnson:**

These questions regarding the direct services of an athletic trainer, I can tell you that it's largely first aid oriented, minor, immediate rehabilitative measures, it's nothing extensive, as it would be in a circumstance for clubs, sports, people who are injured immediately. Now, if the point were extended to people, any anyone who goes to the IM and says, you know, maybe I wasn't immediately injured per se, but you know, I've been having this issue for such and such period of time, you know, I was doing this what have you. You know, not only would that open up calls for questions, or open up questions as to, okay, maybe this is considered viable now that we're funding like, not just, I get it's a large amount of students, but all things considered a smaller entity when it comes to club sports. Whereas you're considering the entirety of campus rep. participants. So that addresses the services of an athlete that an athletic trainer would provide, like, medically speaking, and second, you know, assuming of work to address a larger population, I think that's worth an even greater discussion.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Representative Scaccia.

52:12

**Representative Scaccia:**

\*Indistinguishable\* Not sure facilities that have a similar sort of issue. But that just the natural variability. And this might be a question, but as a voice concerns on top sports members that they haven't been able to be UHS. Would it be like PT?

52:48

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yeah, we could ask for clarification, but there isn't their document in their budget request. So I'm, it's in my I guess it's implied. Exactly. Yeah. Yeah. We get asked explicitly if they have found that they were not able to go to UHS.

53:08

**Representative Scaccia:**

My concern would be if it’s just for club sports.

53:12

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. And then last point, quick thoughts. And then we'll move on from both of you. Representative Miller and then D’Elena.

53:20

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, I think that was maybe worthwhile for campus rec to have a better working relationship or have a relationship with athletics in general, because it was said by Vice President Thorndike and President Bendapudi that currently athletics is functioning a profit. And this may be a great way to start to, hopefully bridge the gap between we have a business report that profit that it's not that for the students, and I'm assuming that like athletics, has athletic trainers and has the staff and establish a mechanism in place to be able to better gain those athletic trainers. So we're gonna be doing sports and make sure that we're going to be dealing with minds working with 100% Instead of having maybe two qualities of athletic trainers, one for the athletes that are making us money, and one for the students who are paying tuition.

54:10

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much. We will move on from this from Campus Recreation. We are now talking about the Center for Performing Arts. In the current year they were appropriated 235,000 And the next fiscal year they're requesting flat funding so no modification to their budget. Our executive recommends that they develop a precise forecasting tool and largely evaluate the unit student utilization of ticket subsidies. And then they are proposing, which is going to be in the following slide, a public interactive project swings to give a to make and have another art installation on campus. They said it's necessary to have more, three more. I'm just moved to the next slide. Three more interns for their Center. And there is a fluctuation in ticket subsidy volumes, so that needs to be reconsidered and evaluated. So overall, they're recommending either flat funding, or to approve $210,000 to redistribute the funds without the swing project. To again, provide further context. This is largely a reorganization of their $235,000 request. They're adding three additional arts engagement assistance as part of their art engagement program. And there's a $25,000 interactive musical swings, art installation, that's there. And they offer to a switch and ticket subsidy amount decrease to pay higher wages for their staff. And then there's a note that there is a 16,000 carry forward between the fiscal year 21 to 22, to 22 to 23. Are there any questions? Discussion? Yes, Representative Nevil.

**Representative Nevil:**

\*Indistinguishable\*

56:22

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Excuse me, no. No.

**Representative Nevil:**

\*Indistinguishable\*

57:33

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you for your comments to be clear that this $25,000 is already incorporated in their 235,000. So what you would be proposing is a decrease in their allocation or appropriation. But again, just please make sure you communicate that in the document for CPA. Thank you. Any other questions or concerns? discussion? Thank you so much.

Okay, we move on to basic needs. We are talking about CAPS, Counseling and Psychological Services. This fiscal year they were appropriated aproximately 1.1 million, but the 2.5% increase, and then the requesting flat funding for this unit they request solely just for salaries. So our executive recommends that they provide more details on the roles and responsibilities, again, develop a contingency plan that addresses the reductions in funding without impacting student services dramatically, and then regularly evaluate current service models to align with student needs. So factors to consider are like historically, they have never requested carry forward, which means that there is no variance that they use as much money as they stated they were going to use. Largely because this is salaries, though. I would hope that we are hiring all of the people that they said they were going to hire and that they're those positions are filled. Again, there's an overall recommendation for flat funding or to approve the 23-24 funding and redistribute the funds that would likely impact the telehealth and telecochain. Representative Miller.

59:16

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA president. One thing I would love for them to consider is what has been spoken about in the overall university budget review is that they're expecting you to at the very least push University Park for full asking to about accepting 500 student, as compared to 100 students and I one thing that I would personally be in favor of that was some of the money that we have leftover from the other things that we don't vote improves on. CAPS, see if we can get another person who is as current at our current capacity are still well underserved. And that's something that a lot of students need especially that we're going to have a full campus with less than half full campus with less resources. I'd rather invest.

1:00:07

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, thank you. I believe that CAPS is along with many other units are having critical conversations on how they can their bandwidth and whether or not they can accommodate recruiting additional staffing at a competitive rate. I believe that's one of the concerns or limiting factors for that, but I do appreciate your comment. And if you would document that in the CAPS document. Representative Concepcion.

1:00:37

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee. I know we met discussion for requesting funds for like, facilities, updates or like fix things that already broken. Exactly what are... because I know it’s mostly salaries.

1:00:52

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, so is my understanding with the verification of Administrative Liaison Bram, that they that's covered that I believe Student Affairs has addressed those concerns. Thank you. Any other comments, discussion? No, thank you so much. We move on to childcare subsidy. So the childcare subsidy, sorry, was appropriated 50% of their total requests of $206,000. There's a partnership with Student Affairs that we have a deal where we pay at this year 50% of their total appropriation request this year, and the following or the next following years will only contribute 25% of their request. It's an agreement that we have, and that would account to $51,000. And our executive recommends that we approve it. It's a deal that we have. So I don't know how we can we can always reevaluate that deal in the future. But there's a recommendation to approve it. Here. I don't know. Thank you so much.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Quick question. So after this 25%, does it go to zero or does it stay at 25%.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

We stay. Any questions? Discussion? Okay. Oh, no, no. Okay. And then this is just reiterating that moving forward will continue to contribute 25% Okay, the Lion’s Pantry. So this year, there is a appropriation for approximately 200,000, $196,000. In the requesting flat funding. Our executive recommends that they promote financial education across all levels of staffing, and then establish a contingency plan to adopt to financial uncertainty. Last year, there was a variance of $18,000 in salary and wages. This came from a mis forecast and it seems that this current forecasting of their spending is on track and is more refined. And our executive recommends overall flat funding any questions or concerns about this unit? No, no comments. Oh, Representative D'Elena.

1:03:33

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena UPUA Appointee. Representative Miller brought up a great point about \*indisitinguishable\* is that it's going to be similar concern that because you know, voting and class sizes...

1:03:43

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Administrative Liaison.

1:03:44

**AL Bram:**

So every unit is undergoing consideration you know, getting this set of results and working with insight really, considering... \*indistinguishable\*

1:04:24

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Thank you. Any other questions or discussions for this unit? No. Okay. Thank you. Okay. So you know, University Health Services are UHS. This appropriation is 3.3 million for this year. This is including the two initially these were two separate fees, the STI testing and then the remainder of UHS request. Now this is merged their 24-25 request is now 2.6 million and our executive recommends that they promote again financial awareness, they create a fund for unexpected expenses and then develop a framework for prioritizing expenses when budget allocations are reduced, should prioritize critical services. Factors to consider that UHS general request their STI testing lab operations are now pulled within one request, as I mentioned earlier, and that there is a major decrease in the requested funding. And I would urge that does warrant further consideration in conversation. Yes, Representative Miller.

1:05:46

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Was there any updates on how the fee worked?

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, that information is in the operational review document that's in the folder. So I would recommend that you and all the board members look through the documents the operational review documents for each unit, but especially for UHS that information should be in that and if it's not please let me know. Any questions or concerns? Topics of discussion? Okay, thank you. We are moving on. Okay. Student Care and advocacy, also known as the basic needs support center. This year they are appropriated to 290,000. And their 24-25 request is 318,000 are from their review, operational review, and our budget executive recommends that they consider again, exploring additional funding sources to weaken the impact of potential funding cuts, develop a more detailed financial report and involve more stakeholders in their budgeting process. The student care advocacy budget modification request is strictly limited to the increased pay for their intern wages. They stated an increase in intern pay is intended to fairly compensate the individual intern but also attract higher quality interns to provide exceptional services to students and the basic needs support center. The need to investigate the validity of their number of staffing is not applicable. So overall, our executive recommends to approve the increase in their budget modification. Any questions? topics of discussion? Representative Miller.

1:07:38

**Representative Miller:**

\*Indistinguishable\*

1:07:43

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

We’ll address that outside of this meeting, thank you so much. Okay, any other topics of discussion for Student Care and advocacy questions? Okay, moving forward, we're going to talk about diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging. The first unit is Center for Sexual and Gender Diversity this year they're appropriate 157,000 and the request is increased to 188,000. Our executive recommends that they clarify the specific responsibilities of each staff member, enhance the fund allocation process, again, another recommendation for contingency plans for funding scenarios where they can ensure quality in challenging financial circumstances such as a budget cut, and then assess their programming and service engagement to accurately represent student needs. Some factors to consider is that there should be substantial not audit, but review of end of fall semester mid March and first of May, finances and regular financial check ins and use their excess funds after periodic review. And overall our representative sorry, our executive recommends to approve the budget request but expect a smaller variance. And there's more. This is just to show all of their projected expenses. They do a lot of programming. They specifically about the student wages, they say that they struggle to have be consistent in their forecasting, but they want to provide an additional $1,000 for CSGD Queer peers for first year programming in that respect, and they had distinct fall and spring programming events as we see here. And then, again, mentioning the wages for their staff that CSGD wants to increase their undergraduate student wages to 13 and undergraduate student wages to 16 an hour, this increase is a key diversion and where we see a large amount of that increase, specifically that 31,000. Okay, any topics of discussion questions for this unit? Okay, beautiful. Gender Equity Center for the 23-24 year they were appropriated $117,000. They’re requesting flat funding. Our executive recommends that they have regular assessment of their programming to ensure alignment with student needs, again, recommends a contingency plan and then diversify their fund allocation depending on student needs. They suggested that they should switch from their primary focus on programming to salaries. There are some factors to consider, then recommended that one, they identify which speakers and events will be most effective for students deliberate on effective marketing and outreach, and then discuss hiring student staff. There was a, they did not spend $4,000 in the 22-23 year because of a cancelled speaker. And then $7,000 was a failure, or I guess, failure in hiring a graduate student. So that's where we see that carry forward. And then there is a contingency strategy to cut back on speakers in large scale events, and source external funding, largely because there is an effort to reevaluate student engagement and speaker series. So our executive recommends to decrease funding to $110,000 based on historical marketing and student worker salary variances. Yes, Representative Concepcion.

**Representative Concepcion:**  
Giselle Concepcion, UPUA appointee. I have a couple of questions. In terms of the recommendations, if any have been focusing that with the Gender Equity Center, how many reevaluating programs and things of that nature? Or is this just in the brevity that it's already laid out?

1:12:24

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

So I will say that there have been conversations outside the scope of the Fee Board to re evaluate the efficacy of their programming as they have traditionally have done it. But within this recommendation, this is provided and prompted because of a review that was from the Student Fee Board and what they've submitted from the keyboard. Yes, Representative Concepcion.

1:12:51

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee. I know when we went to visit, they also really talked about the need for another case manager. Was that at all like in any of their documentation, or are they like working on that kind of request? Because I know, we're putting down a lot of other things based on the fact that they need another case manager. So I just wanted to know where that was at?

1:13:18

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, that will be something we will need to follow up on and look at their operational review again. But again, we'll just make that a point. Unless we, Okay, any questions or other points of discussion? Okay, thank you so much for the discussion, we can move on to Office of Graduate Educational Equity Programs. This year, they're appropriated $197,000, and they're requesting flat funding for their next fiscal year. The executive recommends that they align their hiring process timeline with fiscal planning the fiscal planning timeline, that they continue to seek position funding and to the standard university budget, and then implement documentation and tracking of UPFB funds to enhance transparency. Factors to consider that the salaried positions include student advocacy manager position and an Administrative Support Assistant. And then there is an expected they only expect to spend $162,000. But again, you see that they've requested a total appropriation of $197,000. So the recommendation is to approve $173,000 in expected expenses, and plus they're entitled, which include the expected expenses and entitled 7% carry forward to meet that further clear. This is what they submitted, again, emphasizing that their entire expenses totaled $162,000, but they're requesting $197,000 The reason is to provide cushion for anticipated expenses. We can always request for additional reasons for that cushion. But okay, Representative Miller, then Representative Nevil.

1:15:15

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. One thing I would like to add to his recommendation is that they also look into how they can also serve professional students and not solely graduate students. Yeah.

1:15:30

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you. Representative Nevil.

**Representative Nevil:**

\*Indistinguishable\* What is that request? Identify pushing? Like, I'm looking at this slide. Where? Where is that additional $30,000 cushion for jobs wanted you to support us. \*Indistinguishable\*

1:16:44

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I believe, so there was a hiring, request and process I believe that started last semester. So they're in the process of hiring, I believe to again, provide further context they were not able to fully hire because there was it even though they were authorized the funds, they were not allowed to actually proceed in the hiring process due to the administrative freeze. Yeah, the strategic hiring freeze. So largely, the lack of being able to hire these people in this portion initially was out of their control. But again, we can always request further explanation on what this cushion funds would be used for. Any other questions or discussion for this unit? Okay, where are we going along. Almost done. Okay, Paul Robeson cultural center, so this year, they're appropriate 609,000 And they're requesting an increase to 631,000. This next fiscal year, or executive recommends that they provide a clear description of organizational structure, including roles and responsibilities of different teams who managed UPFB funds, improve their documentation and communication of their budget process and establish again another formal contingency plan. In case there are budget cuts, factors, he considers that the PRCC liaison board should help to facilitate fiscal management, and that they demonstrated engagement and student demand for regularly programmed and newly introduced events. So our executive recommends that they that we approve the budget request but requests regular review and incorporate programming metrics of how students engage with their programs. To provide further context. They have five signature education and engagement programs. There are newly approved community coordinators something that we the fee board approved last year, but they're actively hiring. And then during listing and cultural wellness professionals. And largely in summary, the requests and extra funding will enable them to sustain and expand these critical initiatives ensuring that they continue to foster a campus environment that celebrates supports and nurtures the diverse identities within our Penn State community. Any questions or point of discussion for this unit? Okey dokie.

Awesome student government and wholly fee funded entities. We have student legal services, they requested an appropriation of 525,000 and they’re requesting flat funding. Our executive recommends that there's cross training and new staff to manage UPFB funds. They should monitor market trends for essential services develop contingency plans again in case that they decrease their funding and maintain active engagement with Student Advisory Board and student leaders which they do. Factors to consider, the office still is seeking to fill vacancies, and then due to a need for competitive salaries, and that there's a robust analysis of student demand in necessary position responsibilities, so our executive recommends that we approve flat funding but also again, since just to consider that there, they were struggling to fill vacancies due to a lack of competitive rate that the Board should feel free to recommend an increase. Okay, Representative Zebrowski and then Nevil.

1:20:36

**Representative Zebrowski:**

I'm sorry, I'm like walking out the door. To give some insight into those competitive salaries. To be frank, the numbers may need to be like doubled to get. And as far as I'm aware, they still need a qualified immigration attorney to get a qualified immigration attorney to come here you're gonna have to bump that number up. Just so everybody knows that this is this isn’t like bumping up by like 5 or 10%.

1:21:04

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, thank you, Representative D’Elena.

1:21:10

**Representative D’Elena:**

\*Indistinguishable\* Is that easy dealing with immigration, generally, non-metropolitan areas, that one? Additionally, they're walk in services, given the amount of vacancies they have, they have a lot of walk in dates, where they're like, oh, come in with...\*Indistinguishable\*

1:21:47

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much. Administrative Liaison Bram.

1:21:52

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

\*Indistinguishable\* University just last week rolled out new job transportation. Everybody is entitled to their own salary. There are occasions where, let’s say I got assigned to this thing, my salary, current salary might not be within the range. So the university has made it to try to get everybody to at least the lower end. But that might be only for a handful of services and salaries that we find that these requests will change. We won't have insurance in the market... \*indistinguishable\*... I think you should know this information by March. Spreadsheets are out and we're working on something... \*indistinguishable\*

1:23:48

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you so much for the clarification. Okay, any other points of discussion or questions? This will be the last one. Student Leadership and Involvement. For this year, there's an appropriation of approximately 2 million they're requesting 2.1 million. Our executive recommends that they adopt a more dynamic approach to budgeting planning, improve their financial documentation to increase transparency, and then again, develop a comprehensive contingency plan in case there are budget cuts factors to consider. There have been large variances seen due to post-pandemic stopped staff departures. The primary use of UPFB funding is associated with fixed costs of third party services such as or essential and that this unit has a large amount of staff led social programming that has not commenced due to lack of student demand. And then the large unit or subsidy is SPA so they recommend that we approve the budget request but also recommend periodic review. Similar to UPAC and specifically towards how students are engaging with their programming. Okay. Representative Miller.

1:25:05

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. I know that there was a concern last year. The first one was about SPA and student wages. Do we ever get an answer about that? Is that a part of this? The second part was there was a request for them to not come at one big chunk and SPA, the MLK Day banquet, Homecoming. How did that go?

1:25:31

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

So I believe this is all in but with this... please.

1:25:37

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

I think we should table this discussion.

1:25:43

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yeah. Okay. Yeah. That's fine. So, thank you for that. Any other? Any thoughts? I do think we can make it through this. So I'm so sorry. Okay. Environmental Sustainability. The student farm is appropriated $230,000. They're requesting an increase of $6,000 for the next fiscal year. The reason is for farm tools, internal wages, and GSI for salary, food systems coordinator position, and our executive recommends that we approve this request. Any thoughts, points of discussion for this? Okay, thank you, and Sustainability Institute. So this year, they're appropriated $75,000, there's a request to increase it to $109,000. And this request is for additional programming support and salary, a 50% increase in salary support for newly created Student Engagement Coordinator. Any questions or concerns? points of discussion? Amazing. Okay. So our amazing executive provided some models of what it would look like if we approved the standing modification request as they were requested. And we would see a variance of approximately $276,000, which is great. But if we approved it based on the recommendations from our executive, we would see a variance of approximately $440,000. This is just to provide a scenario of what it would look like, again, the board should strongly review and think critically on what the implications of approving or modifying a budget for these units would look like. And that is it for this portion of the presentation. I want to congratulate you all because that was a lot. But I made it through. Yay, I'm going to go to the agenda now. Amazing. So we're moved to striking the chair report from Najee, that's been stricken, or at stroke, whatever. Point line item eight Vice Chair report, I do not have a report. We can move to line item nine, the Executive Committee Reports. These reports were shared in the email and I believe that in the meeting folder, so if you're interested, please review those reports. And then now we'll move on to line item 10, comments for the good of the order. Congratulations. This is a lot of Fee Board stuff this week. So I just want to say you guys should be really proud. And then we'll do some closing roll call.

1:29:05

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

\*Conducted closing roll call\*

1:29:41

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. Thank you. I call this meeting adjourned. Bye. Bye. Have a nice weekend. No groundhog hopefully, we can have a quiet weekend.