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07:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Alright, so I call this February 23 meeting to order at 9:10 am. Vice Chair Chandler, would you please take opening roll call.

\*Vice Chair Chandler takes opening roll call and quorum is met\*

08:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there anyone's name that wasn’t called? Seeing everyone's name being called, we will now move into line item two, which is the adoption of the meeting minutes from our February 16 meeting. Is there a motion to adopt the meeting? Is there a second? All right. The meeting minutes from our past meeting have been adopted and we’ll now move into line item three of the adoption of the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Seeing that we have adopted the agenda will now move into line item four, public comment. Are there any students here for public comment? Seeing none, we'll now move into line item five of old business which is a continuation of FY 25 reviews. Once again, as we pull up the PowerPoint related to that, I did want everyone to know that given the Groundhog Day absence from me, there was confusion over the linear timeline that we had set forth for reviewing FY 2025. I thought some aspects of 2025 are already approved and discussed and that was my oversight. So we just have to loop back on the standing funding appropriations that requested a budget modification. And once we do so, you all had the discussion with Cierra so you're already aware of what that looks like from that day. If there's anything outstanding you can bring it up. But again, the mentality is you have already had those discussions that are pertinent to the topics that we need to catch up on.

10:08

All right. And I will now begin with line item 5.A the Paul Robeson Cultural Center fiscal year 2025 budget modification proposal. Again, it's my understanding you all did the reviews and discussion of this. Just so we are in the structure for modern rules, I will go over each line item with questions and discussion. I would ask that a lot of it be reserved for what we actually had discussion about on Friday, if something does come up, that's fine. Although I would have hoped that it would have come up two weeks ago when these were originally discussed. Okay, starting first, Paul Robeson Cultural Center, I'll give the brief overview, so everyone has a reminder of what you all discussed two weeks ago, I don't want to be redundant. But they, of course, provided the updated information for their salary positions and the implementation of that. They'll be using student staff, the recommendation was to approve the budget proposal. I don't want to get too into the weeds because again, you've all had this discussion. But that being said, I'll open it up to any questions related to the proposal. Are there any questions related to the proposal? Seeing no questions related to the proposal will now move into discussion on the proposal. Is there any discussion on the proposal? Seeing no discussion on the proposal will now move into line-item 5.B, which will be the review of the Student Leadership and Involvement Budget Modification Proposal.

11:47

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege, can this screen be shared?

11:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We Yes, yes. Thank you. Okay, again, I just want to confirm it's my understanding that you all had the discussion with these as well. Great. Okay. Student Leadership and Involvement. This is their modified request. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz explained, I'm assuming, the variations and the reasoning as to why I'll open it up to any questions on Student Leadership and Involvement. Representative Miller?

12:32

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. I know one of the things we were talking about, I don't know if this ever made into that question document was about the fact that last year's board asked Student Leadership and Involvement to break down their line item so that they're alone and then SPA is alone.

12:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

They’re going to do that. Yes. So they haven't been able to do it for the budget modification, since it's a specific variation, but for fiscal year 2026, the materials that they're submitting, they are adopting that.

**Representative Miller:**

Perfect.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Any further questions? Yeah, I'm glad you brought that up. That was a big that they'll be implementing. So you're all able to see the separate proposals from the student organizations? I think that's going to be a lot easier for people to review and understand. Okay, any... no other questions? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on Student Leadership and Involvement? Seeing none, I'll now close the floor for discussion. And we'll now move into line item 5.C, which is Penn State Sustainability. Again, the request for proposal was to ensure that there could be a student engagement coordinator that would be able to facilitate student volunteers, initiatives, programming to really provide that support, which is the core mission of Penn State Sustainability. I'll now open up the floor to any questions that anyone might have. Seeing no questions, we'll move into this discussion. Representative Miller.

14:09

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Kind of question, kind of discussion, from my understanding like last year, when they came in and spoke they had like a huge decrease in their budget because of the because they saw like the programming stuff really died down. But they're going right back up to where they were before just to fill another person.

14:29

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So, this is to actually coordinate their program. So they weren't they didn't really have the capacity to do so in a really hands on manner. So they were able to like hire students and whatnot, but it's really, from my understanding of who's able to help facilitate this. So this would coordinate the programming that they weren't able to provide attention to in the past, thus making it like an ambition not just why they had that reduction that they propose but they want to adhere to their core mission once again because this is what Penn State Sustainability is, and they want to invest in those programs and other initiatives that essentially teach sustainability but also like bringing students involved in the process as they formulate projects and things like that from my understanding. Any further discussion?

15:21

Seeing none, we'll now move into line item 5.D, the Keiko Ross Student Farm. Again, this was probably discussed, but there's the typical increases that we see my would label as general GSI. And that's where we're student staff, that's for their food systems coordinator that we funded. And then to accommodate inflation for the equipment that they utilize for agricultural production and also just their general facilities and increase for that. I'll now open up to any questions. Are there any questions? Seeing no questions, I'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the student farm? Representative Miller.

16:06

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. I'm not really a big fan of cents in the request, can we just round up to the nearest dollar?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, yeah. So this was something that I think we last year, we were able to do this without having... we can make the decision to...

16:27

**AL Bram:**

Even if you leave it in there to be honest, that they won't transfer cents. I would recommend changing it so it’s clear that

16:35

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, any further discussion? Okay, so we'll take that into account. And also that that's a really good point. No further discussion? Seeing none, I'll now close the floor for discussion. And we'll now move into line item 5.E of Student Orientation and Transition Programs for their fiscal year budget modification request. The increase that they are requesting comes from a new project that is replicated in other Big 10 universities that they would like to bring into their Penn State programming and projects, this specific request or the recommendation was to satisfy some portion of what they initially proposed. And again, just an implication that comes from that is that it literally includes an entire class. So 6000-7000 students, that is maximized impact. They've spoken to athletics about having collaboration fiscally between their units being able to have this opportunity and to determine other funding sources. We determine it to be reasonable because of those purposes. And we also did not fulfill their entire proposal, mostly because there are those opportunities for them to cost share, and we are able to see that. But yeah, so it would be the approval of $120,000 Compared to $130,000. You all are I don't know what your discussions were two weeks ago, you're all willing to accept that, modify that. But that is what is proposed. And again, I apologize. I don't know the context of what was discussed with this, but I'll move into questions. I'll close the floor to questions. And I'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? I'll close the floor to discussion. And we'll now move into line item 5.F which is the Campus Recreation fiscal year 2025. Proposal. Okay. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz. Would you mind adding just some kind of context to those two choices that we are?

19:06

**Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz:**

Yeah. So obviously we see an agreement we can approve budget as is or as it was requested or approve half of what their overall increase modification was so 91,500 would be the cost for one additional athletic training position and there's other equipment to gauge you know, the in rationale of having a club sports athletic trainer. I know we went over last week, I believe the response from Campus Recreation, and outside of their response, I really can't offer you any more insight but those are the two options that we have recommended.

20:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we’ll need to decide on what direction we'll go on here officially, because then we'll go after you go through these reviews. But essentially, there's been no issue with variances of the recommendations until now. So these are two distinctive options that you all have to officially choose from. I'm hoping we can decide on an option that we can vote on. If it fails, then it fails, but I'm hoping a deliberation can yield some sort of direction as to how we can move forward. It's not that large of a difference, which is why I'm comfortable having this discussion now, given that it's the one position compared to the two that you are ultimately reviewing. And I want to leave it at that because that's a lot to decide. So now move into question unless there’s... Okay, we'll move into questions. Vice Chair Chandler.

20:57

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Can you remind us of the responses?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Of course, I can actually pull those up right now.

21:04

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. The two choices one of those is like approved 91,500 What would be the total?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

That times two.

**Representative Miller:**

Okay, cool. So it’s just either one or two.

21:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, so the answer to the club sports question or any student primary risk manager may need at this time is for athletic trainer dedicated to 2200 students who participate in club sports annually. “What is the current demand for pre performance therapeutic modalities such as athletics taping or designated warm-ups?” Demand is certainly high we have 25 clubs sports teams that would benefit from this. However, the plan is for the new athletic trainer or trainers to assist with event coverage for the 18 high risk club sports. Some of the responsibilities during that coverage will include athletic taping, and potential warm-ups, but injury response and care will be the primary responsibility of that athletic trainer.

“Have there been attempts for discussion in partnership with the ICA?” We have some we have some initial questions that ICA about assistance with athletic training coverage. Their current athletic trainers are all assigned to multiple sports seasons throughout the year though and do not have additional availability to cover the 30+ events hosted by our high risk club sports.

“Where do club sports athletes currently go for athletic training services?” Currently, athletic training services are outsourced to certified individuals and community on a very limited basis. The demand for athletic training coverage in the community is so high that our help sports are often paying upwards of $50 an hour to simply have an athletic trainer coverage. This coverage also does not include any additional services outside of emergency medical response during completion. We’ll now open the floor back to questions. Are there any questions? Seeing no questions, we will now move into discussion. Is there any discussion from the board? Representative Miller?

23:11

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. The one thing I do worry about is the fact that it's solely the athletic trainers solely for club sports. While I think that that is important, I wonder if we're going to get minimal pushback from students basically saying, “I never want to use I never do watch sports, but I could really benefit from having an athletic trainer that I am paying for anyways.”

23:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes, and I will point of privilege myself. Administrative Liaison Bram, hopefully, you could provide some hints. I don't know if Dr. Comp was coming from the perspective of like, this is club sports. I'm sure he has the mentality that it has to be available to all students, essentially up to policy, right? So, if no matter what, even if it's being narratively directed towards club sports, the expectation would be that it would be open to all students who would need it?

24:04

**AL Bram:**

That rationale. I get what you're saying that essentially, any student could choose to be involved in club sports, and they don't choose to be involved in clubs sports, then they do not have access to see the trainer and I haven't talked to Steve about this at all. You know, we do that with you know, we had this discussion over student government retreats and all that sort of stuff, right? If you're not a part of student government. That's so.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, thanks for that insight. Representative Miller.

24:40

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. I have I guess concerns with what you say about the narrative that he understands that it's supposed to be for all students and that any student could have the access to join club sports if they don't. However, not all students know the process. I've never once been in the process of joining club sports. And I know that if I walk and say “Hey, I want to reach the athletic trainer” and somebody says, “are you in club sports?” And I say “no.” They say, “Oh, it's for club sports.” But I pay for it, then I'm gonna get into an arguing match, whoever is working behind the desk who's not paid enough to deal with this to be like, No, I pay for it. Let me use them. And that's... I look at those barriers.

25:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Um, I think in response to that, I would say, I think that there's a formation of consensus here, potentially, I think that what you're saying is there's varying ways to consider this. And I think that this is the first year that they would be going about it. So I don't think they would have all the nuts and bolts even said, and that being said, I am gravitating towards one over the other, because I think there's reasonableness in at least extending the pilot, to some extent without investing all the way because we don't know what that would look like. Ideally, it would be open to all students. Like Administrative Liaison Bram, though, I would point to the fact that we indirectly, students, theoretically have access to everything that we fund, but it's their choice to voluntarily participate in that with the money. But that's just my perception. Chief Budgeting and Planning Executive Kurtz, I will yield you time.

26:20

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Yeah, when I was reading through this one, too. I kind of saw that same narrative, though, is it's only for club sports. What's the cut off here, but I think that and I actually reviewed campus rec, one of the first ones that they did, so as I kind of use that as a benchmark to read the rest of these, at least from a financial perspective, if I was going to read each of the proposals and base it off of my access to every single one of them, I don't know if that would serve the operations we do to be the most beneficial because I think that you know, especially as you're taking on larger infrastructure projects, expanding our students staff, like all we're doing right now is to diversify our funding portfolio, and touch a lot of spaces that maybe each of one member of the board is not familiar with a total of them. And we know we're encompassing a large body of students. So I don't think that it's necessarily, it shouldn't necessarily be a deterrent, just because not every single student can. Because there are other UPFB funded medical staff that students can turn to.

27:35

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA Representative, I think I'm in favor with what Chair Rodriguez said about how to lean more towards the approved one over the other with any idea that take this next year, the pilot program, figure out what's the best way that do they have the bandwidth to take on more students? Do they have a way to be able to be maybe like there's large structures, but they could leave at any students could walk in and join in, we have to lean more towards one.

28:07

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I think as responsible, I think that's fair. I yield time.

28:13

**CPBE Kurtz:**

After reading for Campus Rec’s approving of one will probably just mean that the athletic trainers will be allocated towards less of the most vibrant sports, but I think having two on board was likely just for scheduling. So they just spread themselves out between the 18 high risk sports. So I like just forward thinking like if we were curious about what these hours would be with just one, I'm pretty sure they would prioritize the most supportive role and that's all.

28:47

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Generally understood. Right. Okay. Does anyone want to make a motion to approve $91,500 for a position?

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, so moved. Snickers there had to be competition.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That being said, we've been voting on $91,500 for one additional athletic trainer. All right. Well, that concludes the budget modification proposals. Congratulations on that. We have not yet voted, but we will vote soon. And we'll now move into the OriginLabs. I'm actually going to field that to Vice Chair Chandler to introduce because you have a better way of conveying what they’re articulating.

29:37

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

So as we discussed last week... can you pull up the questions and responses we shared some questions with OriginLabs to respond to focusing on protection of intellectual property rights. They have an entity at OriginLabs called the Service Bureau, so that would be something that we would likely utilize and refer to all of our units to requests for furniture and marketing materials, as we see here.

30:21

So the first question is, “The Board understands that there are currently 28 students utilizing OriginLabs. If the proposal was funded, can you provide the maximum number of students that can utilize the subsidized memberships, and would there be a cap?” So this is the understanding under proposal, we see on the last slide of the presentation, we are currently funding staff positions, as well as student engagement staff position... Typically, what goes into the cost of a membership? So by providing these conditions, that means that we're subsidizing student memberships. So just to clarify that. So by hiring these people, we are creating memberships for students. At least that was intended in their proposal, so there's funds for this question on a cap. He says, “No, there will not be a cap on the number of students who can utilize subsidized membership. There will be limits to how many students can work in the space simultaneously, for safety reasons. With the scheduling software we already have in place and an increase in staffing supported by the UPFB funding, we don’t foresee this being an issue. In the event demand proves to be overwhelming we may reapproach the UPFB for additional funding to support increased staffing and more comprehensive hours of operation.”

And then the second question was about concern about intellectual property. The question was, “Can you comment on the protections for IP for things that utilize the membership. Do you foresee any changes on IP policy with future performance in using the subsidized membership and space?” He responded, “We do not take any stake in customer/user IP and our employees honor customer confidentiality, we have two contracts/documents authored by the University General Counsel that articulate our approach to confidentiality, and the customers retention of IP ownership which we made readily available to any customers who require this level of assurance. This approach is consistent and part of the culture of across the entire Invent Penn State ecosystem. I do not foresee any changes to this approach.”

The next question was, “There is an interest in promoting the service bureau and establishing that framework on where units request funding for furnishing and marketing would give prioritiy considerations to OriginLabs. Can you provide a comment on the feasibility of establishing this framework and any considerations” He loved the question and they’re, “absolutely interested in developing this framework that designs the service bureau into operations to be scalable and self-sustainable through the billing of our approved rates, which were developed in accordance with financial policy FN27, approved by Cost Analysis under the AVP for Budget and Finance."

And then the last question was about the wages for students staff, “In the event UPFB funding is approved, we do intend to start all hourly employees at $15/hr.” So that is their response. And, again, we're maintaining that they're requesting 271,000 for some time during proposal and that proposal that means they’re hiring staff members, and by hiring staff members we are subsidizing the cost for students to access OriginLabs.

34:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Awesome, and the only thing I would add is that some discussion that we had, which I think is important is that obviously if it came down to it, I think that there are core vertical, again, pilot approaches to go about this and reasonable ways, specifically with student engagement and that manager and then having students help staff the facility. And one thing I suppose also to board is that we had discussions about what appropriation like a general appropriation would look like for this OriginLabs to be able to utilize for Student Affairs costs. So if the Student Affairs unit lead, need something, or if they're collaborating with students daily be able to pull from this amount if we were to just fund the student aspects, and then the engagement manager. And that would be the symbiotic relationship that we would be pushing and implementing for this. And I think that might have been the intent. I know that in the future, then they'll probably evolve potentially to this is probably what it would look like. This was more of an advanced standing appropriation. Vice Chair Chandler and I basically told them to request what they initially wanted. And then from there, it was up to the Board to decide how they would go about it. But this is their essential like core if they would want full operations. This is what it would be. So I'll post that in the beginning before moving into questions and discussion. Yeah, but that being said, then I'll immediately move into questions. Seeing none, I'll now move into discussion. Representative Miller.

36:27

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. The one of the things that I have concerns with is going back to the IP question, just as a refresher for everybody and the concerns that myself and Vice President Zebrowski brought up was about the intellectual property rights. And while they're question says that we have two contracts documents authored by the general counsel's it's still not really providing what are not really appeasing, because I'm reading both of these documents. And basically, the two most important things is that underneath the actual participant for stuff that's not a part of like the scope of employment or class says that, “university retains all rights titles and ownership in into any materials” and the materials or the things that are going into the project. That's not personal materials, who's going to it. However, if you go into the service agreement under item four, it says that there's two that are, there's two lines that are important. Number four is ownership of the deliverable, which basically says the client, whoever the client is owns, all right, title, interest in into the deliverable, which can be defined later, because it's contract and deliverable could mean anything that could mean the ChapStick back could mean the process to make ChapStick. However, it can also only mean the ChapStick process that you make there, which brings me to number five, which is where the concern really comes in.

It says, retention of university rights, “the university retains all rights titles and interest in and to any scientific process, technique, methodologies, materials, and information used or developed in the performance of this agreement, including any and all intellectual property rights there, too, that were not provided by the client and are not invited, embodied, contained or incorporated in whole or in part by the deliverable called process IP.” And then, “no rights or license in order to the process IP is granted by the university to the client here-under expressed, implied, in shop, or otherwise.” So basically, from my reading of this, the way that it's currently saying is if I'm a student who wants to go make, I want to go sell racecars. And so I just made a new tire and I'm coming here and I say, hey, I want to go use OriginLabs to make a tire. Because I'm not a lawyer, I'm going to write up the my deliverable is going to be this cool tire. I do it. Congratulations, I've made the world's best tire. And what the only thing that I put in this methodology is the tire itself. So I can take that tire and say, “Hey, I'm gonna do this and do this do this.” However, the university owns all property, or all processes, techniques, methodologies, materials that have gone into making this tire. And that's a concern. Because how are we going to be able to ensure that students works are being used for this thing, and it's not just gonna be another way for this university to fatten pockets is what have been the process of making the super cool tire, we now have created a new process that's also applicable to making the next level of medical tubing, that's going to make it $2 billion. And so like that's a concern that would be coming from this IP thing. And I really don't think it's the best.

39:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Awesome, and I will move into dis...

**Representative Miller:**

Oh, sorry. That wasn't discussion? My bad.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

No, no, sorry. That was I'm trying to figure out how to respond. I had representative Johnson and then...

39:44

**Representative Johnson:**
Point of privilege, are we in discussion?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah.

**Representative Johnson:**

May I then? Thank you. Brian Johnson At-Large Representative. While I can proceed the concerns relayed by reference and Miller, I think it's going off at the event partially because as, as you're speaking, I would imagine to be the efforts of students to develop said creations that will be protected under the wording, if I understand. And while I think, once again, I think the concern is valid. I don't, I don't think it's quite right to make such an argument regarding fattening pockets of the university, per se, because as the university does own all the mechanisms and given those and what have you in order to produce such amazing tires, and I quote, I just think, you know, we're going off the deep end and into our fabrications things. And I think that concern is out of line, but certainly willing to hear more on that.

40:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, I also, I would pose to you that we do have the ability to Vice Chair Chandler and I did discuss this, but we do have the ability to write up a MoU related to our funding that stipulated to this. I envision by chance, and I did the theoretical playout. I envision, though, that that makes sense to me, if there is a very prominent entrepreneur that was able to develop this like very profitable project, right, like in an in the exception in the extraordinary case that that would happen, I think I'm understanding that Penn State would own that product that they created, ultimately, and that they would not be able to profit off. I would say for this, though, a lot of the utility that students would be able to like derive from this would be things based on maybe external academics, prototypes that they might want to produce for their own benefit. People can make their own things and then use it with the assistance of the staff that's there. And I think that the entrepreneurialship program within the innovation lab or center, that's more so where that would play in, whereas this is they're just providing a service of what the students would want. And I think that's mainly the difference, because that will be applicable to the entrepreneur grant program, where they develop businesses and different products. And I think for this, this would just be more of a mass supply kind of thing, or for the student, just benefiting what they might need to produce, given the varying products that they're able to create, if that makes more sense. But I do see your argument. Representative Miller.

42:48

Representative Miller:

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. While I do appreciate the both concerns listed. Ultimately, I do think this is a little bit out of our scope. Because if it's something that's going for class, that's not within our scope of doing if it's for the academic procedure, which they do provide underneath their rules and regulations for products or research related to enrollment or employment at Penn State, for instance, class projects, that kind of stuff that we couldn’t touch, because it's within the, it's the in-class experience. But when the ones that I'm talking about for the stuff that is unrelated to Penn State enrollment or employment and the service agreements for those that are not related to Penn State enrollment. And I do think that even if it's not something that we can, we can't expect that everybody at the school is Tony Stark is going to make the next Ironman. We may create an Ironman. And because Invent Penn State is a for-profit institution, I think there's value in us rejecting this, and either having them come back with some stronger legal protections for the students who are going to be using their services, or finding money and other sources, because Invent Penn State under whatever vice provost is over that. I'm sure they have a little bit of funding, if they wanted to really open this up.

44:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Vice Chair Chandler.

44:04

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I understand the concern. I personally don't believe that it's worth rejecting access for students who are an entrepreneurial out of class spirit, because of the potential concern that the university profiting off of their process. I think that that's something I think we've developed outside of this. If we do decide to approve as it is I think I can do whatever and I understand outside and stronger protection on the process specifically if I was concerned with making that prototype, but I don't believe that it's I don't think that concern is worth rejecting in hiring student staff and staff in general to assist students who are out of class and making things. You're getting access to space like this.

**Chair Rodriguez:**
Representative Johnson and the I’m closing the floor.

45:09

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson At-Large Representative. First and foremost, I second Vice Chair Chandler’s statement. And secondly, I really think it's important to hit home the notion that, yes, there may be elements of an organization that could pertain to the in class experience or academic involvement per se, class projects as it was phrased. But I think when looking at the bigger picture expands beyond that it does within the purview of allocations permitted by the board. And I really think just kind of with the same tone of Vice Chair Chandler’s statement, I think we need to look beyond the intricate details and see how this is truly going to impact.

46:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, and discussion is closed. And we will now move into voting on the proposed line items here. Vice Chair Chandler, I'll give you a second to pull that up. Okay, awesome. So again, as a reminder of how this process is, is everyone on Zoom okay? Just a reminder as to how this process works, we'll go through each line item, you will vote by roll call. Once your vote is made, and once we conclude each line item, that will conclude our voting process for fiscal year 2025. And then we'll move into fiscal year 26 details. Any questions before moving into the process? We cannot interrupt the process. So I ask that you remain until this process is complete. It's pretty straightforward. And that being said, I just want to confirm Zoom. Good?

47:03

**Representative Nevil:**

Yes.

47:07

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, um, that being said, we'll be 5.A the Paul Robeson Cultural Center on fiscal year 2025 budget modification proposal.

47:17

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I would recommend that we pull up the slides with the funding requests.

47:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I absolutely agree.

47:25

**AL Bram:**

Administrative Liaison Bram.I just I just want to add. The Robeson Center is the only unit that I've heard from so far that has given me an amount that they will need to the compensation modernization. So the four positions that you funded last year, I'm going to require about $40,000 more in salaries based on the university's new classification system in order to fully fund. So I just want you to be aware of that. The amount you're voting on here, we're actually voting on 670,000 approximately. The numbers aren't exact yet, but that's when this is going to happen with some other positions.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'm assuming this is out of our control. Okay, well, transparency, it's important.

**AL Bram:**

I haven't heard from any of the other units. I anticipate hearing hopefully soon.

48:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we will navigate those issues as they arise.

48:24

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call voting for the PRCC FY 25 funding. It passes eight yeses and one no.\*

49:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Moving to Penn State Sustainability.

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call voting for Penn State Sustainability FY 25 funding. It passes eight yeses and one no.\*

50:24

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We'll now move into the student farm.

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call voting for the Student Farm FY 25 funding. It passes nine yeses.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. Student Orientation and Transition Programs. Okay. The overall recommendation is to appeal 20,000 of their 30,000 request.

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call voting for the Student Orientation and Transition Programs FY 25 funding. The request received four yeses and four nos. Chair Rodriguez broke the tie, in approval of the request.\*

51:54

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Campus Recreation, this is to approve one athletic trainer plus the materials for the athletic trainer.

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call voting for the Campus Recreation FY 25 funding. It passes five yeses and 4 nos.\*

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call voting for the OriginLabs FY 25 funding request. It passes six yeses and three nos.\*

53:44

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That being said, we have concluded fiscal year 2025 reviews officially this time. Congratulations everyone. And thank you for your time with fiscal year 2025. Now we will now we'll move into line item six some new business of a fiscal year 2026 materials and process presentation. I will be animated so as to awaken and to gravitate your attention. I am going to go over what was sent to the units. So you all are updated on how units are going to be going about this process. If you have any questions as we go through anything, feel free to raise your hand and make that known and I will acknowledge your request.

54:39

Excellent. Okay. So we'll first begin with the memo I sent out so we're all on the same page with everything. This was sent out to all of the unit leads. If you haven't been paying attention already. This is the time because fiscal year 2026, everything fiscal year 2026 is important. Okay, so we basically sent these to our standing funding appropriations to prepare for what fiscal year 2026 is going to look like for them. If you can see that this is our updated timeline. So this is pretty important. February 16, we released applications, we are tentatively aiming to have the deadline March 8, with the knowledge that those who might need extra time will be afforded that, then that will be followed by our next of five meetings, which is essentially going to be reviewing those fiscal year 2026 proposals, that's probably when a lot of the outside work will be helpful for you all. So that's when I would encourage you to utilize Vice Chair Chandler, myself, or Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz to help you throughout this process, depending on what level of investment you are committing to reviewing fiscal year 2026. And how much engagement you want to have with it, which I hope is a lot, although I cannot control your decisions.

Moving on to what we agreed with the strategic priorities of what our budget model is, for fiscal year 2026. Again, that's hiring critical staff, boosting UPFB staff compensation in general, upgrading our facilities, and then reimagining programming funds. These kind of breakdown, again, the importance of what we're getting at. So for critical, salaried staff needs, we've been discussing this, but we do have to keep up with enrollment that is slated to increase, as well as providing the funding that central funding cannot cover to help support the student experience and to ensure that they have the ability to be able to provide quality support and quality spaces. Followed by that, student staff and wages. Obviously, were all under the awareness that the cost of living in State College is rising. Wages have maintained the same in Pennsylvania, for since the Great Recession, I believe. That's over a decade ago. So I would just keep in mind that when we consider the request that we're making to units to strongly understand that you can pay your students more than $10 an hour, especially given just the reality and nature of the geographic location of State College. That is what we are ultimately encouraging of gradual increase in pay, at least for hourly employees.

And then enhancing the student experience through facilities and infrastructure, we'll be receiving a presentation on the two major infrastructure projects towards the end of the semester. That's the wellbeing building, and then the hub expansion. As just general context for you to have, two years ago, the feasibility study that we received, listed both projects as costing approximately 200 million dollars, those costs probably went up since that period, given construction costs and whatnot. So the decision of the board, when discussions start now, and then when they make the decision in the future will be of course, deciding if we are first willing to take on a project, which is a necessity for the Student Affairs capital plan, and then two to decide what the future would look like in terms of debt payment, and how long it would take us to pay that off. So those will be considerations that are important. A

nd then programming funds. So we labeled these strategic engagement funds. And I implore you all, as you begin to consider fiscal year 2026, if you're really searching for I think ways to be fiscally responsible, especially if the unit has requested variances in other areas like salaried or staff, it will be the expectation that, you know, sacrifices are made within these units. Not everyone can have every slice of the pie. I don't know the saying, and you need it too, but you get it. And I think as you begin to analyze and critically review that and ask yourself, Is this needed? Or could this money be better used elsewhere, subjectively within their unit or external of their unit, that is always going to be a consideration that you are afforded. And then we'll go into this after this. But we are emboldening our ability to have metrics that are objective and that can help us guide our positions dependent on what we're looking for.

So that's that and then I'll show you the application which ultimately showcases how we went about the budget model. So you're able to see that and how we actually actionized it. So this is what you will look at or see in terms of units that we fund annually. It's simplistic for them. They come each year. So you wanted to make sure that the basics are covered. And then we go into what their modified budget that they're proposing is for fiscal year 2026. And sorry, not modified, but their new proposal. And that essentially is okay, what are your strategy and goals for your budget? What are you articulating that you're going to use your budget for? The reasoning for the increase and decrease. So providing that context, whether it be inflation, just changes internally, things related to that. Impact on operations and services? And so will it enhance your funding? How much do you need it? How can we assist to a reasonable extent, this is the same, we asked for their budget amount, and general timeline, nothing new with that. And then this is where we come into the metrics aspects, and then being able to check those metrics. So that includes for relevant units that are able to do so tracking student participation through swipe ins, through registration, being able to see what their level of cost sharing is, and then specializing cost sharing and specifying I meant rather. Marketing and outreach efforts, having a narrative of what they're actually doing, whether that includes campaigns, student staff, supporting certain levels or areas that might be needed. And then of course, the testimonials.

And then this is how we went about strategic priorities of if they are addressing them, if not, or if they're not. We understand that most that not everything is going to be applicable to each unit, which is why we added so much variation with the budget model goals so that there's two approaches that each unit that comes to us will fall under. And again, these are for standing funding appropriations. So we know for a fact each one is relevant to at least one of the units.

And then finally, before if you have any questions, I just want to show you the budget sheet because that offers a lot of the actionization as well, and context behind that. And the way that we divided the budget sheet, strategic engagement funds, students, staff, wages, salaried staff, and then miscellaneous. So they're able to go through and actually fill in where we want our priorities, and it's relevant to all. Okay, well, I don't want to waste further time of fiscal year 2026. I'm gonna keep you all here. So I'll open up to general questions or discussion on the process, whether that be timeline or anything else.

1:02:51

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Sorry, for fiscal year for the standing on patients, given the government are suddenly on that three year cycle, or is there any way? Do you want us to submit stuff for 2026? I don't think that's what would be necessary. And I think we can also talk in the steering committee not to say that about that requirement.

1:03:18

**AL Bram:**

Is that the same case for the hub reserve? Did you I can't remember what we sent this to Mary Edgington, $200,000.

1:03:30

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I see. Yeah, I can send that. Thank you. Any further questions or discussion? We have cheap budget planning executive Kurtz that will develop one sheeter briefs for you all on each unit. So you're not overwhelmed with the materials that are submitted that will list the basic outline of what they're proposing, why, and then the recommendation to be a starting point for discussions. So that will be the structure and that will hopefully help a lot with fulfilling your responsibilities. Any further discussion? Seeing none I'll now move into the new budget line item 6.A of new business is there any new business. I'm so sorry. I'll now move into line item 7 of the chair report. That is listed in my email and I'll now move into line item 8 of the Vice Chair Report, Vice Chair Chandler? All right, and now we'll move into line item 9 executive committee reports? Are there any executive committee reports?

1:04:47

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

I'm currently working on creating a like operating guidelines based on the holistic recommendations and kind of an update. Like all of the things that we've been working on this year for the UPFB, which is really exciting, so stay tuned for that. It's kind of like a cumulation of everything that's been worked on. So other than that.

1:05:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Any questions? Seeing none, we'll now move into line item ten comments for the good of the order. Representative Miller.

1:05:18

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. In relation to the OriginLabs, because I do think it is we passed it, but I do think it's important that in whatever memorandum of understanding that we give to them at the end of the day, that it's clear that at least would make me feel better is if they have some sort of IP attorney or if they work with the LaunchBox or something that's going to help students fill out that deliverable section, so that they don't lose their intellectual property because ultimately, we don't care about the class projects, that's not something we fund we do care about the personal products and the student experience. So let's make sure that they aren't getting shafted by just saying–I apologize for my language–by saying just race tires instead of all the processes that make up coming to this race tire and all the variations there because it's basically like a mini pattern and it's important that students don't lose that.

1:06:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Would you be able to email me that specifically? And I think that's really fair to do with LaunchBox as well to ask about that. So yeah, you bring that up that will be helpful any further comments for the good of the order? Seeing none will now move into closing roll call by Vice Chair Chandler.

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts closing roll call\*

1:06:56

Chair Rodriguez:

Have a great one, happy state patties!