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01:02

\*\*VC Chandler takes roll call attendance and quorum is met\*\*

01:21

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into item two, which is consent action items 2A will be approval of minutes from the April 5 meeting. Is there a motion to approve those minutes.

\*seconded\*

01:34

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And seeing that that has been seconded, the motion has been adopted. Representative Nevil is also joining us. And we will now move into line item 3, adoption of the agenda. I will make a motion to amend it line item 7, to include 7B VC Chandler discussion on pilot program.

\*seconded\*

02:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And that has been officially adopted with the agenda noted. Are there any other motions to the agenda? Okay. That being said, we'll now move into line item four of public comment. Are there any students here for public comment? Seeing that there are no students here for public comment, we will now move into line item five, which is the reports from standing committees and seeing as those have not been established yet, we'll now move into line item six of other action items beginning with the discussions for fiscal year 26. Just as some context for today. This is the amendment for the chair report and discussion. But of course, we'll be going through the Gender Equity Center, Student Farm, Basic Needs Support Center, and then Campus Recreation, which will take probably a little bit more time. Followed by that we'll go into the updates from unit leaders on clarifying questions that you all had in previous meetings, and explain the context behind what we've received. We have not received numbers just yet from everybody. So we're still waiting on that. But that will definitely be with us before we do have that final approval. So when we have those deliberations and actually begin the vote, and those that information will be readily available to us. And then, of course, Vice Chair Chandler will give some context later on into a new pilot program policy proposal for the UPFB to be able to appropriately track and ensure and maintain accountability for projects that we fund and to ensure that there is record of what we're doing and what we're committing to, for us to be able to reflect and also backtrack on any questions. Okay, seeing no questions, we can continue with the line item six, which will be the Gender Equity Center. So we did have some context as to just a discrepancy that we had with the Gender Equity Center that I'll have the Administrative Liaison Bram just touch upon so everyone is in the know and understanding that it is resolved but also just to give you some context behind it. So obviously they increased the wage standards for their part time interns, which is something that we have course recommended. And they've demonstrated increases in New Student Orientation presence which is a new addition to something that we have discussed and talked about in the past. And by doing so the aim is that the engagement, of course, will increase by getting those students immediately integrated into what the Gender Equity Center does, bolstering kind of the exposure that they provide to those students. And interestingly enough, they have developed a financial metrics annual reporting tracking system that will allow incremental a year over year metric evaluation and reflection. So they've already instituted various mechanisms that would allow us to have the ability to properly evaluate their budgets after. But also, as you can see, there are variations as to some increases to programs that they have found to be more successful rather than not, and that is reflected within their explanations, and what they're hoping to do with that increase of their budget. That being said, I'll take some time for you to look over that. And assuming you've looked over, Administrative Liaison Bram, do you want to provide some context to that one discrepancy?

06:12

**AL Bram:**

You allocated for fiscal year 25, $121,000 or $122,000 something like that, and Gender Equity expected $120,000. And what ended up happening and this goes to some stuff that happened last year, when the university moved to a two year budget cycle. Every unit that receives fees had essentially estimate how much it would receive for fiscal year 25, because we didn't have time to go through a hearing. So the Gender Equity Center said put $112,000. Jennifer and I actually looked at those and fall and we just wanted to be honest, because I didn't get one to one. And so when they did not submit a budget modification form, they assumed that they were getting the $120,000 because that's where they put their spending. We assumed that they were just asking, which was what they got last year. So it's a $2900, that is a very minor momentum in the life of the fee. So I think we can talk to Yvette who's the director and just say, Okay, we’ll allocate your the $117,000 if you need the $2,900 it’s in reserves.

07:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, and I think for context, the modified appropriation process will hopefully be able to assist to some extent as they speak.

**AL Bram:**

Yeah. And I think we just need to in this first year we're doing this we just need to be clear about what the modification is, like next year, too. It's not just, “let us know if there's a what you put in here where you put the fiscal year 26 thing” for income.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. That being said, we’ll now move into questions on the Gender Equity Center. Are there any questions on the Gender Equity Center? Seeing no questions on the Gender Equity Center will now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion on the Gender Equity Center, we will now move into line item 6B of the Keiko Ross Student Farm with their requested appropriation for fiscal year 26 being $347,090. I will now yield to Chief Budget Planning Executive Kurtz to introduce the Keiko Ross Student Farm.

08:47

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Thanks for bearing with me here. So the student farm has been expanding their involvement across dozens of RSOs throughout campus as well as external entities and other collaborations with campus offices. In 2023, the student farm has hosted 849 student volunteers totaling over 1600 service hours, please direct your attention to the board as this is what they have provided to us within 2023 primary operation. I'll give you guys a second to look over this just to kind of gauge what they've been doing over the past couple years. And I'm sure 2024 will look similar to this. But obviously, as we're not done with 2024 yet, they cannot provide accurate data for that. In addition, the farm has updated their student wages per our standards for the UPFB budget models wage prioritization. They also take part in extensive cost sharing and external fund sourcing. They received money from over a dozen external, off-campus organizations. All their other increases in their overall requests have come from GSI and inflationary costs of operating expenses, their infrastructure projects, which is total really to their operating expenses for tools, supplies to the farm and primary services. Now, based on all that good information, I'm sure you're wondering why our recommended appropriation is about $27,000 less. Of their total request, the farm has requested a partial payment for a salaried position whose expected start date is January of 2026. And that partial funding would be about half what they're asking for this year, we have decided that this request will better be suited at least in the budget modification process for next year. And that is not something that we should be concerned with as a board this year. Therefore, the UPFB recommendation will total everything that student farm has asked for, except for that partial payment of the salary position, which would equal $320,529.

10:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we will now stand for any questions. Are there any questions? Representative Delena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. It was mentioned that there was external funding of which it's also in the PDF that was provided like the dozen or so do we know about roughly how much they get from those donors?

11:10

**CPBE Kurtz:**

It wasn't specified in the proposal, but I would assume that all external funding is being used towards operations and services that don't have much to do with UPFB appropriation or utilize funding that we give them. I don't want to misspeak on any of their other services that we do not fund but from what I know, it wasn't listed in the proposal, so I can't give much clarity other than that.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Thank you.

11:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Administrative Liaison Bram, I’ll yield you time.

**AL Bram:**

I actually have to supervise a student farm. They get money from Penn State Sustainability, from Student Affairs, and they get money from the College of Agriculture. And they actually sell things. Right. So and they're selling to each of us and Penn State for the produce that they grow. They may also have stuff that people purchase. So that's the primary sources.

12:17

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion. I would also just add supplemental information and say that their position as well is connected and contingent on infrastructure and facilities project that we have yet to review. Just baseline, with that recommended decrease, again, we don't know what that position would look like. Yet, we also don't know the context of our decision regarding their infrastructure and facilities project external to here would look like. So that also offers just another piece of context as to why the even the incremental increase would rather be better suited from our observation probably to the next board. And we're in discussion. Representative D’Elena.

13:15

**Representative D’Elena:**

Point of inquiry, I have a question. From 2022 to 2023, they went from 26 student interns to 50 student interns. Do you know if there's any proposal to go beyond that? Because that's doubling in one year by the year 2026? Is that like it's anticipated as well? It does affect how much we should allocate for this.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I think for fiscal year 26, it'll be capped at 50. If they choose to increase that... Administrative Liaison Bram.

**AL Bram:**

It's not going to have a drastic double in the future. Regardless of what the people are doing, where the farm stands in terms of its physical infrastructure and getting supplies, they will likely be more inclined to up interns but it won't be up to 100%.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And I think that also is a good segue into just up further context into seeing that we will see a lot of you know, jumps and what we review to in some cases this year because again, they are forecasting for fiscal year 26. And forecasting isn't always accurate. So these are our projections that we do have. But I think that's why the number just went up so extensively. Representative Nevil.

14:56

**Representative Nevil:**

This goes back to a couple of things you said last week talking about our logo and branding, we give them $320,000 a year plus whatever infrastructure investment might be or might not be. Our logo can't be found anywhere. Like, we're shelling out a fair bit of student dollars, students should know that this is what their money is helping to fund. I think that may partially benefit that but should be a conversation all of our units that we are helping to fund it at this level.

16:17

**Chair Rodriguez:**  
Any other further points of discussion. Okay, seeing none, we will now move into line item 6C of Campus Recreation. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz will introduce this, however, I will say that this is a recommendation based on three different pathways that would allow us to initiate discussion somewhere or to start discussion somewhere on the direction that we will go. If there is further complexity in the explanation or understanding for Campus Recreation, I’ll motion to suspend the rules so that we can take this time to look at more nuance and reasoning behind this. I can imagine that we would be able to potentially table this discussion based on where it goes. But I think as a starting point, there is no solid direction, but I will be introducing an amendment for one of the options and that of course is open to discussion and approval or denial subsequently. That being said, I will yield to Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz to introduce Campus Recreation

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Now Campus Rec, as usual is a large scale unit with a large scale request. They also have submitted an infrastructure project and we have yet to cover and that will be coming up in the next few weeks. However, Campus Recreation, obviously, for those who don't know anything capsulated by seven facilities, including the IM building, the White Building, the Hepper Fitness Center, the McCoy Natatorium, the Stone Valley Rec Area, the Tennis Center, and West Fields. Their facilities are visited by hundreds of thousands of individuals per year and will continue to increase inevitably in visit based on the university's increased enrollment. As you can see on the screen, their purpose and impact is truly just to provide us with free access to enjoy physical, mental and wellbeing activities. This is completely free for students as we all know. They have also been seen to increase the facilities as we know last year, they just finished eSports center back in the White Building, and that was a huge hit.

So if you were to direct your attention to the screen. As of now, this is their current budget request for fiscal year 26. They are hitting on all the categories including infrastructure and operations not including their infrastructure project that we have to go over. Student engagement funds, UPFB student staff, UPFB salaried staff, and miscellaneous. They have continued to put emphasis on their athletic training and club sports prioritization. As we have voted on last fiscal year, we have passed one athletic training position for fiscal year 25 at $91,500. Then you will see how that plays into one of our three recommendations in the next slide. So I'm gonna pass it back to Najee real quick to get some more context on that before I go over how we calculated these three options.

19:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. So there are three options here. Obviously, we approved the one athletic trainer from fiscal year 25, with the anticipation that they would collect data and supplementary contextual information for the potential addition of a second. So this is where option one where we have no change and keep it the same. Option two, would cover one athletic trainer. And then option three would be our updated UPFB wage standard that I will elaborate on regarding this because it does have that incremental increase from option one and option two. I think we can start off with questions on these options. And I think that will lead to further understanding and context as to what direction we can go to one thing I will say as part of the introduction is would it be helpful for you able to see our updated our direction of wage classification of what we have so far? Okay. So this is just the main like statistical objective kind of approaches to how we were trying to go about making this simplistic without going into the nuance of position titles of how other people go about it. But essentially, Chief Administrative Executive, Alexander helped with a conceptual classification of what this would actually look like, for these classification levels, especially for fiscal year 26. So all of this is compared in preparation for two years in advance of some sort of rudimentary structure that would allow us to give the flexibility for unit leads to be able to justify and classify their student workers based on the level of, you know, time and also talent that it would potentially require. One thing I will say, again, as an emphasis is that, again–Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, do you mind sharing this with everyone? The one thing I will say is that, in terms of the intricacies for how that calculation was made, to the best of our forecast ability, would you be able to elaborate on the math behind what that would look like?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

So Campus Rec was very diligent in their information sent to us, they sent us all of their employment levels, and the amount of employees per level in each category. However, what they did not specify what made this a little tricky at first was, obviously, Campus Rec hires a lot of employees, they have a lot of employees spanning across their 7 facilities. And we can't accurately understand how many hours per week each of those employees are working. What they did provide, if you see on a UPFB student staff, they have a set line item called Student wage increases 50 cents across the board at $113,000, that number was not functioned into Excel. But we can assume that that is a calculation that they have taken from their own wage calculations or other external websites or software that they use to calculate their wages. And we can assume that that is based on their data of how many hours everybody works, and encapsulate that by that 50 cent increase. So what I did was I took my original calculation from Campus Rec’s information on their amount of employees and their specified wages. And I compared it to this number being extrapolated up until we get to $15.27 per hour, which is the UPFB minimum standards wage, and comparing that we got about a $643,000 increase instead of the $113,00. So that was simply added on to their total requested appropriation, which would leave us with that $6,064,000 appropriated rate.

23:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Great, so Okay, as you can obviously see, I think a discussion would be helpful, I do know that within the framework of what is established here, this is pretty confidently based on, you know, math and statistics, which I will keep on kind of pushing, because this was really it was fun to do, but also, given the fact that we are planning ahead for two years, and is that the 50 cents increase was not really significant for any of the positions. As you'll know, there is a lot of flexibility to how unit leads would be able to go about the different classification. So for example, if someone wants to stay at level one with the same position that doesn't add on additional tasks, for example, in seniority, they could still increase their wage per year based on retention, but they'll still be at that level one. So that is what that minimum-maximum means for what student responsibility and ultimate time commitment is required. Same thing for level two, it will require still supervision. But it lessens that supervision, especially as students advance forward, we have that minimum, and then that maximum based on Cornell and Ithaca in comparison to State College. And the reason why, again, these are kind of flexible is because we can obviously be statistically accurate to a T. But this was the closest that we were able to get with that deviation. And then you can see that it goes forward, starting and ending with level four. And that is specifically for graduate students, mostly, we would imagine minus maybe an undergraduate manager if they ever get to that point. But that explains kind of, you know, the first three levels more so undergraduate, whereas the fourth level would specifically be more so graduate. And that's the same wage classification scale that you use at other institutions, which we adopted and did research on. Cornell has obviously good examples from what we've seen, we did other benchmarking at Ohio State, in different Big Ten universities that have their own specific student wage scales. And I did try to make this is simplistic as possible. I've collected data on position descriptions and position titles and names. And in the future, if this were to be amended, it would have those position titles and names as examples for unit leads to adopt. So yeah, it definitely is an increase. But as you'll know, Campus Recreation, as you go up in the levels, there are less student staff and employees. So the strain is mostly within level one, and ensuring that that wage in general is boosted from the starting of $15, essentially, which would be very helpful for students. And also we wouldn't be having to wait for fiscal year 26, because we forecast the budget that we're appropriating for this. But that being said, that was a lot of information. But I did spend a lot of time on the wage aspect, but I hope that it was at least informative and offers a good starting point. And of course, with our discussion of the athletic trainer, that could be another component to it. But we'll now go into questions. Miller and Nevil.

27:16

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. For option 2 and 3 where it says cover one athletic trainer, is that the athletic trainer we've already covered this year? It's not inclusive of another? Okay, so we're not recommending that we're going to increase another athletic trainer?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

The issue that we saw in this budget request was that Campus Rec has still been pushing for athletic trainers for the flex forward appropriation. But they requested $160,000 flat out just of the line and brought on by the trainers, whether they are aware that we gave them funding for one of them is up in the air right now. But that $160,000 minus this cost that we approved for them at $91,500 for the first athletic trainer gave us $60,500 that we just reduced from their overall quest. I think we still want to give it another at least fiscal year to play out and see the demand of the athletic trainers and how much people are engaging in that. And then if this continues to be a problem for budget modification, the following board can do as they see fit. But yeah, it's the one we covered already.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Nevil.

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. We asked them their feelings on us per view, using our funding model for that, like, do they know that at the end of the day, we approved... say we approved option number three, and we're giving them the updated wage standard. Have they been aware of that? Have they been made aware of that? And then what are their feelings on that?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

The Director of Campus Rec has been made aware of that beginning in early fall, we've been like socializing this. So he's aware. The issue with unit leads is that the student staff is what we fund for their operations, besides maybe the facilities projects that they'll come and ask us for. But almost all of it is student wages so that they can support obviously, those facilities. They were under the impression and as well as a lot of unit leaders, they were hesitant to raise wages, you know, I'm sure they have their reasons, but at the end of the day, there's a paradox here where it's like I'm sure they maybe don't want to spend student money at an increased rate. But that's just the reality of what they've already been doing. And in order for efficient and quality services to be provided. They need to remain competitive. So we've been pushing that for a lot of the units, especially the smaller ones. But in terms of Campus Recreation, this would have the largest impact on the wage influence that we have on campus and this will hopefully be the primary motivating factor to get other areas on campus to begin moving in that direction, at least two years in advance. So to clarify, yes, he's been made aware. But the larger issue is that they didn't know essentially, that wages could be increased to that extent and did not want to risk their appropriation. That's my personal assessment based on the conversations that I've had. But that is the general sentiment that has been explained. And I think that attitude is changing. Representative Sciaca.

30:38

**Representative Sciaca:**

Representative Sciaca, Alternative Representative. If we pick option three, are they effectively binded to increase wages, so people retain the same position every year?

30:53

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Essentially, that would be their supervisory responsibility, that will be the intent, giving them the ability to be able to stay within that range, that average range. So for example, if that level one is if they're getting paid that $15.50, if they are returning a second year, that potentially would be elevated to like $16. Yes, it would be up to the discretion of the units, we would just allocate forecasts and projected money with the expectation that they would boost the wages and use the money, as has been stipulated within that wage realm. Administrative Liaison Saunders.

31:33

**Administrative Liaison Saunders:**

Just a question, when you send back the final appropriation, does it have a breakdown of an expense breakdown so that when they receive this extra 600,000? Are they aware that that amount of money is intended for wages?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep, yeah, we will classify it in the decision letters that we give out. What I've been asking, especially for the Basic Needs Support Center is I actually just asked her for a revised budget from that to like, showcase that there's confirmation that they've modified their budget, they understand that this is what they're doing. I'm having them send it back to me. So I think that will also be a helpful, hopeful indicator that they would be able to manage that appropriately. Representative Nevil.

**Representative Nevil:**

At-large Representative, Tim Nevil. When we send that out as well, are we able to send out our wage classification as almost like a mandatory that you must comply with that we're giving you this money, go hire an extra 200 staff or whatever you choose to do? Can we say you are required to use this budget model to pay for your employees? I guess that at that point at the time, it'd be implemented in 28-29. We want to break down each of these categories.

32:59

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes, that’s the ultimate goal. So I like I will just concede and say that this like it is a jump and a push. But again, this is because we're two years in advance. So it's not like we're having an immediate impact, unfortunately, but there, at least can be that anticipation and less of a shock to our finances, if we are predicting ahead of time, especially with what that will do. And by the time it's 2026, I'm sure that will be the standard and other areas, hopefully, which will just allow them to be and remain competitive. Any other questions? Representative D’Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. Excellent job by the way, I believe you said that you were to break down the amount of points per level. I can't personally find it. Do you know where I could possibly find that?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, it's in the budget calculator. You just want to share that, just don't touch it. So be like just You're fine. Just don't touch like the excel sheet. I just get worried. And I can help somebody told me,

but as a point of privilege that will be sent to the Teams. So you will see recommendations and what that map looks like. So that will be sent. In the meantime, do I see another question? Representative Miller?

34:50

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. As a final question for option one $5,507,809. Why is that different than option two? Like, was it no change compared to?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Option one is just what they asked for. Option two is incorporating that we are appropriating this much, because we passed one athletic trainer for funding for you, and we are not covering the additional $68,500 for whatever, whether that's just for one or two, which also was a little confusing to us. Because if we were to take $91,500, which is what we passed, the one staff athletic trainer last year, multiply it by two, it's more than $160,000 anyways, so I'm not really sure where that came from. But the difference is oftentimes, what they asked for.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We just removed one athletic trainer from option two. So they asked for two we just want to keep that one. Okay, now we can move into discussion. Is there any discussion because we wait for that supplemental information? Representative Miller and D’Elena.

36:23

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President for today. I'm in favor of option three, I my pressing point is by 2026 is when the university's budget model is going to be in like full swing and also eliminated that generational cliff thing. And I feel like that's going to boost up the fee per student amount. It's actually not my word. They're trying to drag us to the gills here. I worry about the increase. I think that it is more important that we go for the wages rather than not. But yeah, I just worried about the increase in general.

37:05

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena UPUA Appointee. I'm also for option three. First of all, I don't think two athletic trainers is necessary. While it is a very large increase in having planning here to some extent I think if they're like, Representative Miller has tried to say like, if there was ever a thing for us to drastically increase, it should be one of the larger players on campus and updating their fees so that it can fit our requirements and our standards. Additionally, it's one of those things that if we keep on kicking the can down the road, it will just never end up in the trash. So let's do it now.

37:44

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee. I agree with previous points made I'm for option three, I don't feel comfortable approving this without having the updated wage standards given it's a two-year budget cycle. And this is also one of the largest employers. And I do agree we've kind of moved away from the conversation about the athletic trainers at this point. So I just think the most important thing is to make sure that we're keeping up with wage standards for students.

38:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other points for discussion? Seeing no further points of discussion, I'll make a motion to amend the appropriation to $6,604,108.

38:37

\*Seconded\*

And we will now move into a vote by roll call beginning with Vice Chair Chandler.

38:49

\*Option 3 approved unanimously\*

39:38

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So we'll now move into line item 6D, which is our final standing funding appropriation discussion for today. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, will you please introduce this?

CPBE Kurtz:

Now we have the Basic Needs Support Center. The basic needs support center is a unit within the Student Care and Advocacy Office on campus. Obviously the Student Care and Advocacy Office is more extensive and covers a larger portfolio of services and just the Basic Needs Support Center. But everything outside of the Basic Needs Support Center is not of our appropriation and quite frankly, none of the board's concern. The center provides services and resources to those struggling with food insecurity, housing insecurity, limited access to medical care and general affordability concerns. The center's roles are consistent with basic needs case management, which is conducted by their salaried staff and there four case management interns resource and program development, co-curricular opportunities and university wide collaboration. Their expense report has covered three main categories, their student staff is around $20,000, their salaries that infringe pulled around $302,000. And they're basically hub materials line items totaling around $15,000. Now, when these students that wages have been adjusted to UPFB standards, this would include a $22,000 increase in total student debt recommendation, like we've been talking about the past couple of units, a lot of these units are not assuming that the money that we are offering to give them can be offered now. So we will continue to see a few other units that were being recommended a little more than what they're requesting, just based on, you know, our, our prioritization on, you know, student staff wages, so ultimately leaving our recommendation is their initial request, or $337,100, plus that additional $22,000, which would be the upkeep of our standards for students staff wages, leaving our total recommendation at $359,100. Now, I kind of want to umbrella term, these past couple units in the sense so it doesn't seem like we are increasing everyone's requested appropriation, just on a whim. However, these recommendations are backed by their data. And I don't want the board to be concerned that we're increasing units at a unsafe or unstable pace. Obviously, if there were any concerns with how much we're giving units, it would be raised, but overall, we are standing moving forward into further deliberation within the next couple weeks. I just wanted to give a little context to how we are going about making these decisions. So Chair Rodriguez, I will pass it back to you for further clarification.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we'll now move into questions. Are there any questions? Representative Nevil.

42:46

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-large Representative. Just for clarification, so that $22,000 gap between what we're recommending is for all student wages?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Yes, it’s there four case management interns. They had three last year, and they onboarding one within the past year and did a little bit in forecasting two oboard one. And they were just they had a range between $12-$15 an hour. But we gave them the benefit of the doubt just listed them all as $15, extrapolated their wages by their average hours worked per week. And obviously, any excess money will be returned anyways. And that $22,000 in the grand scheme of things is a little less than some other units.

43:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We're also noticing, and this is something I've noticed too, is that they are trying to add on in anticipation of the next fiscal year that we're under review. So like, you'll start to see these jumps probably like universally, and that's, that's the reason. So this is unprecedented. So if you have questions, you know, totally understandable. I have not experienced this process like this before. Representative D’Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena UPUA Appointee. Under the basic needs like up thing, which I'm assuming is the $50,000. You're saying, the opening line is despite a delay and access to grant funds when they launch in fall 2023. Have they got access to those grant funds in the time since they've opened it? And if so, does that directly impact the $15,000 that they're spending?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I can answer this because I applied for the grant the first time but essentially the Commonwealth has delays with distribution of grant money, like it's really just a logistical issue where they ended up waiting like an extra year ultimately to get the money from the previous year. And there's a stipulation that you have to spend it within that fiscal year that they give it to you. So they get, I believe the maximized amount that we got was 60k from under that plan, the Hunger Free campus grant. So they will use that for like base... that's how the cost share some of the wages. That's how they cost share the basic needs supplies that they buy, this would be supplemental to that based on the materials that they see demand in. But we're hoping that with that increase of cost sharing, I've seen a lot on development with the development officer that they got assigned to them. She's really great, forgot her name. Yeah. So Leslie also has been assisting with that. But yeah, so that explains kind of the direct contribution provided externally, and then where that money is redistributed once they get that grant or supplemental information. Any other questions? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Representative Nevil.

46:10

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil At-large Representative. Just a point of inquiry, so looking into their documentation that we have in our system, it says that the internship is a stipend based position based on contracted hours. Is that just going to be that they're going to provide a stipend based on our recommended for their number of hours per week? Is that going to how like...

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That's a good question, it'd be hourly because that's because they were using money from the federal oversight program to help supplement the contracted money that they give. And, actually, the contracted money technically, is from the project carried out, that exists to support those specific students via stipend. So that comes from developmental money, which is another aspect of the cost sharing piece. Whereas when they are looking into these actual student staff for fiscal year 26, that will be done through workday on hourly wage, etc. But that's the nuance between the Students United Against Poverty endowment where they provide that stipend and I don't know why they list that within their records. But I think it is an indication of that cost sharing, because I was there when they agreed to that program. But let's make note of that question to confirm. And then we can just like follow up on, it shouldn't be that difficult. Given an average Workday is the easiest way to go about hiring students like the way the contracts aspect is just complicated and inefficient. So I'll clarify that with them. But we statistically based it off hours.

47:57

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Also, in their proposal, the case management insurance have a rough expectation of 10 to 40 hours per week. I don't know if that has to do with seniority, but with the four of them, we just took the average hourly work per week, extrapolated it for interns. So that $22,000 Roughly covers that average between 10 and 40. And if, for whatever reason, they feel that they're working over that or working towards that tail end, that can be a budget modification in the following year.

48:40

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, I'll close the floor for discussion. And we will move into line item seven of the chair report and discussion will begin with just updates from the unit leaders on clarifying questions. I'll start with the CPA, I met with them yesterday to discuss their metrics collection project and the robust systems that they have in place for those interns. So I have more clarity on what this would look like for each unit. But essentially, these data analysts interns would work with the CPA for the fall semester to build out a dashboard that would be able to collect relevant metrics and materials for the CPA. So for example, when it comes to ticket admission, or the amount that's distributed, having that in a centralized location, as well as a live tracker for wage expenses that they might have any facilities, they'll be able to independently track their spending based on this established infrastructure. Same thing goes for Gender Equity Center or PRCC. Having the ability to to have students help assess internally, how each unit, whether it be is a qualitative heavy unit or quantitative heavy unit. Being able to modify and augment the collection based on that. And what I mean by that is, whether it's PRCC, which is subjective. We're obviously offering a service to students that don't have any other, you know, resources or opportunity really, to get those resources. Ultimately, it would be okay, how many people are engaging, like we at least have some sort of metrics to see what programs are working within those communities. But also what isn't working within other units or entities, and he would have statistics to track that, survey data that's completed would also be something that would be included in there. And that's just asking, how did you enjoy this event? How was it helpful or beneficial? And they do have a, you know, surprisingly, a lot of like feedback and engagement, at least from the CPA perspective. But really, all this would be a framework to establish that quantitative and qualitative piece that we need to make more informed decisions moving forward in the future, but also to make it easier for everyone to understand progress or development. All right. So that being said, I'm also waiting on, we're waiting on Dr. Preston's response to that supplemental question. She's out of office, by the way. So that's why we're, we're waiting. So nothing bad in that regard. And then everything else that I have to follow up on is, I think, related to Representative D’Elena. But I will say that I went through the CAPS experience, because it was time and it was time one of us did it instead of you know, rumors circulating. So I called the day of our last meeting, I was able to secure an appointment based on that intake call, they got me on the intake call the same day, I said, no, there was no emergency, I'm fine. But they essentially a scheduled appointment on Monday. So this upcoming Monday. So about a seven day wait, is what I experienced. But honestly, it was really good and I'm graduating too so they could only fit in one appointment before I graduate. But what they're gonna do is just help with support mechanisms. But I did want to make that known. Because I don't I think it was about time, we just went through the process to see what it was like, and to get that idea. So whether or not you agree with that five day wait that is subjective and up to how you will want to discuss that. If you do see issues with you know, caseload we’ll have the ability to discuss any further detail during deliberations. And I can't guarantee that it would go far given we have a month left, but those are considerations to keep in mind. I also got basic information on the payment system. I was writing notes as I was going about this. It's really interesting. Okay, so essentially, they'll have, you know, that screening, you will have the ability to have six free appointments confirmed. So those would be six free appointments that are given to you. They charge around $25 to $30 for psychiatric appointments, so different from the therapy or counseling. So that's a new fact. I don't know why that hasn't come up before but I'm glad that I was informed of that. So they at least subsidize the cost of the psychiatric appointments, which of course is how to get your medication, etc. However, there are external costs that are outside of that initial baseline. Other than that, I think we'll have more details but if you wanted to add anything you can but yeah, all right. So we have that. Any other questions based on that development?

54:33

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-large Representative. I'm guessing that's billable to insurance as well.

54:45

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Alright, so seeing no further questions will now move to Vice Chair Chandler's introduction to this policy proposal.

55:00

**VC Chandler:**

I’ve shared this pilot policy proposal in the meeting folder, if you would like to pull it up. But this policy is primarily motivated by, I guess, this entire year and our efforts to comprehensively have an understanding of the commitment that we made for short term or even, you know, new standing appropriation funding entities. I think that, for example, something similar to like, the OriginLabs proposal would benefit greatly from the pilot project policy proposal, because it gives us time to evaluate, you know, the performance and I guess certain metrics that are detailed in the policy document, in order to evaluate if the fee board would like to fully adopt or consider whatever proposal preparation request as a standard domain of the creation. That includes, I mentioned in the documents that primarily we would kind of be a bit cautious of allowing salaried positions. That's a huge commitment that really, we should be very critical about when we're awarding appropriation funds because we can't just get rid of salary positions. So I would encourage you to read it in obviously make comments. There's a lot of details of the evaluation process the duration of the pilot status, I said either two to three years depending on the proposal, I think two to three years gives us enough time to evaluate whether or not a proposal would be viable within the board's portfolio. There are considerations for if we decide to get a sunset of proposal or a project. I would love to receive any questions or comments or concerns about this.

57:24

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions for Vice Chair Chandler? Seeing no questions for Vice Chair Chandler, we will now move into line item eight, which is executive reports. Are there any executive reports? We will now move into line item nine, comments for the good of the order. Are there any comments for the good of the order? Seeing no comments for the good of the order will now move into item 10, closing roll call by Vice Chair Chandler. Will you begin closing roll call?

\*VC Chandler conducts closing roll call and quorum is kept\*

58:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there anyone who has not been called? All right. I now adjourn this Friday, April 12.