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00:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I call this meeting to order at 7:04pm. Vice Chair Chandler, will you please take opening roll call.

\*Roll call attendance is taken, and quorum is met\*

00:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Perfect. So today obviously going to be going over and finishing up the standing funding appropriations alongside beginning some of our new funding proposals. And we should have those complete. We'll also discuss the pilot program policy to have that vote. As you all had that content in received that, as a reminder, if that passes that will be then sent to the steering committee to be discussed there. That being said, I'll now move into line item 2.A, approval of minutes from the April 12 meeting. Is there a motion to approve?

\*Motioned and seconded\*

01:35

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We'll now move into line item three of the adoption of the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda?

\*Motioned and seconded\*

01:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And seeing that that has been seconded, we'll now move into line item 4.A, public comment. Are there any students here for public comment? Seeing that there are no students here for public comment, we'll now move into line item five, reports from standing committees .Seeing that those are not yet established yet, we'll now move into line item six of other action items. So as a reminder, of course, you do have the folder for the note taking, that's in the general Microsoft space. So feel free to open that to take notes along the way, or just questions that you might have. And I also can send you the link to if you need in the Teams. But we'll be we'll begin with Student Leadership and Involvement. And then we will end with the pilot program policy authorization vote. We can now then move into line item 6.A of the fiscal year 26 Student Leadership and Involvement standing funding appropriation proposal, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, would you please introduce us?

**Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz:**

So upon the 26th deliberation materials that we send out to the units, we requested that the student leadership involvement send multiple budget proposals based on the volume of their heavy programming subunits, so SLI as a unit itself has requested a proposal as well as SPA and Homecoming. Now, SLI as a unit in itself is a heavy programming unit. As we all know, they are one of the leading appropriators and all of the programs that go along with our portfolio program and units. They came in at around $767,000. Upon further discussion that we can get into throughout the duration of this meeting, we have decided that units such as SLI and heavy programming units will definitely be taken a deep dive more so into some clarity, which we'll get to in a second. So that $767,000, as of now has been decreased in the overall recommended appropriation. I can go through that when we get to their line items in the next slide, but until then, I'll hop on over to SPA. As you can see, you can see two numbers up there, one of them at round 1.9 million and one at 1.4 million. SPA has requested in their proposal that they want to get some BJC presence for their shows. And so we have learned that SPA’s bookings within the hubs, such as Alumni Hall and etc. are selling out and cannot really fit all of the demand that's coming from the student body when SPA brings in these artists, events, comedians, etc. So that 1.9 million is reflective of the price of two BJC shows as well as the rest of their already implemented operations, that 1.4 number is that same request without the BJC shows. So you can see about a $500,000 variance between that so you can apply that cost about $250,000 per BJC show. And finally, for Homecoming, they are requesting $180,000. That's pretty standard for homecoming, they did list in their future considerations area that they do wish to start brainstorming about how they can have more long term, yearly presence on campus. But none of those ideas have found themselves in the 26 budget proposal. This is SLI as I was referencing a few minutes ago, SLI is budget proposal expense report for fiscal year 26. Now, if you were looking under infrastructure and operations, I know we had a few discussion points last time about the need for RSO event ticket and poster printing fees. As Penn State and as most universities now we're trying to go towards virtual check-ins when it comes to events such as these. So we would like to get some points of clarification from SLI, to see if we can delegate these funds, or maybe just, you know, remove them and move more towards the virtual management platform. Now for looking at the Student Engagement funds, we would like some clarity on their social programming, Alternative Breaks Programming, Leadership Institute, and civic engagement line items for the volume of their requested appropriations for those categories, we would like to see more of an explanation, by just a line item followed by a number that's at least $10,000. So if we want to go back one more slide, all in all, between these three units. And I know that's kind of hefty, so I apologize for the rambling. Recommended appropriation is just a starting point, we have recommended just under 2.7 million in recommended appropriations, and that includes the full request for homecoming, one BJC show a lot of two SPA’s request, so in between 1.9 and 1.4 and a somewhat significant decrease in SLI is programming expenses until we can deem more clarity on those line items that are a little vague as of now.

07:23

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, and we'll now open it up to any questions. Are there any questions?

07:30

**Representative D’elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. I noticed two things on there. The summary Leadership Conference student delegation support as well as the summer day of service. Do we know how well attended these are given the fact that enrollment at University Park is much lower during those times? And you know, what's the involvement rate there?

07:57

**Representative Nevil:**

At-large Representative Tim Nevil. I cannot speak to the Summer Leadership Conference, what I can speak to as a summer day of service and I would say that like across the board that is their least attended day of service. However, if you see like MLK is given what is almost $90,000, that summer day of service is largely targeted towards on campus LEAP students who do utilize that and almost my understanding is that entire budgetary cover is for like food and buses for them. So I think that it's kind of important that we still give the summer students an opportunity to stay engaged on campus. And I do think that they see a decent involvement in that and $2,500, I don't see that being as large of an expenditure for us to kind of bite ourselves.

08:53

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thanks for that. Are there any other questions? Okay, seeing no other questions, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion?

09:08

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I just want to make some comments about a few of these line items. So firstly, for the civic engagement line item. I know from my experience with the UPUA and formerly being the Chair of Gov Affairs, we attempted to do a lot of cost sharing for what civic engagement activities for PSU Votes. And there's also been discussions about like paying some students to view some of this work. So I would just like some more information about specifically what that looks like. In the future, I know that they're hiring a new programming director specifically to do civic engagement. So I guess maybe that person would have like a budget of $22,000. But I’d just like to see a little bit more because I know that in the past, even when we've been probably the sole collaborator with SLI on civic engagement activities, and I don't think that that's necessarily reflected in the 22,000 dollars, we I don't think we've ever spent that much or like the program's ever been that much. So I'm just curious like what the plan for that might be? And then not that I don't think that there should be like a lot of money going into civic engagement more so just like what does that actually look like right now. And then also like the Leadership Institute, also kind of I agree that there needs to be more clarification there. And then finally MLK Jr. Commemoration, I worked really closely with SLI this year to help make the speaker happen the keynote speaker, and although it was a very expensive event, and we partnered with SPA for the first time, and it wasn't necessarily as high in attendance as we might have expected. But just because there have been some partnerships with SLI and SPA. I'm like interested to see like what that actually looks like, because it seems like the initial sort of like precipice for the project was that SPA would be taking on the up like the burden from SLI to bring a speaker that fulfilled a lot of these DEI components that they couldn't get in any other programs throughout the year, but then ultimately SLI foot the bill for most of the speaker, so I'm just kind of like curious as to like maybe if they have mentioned anything about like the speaker in there, or like just what that commemoration committee budget looks like, broken down. Sorry, that was a lot.

11:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So I wrote down that we can definitely get context and insight with Jeff about asking about the specific programming that might take place, especially with the part time staff that's coming on board. And also the speaker inquiry on the issue of cost sharing is what I'm understanding.

**Representative Concepcion:**

I want to know if there's any like policy or any guidance on the cost sharing between SLI and SPA, because if we're giving them each separate budgets, but then they're gonna cost share together? I'm just curious how that might be working in the future and also if SPAi s really responsible for bringing lectures then do we need a line item that ultimately is mostly a lecture cost in SLI?

12:16

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Nevil.

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-large Representative. So this is more of a question. Do we know is MLK Jr. Commemoration ever planning to go back to being a student led board because when I first came to Penn State as a freshman... I don't know how many of us are fifth years around the table... however pre-COVID that was a student run organization. Like it looks like homecoming, it looks like SPA, it looks like UPUA, it looks like every student organization on this campus where they had an executive director and they had planning and it was entirely housed under students. COVID happened, they moved it to SLI staff running. Is it ever going back to student run?

**Representative Concepcion:**

So they are trying to be the backs run, I believe that they have an executive board. And they have like a plan to move that back to student run. But I think it might help from the Fee Board, if we did try to make sure that that was the stipulation of funding that it maintain some student involvement.

**Representative Nevil:**

Because I think that may also help eliminate some of that confusion with SPA and that and I think that would be like an important stipulation for us to provide and should be a conversation we should have. If we're going to provide them with $91,500, just like we're providing homecoming with $180,000. They should be student run. Thing number two, RSO ticket printing fees, why we're budgeting for $17,000? When we have Org Central and we are encouraged, everybody should just be on online ticket. We have it, we have the infrastructure to implement it. Why are we budgeting $17,000 for that. And then the third thing going back to the SPA one, I'm happy to see that we are at least considering funding at least one BJC concert. And it was something this board has talks a lot about is we don't feel like the artists or the acts that are at the BJC are necessarily representative of what the student body wants. And I think that SPA going into the BJC is going to be a way for us to be able to obtain that, because it's way easier for them to book an artist for one show that meets one student demand is versus the Bryce Jordan Center's way of acquiring tours. So I think that at least piloting that, and then we can also like write in a stipulation that they at least charge some level of ticketing. When I say charge some level of ticketing, I mean, they can charge $5 for ticketing and then hopefully turn this into a program where we don't have to fund $250,000 for a show at the Bryce Jordan Center. In two, three years, maybe we're only funding by $5,000-$10,000. So I think that that's something that might be worth asking them to explore.

15:03

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Yeah, I would say that just based on that discussion point, my mind went to if eventually down the road if Penn State Music Group comes back to us with a deeper proposal, and more experience, I can also see that if SPA has grown their presence in the BJC having some sort of collaboration with Penn State Music Group itself, given that there are many some sort of student advisory board in the BJC and maybe not getting as much student opinion as SPA could potentially give to the BJC artists and potential events.

15:41

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. I'm a little bit curious after the SPA or the involvement cost it's about $25,000. It says Involvement Fair is that including both involvement fairs on that's on the Hub lawn in the fall as well as forget which auditorium it is in the spring. And also further point like what exactly of those events are costing $25,000 hours? A breakdown of that would be very helpful for my observations like this is also just you know, I have never been part of the organization for the logistics I think this could be very ignorant question but like what exactly constitutes that.

16:23

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-large Representative. Hosting events on Hub lawn are expensive. Like especially when you're talking about in the way that PSU OPPS runs is like you do damage to their turf, they come back and like charge you for it. So like, putting that event on Hub lawn to my understanding is a very cost expenditure, like the operations and all that stuff, renting out hub lawn, getting the tables, doing all the delivery, having Campus OPPS come and drop it off. I wish I could say that the PSU OPP does student organizations really well and does offices really well on this campus, but they don't they charge them arms and legs. And things are really expensive. And Admistrative Liaison Bram can probably talk about it a little more, but I'd say $24,000 line item for involvement fair doesn't seem far off from what it costs to rent facilities and use facilities on this campus.

17:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We'll make note of that. Is there any further discussion? Okay, seeing none, we'll now close the floor for discussion. And we will now move into line item 6.B.

17:42

V**ice Chair Chandler:**

I did want to comment that we wanted to recommend the current appropriation amount, it's because we definitely didn't decide on that, as of now, based on our discussion.

Chair Rodriguez:

Yeah, I think we'll need more information from Jeff before making that decision on anyone to add on as a general point of privilege to within the framework. We're asking for clarification from several different units on specific programming areas that have larger than average budgets. So we can get an understanding of okay if they named this programming event like a Wellness Fair, for example. Okay, what is that 30,000? Can you provide a short description. SOTP has done this and we're actually replicating that request based on but wanted to update everyone on that for further context. So we can definitely get those answers first, even discussing with Barry after the meeting and then closing up loose ends as we can. That being said, we'll now move into line item 6.B, fiscal year 26 University Health Services standing funding appropriation proposal, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, would you please introduce this.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

UHS, another heavy requesting unit year over year. I'd like to draw our attention to three discussion points, which I think are going to drive this deliberation period specifically, as we remember from fiscal year 25, during the budget modification process, UHS internally reorganized their budget and sent us a much lower request than we were expecting. And now it's coming back with vengeance this year. As you can see, the three bullet points I have up there are firstly, radiology which would be the X rays and ultrasounds within their operations. They have specified this as allowing students to utilize X ray and ultrasounds obviously as seen fit by the medical professionals at no additional cost. We have not received a medical code and billing statement from UHS kind of depicting the per student cost of what this would cost and how we can kind of leverage what that $501,000 would really mean in terms of utilization. And that $501,000 does come from a combination of radiology equipment that subsequently goes along with the four full time and one part time staff that would help with these operations. The second thing that we would like to point out is a combination of community health expenses. And I, at some point, I will throw that back to Chair Rodriguez to give a little more clarification on but if you want to hop to the next slide for me real quick, the two arrows that say Community Health, I have the word feasibility and a question mark next to them. The things that raised the most concern in our eyes were the Community Health speakers and outreach events at $61,000, as well as the community health student greeters at $26,009. We would like to also gain more clarification on these line items, as we have historically seen that these line items have not been engaged with enough that we feel like those numbers are completely justified just like similar to SLI as a line item. And then the last thing I want to bring to everyone's attention is their capital expenses request at $50,000. This will just encapsulate fixing or replacing all of the medical equipment, overhead lights, etc, that would go into UHS. They also put in their proposal that this money could also go towards the funding for new ambulance. And we as a board, we're considering the trade off of an increased level of capital expenses, in sacrifice of other line items that we feel may not be completely feasible. So our recommended appropriation, $3.174m is a combination of two full time staff for radiology instead of four full time staff. A significant cut in a combined group of community health expenses, and no change in the capital expenses. I would like to bring your attention through deliberation that the radiology line item in our eyes is a little bit tampering and onto whether or not we consider ourselves an insurance coverage in the sense that these monies would allow students to use these with no additional cost to their medical bills. And I just wanted to plant that seed a little bit as we continue to have to make tough decisions and kind of levy you know what the real purpose of our board and our portfolio funding is truly about so I'll pass it back to you guys for questions of discussion.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions?

22:41

**Representative Concepcion:**

Just for clarification, the request is for radiology staffing positions and your recommendation is two?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Correct.

22:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And for context, we're introducing an amendment to cut that to zero. And I will get to that in more detail after Representative D'Elena.

23:08

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. I'm also kind of curious about the student greeters. UHS’s check-in process from what I remember is just like a check-in by computer. So I really don't see where that's... just trying to add my personal experience for that question.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

I'd like to add sorry, one more clarification point specifically for Representative Concepcion. My recommendation is the full expense of all the equipment that would be need to be used for radiology and the X rays and ultrasounds and then taking that section of what those four staffs would be divided by two. Sorry, I just wanted to clarify that.

23:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I would probably say that I'm going to introduce an amendment to slash the official amount for the radiology of $378,549. As to introduce this, the reasoning is, we don't have enough data or statistics to understand what the demand is, nor do we know or we haven't received an answer yet to the actual costs of what radiology would be within medical coding and billing for UHS. An immediate jump to four full time and one part time in salaried positions that we would be ultimately forced to maintain to some extent without further information did not even allow us to really appropriately consider even two because we have nothing to start with. And there's also an understanding that they will be able to come back to the Fee Board in the fall if they were to have a more robust plan as to its utilization. So now that I introduced the amendment, we move into questions on the amendment rather than going back to discussion, so are there questions on the amendment?

25:23

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. Would there be a way for us to fund the infrastructure necessary and they fund the staffing? Or is this an all or nothing deal? And then what would the infrastructure cost be?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Well, I was going to ask a similar question on the basis of the amendment to strike that $378,000 wouldn't include the radiology equipment and supplies line item for $123,000. However, they're also to my full understanding was not enough data to imply that their current radiology equipment is not of substance or too minimal to continue offering the service. So I would also recommend they'd have to come back and say, you know, we still would like an additional amount of radiology equipment before. I would motion to strike it all from the $501,000 completely.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. We'll get discussion into that can be amended. Any questions? Any other questions? Okay, seeing none, we can move into discussion. And given that this is my amendment, I will amend the number that will be striked from our expenditures to the total of about $501,738, and that's what I'm changing. Is there any opposition to that? Was there general consensus? Okay, now that there is general consensus, that number has been amended to incorporate that amount. And we can now move into general discussion related to striking those line items.

27:31

**VC Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA Appointee. I do want to supplement this amendment but adding that it's seems the way that they proposed this radiology aspect of their proposal, it is communicated in a way that you would be funding their whole like radiology department, so if they do already have the infrastructure for that, so I don't think that they would seem that it would be an all or nothing, if anything, if we only did supply the materials for it, it would be like a subsidy. And I think that we should be hesitant funding radiology within what would be conceived as a basic needs for this what we are contributing for UHS.

28:28

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I can yield you time.

**CAE Alexander:**

Okay, I know that as an impartial voice. I've used both the radiology services at UHS and Mount Nittany Health Services. They have adequate technology from the experience that I had at UHS, and then I was also getting referred off to Mount Nittany. So I feel like there's the infrastructure there. Just from a personal like anecdotal experience. I hope that's helpful.

29:00

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. I think, if we can get an explanation, but at this point, I support approving this amendment, but if they can come back within the next year with an explanation as to why they need new equipment, and not just because they want state of the art equipment, but like, if students are actually feeling detrimental impacts because of the current equipment we have and then be why we are covering all of that staff and they can't continue to support the staff that they have, at least seems like they're already paying.

29:45

**CPBE Kurtz:**

On that note, they did provide data on a slight increase year over year in radiology usage. However, that was not of correlation to a need for increased staffing or increased equipment. And kind of on the administrative side, and this is an offsprint of that complete sentence right there. But from the unit's we've already covered and the several is that we will today, all the briefs, if we want to look back historically will be updated with these conversation recommendations. I'll just have those done within the next couple of days. So if you guys want to look back, and circle back to the discussions that we've had, and the recommendations that we've amended/changed by latest, like Saturday or Sunday, those will be updated. I just wanted to put that out there.

30:38

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. Yeah, I think just kind of with the new infrastructure there, maybe provide an incentive of why four is necessary, because like, there's no way that they're using it all manner of the hours of which UHS is open, maybe having times where it hits peak months of radiology, because that infrastructure is already there. And maybe, you know, saying like this is, you know, why two would be necessary, why four would be necessary. This is what they were doing during the times. And UHS is open, I think that would be more helpful. But four things that are drastic measure at this point.

31:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion?

31:18

**Representative Concepcion:**

Point and privilege for me before we got to your recommendation again. What is your final recommendation? Both the community health lines, are you are you motioning to strike those? Or are those going to stay?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That hasn't been motioned. We're aiming to get answers for that, by the time we have the official deliberations and vote for the unit.

**Representative Concepcion:**

Okay. I will just say that I agree with previous comments about I'm not really sure what the need for student greeters are. And then on the outreach side of things, especially considering its speakers and outreach events, despite what they come back to us with whatever information they have. I think it's really important that we recognize we're at a university and I'm sure that there's a lot of healthcare professionals that they can tap into and like, at this level of a network in terms of professors and other staff and faculty to like have in terms of like speakers and, and outreach in those particular academic areas. I also think this might be an opportunity to collaborate with SPA, they do a lecture series in which I think Community Health is a fitting topic for students. So I do think that more conversation about like, were their cost sharing/need to have these specific types of speakers and outreach events without thinking about like the academic and other student programming components. So I'm not sure that I wouldn't be in favor of that entire line.

33:02

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena UPUA Appointee. Also, depending on what the speaker is for if they're for an educational purpose, it's going to be a weird idea. But like, you know, like the College of Nursing, I don't know, could that possibly be cost shared with them? Is that something that's even possible or worth it to kind of look into? So I guess, ultimately, like, you know, what are these speakers for? What else can we cost share.

33:31

Representative O’Toole:

Nora O’Toole, UPUA President. I'd also like to know if possible like the turnout at these events, or if the amount that's being spent is being projected into the audience that's coming, because that could be a chance, as with most programming that's happening, that there's not a parallel relationship to the amount of money being spent on the speaker and the turnout. So if that's possible, it'd be nice to know who is showing up.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, I can add that to the question package we give to Dr. Kraut. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, we will now close the floor for discussion and we will now move into line item 6.C, fiscal year 26 Penn State Sustainability standing funding appropriation proposal, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, will you please present.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Penn State Sustainability formerly coined as the Sustainability Institute received just under $110,000 In fiscal year 25. Of their increases for this current proposal $3,124 of them is coming from general increases in salary per positions with fringe have their two positions funded in support from the UPFB that number is deemed adequate by the ratios in which inflation is, you know upping the livable standards for salaried positions. On that same note, implement inflationary costs of film screenings, advertising, speaker fees and travel expenses have amounted to their request an additional $5,000 in programming $3,000 of which are going towards strategic engagement funds, which is programming in itself and $2,000 into paid promotions, such as advertisements and physical and virtual marketing. The UPFB currently funds 50% of Penn State Sustainability’s junior staffing programming coordinator position. And they are requesting a $31,323 increase to fund an entirely new position coined as the Peer Engagement Coordinator. Now, our recommendation for this appropriation includes all of these increases, but only includes 50% of that newly funded position when looking through their position specifications. Although not super detailed, we have announced or come to the conclusion that based on the comparison from the junior staffing program coordinator in this new peer engagement coordinator, their roles and responsibilities within Penn State Sustainability are similar enough in reach that a full funding request for the entire position hasn't really been deemed necessary, at least for our portfolio of funding. So I'll throw it back to questions and discussion.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. I’m just curious, notable findings kind of clarified this, but what is the other 50% of their junior staffing funding come from for their salaries and kind of in line with the recommendation why that isn't extended to this new position as well.

36:58

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Off the top of my head, I believe their cost sharing with OPP on the other 50%. However, why that request is not being split for the new position, off the top my head I can't remember it. Nor do I remember that being addressed in that proposal. But I can look right now for you.

37:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Well, I want to yield time to Administrative Liaison Bram.

**AL Bram:**

From a purely logistical standpoint related to the fee, it would be easier if the fee board fully funded one position, and OPP funded the other as opposed to 50% positions. As you know, it gets messy when we start talking about salary increases. It's just clean that way. So if there's a way to figure that out, I might suggest that you talk to Penn State Sustainability about that, if you’re so inclined. Otherwise, you're just going to be in this position where you kind of have to deal with stuff for two positions. As future things happen with that.

38:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any further questions? Seeing none, we will now move into discussion. Is there any discussion?

38:29

**Representative Concepcion:**

Point of inquiry? Where is the where is the requested versus recommend? What line items specifically? Is that about 50,000?

38:41

**CPBE Kurtz:**

The 50% of the 31,323.

**Representative Concepcion:**

Okay, so then that's moving. That's moving to 50% for each. So then could we make a motion to fully fund one then? So I motion to fund one full, peer engagement coordinator and not 50%.

39:06

**AL Bram:**

I'd be happy to have discussions with Penn State Sustainability staff. If you want me to explain.

39:17

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So motion has been made. Are there any questions on that motion? Is there any discussion? Seeing general consensus the motion is adopted and will be reflected in the updated appropriation and will now move into general discussion with Penn State Sustainability. Is there any general discussion?

39:44

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. I guess this probably goes back and should have been brought up during the previous one. But I would say since we are now funding one whole position, we should continue to fund the position that we funded 50% for rather than the new position, just based on my opinion.

40:05

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Would you like to introduce that as an amendment?

**Representative Nevil:**

Motion to amend that we fully fund the first position, which is the junior staff position for programming.

40:20

\*Seconded\*

40:24

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And are there any questions on the motion that's been made? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, that would be what will convey back to Penn State Sustainability. And we'll inform them of where we would prefer the full salaried position to go, which was the past position that has existed and we will not be funding.

**AL Bram:**

Do you want me to follow up?

40:55

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That would be great. Yeah, if you could, thanks. Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, we'll close the floor for discussion for Penn State sustainability. And we'll now move into line item 6.D Fiscal Year 26 Bank of America Career Services Professional Attire Closet standing funding appropriation proposal, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, please introduce this.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

I apologize for the zoomed out Excel screenshot, I figured the Bank of America Career Services PAC is fresh on our minds from just a couple of months ago, if not sooner. Their proposal has stayed mirrored in the sense of, you know, this proposal is allowing the career services built into broaden its outreach with the PAC and including students to be equipped with workplace related supplies, provided tailored servicing, more equitable community outreach, etc. I know we had conversation back during the modification period, about the student garment bags, and you know, the eco-psychology behind that. And that was not addressed in their 26 proposal. I don't know if that was brought up to them in the modification period. But if that still remains a glaring issue, we can definitely have conversation. But outside of that, a large part of this is almost half is coming from their student staff and their PAC interns. And obviously, the supply support for the clothing is, you know, and donation cleaning are the lead drivers in this proposal. I mean, it's pretty simple line, and there's not much else I want to over explain. So I'm gonna toss it back for questions and discussion. And we can deliberate from there.

**Representative O'Toole:**

I know back in June that they'd asked for around $10,000 from UPUA and trying to use our budget, does that affect this funding or moving forward? Is it like, on UPUA to not give up UPUA student fee dollars to also another org that’s also asking for student fee dollars?

43:09

**AL Bram:**

You funded them for fiscal year 24. This is fiscal year 26 expense.

**Representative O’Toole:**

So if they were to ask UPUA again, we have to say no.

43:27

**AL Bram:**

I don't think so. Because I think that, you know, student governments have encouraged collaboration among offices. So I think if you'd be able to do that. Sometimes, like even now CCSG will jump on proposals.

43:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'm fairly confident this proposal was meant to like offset the costs for student governments.

43:58

CPBE Kurtz:  
Yeah, because student governments weren't identified in their 26 proposal, as for 25 I also didn't see much. So I would also be under that same assumption, as Chair Rodriguez, but definitely a point we can bring up in further conversation for comes to that.

44:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we'll move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, we'll now move into line item 6.E. This is entering our new funding proposals. So this is where I think a lot of the questions and discussion will be centered. So I would encourage you to engage as this will be, of course, an important discussion before officially voting. But we will begin with line item 6.E, fiscal year 26 Millennium Scholars new funding proposal, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, will you please introduce this.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

The Millennium Scholars Program in itself is a program offered to students entering into the undergraduate space and presenting themselves as STEM students who want to conduct their path into graduate school. This proposal in itself is not necessarily part of that MSP program. Rather the MSP unit in itself is offering up a new initiative called the “next step initiative.” And this would be offering workshops information sessions and retreats for students who did not qualify or who don't qualify for the MSP scholarship. Basically, this would be almost like a feeder program from those who were denied access to the MSP program, but still want to, you know, gain the information gain the absorption of being in undergraduate space that are being pushed into the graduate space. The current MSP recipients are stated at around $140,000. And MSP hopes that with the next step initiative, approximately 160 students could receive the next step initiative workshops and services that could you know, cultivate their skills and push them towards a graduate path. So that would leave about 300 students combined for the two initiatives in a whole in receiving those kinds of services. Now, I know we've had discussions in the past about OGEEP lifting up their undergraduate presence a little bit, so we kind of decided that it might not be a bad idea to have some collaboration with the next step initiative and OGEEP to kind of work in unison, and fuel the undergraduate and graduate connection early on in undergraduate space. This would be likely just in a preliminary experiment, the next step initiative recipients and individuals with OGEEP as MSP is technically separate from this proposal. And those recipients of the scholarship are separate from this proposal and its entirety. So I'll pass it back for questions that we can start discussing.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'll yield to Vice Chair Chandler to add some supplemental information, via conversation with Dr. Preston and then we can move into questions.

47:15

**VC Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA Appointee. So referring back to the original question of OGEEP’s requested appropriation, there was approximately $30,000 that was unaccounted for or formerly unaccounted for. She has clarified that with the new role, newly hired position within her office, they even require programming funds to help support that role and that $30,000 would help support that. She was aware of this proposal, the Millennium Scholars next step initiative, and already has reached out with Dr. Franklin who submitted this proposal to see if there is a way that they can synergize these efforts in, you know, sharing and helping and supporting students, undergraduate students who are interested in pursuing a graduate degree. I think she shared that she's definitely open and interested in pursuing this recommendation.

48:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we'll now open it up to questions. Are there any questions?

48:25

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. Did they seek alternative funding means or are we there first? Have they seeked other alternative funding? Where are we their first step.

**VC Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA appointee. I think what clarification and verification from AL Bram they this program is housed within at least three different university entities. I believe one of them is the President's Office and the Vice President of Research and like there's different offices, at least the Millennium Scholars program itself is well funded across the university. The request is that students that are not able to get into this program, be able to have this thing and opportunities to the workshops or retreats that are not funded by the university entities. So at this point, in that respect, no, and I'm assuming due to budget cuts, that it would be a lot likely to come from other funding sources across the university but I would love to hear any other thoughts from Administrative Liaison Bram.

49:49

**AL Bram:**

I think you summarized it well. I’m not going to beat a dead horse. This is a college. This is an academic problem. And the goal of Millenium Scholars is to prepare scholars for when they graduate from Penn State. I'm not sure personally that aligns with the Fee Board mission, which is the out of class experience. I know we can you can, you could argue all the time. I wasn't a big fan of OGEEP. So every academic program does have some out of class component to it, that almost everything has. They try to do engagement stuff, that try to get people together. And I worry that this is once again taking us down a slope, where we're gonna get more college specific and more academic programs asking for.

51:24

**Representative Sykes:**

Zion Sykes, UPUA Appointee. Is there not like the issue with funding food again? Because that's like, the big $2,500 on that.

51:35

**Chair Rodriguez:**

It’s just for UPAC.

**AL Bram:**  
This Board funds food.

51:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Any other questions? Okay, we'll close the floor for questions and move to discussion. Is there any discussion? Representative Nevil.

52:05

**Representative Concepcion:**  
Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. The numbers are really... 300 students is really small, I think. And I think those two restricted points. Also, and I don't know if this is like totally out of turn. But I'm pretty sure that like, what the main mission, or at least a huge part of the mission of the Honors College is to prepare for like graduate school, like has some graduate school components, considering that they have to have honors advisors and thesis advisors, and that's like a graduate sort of like pipeline. So that is open to like all students of all nine majors, and you can get in later. So I would be interested to see if like, we do hear other proposals in the future of like a collaboration maybe between the Honors College and Millennium Scholars Program, something that has like more sense of cost sharing, but at the same time, I'm definitely a no on this, I think it really crosses the lines

52:55

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. I also have to concur with Representative Concepcion. I also struggle with like, an entity that is so heavily funded by private donors as well as alumni donors coming to us as a student entity to say, hey, we want to make this more accessible to your student body, you have to fund it. Why are these not why is this entity not funding itself? Why are we being the ones that are forced to say, hey, we want to make this more inclusive to the student body? Why aren't they just doing it on their own? That's something I struggle with because it feels like they're trying to make this more open, but it's like why? Why are we the ones that are responsible for funding that so at this point, I stay as a no on it as well.

53:44

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? See no further points of discussion we'll now move into line items 6.F, fiscal year 26 Anthology Engage Platform new funding proposal. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, will you please introduce this.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Anthologies Engage is a student organization management platform. Engage is currently used at University Park and we refer it to as OrgCentral. Current funding for Engage at University Park is provided by SLI, that is a line item for ESA SLI’s budget request every year, engages the management platform used by up in other Commonwealth Campuses. However, this proposal is requesting UPFB appropriations to make Engage accessible to all of Penn State's campuses under one centralized location in one centralized name. Now, this is intended to centralize RSO management platform for all commonwealth campuses, as UP and some commonwealth campuses are using it currently, some commonwealth campuses are not using Engage. This would replace SLI or essential appropriation and it would be funded under one line item, probably under as SLI and this would probably be a one time or as a new funding appropriation. And this would offer convenience for RSO units to operate and collaborate under one software program. Anthology Engage offers the shared platform for managing the student organizations. This would also include fraternities and sororities, club sports, events, communications, and it would foster an obviously engaged student experience. This would also correct me if I'm wrong, Chair Rodriguez, cancel out using Canvas as training platforms for a certain RSO, and this could all be done under the centralized Engaged platform. Other than that, I would honestly like to open up for questions, discussions, as I could probably filter my responses further from there.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you. Are there any questions? Beginning with Representative D’Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. You mentioned at the end there that you can essentially move on from Canvas to move this through Engage? Does that go broadly for Canvas as well, like, I know there are certain clubs that like to use Canvas, just kind of as like a big forum for everything as well. Does Engage have that possibility as well, where they can make a big kind of page where there's trials, discussion, etc, we all know.

56:10

**CPBE Kurtz:**

I believe Canvas is kind of like “well, we have to use Canvas if it's not offered to us,” and from the information that I gathered in the proposal, but also just going a little deeper on Google, it seems like OrgCentral just can't upkeep with all of the RSOs that we have coming in. And that's like at the most funded Penn State campus. So all of the commonwealth campuses that are utilizing Engage in whatever name, they coined it as, number one, they don't really have the funding for it. But number two, centralize them into one name, one common, I want to say server, I don't know if that's the correct technological term, but I think it would kind of synergize a little more of the disconnect that we feel from, you know, commonwealth campuses, and especially the disconnect that Commonwealth Campuses feel from UP similar organizations. I don't know if you have any other supplemental information on that...

57:07

**VC Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA Appointee. I did want to add that with this Anthology Engage platform, but there's a heavy emphasis on data collection and metrics, which is something that we are encouraging all of our units to utilize. And so I'm confident that the shapeabilities that you were mentioning, Representative D’Elena that they will be able to do forms and host is ticketing and all that other stuff. So it's just the upgraded OrgCentral.

57:37

**Representative Nevil:**

This is probably going to be something only Administrative Liaison Bram can answer, but where's the the Engagement App that we attempted to roll out? Like two years ago. And do we fund the student engagement network and application?

**AL Bram:**

No. You don't fund them at all. This is a this is a complicated technological answer. But the company that built the app is connected with Anthology. You wouldn't be able to use the app in the future update the roster and such but you can't. Okay, so there are some benefits. But that's not the reason why we're why this proposal was being brought forward.

58:38

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Yeah, I'd like to supplement that with, as he just mentioned, it just does come with the two notable benefits of increasing as it will serve as interface for the Engagement App. Another additional benefit that they have listed in the proposal is that the additional usage of functions, features and tools within Engage that like Vice Chair Chandler was saying will have an increasingly larger impact on student engagement data tracking for event attendance, and just overall more robust evaluation of, you know, programming events and RSOs and what they're up to year over year.

59:28  
**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. Is to plan for it to be rolled out where they are still using OrgCentral every year or are they going cold turkey on the student organizations and saying OrgCentral's over, we're now seeing this platform.

59:45

**AL Bram:**

I don't think anything's going to change for RSOs at the university. The plan is that there'll be three hubs for the state. UP will be its own and then we'll have one on the east side of the state and west side of the state.

1:00:09

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I'm not sure you can answer this, but like, was there any CFB or like Commonwealth involvement in discussion? Like, what is that kind of look like? Just curious?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so the Commonwealth will be contributing a percentage of the overarching amount that is estimated in accordance with their utilization and the students and headcount that they have.

**AL Bram:**

Essentially, the quote that the university received from Anthology was based on per student across the university. And so University Park is paying a per student rate and then the Commonwealth Fee Board is paying for every student they have. They've already approved it.

1:01:05

**VC Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA Appointee. If they're already approved it, where does that leave us?

**AL Bram:**

Yeah, I didn't mean to say that you have to approve it. It just means that if you approve it, then this will go forward as an institution. If you don't, this will...

1:01:30

**CPBE Kurtz:**

As in like, if we don't appropriate these funds, if they were to externally source it, could it still happen then?

**AL Bram:**

No, because the campuses couldn't afford it without University Park’s contribution. Anthology bases its prices on the total number of students, right. So when you take out 45,000 students at University Park from that total number, it's, you know, it's like a tier thing, so that the person who costs will go up significantly.

1:02:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

In further clarify, that means both are separated. So our spending will not account for a student from the Commonwealth and vice versa. They're spending three UP students. Are there any further questions?

**Representative Nevil:**

I think you said that, but I just want to confirm. This would be a one time cost. And then SLI will pick it up. Is this going to be sustained costs.

**CPBE Kurtz:**  
Sustained costs, but as a new funding fee, it will no longer be SLI is OrgCentral and Anthology Engage separately. It will be added on to one cost. Am I correct in saying that?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. It will replace the cost of OrgCentral.

1:02:47

**AL Bram:**

Also to respond to Vice Chair Chandler’s question, depending on how you if you vote that you don't want to support this, I would say you would still need to vote to support OrgCentral, because if you don't support anything, then OrgCentral goes away. That's probably a problem.

1:03:09

**VC Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA Appointee. Since OrgCentral is already under SLI, then it wouldn't be considered with here, right. Because if we approved SLIs appropriation...

1:03:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes.

1:03:40

**CPBE Kurtz:**

I'm more so wondering in the terms of if we were to not appropriate for Anthology but to appropriate to OrgCentral. Can you foresee Anthology Engage increasing their costs every year at a higher rate than OrgCentral might under SLI?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I believe the contract was multi year.

1:04:07

**AL Bram:**

There is normally like a two or three percent increase. And that's that's been the case since OrgCentral has been used.

1:04:16

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-Large Representative. So if we approve this line item $160,494. We’re then eliminating the $64,000 line item that currently sits under SLI that we talked about?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. So we'll amend that when we have deliberations.

**Representative Nevil:**

And then we will vote on this before that correct?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep. Are there any other questions? Representative D’Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

This question has been asked to death. But we talked about this in a previous meeting, where we don't really know what the enrollment numbers look like a year ahead of time, but two years ahead of time. That's compounded. How did we get a quote on a person basis if you don't exactly know what those enrollment numbers look like?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

We're using fixed enrollment numbers, right? Just as we would for our revenue streams here.

1:05:15

**AL Bram:**

They used this year's. That’s pretty standard. When you're figuring out how it impacts the fee, you’re using a fixed rate, right?

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Yes, yes.

1:05:29

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Do you have a second question?

1:05:37

**Representative D’Elena:**

I know that they're using this year's enrollment, but if let's say we get, you know, a whole bunch of our students, is that going to be a problem with them at all?

1:05:53

**AL Bram:**

We'll have to come to a contract and agreement. And so we will honor you know, I would assume that they would honor whatever number is in the agreement. And if there's a contingency in the agreement that says, we will look at fiscal year 26 numbers and adjust as necessary.

1:06:23

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, I will close the floor for discussion. And we will now move into line item 6.G, the Pilot Program Policy Authorization. Vice Chair Chandler, would you like to introduce this?

**VC Chandler:**

So last Friday, or last board meeting, this pilot program policy was introduced. Basically, it proposes that any new funding request would be considered and pilot status pending two to three year pilot status to allow the proposal or the proposed request time to deliver metrics to see if it fits well and meet the board's budget model and values and delivers on the metrics that the Board sees fit. It details. Again, I guess, sun-setting policies or infrastructure or detailing how, basically just detailing how this pilot program would work for a new funding request for the board if there's any questions, that pilot policy was shared in last week's folder, and I can share it again in this week's folder just for your reference.

1:08:04

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions? Seeing no questions will now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, will now move into a vote by roll call. Vice Chair Chandler.

**VC Chandler:**

Okay, a vote yay is to approve this pilot program policy.

\*VC Chandler takes roll call vote\*

**VC Chandler:**

Okay, so the yeas have it unanimously, seven to zero.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. So that has been adopted and we will now move into line items 7.A, my chair report and discussion and then 7.B. So I'm, I've taken up the mantle of planning an end of the year together for us to some capacity. And that is currently still in the planning stages. However, I would imagine it does include a geographic area of some sort that we invite you to. I wish I could give more details but surprises are best.

**AL Bram:**

If you want to come to my house, you’re welcome. If you’re planning to drink, you can’t.

1:09:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, that sounds like a really good opportunity that we will take into considerations. And that is probably what will end up doing. So keep an eye on your calendar, we'll reach out to find a day that will work before everyone has to leave State College. And then finally, the student wage classification skill update, I sent information to Dr. Dowhower and a meeting where she was in charge of Student Affairs HR, about their thoughts and implications of those decisions. So that will be discussed back to us at some point and I will keep you updated as that comes about. Are there any questions for my report? Okay, seeing none, we'll now move into line item eight executive committee reports. Are there any executive committee reports? Chief Administrative Executive Alexander.

**CAE Alexander:**

Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, we have been conducting interviews for students staff this week for the next board. So thank you to everyone who pushed those out. We've had excellent candidates. And I'm really excited about the students staff next year. And we'll probably have an announcement of who will be filling those roles either by the end of tomorrow or early next week. So keep an eye out on that too to congratulate our new students staff.

1:11:34

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions? Seeing none, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz.

1:11:45

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Not really necessarily a conversation starter, thanks for bearing with us. I know the deliberation process has been thought provoking. Obviously, we're coming towards the tail end of this semester, so within the next week or so, I will be forecasting and modeling a bunch of potential new SIF amounts for the following fiscal year for 26. Obviously, if you have any opinions, ideas, questions, please come prepared. Nothing's really set in stone. And obviously, the board is of your jurisdiction to you know, raise any concerns or questions outside of my current knowledge. So just keep hanging on. I'm really excited to, you know, finalize this year. And like I said, thank you guys for engaging and all the materials. I know, it's a hassle, but we are doing important stuff. And I appreciate people opening up a document. And so thank you guys, and I'll see you tomorrow at nine o'clock.

1:12:51

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions? Seeing none, are there any other executive committee reports? Okay, seeing none, we'll now move into line item 9, comments for the good of the order. Are there any comments for the good of the order? Okay, we'll discuss more about next week tomorrow. So there will be more context provided. And Seeing no other comments for the good of the order. We'll now move on to line item nine closing roll call Vice Chair Chandler.

\*Roll call attendance is taken and quorum is kept\*

1:13:52

Okay, enjoy your standing is hereby adjourned at 8:18 PM.