

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
NEGOTIATED RULEMAKING TRIO SUBCOMMITTEE
SESSION 2, DAY 1, MORNING
FEBRUARY 9, 2024

On the 9th day of February 2024, the following meeting was held virtually, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. SMITH: Good morning everyone.

Welcome back to session two of the Federal TRIO programs subcommittee. My name is Krystil Smith. I am a commissioner at FMCS. I will be facilitating our committee meeting today. Along with my co-facilitator, Cindy Jeffries, also with FMCS. To begin, I would like to start with the roll call for our subcommittee members. Good morning and welcome back. I will begin with our Non-Federal subcommittee members, beginning with the current or former participants in the Federal TRIO Program representative, Wade Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Here.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Wade.

MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning.

MS. SMITH: And representing our institutions of higher education, D'Angelo Sands.

MR. SANDS: Here.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, D'Angelo. Representing our public or private agencies or organizations, including community-based organizations with experience in serving disadvantaged youth, Emalyn Lopus.

MS. LAPUS: Here.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Emalyn.

Representing secondary schools, including local educational agencies with secondary schools, Geof Garner.

MR. GARNER: Here. Good morning, everyone.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Geof. And I don't know. Michael, Michael is not here yet. But for our state officials, including state higher education, higher education executive officers, state authorizing agencies, and state regulators of institutions of higher education, that representative is, Michael Meotti, and he is not yet here. For the Department, our subcommittee leader is Aaron Washington. Good morning, Aaron.

MR. WASHINGTON: Good morning.

MS. SMITH: And assisting Aaron today we have Hannah Hodel from the office of general counsel.

MS. HODEL: Good morning.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Hannah. Along with Vanessa Gomez.

MS. GOMEZ: Good morning, everyone.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Vanessa. And Gaby Watts.

MS. WATTS: Good morning.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, everyone. As we know, this is the second and final subcommittee meeting. And we've got- we do have our issue paper before

us. To help us guide us through the discussion, I will turn it over to our lead subcommittee member, Aaron Washington. Aaron?

MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you, Krystil. So, welcome back, everybody. For those tuning in for the first time, my name is Aaron Washington again, and I'll be the subcommittee team lead. So welcome to day two, the final day of our subcommittee. At the previous subcommittee session that we provided, a super high-level overview of rulemaking. The purpose of the subcommittee. And we took a deep dive into the issue paper and had really great discussions. We won't go back through it all today. So if anybody watching for the first time really is interested in seeing what transpired at the first subcommittee meeting, you can head over to our negotiated rulemaking website and check out the recording and the transcript of our first session. So at our first meeting, several members discussed concerns with the Department's proposal and also presented a counter proposal. We also had support from one member of the subcommittee who has since shared several emails from the community or stakeholders indicating support for the Department's initial proposal. So before diving straight into our discussion, I just want to take a pause. Like, remember the last time I kind of paused between, like I said,

paused, like just kind of hear what the subcommittee had to say. So before diving into, like, a deep discussion on the issue paper, I just wanted to allow the subcommittee members to discuss anything that they've heard from their constituencies or the TRIO community at large. And no, it doesn't necessarily have to be the constituency specifically to represent, it could just be the TRIO community at large, that you've heard between the first session and now. So I'll just pause there and kind of open up the floor for just a little bit of general discussion.

MS. SMITH: And while we're in this pause, I would like to welcome Michael Meotti to the table. Good morning, Michael.

MR. MEOTTI: Good morning. My apologies. I've been having problems with my Zoom client for the last week or so after a computer reboot, so took me a couple of cycles to get in. But I'm here.

MS. SMITH: Yes, you're here, and we're happy to have you.

MR. MEOTTI: Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Anything that you all have heard from your constituency groups or that you'd like to share at this time? And just by way of the process of rule, encourage you as well. You can utilize

the chat box. That will be made available to the public at a later time. And it's visible to the Department.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'll say, from the programs and directors and staff that I've talked to. I mean, I think they kind of have felt the same way that that we did. I mean, would we love to welcome these students with open arms? Yes. Are there concerns about the things that we had discussed and brought forward that would happen after the fact of serving these students? It was pretty common feedback that I got from most of the individuals that I had talked with. So, that's kind of where we are or what I've heard. So.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Wade. Aaron?

MR. WASHINGTON: Oh, you know what? Let's- I'll let Michael go first.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Michael?

MR. MEOTTI: Yeah. So it was totally coincidental that I was in the central part of the state of Washington for the last two days, central and eastern part of Washington, probably in, you know, political terrain that may be driving some of the concerns that we're hearing from some members of the subcommittee. And I was at a community college, but then also meeting in employment settings that were served by programs in the community college. And the area I was in was a college

that had in recent years become an HSI, in parts of the state that historically had not been. Right. And so, of course, all of the issues that are, you know, discussed are present and location like that. It's similar, I'm sure, to spots around the country and in the conversations- and I happened to walk right past a large area with TRIO, right, TRIO services like right there as a sign of that college. Right. And it's been operating for years. And in talking to the people in that community, and this is outside of the educators talking with employers in manufacturing and other types of things. And this was the kind of manufacturing facilities large could have, you know, had about a thousand employees, could take pretty much unskilled people and train them how to do assembly of these complicated devices that they happen to sell. And, you know, I talked to the business people, you know, it's very clear that they understand on the ground the nature of the communities, the realities of who they're serving and what they're doing. And is consistent with my experiences with people at the community level who do not necessarily make their decisions based on the screaming and shouting they hear on national cable news or in Governors rushing to certain borders or something like that. And that in service areas like this, the work can be carried on in a

way that is inclusive and respectful of everyone that we can help. And while yeah, there may be cases here and there, I mean, I've looked for examples of which, you know, gear up, you know, our programs that are inclusive now and they are dependent on local and other state funding decisions. So I'm concerned that what we're doing is allowing this national environment that is isolated to certain circles of, you know, media conversation and occasionally performative decision making that does not necessarily reach to the level of what happens in a community level program that meets people where they are. And I think it's probably important for us to make sure that we're clear on the merits first, because. Right. I mean, I don't think a group like this is convened in order to do a political assessment of the American environment. That may be a factor that people want to bring in. But first and foremost, you know, as someone who is not a front-line practitioner, right, and is involved in Government decision-making processes, I'd want to make sure that we first understand the substantive perspective of people who are front-line practitioners in the appropriateness and the worthiness of being inclusive in the way that the Federal Government proposes. And then if they have additional thoughts or concerns about politics, you know, then that's maybe

something that can be added to it. But I think it's important that we sort of split out the issues that way and consider it to make our communications most clearest to those, you know, who are- who will be hopefully listening.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Michael. Emalyn?

MS. LAPUS: Yes. Hi. Thank you. I wanted to ask from the last meeting, I had presented t, I guess, issues that I was concerned with. One was related to the standardized testing objective for Upward Bound. And the second item was regarding the target school dropout rate for the need criteria for the talent search programs. Was there any further consideration regarding those two points? If there's any movement of any kind?

MR. WASHINGTON: Let's see, you know, we had a chance to review the subcommittee's alternate proposal. You know, there were things in there that included, you know, increases to the Upward Bound and McNair stipends and, you know, a change to the definition of low-income, individual modifications to state testing. You know, and, you know, among the things that you just discussed, Emalyn, and, you know, those areas are likely outside of the scope of what the Department announced during the lead up to our main and subcommittee sessions. We did say that we will be discussing issues related to

participant eligibility in certain TRIO Programs. Some areas we, you know, we lack statutory authority. But I did mention in our first session that due to the other topics of the main committee, they might not have the bandwidth to take on more issues outside of participant eligibility. So, you know, issues related to grantee applications or allowable costs, you know, maybe we could discuss some of those things for something like- maybe the higher education program office could, you know, provide more subregulatory guidance and explain things a little better. But in regards to actually like, you know, changing regulatory requirements, that could be outside the scope. But, you know, this is- you know, we'll talk about- we'll talk- I kind of want it to like, kind of focus just this portion discussion on, like, what you've been hearing from the community. And then we'll dive further into a little bit later, probably sooner rather than later what in fact, you all are going to report out to the main committee because, Emalyn, based on what I just said, that doesn't prohibit you from presenting those ideas to the main committee. I'm just, you know, saying that they're generally outside of the scope of what we announced and, you know, and you also have to think about the on the main committee, like I said last time, the main committee is going to be very familiar

with issues related to citizenship and non-citizen eligibility, because right now in TRIO, they basically mirror those of Title IV Federal Student Aid. When you get into other issues, you know, that- you know, more in the weeds issues of the higher education program, TRIO programs, there could be a- you know, there may be an area of like discomfort for the main committee only because they may not be so familiar. And we're also going to talk about the time that you have to present next week. Well, not next week, the third session. And it- you know, trying to expand out to broader issues really is going to be difficult considering that the main committee has to- still has to discuss, I believe four or five other issues, probably five other issues. Don't quote me on the four or five, but it's four or five other issues. So that's just something to think about when you're- you know, but we'll talk about that soon. Emalyn, what I do want to ask you, Emalyn, though, is, you know, have you- you know, Wade and Michael were able to talk about what they've heard. And I do want to circle back to both of them to ask more specific questions about what they've heard. But, you know, have you heard anything between the first subcommittee table and now in the community? You know, essentially, basically what I've been hearing is there's a lot of support for the change. So, you know,

but, have you heard anything from your constituency or the community?

MS. LAPUS: Well, I think I'll take this as I see my colleagues have their hands up, so I'll let them speak.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So yeah, that being said, with the hands being up, we do want to focus right now on the instant case on what you've heard from the community. So you all are going to be addressing what you've heard. Looks like Wade is a no. So if you don't mind, Wade, if you don't mind if I take D'Angelo since he is addressing what he's heard. And then you can get back in the queue, Wade. We'll get you to. D'Angelo?

MR. SANDS: Thank you so much. And again, I want to thank the Department for the consideration and the opportunity to share our perspective. In our state, in the state of Texas, the concerns are two concerns. One aligns with what we put forward previously. The concern is the possibility of regressive work done as a result of it. And that's and within the state of Texas, there are some activities and actions taken that kind of causes that type of frame of thinking. But the other part also is support, the type of support the Department would hand down with the potential changes. But they also reiterated that whatever the

Department hands down, TRIO professionals are always being able to do the work. When we were asked to do more with less, we did that. But some of the concerns is, salary came up that there is a number of turnover, so there's concern about additional work being done and yet still having to have one hand tied behind your back advocating on Capitol Hill for more funding. But also come an institution where there are lack of support. And so there in that meeting in that middle where we just want to try to, I guess, address any ambiguity. Is that the word there? And so those are some of the concerns that's been coming from folks in my area that I've heard.

MS. SMITH: Alright. Thank you, D'Angelo. Did you want to respond directly to that, Aaron, before we move on?

MR. WASHINGTON: Yeah. So the- you know, specifically in regards to, like, the Department's proposal, what had- what- I know you said, like, one hand tied behind your back and more work. I mean, you know, with the- with any changes, the Department generally releases subregulatory guidance for stakeholders to follow in order- you know, like, you know, support for like subregulatory guidance in the form of like trying to explain the regulation, explaining how to implement the regulation and, you know, to make it more, I guess,

easier to understand. You know, sometimes I get like- when I- regulations is like go here, look it there, go here, look at that, but you know we generally provide those supports to our, you know, our stakeholders, the TRIO community, in order to explain the changes. So-

MR. SANDS: So it isn't- we understand how it's written and we're not too far from the ground. A lot of us are still on the ground. A lot of us are very active on our campuses. It's more so institutions. Right. So there are some institutions that are safeguarded. There are institutions that say, okay, because the institution is being represented, you're not allowed to reach out to this person or that person. We are the one. We have those who want to reach out to our program officers instead of allowing the person that's the PI to reach out to some of the offices. So when I talk about having to advocate on both fronts. For sure anything that's passed down, we're going to articulate that or we understand that some of us are very skilled in sharing that information with our institution to say, hey, this is why this is the change. Here is how we intend to formulate that when we can follow those guidelines is some of the things that are not written, some of the things that are experienced on campuses where you have professionals who have to navigate some of that on their

own specific campus while addressing the change. And in addition, you know, prepping their staff members who ought to have some level of training in dealing with the population. We cannot have people who are insensitive to the population or have any kind of, you know, attitudes or behaviors, whether knowledgeable or not, dealing with the population as well. So it's more, I guess, a broader brush or a broader scope of how some of our folks here are feeling in regards to that. If that makes sense.

MR. WASHINGTON: Okay, thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, D'Angelo. I know Wade and Geof you both had your hands up and this is in regard to additional feedback. Geof, did you have some feedback? Wade, do you mind if I go to him first?

MS. SMITH: Okay. Okay.

MR. GARNER: Thank you so much. I have heard some more questions about it. Thank you all for letting us be part of this as practitioners. It's great to have our voices and expertise welcomed and I thank you for that. I'm getting questions from our regional folks, especially EOC, they're wondering and I put in the chat, just if asylum seekers would be considered part of the undocumented students that they could serve or is that only for the high school eligible as it pertains to Upward Bound and talent search? That's just one of the

questions come in. Is this okay, Aaron, to ask about this now? And then another question is because I'm from Oregon and I worked really hard with our Oregon TRIO association to get the Department's waiver to serve undocumented students. The concern that we have currently, serving undocumented students statewide in Upward Bound and Talent Search is that if students are- undocumented students are not allowed to receive the stipends, this creates a two-tiered system, is there any way we could get some answers about, we will still have to have citizenship questions on our applications so we can discern who not to give the stipends to in our program, has there been any redress or addressing those questions that have come up that we brought up? I think we touched on that last time. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Aaron, are you able to respond?

MR. WASHINGTON: Yeah, sure. In regards to the first question, asylum seekers, well, so we talked a little bit in the first session about how the Department interprets eligible- like the terms eligible non-citizen. So eligible non-citizens are- include individuals who have asylum. So like an application for asylum wouldn't make someone eligible to participate. But currently, if somebody was granted asylum by the

Department of Homeland Security, granted refugee status, granted- they're a self-petitioner under the Violence Against Women Act and the law that is called the battered alien. That is a legal term, that is not a term that may be generally used anymore, but that's a legal term in the law. Conditional resident aliens, lawful permanent residents, conditional resident aliens. Cuban Haitian entrants and individuals that are paroled into the United States for at least one year would currently be eligible to participate as- in- as TRIO participants. And that's- yeah, so I hope that answered that question. So if the individual grants asylum, can participate in TRIO now and also receive a grant. And I think that kind of goes into the second part of your question. The idea behind the grants is that the PRWORA is the statute that defines qualified aliens. Again, that's another legal term. And so- one second, Hannah, did you want to jump in there? I know we have- I don't want to get it totally wrong, but, I know we had some talking points on PRWORA.

MS. HODEL: No, I mean, I think everything that you've said is accurate in terms of the individuals who are already eligible to participate in the TRIO Programs irrespective of what we are proposing today. So, you know, there are already a large category of non-citizens, including persons who are granted asylum

who are already- should already be able to participate, in, for example, what was asked here, the EOC program because they are considered qualified aliens under PRWORA.

MR. WASHINGTON: Oh, yeah, and I found it. I'm sorry. It's- so existing PRWORA explicitly prohibits certain types of Federal public benefits in the kit. In this case, stipends in the form of direct cash from being awarded to our participants who is not an eligible non-citizen. So that is like a statutory requirement on- in regard to the stipends.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. WASHINGTON: We don't know if they know. So I don't know, Krystal. I don't know if Geof had a question.

MS. SMITH: Did you have any other questions, Geof?

MR. GARNER: No. It just makes it clear that we will still need to ask the citizenship question to discern who is eligible to receive stipends on our applications then. Just the groundwork we're doing that seems to be clear. We do need to discern who is eligible to receive those funds when we enroll students in our TRIO Programs. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Geof. Wade, thank

you so much for your patience.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, no problem. I'm glad Geof asked that because that was one I forgot that our EOC director had asked about. Because we actually have a pretty large, again, where we are a population of individuals that are asylum-seeking and refugees. With like where we're at got a very large poultry industry, Tyson, butterball, all of them are here. And so that was one of the questions because there are a lot of refugees and asylum seekers here. I would also like to kind of echo what D'Angelo had said. Now, keep in mind, that I am no longer working in TRIO but I had for many, many, many years and we get the job done. When it comes down to it, regardless of whatever regulations, policies, are given, we still do what we can to serve our students. And so probably what I would say and this is, I mean, like I said, the people that I talked with have some of those same concerns that we talked about in the first session. But again, if this is something that the Department is adamant about moving forward on, I think, you know, our goal is to serve as many first-generation low-income students as we can at the end of the day and make sure that they have every resource available to them. And we'll do that. It's just I would say probably that we just want to make sure that we have the support of the

Department when needs arise and things need to be addressed and maybe changed and adjusted in order to serve all participants, whether it's undocumented or the other participants that we have. I still- and I get it, I know we talked about this last time with the whole stipend issue. That's honestly, that's probably my biggest hang-up because and I understand why. I know it's law. But I just really do hate that. And I know that in Michael's emails that he had sent, talked about how programs are resourceful and can find other ways to fund that. I will say, yeah, we do that. But that also does take time away from trying to provide services to students by having fundraising efforts or other things. You know, keep in mind. I'm in a state where it is a lot more restrictive and prohibitive for undocumented students and so not as supportive typically. And so I just think about obstacles that directors and, you know, program staff would have getting those outside resources in order to try and offset that to make stipends available for undocumented students. So, but.

MS. SMITH: Alright. Thank you, Wade.
Aaron?

MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you. Thank you for all the feedback, I appreciate that. So, I think we can, you know- we hear you and we'll like, we'll move

forward into our next discussion. So I- oh, go ahead-

MS. SMITH: If you don't mind. Michael.

MR. WASHINGTON: Oh, sorry.

MR. MEOTTI: Yeah. I just wanted to quickly add that when I answered the question about things we're hearing, I was focusing very much on the front lines and the state where I live and work. Just adding. Of course, you've all seen it, but, I have helped share voices of 100 plus higher education and K-12 education and other education-related organizations and leaders around the country in support of this. So I think there is broad support, particularly in the work I'm most closely connected to national circles and higher education and university and college leaders beyond whatever else I do and just considered to be like state Government, you know, and so there does seem to be, as far as I can tell and based on the record we've put in front of you, broad support from that community, those communities, for this change.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Michael.

MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you. All the documents that were forwarded to the Department are also on our- I know, I think they should have been forwarded. They probably were forwarded to you all too, but, like- but if you hadn't had a chance to see them, they're also

on the negotiated rulemaking website as well. So, you know, I said, you know that you can- several times even today that, you know, the subcommittee- this is the subcommittee proposal to the main committee, and you can all can decide to present whatever you choose. So, you know, just keep in mind, you know, also that the Department provide consensus or dissent as well. I don't know if you- did you all get a chance to watch rulemaking last week, the second session? Alright, well, if you didn't, there's like- there's a Department official as well. His name is Greg Martin, Gregory Martin. He also weighs in on consents or not reaching consents. So, you know, he'd be in a position to decline consent, depending on, you know, what the subcommittee chose to present to the main committee as well. So even without support of the subcommittee, the Department- even without support from the subcommittee, the main committee may still vote on the proposal the Department put forward. So, you know, the goal, the overall goal of the subcommittee is to present, you know, one, one recommendation to the main committee. So it is in the subcommittee's interest to put forward a proposal that everybody's comfortable with. But I also know that there's a difference of opinion, in the subcommittee on the recommendation, therefore, you can present two, three, or, you know, or however many

recommendations you all feel if each of you has a different recommendation. The main committee will be able to ask you questions at the third session and ultimately accept the [inaudible] consensus. So, you know, with that, based on the feedback we've discussed internally and, you know, you've seen the- you've seen what the second issue paper that we've put out, we've published, there were no changes from the first subcommittee session. So at this point, we'd like to know what is the recommendation that you'd like to put forward, as either a subcommittee or in the event of disagreements, what are the separate recommendations that you'd like to put forward? You know, I can discuss- I can either stop there and, like, let you all discuss what you are- what you're planning to propose to the main committee. Or I can talk through the time, the actual time that you'll have to present. You want me to stop there and like- before we get to the actual logistics of, like, the time. Or do you want to talk about what you all intend to propose? Or we can- or we can just- or we can talk about- we can revisit the Department's proposal. I mean, I can walk through that again. We can talk about that again. It's up to you all.

MS. SMITH: Alright subcommittee, you have it. What's your pleasure? Do we want to revisit the

proposal as it is?

MR. MEOTTI: I have. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt, but I have a process question. But I'll stop and finish what, you know. Sorry for interrupting. Finish what you need to say, but I have a process question.

MS. SMITH: Let's take the process question.

MR. MEOTTI: Okay. I've generally been an observer of rule-making for some time but have never been involved. So I'm curious as to the ability to hold a caucus for members who are interested in being supportive of the proposal but have recommended changes. Because where I'm coming from is I understand the general nature of TRIO Programs and the issues we're dealing in terms of eligibility determination but the conversation on stipends is one that is very new to me. I also have [inaudible] though from the gear up perspective and also from financial perspective have some understanding around sensitivities around capturing citizenship status in an actual, you know, recorded sort of way. So, you know, those are things that I think whether- I don't know whether they're, you know, actually in the scope of what we should be doing, but if they are or could be part of a positive recommendation about the general [inaudible]

eligibility change. That's why I'd say, that would be an interesting caucus conversation for me if there are others who better understand some of those issues and want to help me understand them and come to a place of being supportive of that as a proposal.

MR. WASHINGTON: Can I just jump in there really quick, Krystil?

MS. SMITH: Sure.

MR. WASHINGTON: I just wanted to. I just wanted to- you know, I didn't talk about it earlier, but citizenship is captured in a lot of areas in like the Title IV programs outside of- you know, and I hear the concern from Geof, but, you know, even on the FAFSA, we do capture- you know, the FAFSA asks for your Social Security number. Then it asks for the ARN, which is the Alien Registration Number, and there's an automated- there's a match done with the Department of Homeland Security. And if that match is failed, then the schools will see the individual's immigration status in the country and make a determination for their Federal Student Aid Based on that. So, I mean, we do capture- I know there- I don't know if the concern was, like, actually having to ask the question as like- as TRIO Programs, but we do capture citizenship in many, many areas of the Title IV aid.

MR. MEOTTI: And we do too. That's why I wanted to better understand what the concern was.

MS. SMITH: But your question, Michael, is your question about the procedure for calling a caucus or?

MR. MEOTTI: No. Well, I guess I'm saying I'd like to have a caucus if there are other members who are interested in having that conversation.

MS. SMITH: Okay. And are you requesting the caucus then for anyone that's interested or would you just like to invite them and we can ask if they'd like to come? What's your preference?

MR. MEOTTI: Yeah. I think it's, I mean, yeah, if people are interested in having that conversation, I would like to have that conversation.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Would anybody be willing to have a brief caucus to speak with Michael about- is it specifically the stipends?

MR. MEOTTI: Well, it's the notion of what would be a proposal that would be based on general support for the Department's proposal with recommendations around issues that need to be taken into account to be able to do it effectively and help all TRIO participants.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So that's pretty

broad.

MR. MEOTTI: Do you want me to narrow that down?

MS. SMITH: Well, I'm wondering if we're just asking for, and this is just me asking if we're asking for if there's general support around it and if there's a reason you just want to have that specifically in private and not just continue to discuss it here at the table.

MR. MEOTTI: And not having been through the process, I don't know the value of the caucus in this setting. I know it in a legislative setting having spent many years in a legislative caucus, you know, the value of having a little bit of a conversation to bring people up to speed to get to a comfort level or not. But so I would be intrigued- I would be interested if there are people who want to have that conversation and having that conversation. I don't think it would be very long, but.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Okay. So let's- I'm going to ask, you know, who would like to join a caucus with Michael around getting support for the Department's proposal as it is. But before I do that, I do want to go to Emalyn just to see if there's something else she wanted to add before we make that consideration. I think Aaron had his hand up. Emalyn?

MS. LAPUS: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to, I mean, I just felt like I wanted to just say I echo what Wade and Geof have addressed in terms of the asylum seekers. And specifically the stipends, you know, it's just, like Wade said, I understand, but when it comes time to implement it at the direct service level with my team and members in my community, it will be very- it would just be very difficult. And again, I feel that it's a very divisive tool. But and saying that you know, we did express our concerns and considerations in the papers from the last meeting. We received this, you know, the second document again, the language is the same. So, you know, moving forward, you know, I mean, I will support what the Department wants- is recommending. I just hope that it will in the future, the Department will continue to provide the same support across all sectors. Because, you know, the TRIO Programs, our main goal is to serve low-income and first-generation students. So that's my comment. And then if there is time, maybe we can have, if my three other colleagues and I maybe could be in a breakout room, just to kind of, you know, maybe give us a few minutes to connect and see where we are in agreement, what we want to do moving forward.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So. And when you say

your three other colleagues. Which three are you asking about? Oh, and you're on mute still, Emalyn.

MS. LAPUS: Wade, Geof and D'Angelo.

MS. SMITH: Okay, okay. Before I ask for the caucus, did you have something else that was relevant to the conversation, Wade? Do you want to weigh in on it?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I think I want to clarify. Whenever they were talking I think it was Geof had brought up about the- on the application about- because I think what Aaron alluded to was the FAFSA, which for that, I mean I think what Geof is referring to is on our free college applications as they're accepting applications on students. I think that's what he was specifically talking about is we're going to have to include that on there. Or is it appropriate to include that on there? Will there be any type of negative impact and including that, you know, by I don't know, it's a sue happy world that we live in, you know. So I just want to make sure that we're not- I just want clarification. I think that's what Geof was kind of alluding to is on those pre-college talent search, Upward Bound and EOC, is it appropriate to include a box that they check that they're undocumented?

MR. WASHINGTON: You know, I think, you know, I don't want to get ahead of any subregulatory

guidance that could be released in regards to like, you know, it all has to- you know, but- you know because they are- because there is no- there could be, I guess, brainstorming there. It might not necessarily have to be a box that says, are you undocumented? But more- I mean, there are so many non-citizens or like, you know, designations, categories of non-citizen that theoretically, you could have a question that says are- do you- are you- do you fulfill one of these? Do you- are- has DHS assigned you one of these designations? Do you have asylum? Do you- are you a refugee? Are you this, are you that, are you- are you a self-petitioner? Under the Violation of Womens Act, are you, Cuban Haitian Entrants, as opposed to asking one specific question about a students undocumented status. So then the student could then potentially be counseled by, you, in regards to the stipend, so they wouldn't be in a situation where they were checking on a form that they are. Doesn't have to be a document. It could be, you know, it could be a U Visa holder. It could be somebody with temporary protected status. These are all categories that are not- those are the categories that are not listed in the parole regs as qualified aliens. So, you know- so it could be- it could be similar like that, like just, exhaustive list. It is exhaustive of qualified aliens in

PRWORA. So it could be something like that. Does that answer your question, Wade?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, yeah. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you. Alright. Michael, I'm sorry, I'm ready to call for your caucus. Did you have something to add before we do that?

MR. MEOTTI: Just a question. If we're going to go on a- if others are going to go on a caucus for that, is it appropriate? I mean, I like to ask for a caucus if that's the right time with Department officials while that other caucus is taking place to just give me some- and work through some background issues that I need to have a better feel for.

MS. SMITH: We can and we're going to call for yours first. You ask for yours first. So at this point- and are you inviting everyone including the Department, Michael?

MR. MEOTTI: Yes.

MR. WASHINGTON: Oh. Including me?

MR. MEOTTI: Yeah, I mean, I would say first, I guess it's members of the committee would be first. And then maybe if we went into caucus and we wanted to bring in, I don't think you can [inaudible] done that. I'm not trying to exclude the Department, but it's really a conversation with members of the committee

who are interested in moving this forward but with appropriate additional advice to the full committee.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MEOTTI: Or at least open to that.

MS. SMITH: Yes. So that being said. So you said it would not take long. 10 or 15 minutes is what you're thinking?

MR. MEOTTI: I think maximum, yeah.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Alright. So, for a 15-minute caucus, we'll say, please raise your virtual hand if you would like to be placed in a breakout room around garnering some support talking through that for the Department's recommendation as it stands with Michael. Is there anyone interested in a caucus?

MR. MEOTTI: I feel like I'm at a 10th-grade dance again here.

MS. SMITH: And remember, I mean, what the caucus does, you know, it will just- it's basically we have a conversation, we stop the live feed, it would be just those in the room, in a breakout room, you know, we'll set it for 15 minutes. If you want to go longer, you can. If it's shorter, you come out and we start again. Alright. D'Angelo, looks like you're ready.

MR. SANDS: So if I can ask the question. It would be- I think it would be beneficial if

my colleagues and I who work directly with TRIO currently. If we can meet first, then maybe we can join up with Michael because I think all of us are on the same page previously. And so I think we need to talk through some things together. Put our heads round it because we're so close with working with TRIO Programs. It shouldn't take a long time. We don't need ten minutes. I would say 3 to 5 and then we can cycle back with Michael so we can get our discussions and dialog. And then we can come back and see, you know, what our findings are and then we can take a temperature check from there if needed.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So if no one at this time wants to join Michael in a caucus we, oh. Geof?

MR. GARNER: Just a clarifying question. Aaron, what were you asking us to come up with? Just so I can be super clear when we go into our caucus breaks. When we return, what do you want us to have ready in an actionable item for our group?

MR. WASHINGTON: Well, I mean, I didn't anticipate a caucus. So I, you know, I don't- I don't want to- you know, you can- you all can talk about whatever you want in the caucus, you know, like, so when you go into them, you discuss. And you know, I did hear, you know, Emalyn earlier say she- there could be

potential for support for that proposal. So, you know, I, you know, I- you know, so that I don't know if others feel that- you know, also have that- comes that same support as well. But I think the overall deliverable for today is if you're going to, what you all believe that you're going to present. I know, Emalyn, earlier you discussed the alternative proposal that you presented last time so that- if you want to present that Emalyn, you can present that to the main committee, you can absolutely do that. You know? D'Angelo, Wade, Geof, all you all want to present that as a group to the main committee. You can present that as a- you know, if Michael- you can you can come to the main committee with something else as well. But, the idea behind the subcommittee is to have one proposal to bring to the main committee so that, you know, they can take it, talk about it, maybe put- fine tune it a little bit and weigh in on consensus. But, that does not mean that you are required to present one single recommendation to the main committee. You can all- you can- you know, so that's the deliverable for today. Just to get an idea of what you all are going to present to the main committee and also talk to you all about the time you'll have. So you'll have like- basically you'll have about an hour to present. So, you know, if it's two proposals, two

opposing proposals, you'll each have 30 minutes. If it's three proposals, you have 20 minutes. If it's five proposals, you have 10 minutes each. But that's essentially what the deliverable is. But the subcommittee- I mean, that's how the caucus is open to which- whatever you want to discuss.

MR. GARNER: Perfect. Thank you, Aaron.

MS. SMITH: Before we caucus. Cindy?

MS. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I just want to just clarify here. D'Angelo and Emalyn, your thought is that the three active practitioners, right, for the TRIO Programs would meet briefly, and then, actually, the four of you, and then after that then you would bring Michael in or entertain bringing Michael in to have that overall general discussion of where you want to go. Is that correct?

MR. SANDS: That is correct.

MS. JEFFRIES: Okay. Alright.

MS. SMITH: At that time, just for time's sake, Michael mentioned the opportunity also to caucus with the Department. We could do that at the same time. So, the four of them asked for about five minutes. We could put you in a room with the Department, Michael. And if you take longer, that's okay. We'll just.

MR. MEOTTI: I doubt we will, but that

would be good. Yeah.

MS. SMITH: Okay. So we are going to do that. We're going to call a five-minute caucus. So we'll come back at about 10:55 Eastern. You'll get an invite to a breakout room. If you all need help, there is a request for help button, I believe. Give me one moment to get that set up.

MS. JEFFRIES: Are you doing it, Krystil?

MS. SMITH: I am.

MS. JEFFRIES: Okay. I'll stay out of it.

MS. SMITH: Yeah. Alright. Alright. Michael, who would you like from the Department besides Aaron?

MR. MEOTTI: It's their choice.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Aaron?

MR. WASHINGTON: Can you invite Gregory Martin? Oh, sorry. Sorry. Aaron, me, Aaron, Gaby, and Hannah.

MS. SMITH: Okay. You all are going to seven. Gaby and Hannah. Okay, you all should have your request. You have yours, Aaron? You may have to press the breakout button.

MR. WASHINGTON: Oh, okay. Let me see.

Alright. Join breakout.

MS. SMITH: Room seven.

MR. WASHINGTON: Room seven?

MS. SMITH: Do you see that?

MR. WASHINGTON: I don't.

MS. SMITH: Alright, hold on. Let me do it again.

MR. WASHINGTON: Oh. Is the public looking at my technological skills here? Okay, here we go. Alright, joining.

MS. SMITH: Alright.

MS. JEFFRIES: Can we pause the live feed, please?

MS. SMITH: Alright. Welcome back. Thank you, everyone. So we are now back at- everyone's back at the table. And we wanted to start just to see if anyone had a report out from either of the caucuses that took place.

MR. SANDS: I do.

MS. SMITH: Okay. D'Angelo?

MR. SANDS: I want to thank the colleagues for coming together, having a conversation. Based on our conversation, you know, we- what was stated was we expressed our concerns. We have expressed our concerns during our last meeting. And we understand that

the Department is going to move forward with the recommendations to include undocumented students that's eligible for TRIO. And that's something that we can support. However, since we are focusing on the neg reg on participants' eligibility, we want to uplift the eligibility focus proposed rule change to include eligibility, especially now, with the issues with the better FAFSA. This will be an incredible, helpful change for TRIO Programs.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, D'Angelo. Was there a report out from the other caucus or anything else the other colleagues would like to share?

MR. MEOTTI: No, not from the caucus I asked for, no.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Alright. Aaron.

MR. WASHINGTON: You know, I- so, I guess we can move forward into what exactly you all are going to be reporting to the- well, you don't have to tell us exactly what you're going to be reporting to the main committee. I mean that- but I- you know, if you have a general idea of what you will be saying to the main committee, that would be helpful for the Department, I think the public is [inaudible] hear. So, D'Angelo, what- you know, as a- you know, what would be your recommendation to the subcommittee? I'm sorry, I

apologize. What would be your recommendation to the main committee?

MR. SANDS: Well, we would, based on what is written in the documents, we can support that. If there is any opportunity for eligibility to be considered, we would like that to be considered. And, you know, and we can also seek further guidance on what that could potentially look like because it'd be extremely helpful for our students, our programs, our SSS programs, and McNair programs specifically. What I would like to do is possibly if I can provide some additional language that my counterpart would like to add to that. But that's something that's based on our discussion, but in general, we're going to go ahead and support what Department is putting out. As far as the language part, that's what I have for the moment. But if you need something specific, if something other than that needs to be written down or presented, I'm happy to provide that.

MR. WASHINGTON: No, I don't- it doesn't have to be specific. I just- you know, thank you for the- thank you for that clarification. Yeah, I- yeah, thank you.

MS. SMITH: Yeah. I mean, so just to be clear, I'll step in here, Aaron. So just to be clear, the four, the four of you, all that last session were not in

support of the language, the red line text. You are now- you are in support now, you would recommend the changes as the Department has presented them. Is that correct?

MR. SANDS: We will provide support for our TRIO Programs. We're prepared to do the work that the Department is recommending.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Alright, so in that case, then, Michael had already expressed his support for the language. So we then would have- oh, and I know Aaron, the Department supports its language. So we would be in support of the language as it's written, everyone. Okay. So I do think the next step as- Cindy?

MS. JEFFRIES: Oh. Go ahead.

MS. SMITH: So I do think the next step is to discuss the logistics of the report if it's just you all are going to put a report. I know that D'Angelo will be there and can express verbally the support for the language as written. We can see who else, if anyone else wanted to be there as well to answer any questions. Cindy?

MS. JEFFRIES: Yeah, I just have a clarifying question here, Krystil. D'Angelo, you know, I heard you say, that subcommittee is in support of the Department's proposal, which is wonderful. I'm glad you were able to, you know, find your way there. But I

believe I heard you mention that, if possible, you would like to include Pell Grant.

MR. SANDS: Yes.

MS. JEFFRIES: Did you want to have discussion on that?

MR. SANDS: I'd love a discussion with the Department if we can have- if they can give any feedback on that process or the possibilities of that consideration, and what authority they have to potentially make those changes. I know it's a previous preference about the focus and on what was written, specifically, but if there's any insight into what the Department or what the Department can do to make that change or addition, we're all ears for that as well.

MS. SMITH: Aaron.

MR. WASHINGTON: I think you're talking about Pell eligibility in relation to the definition of a low-income individual, right, D'Angelo?

MR. SANDS: Yes, sir.

MR. WASHINGTON: I want to allow Hannah to talk to statutory definitions. If- or, you know, I don't want to put Hannah on the spot, but if- [inaudible]

MS. HODEL: No. Yeah. I'm good. So the definition of how one documents the status of being a low-income individual is provided specifically in

statute. If helpful, I could drop that definition into the chat box. But I do think that's an area, unfortunately, where Congress has said specifically what we can consider as documentation of status as a low-income individual, and they haven't provided evidence of Pell Grant receipt as a way that we can meet that documentation. So I think we are restricted by the statutory language there. I can drop it into the chat if that's helpful.

MR. SANDS: Yeah, that will be helpful.

MS. SMITH: Wade.

MR. WILLIAMS: But isn't one of the- one of the things I know for, like for SSS, and maybe D'Angelo- because, again, I didn't run- I ran several programs. SSS was not one of those. Was an ICER or like from there- having that- wasn't that something that you could document to show their income eligibility for a student in SSS, D'Angelo?

MR. SANDS: Yeah, I believe that, but don't quote me on that one. I have two SSS programs here on site, and some of the challenges that they expressed to me was the ability to identify and if Pell eligibility was something that can be added, it would help them tremendously.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, my understanding is

with the quote-unquote better FAFSA, programs aren't able to access that through their financial aid offices or won't be able to. So it's going to be a lot harder for programs to get necessary documentation in order to determine who's eligible. So if we had- I think if students were able to present their, you know, their confirmation page showing their EFC then- to show that they are in fact Pell eligible, then that would make it a lot easier for programs and for students to get services to them, I think is kind of what.

MS. SMITH: Aaron.

MR. WASHINGTON: You know, outside of the context of, you know, actually changing regulations, we also have a lot of tools in the form of subregulatory guidance. I apologize, I know you probably all know what subregulatory guidance is. This is probably mainly for the public. You know, just so we all can be on the same page. The Department quite often releases subregulatory guidance in the form of letters or announcements to explain statutory regulatory provisions. And I'm just wondering, you know, would that be- based on what Hannah says, and, you know, being a- not- most- not being able to change the definition of a low-income individual, like through the rule- through negotiated rulemaking, could it help to just actually- could it help for the Department

to provide just a little more guidance about what the- you know, what the statutory requirements around the definition of a low-income individual is? That does not mean that we would say that that- you know, that we would include Pell eligibility in that, but just to provide more- just to provide more guidance about the current definition and how it should be implemented. Could that be something that could help in lieu of, you know, our prohibition on rule making?

MS. SMITH: D'Angelo, Wade? Or would that be- and you all are on mute. It looks like you all are mulling it over.

MR. WILLIAMS: I- all I said was D'Angelo. I was just going to defer to him.

MS. SMITH: Okay. And you said something. We can't hear you, D'Angelo. You're off mute, but we can't hear you. Okay, there you are.

MR. SANDS: I was thinking it through. I think that would be helpful, but I would hope that can be some type of segue into- or you know into hopefully making additional changes if possible, whether we take the advocacy to those who can make things happen and change there. But I think that'll be helpful. And thank you, Aaron, for that.

MS. SMITH: Now I'm on mute. As Cindy

said, I do- Aaron, go ahead.

MR. WASHINGTON: You go first, sorry.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Well, I was just going to congratulate you, the members of the subcommittee for coming together with a recommendation, a single recommendation. So, for- you know, we still have some time, and we can just come together on what that looks like, so that we're prepared as we- as Aaron has alluded to, and for those that did watch the session, they- there are a lot of topics still left on the table. So, it sounds like there has been a, you know, a finite amount of time allocated to the TRIO committee, subcommittee report out. So, if we can get that as cogent as possible, I think that would really help the committee in the long run. Aaron.

MR. WASHINGTON: You know, I was going to talk about the logistics of the report out. So I guess, Michael, if you have a question, maybe, Krystil, if you wouldn't mind [inaudible] first.

MR. MEOTTI: Yeah. Let me make sure- okay, I'm off mute. Okay, good. Just curious in terms of the recommendation, I want to make sure that I understand what the recommendation is, that there's a- the recommendation is support for the Department's proposal, and there are other issues or matters being suggested for

consideration. Obviously, if they're defined by statute we can't- you know, the rules process can address that. But understanding that it is- that that's what the proposal is. Support and think about these other things as opposed to that's one big thing that if you can't do the whole thing, you shouldn't be doing any of it.

MS. SMITH: That's a good clarification. D'Angelo, can you weigh in on that, or are you making the support for the recommendation as-is for the proposal as-is contingent on anything else?

MR. SANDS: As-is.

MS. SMITH: Say that again.

MR. SANDS: So yeah, it isn't hindered upon whether the Department- I think is understandable that with the Pell Grant or the Pell eligibility, there are challenges there or there is a statute in place. So it doesn't hinge upon that. The Department is going to move forward with it. TRIO programs will prepare to do the work.

MR. WASHINGTON: Okay. Okay. I'm sorry. You said it is not?

MS. SMITH: It is a little hard to hear you.

MR. SANDS: Oh. I'm sorry. Is it me?

MS. SMITH: Yeah.

MR. SANDS: I'm sorry. [Inaudible] it's not hinged upon that. No, it's not hinged upon that.

MR. WASHINGTON: Alright. Understood. Alright. You know, and like I said, you can discuss- you can talk about your- you know, like what you would like to see happen in the future at the main committee as well, you know, but again, like as Krystil said, we're really excited about the subcommittee support for the proposal. Krystil, can I go into the logistics or- are we ready to go into some logistics for third session?

MS. SMITH: Let's talk logistics, see what it looks like.

MR. WASHINGTON: Alright, so, we'll have about an hour to present to the main committee. We might not need that much time. You know, because there's, you know, one proposal with maybe some other discussion items. So you don't have to take the entire time. But the main committee will be able to ask you questions about what happened at the subcommittee, and you'll be able to respond, you know, to those questions. Then the main committee will take a consensus check and like- kind of like we did here. Krystil can explain how it'll- how it will look. And if the main committee reaches consensus, so- oh, I don't know if I said that, but the main- so you'll have an hour to present, and then the main

committee will have an hour to ask questions. So it'll be two hours total. And then if the main committee reaches consensus on the subcommittee's recommendation, then that's what we will publish as a proposed rule. So the public will then be able to comment further, on the proposed rule. After that, it will become a- after that, we'll publish a final rule that will take effect the following year, July 1st of the following year that the regulation is published. Yeah. So- oh, does somebody want to say something?

MS. SMITH: No. Well, I can just step in, just to be clear. So the consensus means that everyone- every member of the committee has to accept. If there is one person that is not in favor, then the committee does not have consensus. So as you know, as we explained before, you all's job and you all have done a good job as subject matter experts, specifically in these TRIO Programs, is to give them as much information so that they can make an informed decision. It probably bodes well that all of you all agree on one recommendation. So, you just want to present that, be available to answer those questions. But ultimately after that, it's completely in the hands of the committee. Aaron, go ahead. Sorry.

MR. WASHINGTON: So like I said at the

first, you know, table you all can present out, you know, how it- how you choose. It could be, you know, a PowerPoint presentation. It could be- I remember, you know, it can be, I guess an essay format. You don't have to create a presentation. You can just say we support the Department's language. And that can be it. But it just depends on how you all want to present out, you know, that report, and it's not- and we wouldn't need it until February 23rd. So, obviously the sooner the better, for sure. But, you can take some time to decide as a subcommittee how you all want to present and any ideas who would want to do it? Do multiple people want to come or? That's for you all.

MS. SMITH: Well, we know that D'Angelo will already be there.

MR. WASHINGTON: D'Angelo gonna be there. D'Angelo can go by himself. He could do it by himself. You know, he can have some support from you all.

MS. SMITH: Michael.

MR. MEOTTI: Yeah, I would love to- I'd love to be there, whether or not I actually have to say- maybe mostly for answering questions or something like that. But I would love to be there to- I was- I want to- I keep wanting to say the verb participate, but that may not happen based- verbal participation may not happen

unless needed if D'Angelo is going to give the main recommendation. But I would like to be available, be in the digital room. Let's put it that way.

MS. SMITH: And so, D'Angelo, we are assuming that you will make the report out. Is that correct? It looks like that's a yes.

MR. SANDS: That is correct.

MR. WASHINGTON: Okay. Cool. Alright, cool. So it sounds like it'll be D'Angelo and Michael that will get- that will be- they will present out and- well D'Angelo will present out and then Michael and D'Angelo will answer questions. Sounds good. Yeah. So, D'Angelo and Michael, y'all will get together and let the Department know, like, you know- well, actually, FMCS. You can send the- either- what- however you decide to report out, you can send that to FMCS by the 23rd. Is that okay? Cool. Okay.

MS. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MEOTTI: Yes.

MR. WASHINGTON: Alright.

MS. SMITH: Alright. And just in case you all just let FMCS know, just email myself or Cindy if you do- would like the link to, you know, be on camera on the date. We don't know what date yet, correct, Aaron? But the report will be made?

MR. WASHINGTON: No, we don't. Not yet. I don't know if this- give me- just give me one second.

MS. SMITH: Well. Okay. But we'll let you all know and just let us know. Right now, we will send- be prepared to send invites to Michael and D'Angelo. If you would like to be there, let us know. Of course, you all are welcome to watch it on the public link at any time if you don't want to be in the room.

MR. WASHINGTON: Yeah. So I just- it'll be sometime between March 4th and March 7th. So, D'Angelo, you're already going to be there, you know, so you'll be available. Michael, hopefully you can be flexible between those dates for a two-hour space between. It's 10:00 p.m., 10:10 a.m. and 3:30.

MS. SMITH: And then 1:00 to [inaudible].

MR. WASHINGTON: Okay.

MS. SMITH: So, you know, I guess it would have to start before.

MR. WASHINGTON: Maybe like 1 to 3. So 10 to 12 and 1 to 3 Eastern time.

MS. SMITH: 3:30 Eastern.

MR. WASHINGTON: Yeah. March 7th, March 4th through the seventh.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Alright, I believe- so

is there anything else that this committee would like to discuss? We- you know, we have 25 minutes until lunch. We are scheduled for another- until 3:00 after lunch. Is there anything else that the committee has- would like to bring to the table? Right now, we have marked that we have a recommendation, a single recommendation in support of the Department's language. Anything additional? Okay. Cindy, am I missing anything? Aaron- or Aaron, did you want to add any other statement?

MR. WASHINGTON: I don't have a prepared thank-you for you all. I should have probably written something down. Thank you so much for, you know, joining with us to discuss the issue. And, you know, we're really happy that we were able to come to one recommendation for the main committee. And, if you all have any other further questions, you know, you can always email FMCS and they will get it to the appropriate folks at the Department. And, again, thank you so much for taking this time out. You know, and, thank you for the work that you do in the community. I guess I can go- I'm not accepting an Oscar. I don't know why I'm like thinking of like who [inaudible] I don't know, but anyways, does anybody from subcommittee want to say anything? I don't want to just-

MS. SMITH: Okay, I am getting some other folks that want to come. Geof and then Emalyn it

looks like.

MR. GARNER: Thank you. I put it in the chat, but I'd like to be there to support our process with the full committee, too.

MS. SMITH: Okay, we'll send that link out. And Emalyn, did you have something as well?

MS. LAPUS: Well, I guess just a point of clarification. If it seems as you have stated that because our committees move- we are moving forward with the proposed recommendation by the Department, do we need to meet again at- after?

MS. JEFFRIES: No. You- do you mean like the rest of today, Emalyn?

MS. LAPUS: Yeah. I mean-

MS. JEFFRIES: No.

MS. LAPUS: Because we've come to.

MS. JEFFRIES: Yeah. No. If you- if the committee has concluded and come to their one recommendation and it is stated on the record of what that recommendation is, you have- you will have bought back about four hours' worth of your time for today.

MS. LAPUS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Yeah. Yes. That's true. I'm ready to call for an adjournment. Just remember, that it is still incumbent on you all that, you know, want to

review the document that you will send by February 23rd that will- you know, that will be there- that will encompass the recommendation. So do work with D'Angelo. We know he's leading the report out. If you need additional space to- if you need additional space to talk or discuss anything, just reach out to FMCS. We can make one available to you. But if there is nothing else, Subcommittee, Federal TRIO Subcommittee 2024, we will adjourn this meeting at 11:38 Eastern. Thank you all so much for your- coming together on this.

MS. LAPUS: Thank you.

MR. GARNER: Thank you.

MS. JEFFRIES: Congratulations,
everyone.

MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you.

MR. GARNER: Great meeting you, Aaron.
Thanks for the facilitators. Nice working with everyone.

MS. SMITH: Yes. And thank you, Aaron,
for leading us through this.

Zoom Chat Transcript**TRIO Subcommittee- Session 2 , Day 5, Morning, February 9, 2024**

***Chat was copied as presented, as a result minor typos or grammatical errors may be present.**

From Geof Garner Secondary Schools to Everyone:

Would asylum seekers be able to receive services through EOC projects? Some of the EOC directors are wondering that.

From Hannah.Hodel to Everyone:

20 USC 1070a-11(e) (e) Documentation of status as a low-income individual

(1) Except in the case of an independent student, as defined in section 1087vv(d) of this title, documentation of an individual's status pursuant to subsection (h)(4) shall be made by providing the Secretary with—

- (A) a signed statement from the individual's parent or legal guardian;
- (B) verification from another governmental source;
- (C) a signed financial aid application; or
- (D) a signed United States or Puerto Rico income tax return.

From Hannah.Hodel to Everyone:

(2) In the case of an independent student, as defined in section 1087vv(d) of this title, documentation of an individual's status pursuant to subsection (h)(4) shall be made by providing the Secretary with—

- (A) a signed statement from the individual;
- (B) verification from another governmental source;
- (C) a signed financial aid application; or
- (D) a signed United States or Puerto Rico income tax return.

From Hannah.Hodel to Everyone:

(3) Notwithstanding this subsection and subsection (h)(4), individuals who are foster care youth (including youth in foster care and youth who have left foster care after reaching age 13), or homeless children and youths as defined in section 11434a of title 42, shall be eligible to participate in programs under sections 1070a-12, 1070a-13, 1070a-14, and 1070a-16 of this title.

From Hannah.Hodel to Everyone:

And here is the definition of low income individual in 20 USC 1070a-11(h)(4) (4) Low-income individual

The term "low-income individual" means an individual from a family whose taxable income for the preceding year did not exceed 150 percent of an amount equal to the poverty level determined by using criteria of poverty established by the Bureau of the Census.

From Geof Garner Secondary Schools to Everyone:

I'll attend the main committee session. Please share a link. Thanks so much.

From Krystil Smith | FMCS Facilitator to Everyone:

Got you!

From Wade Williams, TRIO Participant Rep. to Everyone:

I will as well