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00:17

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, so All right, and let us confirm quorum, and then I'll ask for clarification on representative Johnson's need for early departure, I believe, but we do have quorum with the addition of Connor or Representative Kelly, which means that we can proceed. Um, Representative Johnson, what time do you have to leave the meeting by?

00:51

**Representative Johnson:**

Yeah, thank you. Um, it's, I mentioned that more. So in case I cut out like I can, I can remain for the duration, so long as there are no internet issues.

01:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. All right. So we'll keep note of that. Again, if we do lose quorum at any point, or if someone does have to leave, I'll just ask for a motion to recess. And we'll reassess as we continue throughout the meeting. Given that, you know, it's pretty flexible with everyone here. So that being said, we will proceed, and we'll move into line item to the adoption of the meeting minutes, which are the minutes that occurred on our January 19. Meeting, is there a motion tlao adopt the meeting minutes?

01:34

**Representative Johnson:**

So moved.

**Representative Miller:**

Second.

01:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, given that has been approved, we will now move into line item three, which is the adoption of the agenda. As I was stating earlier in the call, the same agenda that we essentially used last Friday was just transferred to this new one. That being said, Is there a motion to adopt the meeting agenda?

Representative Miller:

Can I instead make a motion to amend the topics of discussion to specify the language or can I get some clarification about what is the purpose of our discussions today?

02:14

**Chair Rodriguez:**

The purpose of our discussions today are based on what I have on the forum to primarily discuss your concerns via each recommendation. Based on that and based on the recorded deliberations and discussions, we would have those who you would ultimately make a motion to amend if we do have that all-member meeting on Friday, and then we would vote individually on your specific amendments to the like language or the removal of any of the text that is what the procedure will entail upon voting, but the idea is that we have a discussion on this now and per the directions within the email, that is how we would then reconcile the absence or the needed departure of those members, right you know, at that point, I withdraw my motion and I instead move to adopt the agenda as written. Okay, is there a second?

**Representative Miller:**

Second.

03:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, given that that has been approved, we will now move into line item for public comment given the nature of the meeting, we have and we have not been able to solicit that. So if there is anything that will probably be communicated to us and seeing no students here for public comment, we will now move into line item six of new business. Five of new business – apologies – which is line item a continued discussion.

Essentially, like I just explained what this will what this process will entail will be subdividing the concerns into each of the respective recommendations. Discussion will still be had holistically because again, the copy editing that took place over the past few days, and the more minuscule refinements that needed to be made have already been addressed. So the text as is should be updated. And if it is not, we will make motions to address that will then be voted on that will then again be voted on on Friday. That's the tentative process. Everyone should understand that this will be uniform in regards to discussion and deliberation of those points with the available representatives. Again, following the dissemination of all viewpoints and verified understanding of what was discussed and what will be voted on then the voting would proceed on Friday, then the amendments would be voted on before the voting proceeds. Simple final explanation on that time and then we would move into a vote if there's opposition or deliberation

04:59

I just wanted to open up the floor for questions for this specific line item if there are any of how we will go about new business today? Are there any questions? Representative Miller?

**Representative Miller:**

Yes. So for the like, I guess like in the modern Rules of Order, or whatever, the format or whatever I apologize.

If we're trying to have a conversation, we'd have to make some sort of motion to suspend the rules to be able to actually like, talk to each other or know, since the line item is there, it'll go just as it has been and goes procedurally. And then that's how that will be facilitated.

05:40

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, given the modern rules, component that Representative Miller brought up again, I would just point you, also to the procedural guide, just so you can see what the different motions are. And also just to provide insight as to what the functionality and logistics are of those. Ultimately, you'll see everything referred, that's there to the actual texts that exists. And again, for points of procedure, please understand that we can break and of course, reference the text, but I would hope that there's an adequate backup that provides even more understanding of how you can go about the process of this discussion. So that being said, and seeing no further questions, I will now move into line item six topics of discussion, beginning with line item, a budget model taskforce recommendations. before initiating any questions or discussions, I would like to ask for a motion to recess the meeting for 10 minutes so that Representative Miller can mark the areas of the task forces that might exist or I can also modify that for five minutes. If that is possible for you to do representative Miller, could you provide comment on that motion? If that makes sense to you?

07:10

**Representative Miller:**

Wait, one more time you want me to? Like just my concerns for the budget model part?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

If if they're there, then yes. So everything you outlines, just adding to where that area of the recommendations are, just so we can divide that and then know what those discussion points will be?

**Representative Miller:**

I think, if it's okay, with everybody else, I'm perfectly happy to just sort of go as we go along. And then I'll just bring up whatever ones are relevant to the conversation, so we don't have to recess and save some time.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, that Yeah, we could definitely do that. So I'll withdraw that request for recess. And I will also state that everything that is in the introduction can also be within the content of that first area of discussion, which is the line item six topics of new discussion, budget model task force recommendation. So everything in the introduction, glossary as an example that can also be discussed at this current point within the appropriateness of the context of what's laid out on that document.

08:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That being said, we will now move into any questions and that again, would be related to that specific recommendation point as further clarity and for further verification of viewpoints. Okay, following no questions will now move into discussion.

08:44

**Representative Miller:**

I have one.

08:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay.

08:49

**Representative Miller:**

Can I just have a motion to recess?

08:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Motion recess?

**Representative Johnson:**

So carried.

08:56

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. Representative Miller.

08:59

**Representative Miller:**

Yeah, so the question I have regarding the intro glossary, everything is the admin liaison position. Why is that in our, in our document? And why is that like legitimized as a position that it seems to serve a little bit as a recommendation on the board and not? Why does that need to be in our glossary, or in the document in general?

09:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I believe Cierra can add on to this or Barry and or Jennifer that, since it's referenced multiple points within the document, everything that has been laid out within that general realm of content has been clarified if there is needed clarification of its explanation. That's why it's there. And since I motion to recess, this is it can be informal, you can raise your hand to further discuss that point outside of our current deliberations. Vice Chair Chandler.

10:00

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Oh, yeah, so Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee. To also further explain–so the administrative liaison was formally referred to as advisor, and all boards, we understand that the student fee board and up fee board is not a registered student organization. And yet, we still need an advisor to help communicate and have like us established relationship between administration and what we do, regardless of whether or not we think we have the autonomy or the authority and the questions about that we do still think I believe that's a valuable position to have within the board and is necessary. So the term has just moved from advisor to administrative liaison, and I believe it's legitimate and necessary.

10:58

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I also think to supplement that if the discussions that come within that area of the naming for the administrative liaison, which I'm sure they'll do, things can be revisited. But again, I would second what Vice Chair Chandler said and say that it's more so of like, just part of the structural changes that they're doing within the department, and also the different organizations that they're reviewing and classifying.

So will we technically don't have a name or an area category that was relegated to under the Office of Student Leadership and Involvement. And this would mark kind of that transition as we go through this accrediting process that has stated that we need to reevaluate how we categorize different student organizations. Barry, do you want to contribute to that more technical aspect?

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

Well, I just I read that I remember the discussion that we had in the Executive Council, that is really what spurred the need to include something now. Najee, I think you were right. When you said that. The present I think the administrative liaison is a term used throughout the handbook or guidelines or advisor was and we decided, you know, I think we came to a consensus that it needed to be included in the glossary. We chose not to use advisor and use administrative liaison because like you said, it is not an RSL, nor it is an affiliate organization, it will likely be in that third category of a sponsored type of organization sponsored by the administration.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Jennifer.

**Jennifer Saunders:**

I'm wondering, because advisor was the previous term, Would it help if we just add a line that said something to the effect of formerly known as a disposition was formerly called to tie advisor and why there's a new phrase? So I wonder if we could just add a sentence that just says this position was formerly known as or formerly referred to?

12:58

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller, Does that satisfy once we reenter the discussion period? Would that satisfy that concern? Or comment?

**Representative Miller:**

No, no, my issues are less. So the terminology because the terminology is fine. It's just the purpose and the implementation throughout the recommendation. And I'll bring that back up at a later point or during discussion.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, awesome. Um, I will now reinstate the rules. And we will return to line item six. Point A, the budget model task force recommendations as a whole moving into discussion, what this would essentially entail would be thoughts like representative Miller expressed or other thoughts related to the introduction, and the budget model Task Force recommendations as a whole. We did spend a fairly significant amount of time discussing this in our previous general meetings around two weeks ago. So I won't imagine that there's anything more not negating the budget model narrative, which we'll move into discussion based on what's in the document sequentially. And that's how we'll essentially structure that. But that being said, we will now move into discussion, which means if you have a question refer to the procedures and the motions and I will subsequently call on you and you can raise your hand or you'll just be acknowledged, if it is one of I need to leave for a couple of minutes for whatever reason. Again, the examples are listed there. But if you would raise your hand we can move into discussion and address those points. And again, this is relegated to the introductory aspects and the budget model recommendations themselves

15:02

Okay, seeing no discussion about the budget, the introduction, or the budget model recommendations themselves will now transition to the component of the budget model Task Force recommendations, which is consistent with the narrative.

15:21

First, we'll open it up to questions related to that, given how we divvied out the how we would go about the topics of discussion. So that being said, I'll now open up the floor for questions related to the spirit of the budget model, narrative. Representatives Zabroski.

15:42

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, I'm Dallas Zebrowski GPSA appointee. I guess what is the status of the comments on the document as a whole? And the reason I'm asking this is do I do I need to reavoice concerns or comments that I previously made on the document here in the meeting? Or do they stand alone as a record of a comment being given if, like, that makes sense?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. So when we move into discussion, I would address those within the every comment that you made within the document, so that it is on stated record and so that it's easier when people are watching it. And also to acknowledge other thoughts and discourse that explain it verbally. Where with additional context, does that answer that question?

16:27

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah.

16:29

**Chair Rodriguez**

Are there any further questions? Okay, we will now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Representative Miller?

**Representative Miller:**

Yes, I apologize. If I'm, I have a little bit confused by the process. So please just give me grace. The one of the things that I had concerns with was actually in the glossary, I apologize for jumping back. But in the University Park Undergraduate Association definition it says their core mission is to be the voice and advocate for all students. They pass legislation, voice student concerns, university leaders, which makes sense, and then creates positive impacts on 1000s of undergraduate students at University Park, I understand that that is what is in their documents. But for us, pretty much backing that up makes it sound like UPUA is the governing body and representative body for all things, I think that that should be specified. And I made the recommendation that that should be specified to undergraduate students, or even University Park undergraduate students.

17:29

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, so I'll address that point. And then we can discuss the yielding of time to Chief Administrative Executive Alexander. But one thing I would say is that that can be made, I can allow a motion to amend that within this context. And I think that's completely fair and appropriate. What I will say, though, is I don't think that can be done until our next Friday meeting, given that we only have one UPUA representative that is available in here to be able to ensure that the wording is appropriate and in line with what they consent to.

18:11

Is there any ability to yield?

18:17

**Representative Miller:**

Najee, if it's possible, just for the ease? Is it? Can we go to a slightly less formal process to allow those who need to speak to speak because I am a little bit confused by it. And I, I understand the worth, can I make a motion to suspend the rules and we just go through it in a little bit more informal, I guess.

18:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I would prefer not to only because the cordiality of the meeting is really important. And also to structure it, these it can really get out of structure. If these aren't followed. I don't think it's too and it's putting an imposition on all of you, I think that you'll be able to like navigate this appropriately because we are within discussion. And also this is the same strategies that UPUA and everyone else employs and I can be firm on that because it's within our governing documents. Okay. Will anyone yield Chief Administrative Executive time? Okay. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander.

19:19

**Representative D’Elena:**

Yield time to excuse me, Representative Chief Administrator Alexander.

19:29

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Chief Administrative Executive Alexander. So I just wanted to clarify that that was the definition that for the UPUA that we pulled directly from their website. It does in the second sentence emphasize that it is undergraduates. So I understand that concern. And that was simply just we pulled the semantics from their website. That's all I just wanted to clarify.

19:53

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any other discussion within this and you can just get back in the queue and you can bring up whatever may be relevant to that specific component of the conversation. And then of course, the procedures that are outlined. If you have questions, after someone stops talking, you'd be able to answer that at any time or ask them at any time. Representative D’Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative Hayden D’Elena UPUA appointee. Um, while I understand the concerns, Representative Miller, I do believe that Chief Administrator Alexander's points were very well made. Undergraduate is in this type this definition several times, given the fact that it's called University Park Undergraduate Association, as well as in that second part there that you've highlighted with your comment that it is for 1000s of undergraduate students. So therefore, not only is it directly mirroring the language, but also I think, multiple points and enumerates, that it is undergraduate, coupling that with the fact that GPSA, graduate, etc. is in the following thing, I don't think confusion will be much of a concern.

21:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And also, just to clarify procedure, we're now in discussion on another discussion that was fielded by Representative Miller. So then there can be obviously questions included in this because that was an oversight. And hopefully that will add for more procedural clarification that makes it a little easier to go about this. And then now, we are also simultaneously in discussion related to the point of the undergraduate. So we can sequentially actually go through these concerns that are brought up in discussion as they're supposed to be done.

21:34

Representative Miller?

**Representative Miller:**

Yes. So one of the reason that this is so important, I understand that it can be seen as nitpicky however, the for both of the other student government glossary terms, they say the GPSA, for example, or the console Commonwealth Student Government is a student government for X students at X. And then it goes straight to the primary goal is to represent whatever. The UPUA stands alone in saying that their core mission is to be the voice and advocate for all students that does not add anything significant to the definition when the next sentence says UPUA passes legislation, voices student concerns, and creates positive impacts on 1000s of undergraduate students. It is necessary to have the word undergraduate between “all” and “students” simply because of the fact that here at Penn State, one of the biggest concerns for graduate students is the fact that they are pushed to the wayside a lot of the time, because of the large population obviously, of undergraduate students it cost nothing to add the word undergraduate and it's going to make it more clear especially since UPUA is the first thing that is on this document, or is the first student government on this document. If you see the first all students and then you see GPSA it seems kind of odd. So that's it.

22:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, Representative Zebrowski?

22:57

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, I would I would echo President Miller’s statement in the I guess the holistic part of the document because lower in the document there's a section pertaining to the Commonwealth Fee Board, and UPUA has a would have a designated position but not GPSA. And there's there's instances like that were UPUA as an entity is given authority to represent all students when it is bound to represent the only the undergraduate students. I would highly I, I would highly contest the necessity that UPUA would need to consent to having the word undergraduate thrown in that second sentence, because that's not that's not altering their duties or even their mission statement.

23:51

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. And since there are no new points of discussion being brought up for that related topic, and I feel that the viewpoints that are generally held have been expressed appropriately. And to the extent that they should be, is there a motion to close discussion? Or I will now move to close discussion. Is there a second?

**Representative D’Elena:**

Second.

24:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, moving back into the overarching budget model taskforce recommendations on within that line item. And also with the exemption of us still being able to reintroduce the introductory aspect to that and going back to the budget model narrative. I will now reopen the floor for discussion on the budget model narrative. And what will then happen is that if there is technically a reasoning for the explanations that you provide, just be very clear on what your intent is, so if you're motioning to make an amendment so we can document that because ultimately for any disagreements that we have it will need to be voted on ultimately, because those will be the amendments that are being proposed and the changes. And if you have questions on that, feel free to ask. And you can be called on within the tools at your disposal. Representatives Zebroski.

25:21

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski, GPSA appointee. You can skip me, I think I forgot to lower my hand.

25:29

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, Representative Miller,

25:33

**Representative Miller:**

Representative Miller GPSA President, as a result of the appendix, which I believe has been shifted to Appendix B, whatever the appropriate of the Appendix B budget scenarios, I re-raised my concerns that I expressed a two weeks ago Friday meeting about that we have a there's gonna be a trend for gaining. And I would instead make some former motion to add language to the budget model task force section saying that the goal is to have X amount of money in the reserve or in the appropriations reserve, I guess I should say, and that at any point that that reserve, when you start to create such an incredible gain of money that we have now, instead of the this X amount of money, we have X plus 2 million or plus in excess of 2 million, then we're going to then re-look at the fee, adjust the fee, and then utilize the reserve funding to decide what's the call to offset the fee back down to whatever this appropriate level is for the reserve.

26:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you, Representative Miller. And I think as just a matter of procedure on how we can best go about this efficiently. And I feel competent, that this is within the confines of what we're able to do. Because again, this is what the other student governments do, or at least UPUA, to my knowledge, it will be a necessity to have these proposed amendments in writing. But what I think can be done now is obviously this is the most efficient way to not wait and then have it written is to explain and articulate like you just did, if that is within the consensus of everyone else to how to best go about this. And then what we would then be able to do, again, with this agenda is literally then go through the line items and the points specifically vote on those specific amendments and the language that it would be changed to. But again, have the conceptual explanation occur here. Representative Miller, does that sound like that's an appropriate way that you would want to go about this? Okay. All right. Cool. So that being said, and of course, anticipating that amendment coming through, can we now move into questions related to Representative Miller's comments on the projections and specifically Appendix B, I believe, can you nod Representative Miller, if that's correct, okay. So Appendix B and the general concept any questions that are pertinent.

28:10

Okay, so, we will now move into general discussion on this proposed concept and change. Again, once we have that written language, this will be of course, sent out to you all, but this can just be general discussion, which everyone expresses their varying viewpoints. Once the topic has been sufficiently discussed, that is what will warrant the proposal for closure of that discussion. So, I want to make sure that that's understood universally with everyone. With that again, now, I will open the floor up to discussion. And Representative Miller, if you want to provide like additional commentary, or thoughts to this would be an opportunity to do so. But you introduced it, so.

28:59

Okay. All right. So I will now move to close the floor for discussion. And seeing general consensus, the floor is now closed. And we will now move into back into discussion on the budget model narrative and the components of that. Just as a point of procedure, Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, please make note of that particular area of Appendix B and the language that Representative Miller proposed so that we can ensure that any change language is corresponded with the relevant thought or concept. Thank you. Okay. Now, we're moving back into general discussion on the budget model narrative as a whole before we go back to the budget model recommendations, as a whole enclose out that discussion point.

30:04

Okay, seeing no further discussion on the budget model narrative component of the budget model task force recommendations, and seeing general consensus, we will now move out of the budget model narrative discussion. And we will move into the general document as a whole once again. And the floor is now open for discussion on the recommendations that are there present. Representative Miller.

30:38

**Representative Miller:**

Are we still? You said we're moving into the I guess this is a point of clarification, aren't you say we're moving into the document as a whole? Do we still mean roughly in the first third of it up to the up to the Meeting Agenda Item six sub point A, or are we just throughout the document.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We're so we're going to be going again throughout the document, but we're restructuring it by the introduction and recommended budget model area right now. So that would be the discussion of the points. In relation to that. We moved out of the points related to the budget model narrative. So we could tackle that separately. And then now we're back to the budget model as a whole, before, I want to close discussion on that line item A and then move into line item B, which would then be the structural and operational modernization Task Force recommendations.

**Representative Miller:**

Sounds good. Thank you.

31:34

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Any further discussion? Okay, so I will now close the floor for discussion, same general consensus, and we will now move into line item six, B, which will be the structural and operational modernization task force recommendations. What we'll do is, of course, we'll move into general questions regarding the document followed by discussion related to the document as a whole. And then if there are those motions for conceptual amendments in which we agreed to, for the sake of this meeting, we will move into questions and then discussion on that, then return back to the documents as a whole so we can keep track of those sequentially. Can I just get general nods? If that makes sense in the moment, and once we put it into practice, it'll be easier and more structured.

Okay. So we will now move into questions related to the structural and operational modernization Task Force recommendations as a whole. Are there any questions? Seeing no questions at this time, I will now move us into discussion. Is there any discussion on these recommendations? Representative Miller.

32:52

**Representative Miller:**

Representative Miller, GPSA President. It's not in the document it was talked about on Friday, but the providing voting rights to the alternative at-large member as along with UPAC’s chair. It's not in the document. I don't know if I need to make a motion to just not add that to the document. But if I do I moved to not to remove from the substance UPAC’s voting rights and the at large members voting rights?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. So in to answer that, since it's technically not in the recommendations, there won't be a need to do that. I do think just for the sake of clarity, and also to provide some context outside of what was brought up Friday. This was an oversight on our part with the separation of the outstanding points that we wanted to make for the Executive Council and the task force Leadership Council to review over and add anything that might have been an oversight outside of what one of the task force's might have recommended. So that conversation while it did occur, it ultimately did not find its way into the final recommendations. But what I did want to say related to that, is the point was that, given the precedent that's been established for virtual voting already, and given the adaptation and evolution from 2017, there was less of a need for an alternate, and we were relegated to only having makeup votes for the UPAC chair and the alternate. So if someone we could only have two absences or otherwise the vote would not count for others. And it's unfair and not really sensible is what the discussion went for that in relation to the UPAC chair. Obviously today and you know, every other day, I think it depends on the what the UPAC chair is capable of is a very involved student fee board member or whether they're not very involved student fee board member we really don't have any say over that. There's no incentive bringing and driving them here. If they can't even vote, sparring that you can contribute, but that's really just where the discussion went, I wanted it for the sake of so everyone can understand. But representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Yeah, but just for my like a reasonable standard, everybody who's brought onto this board now, and everybody who's a part of this board is from is by some level or another voted on by the student body, the UPUA chair being is a person who is not, in fact, voted on by the student body, it's voted on by the sub-body of the UPAC after a year in there and has nothing to do with student representatives. They're not a student-representative organization. And so there's not really a reason for them to have voting rights on this student representative thing, they are just a unit who has the privilege to sit into these meetings and hear more versus that or otherwise, if I was another unit, I would demand voting rights, because I'm just, I do the same as UPAC in essentially, because I'm also a unit. So that's what I'm saying. And as the at large. We do technically, I can get I can understand getting rid of the alternate, but I don't understand adding them or adding the vote because then we would just need to add another alternate in case something goes wrong.

36:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Right. Um, so yes, I do see all of those points. And that's definitely relevant. I think for the alternate perspective, the idea was to expand again to 13 voting members rather than 12. So again, the chair would be able to be the defining vote compared to right now, which the chair should be able to do and followed at the end. Usually, typically, what would happen with Chair Keling, I think even you is that the chair would vote last, based on kind of the general consensus of the room, and also very sparingly in times of need of a tie breaking vote. So it was it's really a matter of like the numerical proportional aspects. And I guess the opportunity for readjustment based on what we've seen happen in the past. So that was the thought process there, it was just to readjust that number and ensure that again, the chair could serve as that tie breaking vote as they currently do.

37:22

But yeah, I hope that offers more context into how the chair could be more objective in the future, which I think would be an appropriate intent for this board. But yeah, so you're right, that is a redundant point, because it is not currently in the documents. I mean, is there discussion to offer clarity as to the points and redundancies that we found consensus on in terms of a discussion to amend or remove those lines as suggested? Nope. Okay, so we will now close discussion on that and move into discussion on the general, holistic recommendations for the structural and operational modernization task force. Is there any discussion related to that? Representative Miller.

38:28

**Representative Miller:**

Representative Miller GPSA President, this is yeah, about the document itself. And it sort of bleeds into the steering committee enhancement task force, because the I think that the voting process to for the new chair along with the removal process should be found in the structural and operate operational modernization task force rather than in the steering committee, because both of those chairs are very campus or I guess, campus or commonwealth campus-focused processes, rather than not really. And I think it makes more sense for them to be selected by the voting members, rather than chosen from above.

39:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you, is there any other discussion? All right, representative, sorry, Vice Chair Chandler,

39:29

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee. Maybe I think it would be helpful to provide additional context for I guess, for everyone for the reason why that is structured the way it is, I think it would be helpful so I guess I'm going to request either you or you know, Najee, the chair or maybe even Barry to provide context for the reasoning or the historical precedent for us to even have a process like that.

40:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. So Barry, I believe that you sat on the task force and are aware of kind of the conversations and discussions that we had with that. Another benefit, I think to this being done in the way that it's being done now is so that the other members who might have served on this, which consists of Giselle and others can provide more context, during the discussion on the finalized amendments that we have as to whether they're approved or not approved. So yeah, I think it'll be helpful to do that. And then that is how that process would play out on Friday in relation to this chair selection process and removal. Barry.

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

Yeah. I mean, I think it was, it was housed under the steering committee enhancement task force, because there's thoughts to try to align processes as much as possible between the two free boards. And so that's really where it came from. The concept of having it be a selection process rather than an election process. That is how the Commonwealth Fee Board currently operates. And it's also how affiliate organizations and other sponsored organizations do their selection, such as UPAC, THON, Homecoming, SPA. Lawrence, I know, I know, you I know where you stand on those things. So but I'm just I'm just giving you some rationale on why that task force made that recommendation.

41:35

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. And just to interject, um, Representative Miller, what you would then do, if there was no general discussion related to that, I want to pause and give you the opportunity to make a motion for that amendment. Again, what we'll allow within what we're already doing, is that concept being explained, and then contributed to following the statement, or the motion to officially change what you're thinking.

42:07

**Representative Miller:**

I'm going to be so real I'm, this has been a little bit confusing. And I think it's just a me thing to get used to the way that this has worked. I'll just call it nitpicking and just something that could just be shifted. I don't know if that needs to be an amendment. So I'm just confused. But we can keep going. I apologize.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. So just for clarification, is it just the placement that you i There were two issues?

**Representative Miller:**

Yeah. I have two issues with it. I have one that's like up the substance. And I have one of the placement, I think it makes more sense for the placement would be there. And I think that the way that the substances should be changed, as far as like the placement, that's the both of those are kind of connected, I think they may fit better underneath discussion with the third one. You know, if that makes sense.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes, I would ask though, that it'd be relegated to the content itself, because either way, if it's changed or made redundant, then there wouldn't be a need to change it. But also, we voted on the structuring and the objectives in the beginning as a board when we approved the strategic planning, guide, and document in the very beginning. So just as a matter of uniformity, and what's already within what we voted on, it would be probably prudent to just not object to that particular point, because that would be changing what has already been voted on and set in stone, which I think would be a flaw in how we go about this governance process and sustaining that. Would you make a motion to withdraw that point?

43:48

**Representative Miller:**

I'm not going to make that motion, I still stand. I still stand that it is I disagree, that would be a flaw in governance, because I think that governing body should be able to be flexible, but I'll just leave it at that.

44:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, well, then we'll go for what's already written in the document and approved within that related component and will now move into discussion related to the point of the substance and content. So given that that's generally understood that there will be an amendment. With that, I just want to move into questions first to Representative Miller, related to the proposed amendment that he is bringing up. So are there any questions related to that point?

**Representative Miller:**

Do you want me to like give a breakdown of what like my problems with the substance are first?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We can do that in discussion. It could it. We didn't know how to really ease into that. So I think now that we modified that we can save that for discussion. But any questions? Vice Chair Chandler

44:49

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yeah, Vice Chair Chandler gpsa appointee. I would ask that Representative Muller explain exactly what he has an issue with, and what he would want it to look like that process.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And Representative Miller, we can move into you answering that as the basic explanation.

**Representative Miller:**

Fantastic. So I, the issues is, well, the First Amendment entirety just remove this entire change process, at least for the UP fee board. What I wrote is that we should retain the vote because we're students selected and voting. And that's the sort of the way that the structure has worked. I have concerns with adding CCSG representatives to the UPFB voting process, because they are not going to be impacted by it in the point of the chairs to guide the UP fee board, not so not guide the Student Fee Board in general. And so it kind of doesn't really make sense to me for there, I have concerns with the CCSG chair selection process. I stand firmly against UPUA’s potential involvement, and suggest either replacing that with GPSA. Because GPSA currently does have students in the commonwealth campuses who are represented by the commonwealth campus and ultimately our deal with the consequences that the Commonwealth Fee Board chooses, rather than UPUA, which is solely University Park focused. And so either completely just removed that part or add GPSA or solely at GPSA.

46:25

And then from there, I have also that's for the chair selection process. I also have concerns the chair removal, but that'll be something separate unless there's you want to just do that now too. Great.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Sorry no. Let's keep it yeah, since those are significant, let's sorry, let's subdivide it and just stick to questions on the selection process. Does that sound good?

**Representative Miller:**

Sounds good.

46:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And via all answers to what was explained can be done in the discussion points. So make note of that if you have a response or something to say but again, blitz relegated to question answer. Further discussion can be had after questions. Are there any other questions for elaboration on Representative Miller's proposed amendments for the chair selection process?

47:16

Okay, seeing none, we'll now move into discussion on that concept and thoughts related to it. Is there any discussion? Representative Miller.

47:27

**Representative Miller:**

I apologize. I forgot. Another part is to remove the advisors from both selection processes.

47:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, and Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, if you could make note of that, as we've been doing, and I'm sure you've already been doing that, so that we can insert the relevant language as it's been recommended or suggested and to help Representative Miller keep track of that. And that will be that. Okay. And again, just as a reminder, so like Najee Rodriguez UPFB chair, just your position in relation, and I'll refer to all of you as representatives. Again, it's just for the minutes so we know who's saying what and can reference it easily once we come back to it.

48:12

That being said, Representative D’Elena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative Hayden D’Elena, UPUA appointee. Representative Miller, I obviously get some of the concerns that you have, I think that they were very well done in the comment section of this. But with that being said, I think whilst CCSG and it might seem nonsensical that the fact that CCSG is involved in this process, as we are the University Park student fee board, given the fact that CCSG is often has their conferences base and also includes, to some extent, University Park, I do believe that they should be consulted in this process. Not only that, I think UPUA while, yes, technically speaking, they are, we are only confined to University Park, given the fact that we often cooperate with and meet with and have a lot of different conversations with general Penn State administration, that also includes, you know, the commonwealth campuses, I don't think the placement of UPUA in this process is inappropriate, or an improper delegation at all. In fact, I believe it's quite appropriate to have it in here. And to the point, the fact that obviously the graduate level does include, you know, commonwealth campuses and stuff like that University Park Undergraduate Association reaches into the you know, similar spaces as well. So, yeah.

49:29

Chair Rodriguez:

Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Representative Miller, GPSA President. I understand the point that Representative D’Elena has spoken about however, I disagree, simply because of the fact that the way that things are different. It's different because the way the chairs are selected the chairs representing the body of the it represents the body of up borders. What Chair Rodriguez does impacts University Park Fee board and then you can also impact upwards obviously, and then what the Commonwealth Fee Board’s chair does impacts the Commonwealth fee. And then it can obviously impact up when it comes to the steering committee. However, it doesn't really make sense. For example, if I'm not GPSA president of this, I'm representing the graduate student body of University Park at this point, if they choose me to choose a chair, as we have done in the past, it makes no sense for because we're directly impacting their feet, it does not make sense to me that somebody who does not go to the Commonwealth who does not go to University Park is getting an input onto who's going to be the chair and ultimately guide the vision of that. I also completely disagree about the UPUA stance and input in anywhere with the Commonwealth Fee Board, because the way that we interact with the commonwealth campuses, students are completely different. There is difference between like working with them, and obviously GPSA works a lot with CCSG, UPUA, WCSGA, and general university leadership we had, I always that's just how the Presidents work.

51:02

But we have student bodies that we represent, who are also underneath the delegation of the commonwealth campuses, because they are they physically go there, but they come we represent them as a graduate student, they represent them as a Commonwealth student. There's differences. So while I can understand and if this is what it is, I, at most, at worst add GPSA because it makes no sense why the grad students are being booted out of this at best remove the UPUA or University Park component from their selection process in the entirety. So that's really where I am.

51:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representatives Zebrowski.

51:42

**Representative Zebrowksi:**

Representative Zebroski, GPSA appointee. Representative Miller already stated my point. But just to reiterate. The GPSA constituencies exist on the commonwealth campuses, which is not true for UPUA. So just to reiterate what Representative Miller said. GPSA, at minimum needs representation on this board. And at best UPUA needs to be removed because they are contributing to a discussion where their constituencies literally do not exist by definition.

52:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Delena.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’elena UPUA appointee. I'm not going to functionally disagree with representatives Zebroski. And Miller's–I apologize if I mispronounce your names–point that, you know graduate GPSA Does in their constituencies does reach into the commonwealth campuses. However UPUA, once again, as I'm going to reiterate before, does function in those spaces in some sense, while the constituencies are not directly linked, in terms of a one-to-one sort of scenario. That being said, there are a lot of different Commonwealth, you know, representatives that come into UPUA that have been through a two plus two program or through a transfer sort of method. The argument that it's that there's no relationship whatsoever is not founded by the fact that we do have to CCSG presences and meetings and with you know, President O'Toole and Vice President Concepcion and how they meet, but also the fact that former commonwealth campus people, excuse me, students, my bad, do come into up way and we are still representing them. While there are times that commonwealth campuses is officially finished, that does not mean that the relationship and the experiences that they had is not existent.

53:34

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Zebrowski and before you start, I just want to ensure that everyone's aware of the stipulations of discussion. So again, it's my job to ensure that we're timely with how we address things and make sure that all viewpoints are adequately expressed. So I'll have representative Zebrowski respond to that. And I think it's safe to close that discussion so we can move into the next discussion related to the chair removal process. But yeah, I just want everyone to know that those outlines are listed there and it just referenced that. Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowski, GPSA appointee just to wrap up this point there's a significant difference between the representation of constituencies and two student government organizations working together. I bring this up because two plus two students who started at a commonwealth campus and move to University Park when they are at the commonwealth campuses, they are not represented by UPUA and when they are at Main Campus they're not represented by the Commonwealth Student Government. Fundamental in the distinction between UPUA and GPSA is the fact that GPSA represents the graduate constituency, whereas UPUA represents the undergraduate constituency by creating a rule which allows representation based on interaction, this is opening the door to just a dangerous possibility of just everybody stepping on each other's toes.

I can think, for instance, have multiple GPSA positions right now that would under this theory allow us to be the representative student body of the University Park undergraduate students, which I'm not going to speak for Representative Miller, but I believe nobody, nobody wants this GPSA does not want this, UPUA does not want this. So just to reiterate, it is the constituent the location of the constituencies representative that should determine the election process for the chair of this board.

55:41

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That being said, and seeing and all adequate viewpoints expressed, I will now move to close discussion. And seeing general consensus discussion is closed. We will now move into the discussion on the chair removal process. Representative Miller, would you explain your proposed amendment?

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. So there's two big problems that I'm seeing with the removal procedures when it comes to the chair or the chairs is specifically one line that I highlighted on page 23 That says a two-thirds vote of the can be the removal can be initiated by and, I'm skipping where it's at, by the respective boards or at the discretion of the delegated administrative liaison/advisor of the respective board that I while I do understand the context, and that there's it's not just they can do it willy nilly, but saying that they can do it at the delegate that the at their discretion opens up a dangerous precedent.

Because what if we don't have somebody who's in this is not against you Barry or Jen? And what if we have somebody who's terrible in his role that was decided, and they decide that the chair has done something that hurts them that goes against what they interpret the student fee to being morally instead of following the rules. So there's that the other issue that I have is also still in that same paragraph, where it says that the final approval, well actually three things, the final approval to remove the chair must be provided by the Vice President of Student Affairs. That just doesn't make any sense. I do not see value in that in that other than adding another layer of administrative oversight from University Park administration, which is again, our job is not to be the completely under the thumb and control of them, of the Vice President Student Affairs. The third thing I have, which is the most like meh, is that the Vice Chair shall serve as the new chair for the existing term. I recommend instead that the Vice Chair serves as interim chair and leads a vote for a new chair in which that vice chair can then run and be elected by the board again. Again, that process would have to be what depended upon us not changing our election process as it currently stands. So those are the three things take out the administrative liaison, take out the vice president of student affairs and then change the vice president, the vice chair role was in the in the terms of the chance of removal to chair interim until a vote can be had were in case the board votes.

58:40

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. And again, Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, if you can make note of that in this specific time, Mark.

58:47

We will now move into questions. Are there any questions for Representative Miller? Seeing no questions, we can now move into discussion. What I would say is, again, the individual that I think could best answer this would be Administrative Liaison Bram, did you want to provide some context as to that?

59:19

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

I you know, I don't know that we have. I have great context for it. Chair Rodriguez, you know, we had discussion about it. Representative Miller, I fully understand your concern about the discretion phrase and if you have different language to propose, I think we should consider it. I just think we, we struggled a little bit with how to put that recommendation together and put that document together. Because I you know, we didn't want it to come across as the administrative liaison has control over that sort of stuff. So I fully respect to what you had to say. And I'm open to other thoughts about that.

1:00:05

You know, the Vice President ultimately is the is the person who approves the recommendations of this board and the appointments of this board and all this sort of stuff. So I, in my mind, it made sense to include the vice president for student affairs as the final say, in terms of the removal process.

1:00:24

And regarding your vice chair suggestion, and we think I think it does depend partially on what the selection process or election process is for the chair, so we can let that play itself out, I'd be fine. Either way, if it's an election or a selection, if the vice chair was appointed as an interim person, and we either had a new selection process, or we had a new election process. It will slow things down within the operation of the board, if it's an interim, and so there's a part of me that likes the concept of having like a vice chair automatically assumed to be the next in line for succession purposes, or whatever might happen. And I think that's relatively typical within organizations and other administrative entities. But if y'all have a big concern about that, let's have a discussion on the board. That's what I think should happen. So.

1:01:29

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, thank you for that context. And we'll also ensure that when Representative Concepcion is available on Friday, and we work our way through the specific components addressed by Representative Miller, that will hopefully be helpful to the other members of the board as well. Representative Miller.

1:01:49

**Representative Miller:**

Just to address the last point Administrative Liaison Bram, the main thing I was thinking about for that is it would either slow down the process for one week, while I assume that it would just go into the process the next week, or maybe there can be an emergency meeting to vote or select a new chair. But then also, if it comes to like a worst case scenario, so like, in case we have a, we have John Smith, his chair, he doesn't, we don't like the way that he represents us and his chair, Jane Doe is just as terrible, then we're going to have to have one removal process started by two thirds of the board, and then we’re gonna have to start another removal process started by two thirds of the board's back to back rather than just having this vice chair of serve as interim role for the four or five days. Like that's what I was thinking about.

1:02:42

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Awesome. And for some context, again, everyone will have the available written writing of this, because that will be necessary for when we do vote on this. So I will say representative Miller, the language will have to be confined to exactly what you want or are proposing, and then we can discuss amendments to that language, the day of when we're going through these. Does that make sense? Can you nod. Okay, cool. We will now move back into discussion on the chair removal process. Is there any further discussion? Representative D’Elena. And also to answer your question, Administrative Liaison, Bram is the phrase.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Thank you. Hayden D’Elena UPUA appointee. I just think, Representative Miller, I think your comments regarding other points other than the Vice President are strong points. I think for the vice president of student affairs, I think Administrative Liaison Bram’s comments that it makes sense, given the nature of how we come about, as the University Park Student Fee Board, bringing it to the Vice President of Student Affairs makes sense, given the sense that bringing in another context, and I apologize for this lion, excuse me.

Lions Caucus is a part of the Office of Community Government Relations. And when we go through our recruiting process, we each individually vote as an executive board, and we do it and so with communication of our advisor. That being said, the Vice President of Office of Community Government Relations, Zach Moore, does kind of oversee and ask questions of like, why did we not accept this person? Why did we accept this person? And I think given the nature of while those aren't analogous cases, the fact that we are a sponsored organization, and that is a university affiliate organization, just kind of that oversight a little bit more on the university level, because we only exist because of their virtue, make sense that we should at least go to them in some sense. I do appreciate the point. The fact that it is just kind of another point of oversight, but I think it's unnecessary oversight because we would not exist, if not for those offices.

1:04:53

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller? Yes.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President this is going to be real short. In the handbook currently approved by the student fee board, there is an expectation that the administrators who will review our decisions are going to approve them. There is that expectation that we've had since we've been got started that they're just going to approve us, which is another point of our students shared governance model. So there's not really we don't need to pay deference to the Vice President of Student Affairs, just because the former Vice President started us that sort of takes away the shared governance if we cower, which is I apologize for my strong language. I do understand the strong point. But that's it. Thank you.

1:05:41

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion related to the topic of the chair room removal process? Okay, so I'll close discussion and as the explanation or procedure, we'll make note of this timemark. And those three components, again laid out in their entirety will be sequentially addressed and voted on in a more specific manner. As we go through these proposed amendments. We'll now move into a discussion back into the general structural and operational modernization task force recommendations. As we move into that in further discussion, again, it's all relegated to what you see listed there. And ideally, this would be related to any amendments that you have that we can work out within needed refinement and to ensure that the wording and language is ready to go for adequate viewership. So to ensure everyone has the timeline that is appropriate. And I will now move into discussion.

1:06:59

Okay, thank you for bearing with me, as we recalibrate towards this very necessary procedural rule will now go into line item six C, which is the steering committee enhancement task force recommendations. We will now begin with general questions related to that the answers will be relegated to those who were officially there to be able to kind of provide context as to these amendments or any concerns. And if not, again, we'll have Representative Concepcion on Friday to allow discussion and elaboration on the basic concepts expressed for these proposed amendments. And just to keep in mind, if we are missing anything that you would like to return to, that's fine, because the proposed amendment is going to have to be written in language anyways. So we'll simply add that as topics for discussion for each recommendation as we go through them. So it will be the same process as we're doing now. But on Friday. Hopefully that makes sense to everyone. And if not, I can clarify later, but we'll move into general questions related to the steering recommendations or their questions. Representative Zebrowski.

1:08:18

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski, GPSA appointee. Within the steering committee task force. I'm slightly concerned still about the outer class definition, the definition of the outer class experience. And I voiced my concerns about the content but what I'm specifically concerned about is the process of how this is being resolved. I brought this up in either an executive council meeting or a general fee board meeting in the fall I can't remember which forgive me. But my concerns were brought up in the committee and they didn't quite go anywhere. And when I re-voiced them last on Friday, Giselle told me that I should have brought it up in the committee or representative Concepcion, my apologies, to which provided a comment on my concerns, which was marked resolved with no changes. So, my concern is what is the best way to go about voicing these concerns with the out-of-class experience definition because it seems to not be going anywhere. I'm specifically concerned about current GPSA initiatives which may not be able to exist in the future because the educational and the out-of-class experience for graduate students are is very tightly woven. And I would like some guidance on how to continue going forward.

1:09:41

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so I think that's completely appropriate. I think now that we're officially going through each of these proposed amendments or concerns this will be able to be contextualized within the discussion component. And then what we'll need from you is the actual written changes that you would like to make because that's what we'll have to vote on ultimately, yes, there can be amendments all the way up until Friday. But having that reference will be important for everyone to one be able to see exactly what is being proposed based on two the discussion that we've had that we will have that will elaborate upon that. Does that resolve that process of how we can go about doing that? And I think that that was a misunderstanding on our part on how to best go about that situation. So, apologies for that resolution. However, that may have happened.

1:10:34

Are there any other questions?

1:10:39

Okay, so we'll now move into discussion on the on those specific set of recommendations. We'll start with Representative Zebrowski.

1:10:50

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowski, GPSA appointee, and this is I guess you could say a point of clarification. What is the position of sustainability initiatives? And what exactly are we talking about? I know this is more question-based. I say this because in the define the out-of-class experience, we're opening the door to sustainability initiatives, but then on the end of page 24 to the beginning of 25, there's language indicating that we're not contributing to university initiatives to regarding sustainability. So I guess what is the policy of the board? And if there is a difference, like what is that difference?

1:11:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so I think that there will be a point in which that can be molded into a potential amendment or change. But before that, before we address the discussion aspect of that, there was a question and that again, please have those questions relegated to the questions perspective, so we can just not go into like, rabbit holes. That's the only purpose of that currently, but Administrative Liaison Bram again, would you prefer to wait until Friday to most adequate to most efficiently answer that with Representative consumptions attendance, or do you have any context behind that?

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

Yeah, I think the key the key word in that one, sorry, let me pull it back up here is compliance. Because what we didn't want the fee to have to do was to fund sustainability upgrades that are mandated by law or statute or something else. Okay. So I think that there's a difference between funding sustainability-related initiatives just to enhance the general sustainability of the institution and in our practices and policies, but not to comply with law or statute, if that makes sense. That's that that was the key. The compliance is the key word in that phrase. Does that help to clarify?

1:13:10

**Representative Zebrowski:**

No, that makes perfect sense, actually. And that's a sound policy. So.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

In relation to the logistical refinement of that week, would it be appropriate to tentatively make a motion to amend that to reflect that clarity, or point of clarity?

1:13:33

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So moved to this seems like a very straightforward change.

1:13:38

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So again, nothing's official. But again, once that language is refined, specifically Chief Administrative Executive, Alexander, it would be helpful if we just worked on that. So I would make note of this timemark, so that we can come back to it to make that appropriate and in line with how we can change that easily. But we will now be moving into general discussion, again, related to that the steering committee recommendations as a whole. Representative Zebrowski, if you have that specific amendment, our change that you are proposing secondary to what the original concern that you made was that would you would state that here, and then we would have that on record for the more specific aspects of when we have to change the language. Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Yes, I think I want to make a motion to not remove the mission statements or the under this steering committee task force under Section Two Point 13. Under recommendations, remove the mission statement, and then to revisit this vision statement. Yeah, that's it to not do those and remain with the ones we have already. You're muted.

1:15:07

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you, Representative Miller. We will now move into questions related to that point. Again, this is to make. The reason why this process is going as it is, is because again, the points expressed are pretty clear, as defined by Representative Miller and Representative Zebrowski as of up to this point. So I'd prefer that the available members here ask their questions for that time-saving component. Should you feel like there's a lack of clarity from your understanding this upcoming Friday. So hopefully that offers a more reasonable understanding as to why we're still going through each one, despite us going through this next process exactly the same way. We're doing it now. So questions related to that, and they can be more refined next Friday. If you feel like you've come up with something that is more clear to ask. But until then, it could be anything that's abstract. Just want you to feel like you understand and are engaged. Representative D’Elena. Your question related to that?

1:16:11

**Representative D’Elena:**

Yes. Representative D’Elena, UPUA appointee. I'm curious, Representative Miller, what you think the big differences are between your proposed existing mission statements? And the the proposed one is and why as an effect going back to the original might be more effective than adopting this new one?

1:16:35

**Representative Miller:**

I think well, the largest issue that I have with the mission statement is let me refine that, again. Point 13/3 line in it's highlighted and commented through collaboration with Student Affairs, yada, yada, yada. The I have issues with that. It's the same issues that I've expressed throughout this entire process is that I think that it's imperative that we make this document sound as student-centric and student focused as possible, because a lot of it that I have issues with are around student university administration being a part of it, which is not the purpose of the student fee board. And the ones that exist right now, as far as the mission statement, remains a little bit more independent. And I don't believe that there's any kind of significant increase in quality and all that's the wrong word. I don't think that there's significant increase in not desirability, I forgot the word. Benefit. I don't think there's a large enough benefit to make these changes than to not make the changes except for the value statement, which I thought is done really well.

1:17:56

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. Are there any other questions related to that point of removing or relating? No. All right, so we'll now close questions related to that and move into discussion on that eventual proposed amendment. Is there any discussion? Representative D’Elena.

1:18:16

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena, UPUA appointee, Representative Miller, thank you for answering that question. I absolutely understand it. And I realized that it's in continuity with your some of your other issues. That being said, I think the operative word in the highlighted comment we talked about just previously, is collaboration. I think that's a very big kind of it. I think it was intentionally chosen because the word collaboration does not give any sort of power to student affairs. It just says that they're kind of reviewed in this process, and it's supposed to be with them, rather than it being a solely operative student focus. And I'm while I realized that is within our handbook, I don't think that there's any necessarily harm and use of collaboration. I think it's imperative as representative, excuse me, as Administrative Liaison Bram pointed out before, at the end of the day, the Vice President, you know, is a very big part of Vice President of Student Affairs is a very big part of this process. So I suppose my point that I'm making right now is, collaboration can only ever be really beneficial, especially if collaboration does not mean 100% of power is given over to Student Affairs.

1:19:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Collaboration typically insinuates some level of equality of power. It also typically insinuates that only a healthy collaboration is when people come to the same level of power, as we've had issues in the past. And we actually had this discussion last year as well. There's not a balance of power between student affairs, the Board of Trustees, Vice President Sarah Thorndyke, and the board in the fee boards in general because they have the ultimate power to overwrite. And I think that getting into this as a, oh, we're just working with them, we don't really want to work with them, because then that ends up with what we've had, as was shown in the history where there's a forced fee to pay for something for students, when the reason that we were pushed and created in the first place was to ensure that we have the ability to have the say, and I'm going to be honest, if we can even like look at the way that these conversations have been going on. Some people may be scared to say their opinions because there is this power imbalance. And it's kind of hard to say no to Vice President Dowhower or no to the Board of Trustees.

1:20:35

And it may feel like that that's really the root of all my issues, because I sometimes hesitate in saying no to what's called Administrative Liaison Bram. I sometimes if you have issues saying no to President Neely Bendapudi. But in a shared governance model, that's sort of the point where you have to do it. And I want to ensure that this at the very least stays as pure as it can. We understand that for matters, we have to work through Student Affairs. That doesn't mean we have to say we're going to ask you for permission every time we take two steps and collaboration to me in this context sounds like that.

1:21:11

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Okay, so we can close discussion on that point and make note that that amendment will be received. And it's written final written language to discuss further on Friday. And we can move back into general discussion on any steering committee recommendations as they stand. This will be a more formalized process on Friday, where we'll actually go through the amendments, you'll do the questions, discussion, and then we'll have a final vote on those amendments. And that will be the decision-making as to whether or not they are taken into that final document. Again, once that final document is complete, we will then move into a vote on the document as a whole with these amendments in consideration for those of you in student governments. I'm sure you're familiar with that process.

1:22:12

Moving back into discussion on the steering committee recommendations, Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, this one's really fast. I moved, you know, not to remove recommendations. Number one, the steering committee should be renamed the student fee board Executive Council.

1:22:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, and we'll now move into questions on that for those that are present. Again, Representative Concepcion had answers on Friday for some of these concerns. So, I imagine that she'll be bringing forward those in response, hopefully after watching this and then coming to Friday. But is there any current questions related to this point? Are there and I know we discussed this a little on Friday, but we can I get some refinement or clarity? Should you need it?

1:23:05

Okay, see, no questions will now move into this. Sorry. Vice Chair Chandler.

1:23:11

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee. I would ask that. Representative Miller explain the reasoning behind not wanting that term changed.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Really quickly. It's I don't think it adds anything. I don't think it benefits and I bristle at hearing the Executive Council over the two free boards steering committee does sound like it's a connection together. Executive Council sounds like it's above. And I think that just it bristles against me reading about it. So, which is I think it sounds nicer a steering committee, and I don't think it adds anything. And it sounds like all the real important decisions in the first place are going to the Executive Council. There's no reason for me as a representative to be here. So that's it.

1:24:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions related to this proposed amendment? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion on the proposed amendment. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion will now close on discussion on that specific topic of that name. And we will now move into general discussion again, related to the steering committee recommendations as a whole. Is there any further discussion?

1:24:43

So seeing none, I would like to make a motion to add line items. Six D, add that and officially have that as continued discussion, just so we can ensure that there is uniformity and everything that has been covered. And I also want to double check to make sure that we have those concerns adequately addressed in case we went through line item six, A and B, a little too quickly. And I want to be consistent before Friday and ensuring that so is there a motion to add line item D? Further continued discussion?

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. So moved.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there a second?

**Representative D’Elena:**

Second.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, and let the record reflect that that has been added. So what I want to do here is I want to first open it up to final questions that might be had on any of maybe the procedures that we'll have continuing moving forward on Friday, or any of the document documents that we've had and reviewed just any questions related to that. And of course, if something does come up, yes, bring that forward on Friday, but this is more so for the benefit of those who will be watching and maybe will contribute more to these points once it comes. So, we will now open up the floor to questions beginning with Representative Miller on the recommendations as a whole before we move on to the other points of the agenda.

1:26:18

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. My bad I had a very small amendment. So for the discussions.

1:26:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Sounds good. Are there any further questions? Vice Chair Chandler?

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee. This is a point of clarification. So, this section is just for asking questions and not proposing or motioning for new amendments to the document.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That is correct. So during discussion, everyone has the opportunity to provide those amendments and discuss those amendments that are eventually proposed. And that's a really good question too, because like this is kind of the first time that the fee board has had to go through documents, I think, step by step contextually like this, given that these are what would then become our governing documents, for lack of better words, or at least translated into. So, I just want to ensure that once this process does begin, it'll be a lot like the voting on the resolution and build process that some of the student government representatives will see. So, if anyone is confused by that we can discuss it outside of this meeting, too. But I think that it would be really helpful for you to be aware of how we go about the actual content changes, and the governance that we pursue with that or follow any further questions related to the recommendations? Representative Nevil?

1:27:47

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, at-large representative, I just was looking for clarification as to the question asked on Friday, regarding UPAC standing, whether or not they were going to have a voting spot. Was that just was that going to be in the recommendation? I'm just generally looking for clarification on that.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so that's a good question. That came up a little earlier. I don't think you were here yet. But since those weren't officially added to the recommendations, there isn't discussion or questions related to that. Amendments can be made to modify that if someone should choose, but it was not added in there was some discussion that happened. Any further questions?

1:28:37

Okay, we'll now close the floor for questions. And we'll move into discussion. Again, this will be related to the three recommendations in their entirety that we just saw. I'd ask now at this point that you collect your thoughts, if you have those conceptual amendments, know that these need to be brought forward, again, verbatim with the wording that you want. And we'll need to work on a timeline for that following this meeting. But I'm telling you all that now because this is the point where you would bring those up. Representative Miller?

1:29:09

**Representative Miller:**

Yeah, very brief. I'm going to make a motion to amend language regarding the university employees and refer to them as faculty throughout the document. Sometimes they are referred to also as staff, and that is sometimes confusing, but regarding that we refer to our own students and staff as well. So I would prefer to have that separation of university faculty or university staff in its entirety, or to separate between students staff or how they refer to as also just staff.

1:29:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there general consensus on adopting something similar or would we like to move into questions or discussion until this gets voted on on Friday? Okay, seeing general consensus, I'd like to move back into general discussion related to that point. Is there any further discussion related to the recommendations as a whole, this could also include your thoughts as a whole that you might have. And again, those actual amendments that could include modifications, removals, or additions. Vice Chair Chandler.

1:30:26

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Vice chair Chandler GPSA appointee. I would recommend or move to amend the terminology Penn State Student Fee Board to just Student Fee Board. Yeah, that's it. I could add or supplement but I think… Can I actually add or supplement now? I'm sorry, as a point of clarification for my reasoning.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. So absolutely. So I'm assuming I would rather not adopt general consensus. With that, I would like to move into questions because I think that this would be a good semantical conversation to people have for people to have context for when they come on Friday. So with that, you can introduce that, Vice Chair Chandler, and that's how we'll do next Friday as well. So once you make that amendment, and we address that amendment, you can introduce that amendment and explain the reasoning rather than have someone like ask you during questions or you being able to do that in discussion. So there'll be a more refined policy and rule on Friday. But yes, you can begin with that introduction.

1:31:33

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee. I do not believe that adding Penn State in front of Student Fee Board adds value. We don't interact with any other student fee boards across the floor across the country or any other institution. I think it's needed to add Penn State and for the student view board.

1:32:06

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into questions related to this proposed change slash amendment. Are there any questions for Vice Chair Chandler. Representative Nevil.

1:32:22

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil at large representative. I'm just curious as to the fact of like, I obviously understand that other governance bodies at this university don't use that same nomenclature, but I think a large number of other organizations do use that. Penn State Homecoming uses Penn State Homecoming even though there are isn't another homecoming on campus, Penn State Dance Marathon, Penn State Interfraternity Council, Penn State Panhellenic Council, Penn State National Panhellenic Council, they all use that same nomenclature of that Penn State identification. So I'm just curious as to why we would separate ourselves from that, that similar type of nomenclature.

1:33:02

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, yeah, Vice Chair Chandler, GPSA appointee. Colloquially, it was communicated and even stated last meeting by Representative Concepcion that colloquially, we already refer to and understand that the student fee for is Penn State Student Fee board. It would just be extra work not in the sense that it's bad or negative to add extra work. It just doesn't add value, if colloquially, we understand that when we refer to the student fee board, but this is the Penn State Student Fee Board and not usually will be referred to like the University Park Fee Board, and there's the Commonwealth Fee Board. There's already those designations and clarifications that we're referring to that those two separate feed boards.

1:34:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions for Vice Chair Chandler? Seeing no questions for Vice Chair Chandler will now move into discussion on that proposed change/amendment. And again, this is just relegated to discussion. So if you're here now and have thoughts, I would ask that you contribute those. Representative Miller.

1:34:21

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. I'm in agreement with making the name as short as possible.

1:34:29

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Okay, seeing no further discussion, I will now close the floor for discussion and we will now move back into line item Six D have continued discussion. Is there any further discussion on the recommendations holistically. Seeing no current further discussion, I will now close the floor for that. And I think again, all general points we can make later on and the meeting agenda, which is literally coming up in like two minutes. But moving into the UPAC chair report, seeing that the UPAC chair is not here, we will now move on into line item eight, the chair report. Ultimately, the email that I just sent out today, that is what will constitute a lot of my responsibilities as of this week.

1:35:34

The only thing that's changed, of course, is the scheduling of meetings that I will do with those who are not currently at this meeting so that there can be full preparation and robust discussion on Friday. With the expectation and preparations that we're setting in place. I will be sending out expectations written down for that meeting. Given that I do think it will be very important and we need to make prudent use of our time. I also think it will be the best way to have very relevant discourse that is not frivolous, due to a lack of contextual understanding of what is being proposed or discussed. That is it for my report. I appreciate all of your engagement that you all have had today. And if you have any further questions, just let me know. And again, as a reminder, if you are working on writing those amendments,

1:36:27

I understand you're under time constraints. And I appreciate your engagement in this process. But we do need something on paper. So try to make it as accurate as you would like. When we go into that. And again, if there are refinements that you have on Friday, you can introduce those. But I'd like to this to be a very efficient discussion that is beneficial for all of us. Yeah, so that concludes that. Are there any questions for me? Representative Miller.

1:36:55

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, I put in the chat as well. But when would you like any potential amendments.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I want to make this as reasonable as possible. And like within your timeframes, like even if it's just like you putting down something on text, like by a bullet point of one of the concerns, just a quote, a general consensus of what you'd like to do. So even just striking, I think some of you will be proposing to amend that, so it can be striking lines, this from this or on pages this and then this is the quote that you're striking, whatever makes that the easiest way. And if it's actual alterations, or modifications to have that written out with maybe red wording or something to distinguish what you're doing. Again, I think you all do that in the Student Government settings. So that's why I hope that makes sense now, but we can discuss following the meeting on a timeframe that would be ideal. I would like to get this out to people at least 72 hours in advance. I think that's really fair and reasonable, especially given the conciseness of what we'll be covering.

1:38:05

But yeah, does that sound reasonable for now and we can discuss outside Okay. All right. Um, moving on. Any other questions for me?

1:38:16

Okay, seeing no further questions will now move into comments for the good of the order. Are there any comments for the good of the order?

1:38:27

See no comments for the good of the order will now move into closing roll call Vice Chair Chandler, will you please initiate a closing roll call?

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes. Okay. I believe Tim Neville is here. Vice Chair Chandler here. Najee Rodriguez here. Dallas here. I'm not sure Connor here. Nora is not here. Andrew here. Zenia is here. Brian has left early. Giselle is not here. Zion is not here. Fiona is not here. Lawernce Miller here. And Hayden is here.

1:39:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. I now adjourn this January 21. Meeting to order at 4:41pm. I'll see you all bright and early on Friday and between the week. Bye everyone, love you all. See you later.