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08:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Right everyone. I now move to end the recess and we will now resume the meeting that began on January 26 into February 1. Vice Chair Chandler. Will you please take opening roll call.

08:53

\*Nine voting members are present\*

09:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you, Vice Chair Chandler. Do we have quorum? All right. And given that we do have quorum, we will now move into line item five of old business. And Vice Chair Chandler, Representative O'Toole has entered the Zoom.

09:44

All right. So, now that we're moving into line item five of old business. In letter A, we can begin with everyone pulling up the amendments document that was sent to you within the materials. And we will be going through the reinstated and modified amendments since we last proceeded at our last meeting. And once everyone is on that document, just go ahead and raise or give a thumbs up. Representatives, O'Toole and Miller, do you have the document?

10:37

**Representative Miller:**

Is it possible to just share the screen?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Well, this is okay. I just shared it in the team's channel. Can you enable participant sharing? Okay. And I'm going to enable screen sharing, please let me know if you can see this. Awesome. Okay. And as for matters of privilege, does anyone have any questions on how we'll be reviewing and going through. I'm sure you're channeling or will make note that Representative Nevil is here recorded in the minutes. And we can take a second before beginning and Representative Nevil, you want to get Panera and a beverage as a point of privilege, feel free to go ahead and do so. Um, if you have not done so already, I'll just remind you to give a quick review of the amendments that we'll be starting off at from where we last preceded. So all of the other amendments that have been voted on are in the previous document. And will this is reinstated. The amendment number five. So we'll be getting with that as some context for how we will proceed. And all right, saying that everyone seems situated. Okay, we will now officially move into amendment number five, will now open it up to introduction on the amendment by me.

Najee Rodriguez Chair. Upon further discussion related to these roles with Andrew and Fiona, we determined that moving forward, it would be appropriate and necessary to retain UPAC as a non-voting ex officio member to be able to update the board on the processes that UPAC is following as well as of course, there needs within a student fee money and also to supply a lot of opportunity for different students. So that importance was discussed with Fiona. And she was very excited and understanding of how we went about that. As far as the at large alternate role goes. Again, I spoke to Andrew about it, he's been a very active member of the board, I'm increasing the number essentially, again, would allow the chair to retain that role as a tie breaking vote. And balancing that number. And it also would allow for more opportunity from the perspective of students who might want to get involved in the board and also contribute back to the overall community. So essentially, it's an extra spot for reasonable expansion. And I believe it could be a necessary tool to better assist our operations and retainment or recruitment of future members. I'll now open up the floor for any questions. Are there any questions? Representative Nevil.

14:17

**Representative Nevil:**

Representative Nevil, At-Large. So, then if they come to meetings and if we have all the Board members there, they would not vote?

14:41

Chair Rodriguez:

No, we just wouldn't have an alternate

**Representative Nevil:**

So the alternate would become a permanent board member?

14:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Yeah. Um, yeah. Representatives Zebrowski.

14:58

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So with this amendment, how does this affect proxy voting? Because the non-voting alternative is the proxy vote if a board member can show up, so I was like that work.

15:11

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so given that we've already established the precedent for virtual e-voting, and we also took precautions, before today's vote and other votes to have discussions and gather the votes of other representatives who are unable to attend to abide by that 48-hour rule without necessarily having it constrained to two individuals. So essentially, this just keeps and remains the UPAC role as it is, and instead just transitions, that alternate role into that just voting representative role.

15:48

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Please remember to state your name and constituency.

15:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Perfect. Yes. And just state your name and position. Vice Chair Chandler. Okay. All right. Any other questions? Representative Johnson.

16:11

**Representative Johnson:**

Representative Johnson, At-Large Representative. So this would be for my understanding, just an extension. Okay. And yeah, I'll be asking questions about the reason.

16:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Seeing no further questions, I'll now close the floor. And we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, I will now close the floor for discussion. And we'll now move into voting Chief Administrative executive Alexander, will you please send out the voting form?

16:46

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

It's in the channel and it's titled 5 original just so as to not confuse with the ones that we've designated.

16:59

**Chair Rodriguez:**

If you have any points of procedure, just feel free to ask. Just a thumbs up if you've voted please. Do we have the numbers? Okay. Absolutely. Cierra, how many voting members do we have? Or, Vice Chair Chandler.

18:04

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, so we should have eleven. I'm still missing...Yeah, we're still missing a vote then.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, wait, I see a chat. Okay. So, yep. Representative O'Toole will be voting. okay. And it's nine with me. You said?

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, eight was without Conor. Okay, so the yeses have it 7-2 will be establishing that alternative as an At-Large [Representative].

18:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, and we will now move into the steering committee enhancement Task Force amendment section. We will now be moving into amendment six Representative Miller, would you please explain and introduce your amendments?

18:58

**Representative Miller:**

Okay. Lawrence Miller, Representative Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Amendment six we're in alternative motions 1, 2, and 3. Just as a reminder of all three of them the first one is striking the language or at the discretion of the delegated administrative liaison slash advisor. Additionally striking and approved by the administrative liaison slash advisor this is in the steering committee enhancement Task Force section of the document and the current language are at the discretion of delegate administrative liaison is a part of the chair removal process and then approved by administrative liaison/advisors as a part of the chair selection process. And my concerns let them stand from last time where they should not be a part of this.

Alternative motion to is striking the requirement that final approval to remove the chair must be provided by the Vice President of Student Affairs makes no sense for us to have that given that we are student focused first, there couldn't be a thing where they are in cahoots–quote unquote cahoots–with each other. And if the entire student body through the will of the board is against the chair, there's no reason that the Vice President of Student Affairs should be able to overturn that.

And then for three, it is a replacing language that currently says the Vice Chair shall serve as the new chair for the existing term, as a result of a successful removal of a chair to replace it with the Vice Chair shall serve as the interim chair until a vote for the respective for the for a new chair of the respective feet or can take place at the next meeting of the respective feed board. Those are the three amendments I assume will be on the first one.

20:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. So just for clarification, Representative Miller, before moving into questions, I want to make sure that we're on the same page. We specifically did the motion at the previous meeting to strike all of the language failed. Is that?

20:59

**Representative Miller:**

I believe so.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. And then alternative motion one, section one will be voted on. So I want to make sure everyone understands that, that's where we will now be moving into for consideration. If that fails, then we'll move into the second section. And then third section. Thumbs up if everyone understands. Okay, so we'll now move into questions on section one on what Representative Miller introduced. Are there any questions for Representative Miller? Seeing no questions, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Representative Concepcion?

21:44

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee. I made this point last meeting. But I just want to reiterate that I think the involvement of the advisors is critical at this point. As we all know, the presidents of GPSA and UPUA are suddenly involved in the selection process. And particularly with the chair's election process. Well, I think it's important to have advisor and advisor people given our budget, which mostly time that is in the transition of the administration's for the presidency is for also really good checks and balances in place. And with the guidance of advisors extremely important for given how high learning curve it is. I think it's really important that we need to maintain advisor oversight at this point in the selection process.

22:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, Representative O'Toole.

22:30

**Representative O’Toole:**

Nora O’Toole UPUAP resident. To offer some more, I guess a more anecdotal story to what Giselle just shared, I had never been on the student fee board before. I was honestly a little bit lost and overwhelmed just transitioning to UPUA president on top of having to pick At-Larges for the board. So having Barry there as a resource as a sounding board, someone I can lean on and ask for help and advice was truly very valuable. And I think moving away from that and taking that resource away from students would hurt and be very detrimental to the board. So I would encourage you all to vote no on this.

23:09

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

23:12

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, I would like to offer the clarification that nothing in my language would take away the power of the advisor to serve as an advisor. It is just simply taking away the overarching power for the advisor to go against the will of the board. And against the will of the students it is completely understandable for an advisor to serve in a position to help somebody get up to speed. However, the students select us, they don't select the advisor to serve to do our will and it is the purpose of the governments and of the University Park Fee Board as a student driven and selected community to be the ones who have the driving force the emitted this nothing the language actually takes away the ability of the administrative liaison to function as a liaison or as an advisor.

24:03

Is there any further discussion? Seeing no further discussion, we'll now move into a vote on amendment six section one. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, please feel free to send that voting form. When you are prepared, Representative Delgado as a point of privilege, you can go ahead and get some Panera, waterbottle, over there and then you do not have to vote on this one. So you can see you're good with that one and you'll be voting from here on fourth on amendment six section two.

24:44

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Amendment 6.1 formerly 5.5 is now in the team's channel

25:30

Chair Rodriguez:

Vice Chair Chandler, what would our new number be?

25:51

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

We should have nine correct? But Zeina is not voting, correct?

Chair Rodriguez:

Yep, that's correct. Okay.

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

So, the noes have it 6-4, we will not be striking this language.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into amendment 6.2. Representative Miller, would you like to reintroduce this?

26:17

**Representative Miller:**

Section 2 says final approval to remove the chair it's striking language it says final approval to remove the chair must be provided by the Vice President of Student Affairs. Same concern that I said before we are chosen by the students, we should have the ability to remove the chair if we deem that the chair is not serving the will of the students as that is what the students interest is to do.

26:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we'll now open up the floor for any questions. Are there any questions for Representative Miller? Representative Zebrowski?

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski GPSA representative. President Miller, do you have any? Do you have any information on I guess student concern over the optics of the administration making budgetary decisions without consulting the students?

27:13

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Great question. To answer the question. Yes, as I've made it clear in pretty much every forum I've ever been in, and has been made clear to me by a lot of my constituents at the very least from the graduate and professional students. A lot of the decisions that have been made at this university tend to be made over the heads of the university students, even if they do say this is something we will tell you they choose to not. Case in point, the law school. Case in point this next 18 months, the idea of student governance or the shared governance model, not including students as a default. We need to have something which is why that the Student Fee Board was created the way that it was back in 2017.

27:56

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions? I'll now close the floor for questions. And we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on this amendment? Representative Nevil, Representative Concepcion, and then...

28:11

Representative Nevil:

Tim Nevil At-Large Representative. I guess I'm just looking for an explanation...

28:24

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Point of privilege for some information outside of that would, okay.

28:33

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. So this, this part of the approval process, I think it's important for us to know that we basically exist at the will of Student Affairs like that, as he created his body and ultimately, like put into the standards body. There are under the purview of the Vice President of Student Affairs. So even if he chose not to make this right, this amendment, I still think it would hold the street and Vice President of Student Affairs involved with the Fee Board because it is under the direct purview and under their jurisdiction. That's why it was added because this is under their purview. And so therefore, when it came to be notified when chair removal and thus to approve it was under their purview. So I think this is actually a codification of what is already existing.

29:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative D’Elena. And then Representative Miller.

29:30

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. I think just gonna kind of continue on what Representative Concepcion was saying. When I was onboarding to this, the Fee Board. I was told that it was kind of on a good faith basis that we're operating on... So I think that good faith is kind of violated an a sense, especially by the chair. Therefore language indicating Student Affairs Vice President very high up person, I don't think that... if they have to get involved, they should be able to get involved if that faith is breached. By someone that is an adult...

30:16

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

30:19

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. One of the lines that is in the handbook, that is the current way that we function says that there is an expectation by the student fee board that decisions made by the board are almost to the, to the word and to the number approved and implemented by the university as whole, as recommended by this board. Obviously, we all understand that we're simply a recommending body and it goes up. And while I understand that a final approval of the chair being removed, may in some instance, have to go through the vice president for it to matter. If we codify it, that forces our hand to do it. In my position as chair last year, I we did have some conversations, and there was disagreements where I did stand against the vice president of student affairs, and then, quote unquote, one with my decisions, because that is what the students did, versus this way where we are saying, Hey, student affairs is the people who make all the final changes. So...

31:21

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative D’Elena.

31:24

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena UPUA Appointee. I think that's great point out. And I think that expectation, I think there's an expectation that, yes, we are recommending body too, that there's also an expectation for us to operate in good faith and operate on behalf of the student voice. And if that expectation is violated, then there should be a removal process in place.

31:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representatives Miller.

31:52

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, I believe there may be a confusion as to what this language would actually do. If there is the violation of good faith, then the board or as has been recently denied, the administrative liaison can start the removal process. And then after a vote, the removal process, what this line would end up doing in practice is saying, now that this approval, this removal process has been done and that the chair has been removed by either the administrative liaison for violating some rule, or at their discretion, or the board or a majority of the board for whatever they view as the thing. This can happen. Both the board and administrative liaison says the chair needs to go. Student Affairs Vice President can then say no, final approval means that they have the ultimate chance to say no, that is the important part. We don't want to do it and to I guess to address the point that was said about an adult needs to step in. We are all adults. This the reason that we are a part of this board is because we are seen as the adults of the campus. I am 24 years old, I don't see myself as less than an adult as much as Barry. It's not saying that student affairs won't obviously, I was saying this, it is simply saying we're not going to have to ask permission to remove something that the board and the student will says is out of good faith we are capable of governing ourselves.

33:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, I'm gonna move to close discussion and then we're gonna move into a vote. Is there any opposition general consensus feel all viewpoints have been adequately expressed? And Chief Administrative Executive Alexander will be sending that poll um, I'm sure as you all are going through these just be sure if there is a new viewpoints to introduce to the topics or concepts that have been discussed. Keep that in mind and in the modern rules guide there's also the points of discussion that I'm going to stay within for future parameters

34:46

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

All right, the yeses, have it 6-5. We will be striking that language.

34:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, we will now move into amendment 6.3. Representative Miller, would you like to reintroduce this?

35:04

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. In short, just makes the Vice Chair serve as an interim chair until a vote for a new chair can take place. The main viewpoint or the main idea behind it is if the chair sucks, or my apologies fo my language, if the chair is removed because of the will of the board. And then the will the board also agrees the vice chair should be removed, we don't have to go through the entire process of the chair removal again, Vice Chair will just step in as interim chair to lead the vote. If we'd like to the Vice Chair, they'll just step in automatically because of the will of the people. If we don't like the Vice Chair, we can vote somebody else in at that moment.

35:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now open up the floor for questions. Are there any questions? I will now close the floor for questions. And we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on this amendment? Representative Concepcion?

35:57

**Representative Concepcion**:

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I think having the vice chair is to create some sort of succession plan. That's why I've been a vice chair exists when we think it is particularly because they're like we talked about very, this is like a very difficult institution for the Fee Board to learn. But also like with the experience, the knowledge information that was uniquely positioned to actually be the chair and kind of circumvent a lot of the administrative, kind of confusion, if the chair where to step down or be removed. I would like to point out that the UPUA all have succession plans. In UPUA, we have Vice President, then Speaker, and so on and so forth. I think this is in step with how other governing bodies use their vice chairs or vice presidents such and I just think that this would make these things a lot more streamlined and clear. And there's no need to have an interim.

36:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other further points of discussion? Seeing none. Representative Johnson.

37:03

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson At-Large Representative. More so I think a point of clarification if I may

37:09

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Point of Privilege.

37:15

Representative Johnson:

The current process states that the entirety of the Board does not for the vice chair. Isn’t that decided by the executive council?

37:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

This would be this would actually implement this.

37:29

**Representative Johnson:**

I'm not counting what those amendments would change. I’m ask what’s currently in place.

37:33

Yeah, it was an appointment of Vice Chair Chandler

**Representative Johnson:**

Rather than a vote, gotcha. Rather than rather than Yes. Okay. So the amendments would suggest that the Vice Chair would serve as an interim chair until the Board could...

37:57

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So, is your point of privilege resolved? Any other points of discussion? Vice Chair Chandler.

**Vice Chair Chandler:** \*indistinguishable\*

38:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Vice Chair Chandler Do you want to repeat that? Just a little louder? So the folks on Zoom can hear.

38:40

**Vice Chair Chandler:** \*indistinguishable\* \*motion regarding adding an “abstain” option\*

38:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I would respond as the chair to that point of privilege and say that I think we can make a motion to recess following this vote since we're about to proceed into the vote. The idea is with abstaining is that typically if we had the option, Representative Delgado would have abstained from that vote that she wasn't in because everyone participated within discussion. And the idea is that if you’re here. The vote would either should be yes or no. But I think we can make that possible moving forward. I would just discourage the use of that. Now that that point of privilege has been resolved, we'll now close discussion and move into voting on Section amendment number 6.3. The abstain option will not exist for this but for future votes it will.

39:56

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

The form is in the channel also labeled formerly 5.7. All right, the noes have it 6-5, we will not be replacing that text.

40:56

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into amendment seven. Representative Miller, will you please introduce the initial amendment?

41:06

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, my bad brain stopped... the amendment seven the initial amendment? I think the Yeah, the initial amendment is to clarify the role of the Fee Board administrator. Okay. It's the section within the steering committee enhanced Task Force. I think it's underneath the findings. For a section clarifying the role of the Fee Board administrative liaisons and setting agendas and meeting time, the simple action is to strike the entire section. I think it gives the administrative liaison too much power to be able to say, what is what should be the agenda of these meetings. Typically, like while it typically hasn't been used in a malicious manner, same issues that I have above setting the agenda is able to say how the entire meeting actually is ran. And that is a lot of power, and should remain in the hands of the students with administrative liaison can participate, but shouldn't be the main priority of them.

42:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions for Representative Miller? Representative Concepcion?

\*indistinguishable\* \*regarding striking the text as a whole\*

42:16

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep. Any questions before I close the floor? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on this amendment. Representative Concepcion?

42:33

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee... \*indistinguishable\* But with the understanding that the administrative liaisons are non-voting members of this committee, essentially part of them are the primary responsibility of coordinating the Steering Committee. And secondly, scheduling regular meetings for the Steering Committee and helping them set the agenda through actually collecting their ideas... \*indistinguishable\*... I am, out of pure necessity, for those of you who have not noticed steering committee has not met this entire session, mostly because we have been focused, on the taskforces. But in previous years, the steering committee has been really weak because of a lack of ability to actually come together, to meet to have discussions. The administrator liaison will play a critical role and actually ensuring that the members vote of the CFB and UPFB and we come together and meet and actually facilitating some of that scheduling, and meeting agenda creation will help them to come together because of the necessary tasks that must be done but often get to pushed to the side. This is in no way meant to give administrative liaisons more power than say to actually empowering the group to meet itself. And again, I want to say it's made after this amendment was made because of necessity... \*indistinguishable\* Because if not without the role of the administrative liaison... \*indistinguishable\*

43:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller, Zebrowski.

43:55

**Representative Zebrowski:**

This is a point of privilege.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Could we... Where exactly it's like the sentence in the Holistic Task Force Recommendation. Like what page and paragraph? 20?

44:11

**Representative Miller:**

22. Least what I see.

44:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Sorry, we're gonna I'm gonna get this up there. This will be a continuation of the point of privilege. It doesn't work when you click the folder it doesn't work when you click it. Okay, and one second. Okay. And Rayna, or Chief Administrative Executive Alexander will be dropping it in the zoom and teams.

45:25

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

It is in the teams.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And page 20, correct?

45:50

**Representative Zebrowski:**

It was just a point of clarification.

45:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, just want to make sure since we got it on the screen.

46:00

**Representative Zebrowski:**

I just have it at the top of 22 and that's why...

46:06

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Yeah. So it should be fine. There's no dual formats of the doc.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Oh, no, I believe that. I just wanted to find it.

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Yeah, no, for sure.

46:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. So does everyone have that on their screen. So you can follow along with this document if we need to, we can identify, but hopefully the language is already there, as your point of privilege been resolved. Okay. Representative Miller.

46:36

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President, I, again, just reiterate my concern about the person who gets to set the agenda has the power to set how the meetings will go. Given that I was a the member of the fi board lab, or the member of the steering committee last year, in my role as chair, the way that they ended up going was essentially what was written here, for the most part, except for the setting the meeting agenda that was set by the board in the way that we ended up actually coming towards the steering committee was after a decision that would be infecting the entire that would affect the entire Fee Board came to a vote in University Park Fee Board, then it would be sent to the steering committee, and this is how these things working are all going to work this year. But like it has to be sent to the steering committees 10 days out, and then the steering committee would meet, because there's a reason to meet. So that's really what it was the steering committee met as necessary or once a semester, I believe, is the language in the handbook currently.

47:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion. Representative Concepcion?

47:43

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I believe the entire point of having the steering committee enhancement Task Force is so it does not only have to be once a semester and it can actually produce more fruitful results. And I don't think that we would have had an entire task force to create...\*indistinguishable\*

47:58

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Representative Zebrowski.

48:01

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski GPSA Representatives. Bridging the gap between these two, Because I actually think we're talking about two different things here. Would it be acceptable for the administrative liaison to set the initial agenda that is then adopted by the steering committee, some steering committee consultant modify it? Because representative Concepcion seems to be more focused on making these meetings happen, but President Miller is more concerned about the political power dynamics. So there's this there's this balance these two interests?

48:44

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, I mean, the point of privilege for better understanding, Representative Concepcion. Do you want to explain that?

48:53

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA appointee: before we can make a motion to amend the language there is currently discussing motion to strike the entire section. And when I'm talking about the value of the section as a whole, if you would like maybe the motion after we have a vote on the section, then you can do so and about if the motion to eliminate the section fails... \*indistinguishable\*... we're currently discussing whether or not it's the entire section. That was the amendment before first.

49:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. Representative Concepcion brought a point of procedure. We're staying within the parameters of discussion laid out, Representative Miller, I'll let you go but...

49:37

**Representative Miller:**

I apologize. My hand was just raised it doesn't automatically lowered on my phone. I apologize. Okay.

49:42

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I believe all viewpoints have been expressed adequately and I will move to close the floor for discussion and to vote on amendment seven and its entirety which is to strike the language within the steering committee enhancement taskforce. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, would you please send the vote form?

**Representative Miller:**

Can I move to vote by count or whatever? The one that doesn't require the actual...

**Chair Rodriguez:**

You can make a motion to count the vote, yes. Is there a second?

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, so moved.

50:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there a second okay so Vice Chair Chandler Would you please count the vote? So, and to iterate before we begin again this is to strike the steering committee enhancement taskforce language in its entirety.

\*Vice Chair Chandler counts the vote by roll, indistinguishable\*

51:59

**Chair Rodriguez:**

The yeses have it 8-3. And we will now move into the alternative motion. Representative Miller, would you like to introduce the alternative motion?

52:12

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, the line that I am talking about is the fourth line down under the clarify the role section. And it's removing the specific part that says setting the meeting agenda through collecting action session discussion items from members of the steering committee. I believe that is incredibly vague. And what that means is the power to set the agenda, as Representative Zebrowski had mentioned, is still set within the power of the skill set within the power of the board. Ultimately, this doesn't says that the administrator liaison has to listen to the action items of members of the steering committee. It just says that it will collect some but it doesn't settle... I would be more than happy to entertain a second a motion regarding the... I don't know if that's the thing. I'd think there was a potential motion to change language to replace the language with something set the meeting agenda for approval by the steering committee through collecting action/discussion items from members of the steering committee. I think I don't know I'm sorry.

53:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. Or is that it for the introduction? Yeah. Okay. Then we'll discuss that in discussion. But before that, we'll move into questions. Are there any questions Representative Concepcion?

**Representative Concepcion:**

Are all steering committee meetings led through modern rules?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Administrative Liaison Braham?

\*\*Feedback from AL Braham, indistinguishable\*

53:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

If it's within the handbook. Yes. Because the modern rules is applicable to everything within the handbook.

\*Representative Concepcion, indistinguishable – discussion on purpose of this amendment, given steering committee meetings should follow modern rules\*

54:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, to answer that point of privilege, procedurally, yes.

54:10

**Representative Miller:**

Right. And in that case, I withdraw that motion.

54:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. There has been a motion to withdraw and given that the proposer has made that motion it is now withdrawn. We'll make note of that. Okay. Now that that alternative motion has been withdrawn, we'll now move into amendment 8. Representative Miller, will you introduce amendment 8.

54:33

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. The action item is under the recommendation section, it is two things the first one is to strike recommendation one, which says that the steering committee should be renamed to the “steering fee board executive council” and then additionally to replace all references of student fee board executive council and steering committee. I believe that that's just going to add extra complexity that is under unnecessary and steering committee sounds. It's a steering committee, which makes sense, while the student fee board executive council, at the very least for me, sounds exact a lot like the executive committee that was created for the, for this recommendation in general. And why break what's working? Right.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We'll now move into questions. Are there any questions for Representative Miller? Seeing no questions, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on this amendment? Representative Concepcion.

55:36

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. Changing student fee board executive council from steering committee, aligns with the previous amendment we adopted which is to name the board the Penn State Student Fee Board. Again, this is really for the members who serve on this committee be able to say that they're on the Executive Council, which is pretty much the function of the steering committee. And I don't believe that this will create any unnecessary pass considering that there have been previous motions made beforehand that you, in fact, take things out of the entire document... \*indistinguishable\* And that's something that we've been working on this entire time. So I don't see any addition there. And I do think it's valuable, nothing but I can sit on the Executive Council themselves. And I would like to point out, the new adopt changes we're making are separate from the steering committee planning process, which will no longer develop when these are all adopted... \*Indistinguishable\*

56:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

56:34

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, it is heard what Representative Concepcion has said about it, however, I do think it's important to for the clarification of the students who are going to be impacted by the fee, the 48 odd–actually no–the 80,000 students, if they read Executive Council, about the student Fee Board Executive Council, they may ask but then what's the point of the board's when, ultimately the two boards vote on different things and do different things and impact different populations, while a steering committee is clear that it is a different separate entity? Because me personally, why would I care? Why would I go to the separate Fee Board when I can just go to the Executive Council and make my opinions actually heard by the quote unquote people who matter because that's what at least sounds like to me versus a steering committee.

57:22

Chair Rodriguez:

Is there any further discussion? See, seeing no points of further discussion, I'll now close the floor and we will move into voting on amendment eight the motion to strike the language proposed a vote yes is to strike that language as proposed by Representative Miller vote now is to not strike that language.

58:37

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

All right, the noes have it 7-4, we will not be replacing, we will not be striking the entirety of one nor replacing the references to student keyboard executive council with steering committee.

58:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. We will now move into amendment number nine. Representative Miller, will you please introduce your amendment?

59:01

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, the language is under the recommendation section again under number two. The language currently reads that the date the language currently reads that admitted section outline of the responsibility administrative liaison it's in the section 2.1 that says that responsibilities include setting meeting agendas. You know what, because we've already voted on that I will withdraw my I will withdraw amendment nine.

59:28

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And there has now been a motion to withdraw laid out and we will now move into amendment 10 which is a motion to strike language within the steering committee enhancement Task Force representative Miller will you please introduce your amendment?

59:42

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President amendment 10 is to strike in recommendations number 13 is to strike the entirety of the proposed fee board mission and student fee board mission statement, and keep student fee Board Vision Statement.

1:00:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions for Representative Miller? Is there any discussion on this amendment? Representative Concepcion.

1:00:16

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. As I’ve said a bunch of times, we have had a lot of open availability type conversation about the mission and vision statement, we had meetings on a weekly basis with membership of CCSG as well as the GPSA and many others. I haven't heard any good reasoning as to why we shouldn't stray from either of these statements. And I don't really understand why that should be brought in the first place. I would just encourage you all to vote no. I think it's really unfounded.

1:00:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Alright, so we have Representative Miller.

1:00:58

Representative Miller:

Is that oh, so from the start? Yeah, no, sorry, I thought you were saying that list of people. So Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. The way that these Task Force process recommendation process works is that things start in the task force committee, and then the task force committees created documents that then go to a board. And then in governance, the board then has the opportunity at that at those board meetings, to then say whether or not they want to remove stuff, add stuff, whatever, honestly, the entirety, I could have presented an entire new document, it is still that is how this process works. So the arguments that this should have been brought forward before or it's invalid is literally just not how the process works. As to why the student people or mission statement vision statement, I think that they're just bulky. I don't think that they add anything truly of I don't think that they add too much value to the mission statement vision statement that we already currently have.

1:01:59

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion and then Johnson.

1:02:05

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I know that technically, you have the ability to bring up and make amendments within these meetings. However, I think that doing your due diligence beforehand is incredibly important. And that we don't have to be have discussions about how we should amend these. But instead, put forth amendments that are entirely uncollaborative and working only within the confines of these meetings, is to really just use the rules to kind of further your own agenda instead of working in a collaborative sense. But furthermore, the idea that the work that was done in the task force is simply just too clunky and doesn't really add anything when this was a discussed upon at various lines, and really come to consensus and task force doesn't seem like good enough justification. And so therefore, I really encourage you to vote no.

1:02:53

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Johnson, is it related to the mission statement or vision statement? Okay.

1:02:59

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson At-Large Representative Excuse me. I would respectfully disagree with Vice President Concepcion’s statement in that I do think the mission statement and vision statement are both excessive and I also appreciate President Miller's clarification regarding this proposition.

1:03:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, I'm gonna motion to close the floor. Um, you can oppose that or you can second that

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller opposed.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. We will now move into a vote on that. Vice Chair Chandler.

Vice Chair Chandler conducted roll call vote. Motion to close the floor was accepted. Conversation was indistinguishable.

1:04:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So we will now close discussion and move into voting on amendment number 10 to strike the entirety of the mission statement and vision statement. A vote yeah is to strike that language of vote now is to keep that language within the recommendations

1:05:51

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

One more vote. All right and then noes have it 8-2-1. We will not strike.

1:06:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into amendment 11 Representative Zebrowski Will you please introduce this amendment?

1:06:10

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski GPSA Representative. So, so the purpose of this amendment is to just add some add a little bit of language within the gray area, the out of class experience. So we're kind of looking at the out of class experience as like a solid objective thing. But I kind of view it as a spectrum in the sense that we have things that are clearly in the out of class experience and things that are not. And then as you get closer to the middle of that spectrum, and gray areas creating. So with this amendment, what I look to do is I kept a majority of it, because the majority of it's great. And the only things I added is that second paragraph all does recognize that activities that derive a majority of their funding that paragraph, and you'll notice on they talks about ancillary costs, and that would be number six within the listed definitions. And the reason I did this is because it's creating a scenario where we're asking specifically like UPAC, but gpsa has rolled into this a little bit with our CO sponsorships to kind of define the out of class experience ourselves. And when we hit this gray area, it creates issues.

And as a last point, as an anecdote, this literally happened to me. So I was participating in a competition for the law school abroad, and I applied to UPAC for travel costs. Within this competition, Penn State Law gives a writing credit because it was the writing portion. However, the flying abroad and participating in the competition, you cannot get credit at Penn State Law. And they they actually can't even in general, because it doesn't meet guidelines. So it's impossible for the law school to give credit. We were denied by UPAC, because the competition was tied to this writing credit. So we were we were in this gray area that I'm trying to sort out where it's high to an academic experience, but not really. And if there was no writing credit, then it would have been fine. And it's just this like mish-mosh or issue. Again, the this this section defines what is firmly within the out of class spirits very well. But I just wanted to add some language to kind of flush out this gray area.

1:08:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we'll now move into questions. Representative Concepcion?

**Representative Concepcion:**

Point of privilege. We're in discussion about whether or not we should strike this entire section, although I can't make this motion, I would encourage Representative Zebrowski to bring that motion and to instead motion to add certain...\*indistinguishable\*

1:09:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Do you accept that as friendly?

1:09:05

**Representative Zebrowski:**

I do not. And the only reason is, I believe there's some like minuet grammatical changes strewn throughout it that we lose. That's it.

1:09:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, this okay. All right. Um, so let me just then continue with questions for this. Are there any questions. Representative D’Elena

1:09:35

**Representative D’Elena:**

Could you just go over like some of the grammatical changes...I understand that the ancillary policies like the big one base, but just going over in some of the other general grammatical changes?

1:09:51

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, I don't. I would say I believe if I'm reading it correctly, that I did add one thing in these first paragraph where these experience encompasses and I said, a student's personal growth professional development. And I think I added personal enrichment. When I say grammatical there were some common commas I added and just made the sentence verbally correct. If the representative is really interested, I can get my drafted ball track changes, but it's aside from the highlighted section. And number six, there really is like no, substantial.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. And also, just as my own point and privilege to bring this up, this is a vote on the amendment as proposed this, these were the materials that were sent out. So I would just ask that there be no amendments made, of course, you can go ahead and do that. But it is very much easier for the efficiency of our meeting, to be able to conceptualize and understand as it's being described. We're at that point of the process. Did we have any other questions for Representative Zebrowski? Representative Miller.

1:11:02

**Representative Miller:**

Representative Miller GPSA President. I guess there's a point of that nevermind... as my question. Vice President Zebrowski, do you have any other examples besides anything related to specifically graduate students that this additional or this change out of class experience definition would impact such as any other places that we fund?

1:11:28

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, Representative Zebrowski GPSA Representative, my understanding is that certain speakers that are brought to campus by SPA it's in this gray area where SPA is a student group we fund but they're bringing academic speakers speaking on academic topics. And again, if the board wants to talk about removing funding from SPA, that's a bid for that reason. That's a totally different conversation. This amendment's purpose is to keep the spectrum of where the out-of-class experience is and just to find that gray area.

1:12:06

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions for the representative? Seeing none, I'll close the floor. And we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on this proposed amendment? Representative Miller, Representative Nevil after Representative Miller.

1:12:21

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege for the question for clarification, as was as is my understanding, any spelling errors that are found throughout the entire document are going to be eventually caught by the steering committee? Right? That's my understanding.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes, correct.

**Representative Miller:**

Cool. Thank you.

1:12:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Nevil.

1:12:47

**Representative Nevil:**

\*Indistinguishable – general discussion on the SPA point as null+

1:13:16

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion, Vice Chair Chandler and then Zebrowski.

1:13:21

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I take a little bit of issue with like how this has been brought as an amendment because we're striking out of classes period of things entirety, then voting to replace it with most of the language original document with the auxiliary costs as an option, kind of would make it so that if I oppose any language in the auxiliary costs addendum, then I would not be able to actually vote on it. And I would essentially lose the entire out of class experience language as a whole. I feel like the way this was brought about severely constricts our voting, particularly I take issue with the and posted and seen organization tends to get better, because we've been requiring them for credit independently from the will of the student organization. I think this is what is referred to in the SPA, I think we should strike this doesn't really make a whole lot of sense. And if the professor's requirement for credit for attendance, then I think that we're getting to the gray area there. So I just don't see how we can actually make any strikes here. We're basically taking all of that out... \*indistinguishable\*

1:14:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'm seeing that consideration. And I think I want to take that as a point of procedure because Representative Zebrowski, procedurally we would vote on cutting the out of class experience, first in its entirety. So that would be the first vote that would have to happen. And then that would be, once that vote occurs, then we would move on to the next one.

1:15:06

**Representative Miller:**

Question, point of privilege? Wouldn't I mean, if we just strike the take out the “strike the second” part that is similar to some of the amendments that we've done before, we're just replace section redefined the define that a class experience with this language? That's sort of what it is we, I feel like we could just take out the word “strike this action” out of this action and solve everybody's issues.

1:15:30

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And is there a motion to amend that? Yes. Okay, so we'll now move into discussion on that, Representative Concepcion.

1:15:50

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee, I still don't think that what I said was heard here earlier, you can motion you can strike, strike the section and then motion to replace, to add the language of auxiliary costs and add the language that would recognize inequities. That way, if ever is a consequence of that vote, the rest of what we've mostly come to consensus about the out of class experience we agree upon, still saves in the doc. In a case in which you not agree upon it, then technically, still, the entire out of class experience is striked.

1:16:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, so we're now in discussion on the motion to amend to strike that. Representative Miller.

1:16:29

**Representative Miller:**

Yeah, just as Lawrence Miller GPSA President just as a clarification, all we would have to do is to strike the section. If you disagree with any of it, we can disagree with completely, just completely just throw it out. And then at a later point, at a later meeting, another amendment could be brought up to add the sections that a person may be in favor for. But as of right now, we can just take out the word strike the section and just change the action as we're discussing, just saying the action “replaced with” and that just has the amendments given that there are several. Which is what we have been voting on throughout the entire evening.

1:17:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And apologies, just as a point of procedure that I wanted to rectify, since Representative Miller made the motion to amend and since it was friendly to Representative Zebrowski. Is that correct? Then we will just move into a vote on the strike. The language “strike the section” within this amendment will move into a vote on that since it's already been accepted. So a yes vote will be to strike “strike this section”. And a no vote will be to not strike “strike the section” and then we would revert and vote on the amendment as a whole again. Okay, so we're gonna, I can walk you through this. So given that there was a motion to amend, you accepted that motion to amend. We are now moving into a vote on that amendment that was just made, because you seconded that motion to amend and it was friendly taken us friendly by you by Representative Miller. So his amendment to the amendment is what we're going to be voting on. Okay. Yes. Strike the section that is what you're voting on. Representative Nevil.

1:18:38

**Representative Nevil:**

Then we have to vote again whether or not we are doing this without that language.... \*Indistinguishable\*

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes, okay. Yep. Okay, and do not vote if you're confused. Just ask a point of privilege or come up here and we can help you through that. Okay.

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Do would you like to do that by roll?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there a motion to do that by roll?

1:19:06

**Representative Miller:**

Can we can we do by like just majority, like, all in favor say aye. Is that a possibility?

1:19:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

There's just a motion to count the vote.

1:19:16

**Representative Miller:**

Okay. Then yeah, I second that motion to count the vote by roll call or whatever I believe.

1:19:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. And Vice Chair Chandler will be initiating roll call for again, yes, vote to strike “strike the section” within the proposed amendment in the blue and then a no to just keep it as it is. And then we would move into the vote on the amendment as a whole pending further amendments.

\*\*Vice Chair Chandler conducted a roll call vote – the yays have it, the words “strike the section” are removed from the amendment\*\*

1:21:22

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Point to be clear this is not making any motions right now, but amendment 12 deals with deals with experiences that are funded by tuition. So these amendments don't stand alone, if you will. And finally, the reason I put the onus on the intent of organization is because we can control that with our funding. If, if we have Professor if a professor independently decides that they want their class to go to an event or do something for credit, we can't necessarily control that professor but we can control the group that we fund. Similar last year with the with the the composting proposal through OPP. We received like hundreds of letters from from students and that was supposedly done for extra credit, even though that we had no control over that. So again, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify the gray area and put the onus on the group or the participant to abide by the out of class experience and if other people independently want to work within that so be it.

1:22:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion.

1:22:40

\*Indistinguishable\*

1:22:45

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That was correct. Is there any further discussion? Representative Concepcion.

1:22:54

**Representative Concepcion:**

Although I can't motion to strike anything, I do take issue simply because... \*indistinguishable\*... I don't really understand what that means. But I think you are putting in anywhere in which.... \*indistinguishable\*

1:23:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion representatives Zebrowski?

1:23:21

Representative Zebrowski:

Yeah, again, this is... Dallas Zebrowski GPSA Representative. This is to clarify that gray area and again, in an organization that's firmly within our purview with the student department is a good example, if a professor requires a student to do something on the student farm for credit, we cannot control that professor, we can’t control the student farm and insure still wasn't out of class experience. So again, this amendment does work within the gray area.

1:23:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller's this new point?

1:23:53

**Representative Miller:**

Yes. Just there's a brief example. Lawrence Miller GPSA President, for example, Dallas was talking about earlier representatives, he was talking about earlier how one class that since the competition that's not a part of the class grade. It got denied by UPAC on the other hand, the class that I was in is for the negotiations and then we sent students a competition who were trained in the class for the credit but the competition was not for credit. And they got funding from UPAC so now we're in a gray area where one yes and one no for basically the same thing.

1:24:27

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Representative Nevil?

1:24:42

**Representative Nevil:**

Does UPAC on their end define out-of-class experience?... \*indistinguishable\*

1:24:53

Chair Rodriguez:

Yes, we can make that appointment privilege and does someone have the answer? Administrative Liaison Bram.

\*Indistinguishable from AL Bram. Consensus UPAC uses SFB guidelines for out of class experience definition\*

1:25:21

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Right, we are now back into discussion. Is there any new discussion on the proposed amendment? Representative Johnson,

1:25:30

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson, At-Large Representative. I think a lot of interesting points have been made. But all together. I think the opposition is unfounded because I think for a long time that the board has struggled with the out of class experience narrative, even for meeting new members who aren't as familiar with how this has, I would call it a debacle, frankly, as has reversed over the last few years. It's been quite a struggle. And I think this, while not a perfect final solution does put us a step in the right direction. That’s why I’m in support of it.

1:26:06

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, is there any further discussion? Seeing none, we will now close the floor for discussion and we'll now move into a vote Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, you may now send the form and just before you vote, this again is vote to replace the language so vote yes, we'll be voting with Representative Zebrowski’s amendment and then a vote no would retain the original language as is within the recommendations. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander sent that out so please feel free to vote at your earliest convenience. Representative D’Elena Do you have privilege or did?

1:27:05

**Representative D’Elena:**

Did you get my vote by chance? My computer just glitched out.

1:27:10

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, you've not voted. And D’Elena has not voted. Giselle, I have yours.

**Representative Johnson:**

Do you have mine?

1:27:23

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

No, Brian. I do not have yours. Only waiting for one more. Okay, so it is a tie.

1:28:06

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And I vote no.

1:28:11

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, that is five yeses, six noes and one abstention (5-6-1) All right. We will not be replacing that text.

1:28:30

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into amendment 12. Representatives Zebrowski.

1:28:33

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, amendment 12. On the only things that I believe I did with it are section one I just tightened that up a little bit to be to define that we are not allocating funds to things that are firmly within the academic experience paid for by tuition are not optional proponents of courses to receive credit. And I did make an amendment or a change to number four, just to reflect what Barry mentioned that number four deals with something required by statute or regulation. Yeah, but I believe those are the changes on paper.

1:29:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, and we will now open up the floor for questions. Are there any questions? Representative Miller.

1:29:18

Representative Miller:

Can, as a point of privilege, can we also strike the words “strike the entire section” and just keep the “replace with” such as the same as the last amendment

1:29:28

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And Is that accepted as friendly? So that has been made and will now continue discussion. And any other questions? Representative Miller?

1:30:12

**Representative Miller:**

My bad I apologize. I thought that that my hand was raised tried to lower it.

1:30:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And are there any other questions? Representative Concepcion

1:30:25

**Representative Concepcion:**

Does the tightening up refer to taking out “when not typically” replacing “should not be funded”?

1:30:41

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, so the tightening up refers to in the original document, removing the language, “this includes events featuring and invited guests or speaker focus on a particular topic or area of interest connected to a class or academic program” by tightening up the purpose in section one was to make it hosted by an academic program.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Does that resolve your question representative? Representative Neville and then Vice Chair Chandler.

1:31:31

**Representative Nevil:**

At-Large Representative Nevil, could you just... \*indistinguishable\* what do you mean by “housed.”

1:31:43

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So housed I believe comes from the original recommendation from the taskforce. And within housed, it would be reflected in the following language that it would be an event put on by an academic department using tuition dollars to fund it. So within housed, to go back to the amendment which didn't pass, the purpose of the housed was that if the if the initiative was on the academic department to start an event, then it shouldn't be funded. If the initiative was on the out of class experience student organization, it should be so that's what housed means in that sense.

1:32:28

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And Vice Chair Chandler and then representative Concepcion.

1:32:34

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I am curious if there was any intention.. \*indistinguishable\*.. And it is difficult to define the out-of-class experience. And I believe the consensus of the task force was to not, again, be restrictive and allow that flexibility for things that... \*indistinguishable\*

1:33:05

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, so again, sorry repeat it but

1:33:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Name and constituency to begin sorry. Name and constituency before, sorry.

1:33:14

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski, GPSA representative. To go back, 11 and 12 went together. So the reason “typically” was removed from 12 is when you say it would not “typically” fund, you kind of, with the vague definition of the out of class experience. It goes back to the issues we've discussed are kind of kicking the can down the road of saying we don't typically fund something but not saying why. A good example last year is about the bird strike proposal, which nobody liked. But nobody could articulate why that was not within the out of class experience. There were claims that that it was within an academic building, but seeing dead birds everywhere is not part of the academic experience. So, “typically” was removed that amendment 12 would be the hard line. These are not the things we are funding whatsoever. And amendment 11, which did not pass, was the was intended to be the flexibility.

1:34:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion.

1:34:16

**Representative Concepcion:**

I just want to get back to Representative Nevil;s comment about how it's good again... \*indistinguishable•... then to talk about the typical funding. If we don't use that intentionally to be broad enough. There was situation at the discretion of the board that really was unfounded in any circumstance. And I wouldn't be opposed to adding a require statute or overreaching ordinance to be funded. But again, as I made many comments this meeting, the nature in which we amendments have been brought to me are constricting. We should probably do some work on having these....\*indistinguishable\*

Chair Rodriguez:

Any other question? Representative Nevil, questions directed towards Representative Zebrowski, please.

1:35:23

**Representative Nevil:**

At-Large Representative Nevil. I guess my question would be a academic college, was to host a speaking event, or a program, as defined by this, and has paid for one speaker, which is required for putting on something. However, the student organization we'd like to partner and pay for another speaker to come in during that program. By the definition of this, would that student organization be able to receive funding from us support?

1:36:01

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Oh, I haven't the foggiest, because, again, I'm sorry, I keep saying it. But the purpose of amendment 11 was to clear this gray area by knocking that down when we kind of just kick the can down the road and amendment 12, I'll admit does not provide that definition, because it wasn't meant to. So we're in this weird gray zone.

Chair Rodriguez:

Yeah.

**Administrative Liaison Bram:**

I want to clarify that this other question, when you say this out of class experience document is not laws, it's not policies, its guidance for the boards to consider as they're making decisions. There's never intended to be black and white.... \*Indistinguishable\*... It was intended to help frame the discussion about how people are going to making decisions. And so the language is really important. I’m not trying to minimize that, but it can make it really difficult... \*indistinguishable\*.

1:37:23

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, Representative... questions? We will questions, right? Questions, final questions now, or Representative Sykes?

**Representative Sykes:**

Zion Sykes UPUA Appointee. Going off of what Barry said... actually, I rescind.

1:37:45

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Point of clarification. So in the the introduction with the steering committee enhancement Task Force, it says, furthermore, they defined the out of class experience. And I think that's what's creating this issue, because earlier in the document implied that this was the definition. If there's flexibility in it, we can talk about that, and I can withdraw this amendment and come back with something else I know that this is...

1:38:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will be coming back. Yeah.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

But the problem is, in the beginning, it says this is the definition.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And this is the impetus for what you all will ultimately be voting on within our parameters. So unless you made the motion to withdraw, this is the process that we're commencing because it's related to a representative's proposal to amend something that's written in something that was sent out all to you. So, I will leave that consideration for you if you find that it is not applicable or relevant given the other the passage of the materials but I will now recalibrate us into questions directed toward Representative Zebrowski before moving into discussion. Are there any questions for Representative Zebrowski? Before we move into discussion? Seeing no questions, I'll now close the floor for questions and we'll move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the proposed amendment? Representative Concepcion.

1:39:12

Representative Concepcion:

This is about what the Board defined earlier? I don't think we should go ahead and replace this language, mostly because the word “typically” has been removed, and it seem as so intentionally. If the word had been kept in, it would have a lot of flexibility in cases. That have been said in this discussion. So with those reasons, I think that I will be voting no and at a later date we can come back.

1:39:45

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, yeah, we're just kicking the can down the road. By by coming back, later...

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Name and constituency, please.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski GPSA representative, we're kicking the can down the road and more importantly, like the task force itself, and they're documented, the definition, the out of class experience is very clearly defines that this is not a policy document. Then, like Barry talked about, if these are just kind of guidelines, it's one thing, but in the holistic recommendation, it is turned into a policy document and is the definition. So we have to merge these two issues somehow. In regard to amendment 12, I'm totally open to changing that. But the problem is that we're gonna have to look into this language in the beginning that makes this the definition.

1:40:36

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, Representative D’Elena, and then Nevil.

1:40:44

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena UPUA Appointee. I get the issues of kicking the can down the road, but I feel like unless we're going to do this the right way, I feel like it's very essential knowledge, very essential procedures. Very good definition that we have right now.... \*indistinguishable\*

**1:41:07**

**Chair Rodriguez:**
Representative Nevil.

1:41:14

**Representative Nevil:**

\*Indistinguishable\*

1:41:38

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Representative Johnson?

1:41:42

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege? Could the chair please restate what was just told by the former representative before Representative Johnson? Yeah, it was hard to hear just because of the distance between the speaker and the microphone. Yeah.

1:41:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Would you mind summarizing, just that main point for Representative Miller.

1:42:00

**Representative Nevil:**

At-Large Representative Tim Nevil. Basically, kicking the can down the road isn't great. But at the end of the day, I think it's the best option that allows us to revisit this without putting in guidelines that are too strict for UPAC and other organizations to receive funding from us.

1:42:17

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, Representative Johnson.

1:42:18

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson, At-Large Representative. First and foremost, I would be interested to hear some concise examples, aside from those which have been mentioned, which I think were meant to actually be the purpose of this amendment the first place, I would like to hear, if possible, some examples of how striking this... rejecting it, would aid organizations, at least in the idea of those who oppose it. Furthermore, it certainly is kicking this whole issue down the road, and that the search for perfect language has been ongoing. And I think it would be of value for us to make a decision, however imperfect, some individuals consider it to be I think it once again is a step in the right direction. I think we need that.

1:43:09

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, Representative Miller, Concepcion, and Nevil.

1:43:14

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, I agree with the statement said by Representative Johnson, again, we've already kicked the can down the road until the whenever next we have to come before this. But at the very least, this document, as representatives Zebrowski had said, is, is saying what is law. It's not solely, it really shouldn't be up to the whims of the board that decides it, it really should be specific, because words have power and words have meaning. And now we have a really weird gray zone where a student who says I don't know if this is within our power, or if this is something that university will fund is now going to be confused as to whether or not there is and if they ask Person A versus Person B, they may get two different answers. That's the reason why like for example, laws are supposed to be specific. So there is not that gray zone, it is repeatable. We are into the point now where it's not repeatable because of how vague it is.

1:44:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representatives Concepcion, Nevil, and I'm gonna motion to close discussion after that.

1:44:14

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I am opposition to this just because given the like the situation that this is now going to policy, although I've not understand the concerns about kicking the can down the road. And I will just say that, like I've said a bunch of times, there was opportunity to work collaboratively on this. And when you bring a motion to the floor and you do not consult those who are involved in actually creating the language or really everyone and just choose to change the language. You put us in a unique and difficult situation in which people's vote only on that language and really reduced in collaboration and the ability to actually be language that is representative of the entire board or come to a consensus or even have a discussion on this. So, I will be voting no, because I do not I think this open reconstructing that's why typically was introduced at the beginning. And I also just think that I'd be having a discussion about this.... \*indistinguishable\*

1:45:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Nevil

**Representative Nevil:**

Representative Nevil, At-Large Representative. To address Representative Johnson question, as far as someone who votes no and, and the language that I had problems with. As this reads particularly in the first section is “house, sponsored by academic colleges, schools and departments, any new programs, activity, or space funded by tuition that is not automatically by the source to receive credit.” So a professor for a force requires brings in a speaker and requires their students to attend that speakers event. I understand that not just simply funding, but if a student organization goes to that professor and says, I believe that this speaker would pair well with your program. This is stating that that program can't be funded, we can't find anything associated with that program. So that means that that student organization cannot fund it for more money, because we've said any program. We did not define the single component of that program, we say any program.

1:46:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Alright, so,

**Representative Zebrowski:**

clarification

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

There's a point of privilege from Representative Zebrowski, then I can address yours.

1:46:39

Representative Zebrwoski:

This is giving cantankerous. Can I just... Dallas Zebrowski, GPSA Representative... The issue is this first section that that says they defined the out of class experience. Can I make an amendment real quick that furthermore, “they provided clarity about the out of class experience” that gets rid of this whole definitional argument that we've been on?

1:47:05

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I like there, are you making a motion to amend it to reflect that?

1:47:11

**Representative Zebrowski**

I guess, because we seem to be talking about the...

1:47:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We’re in a point of privilege. Do you mind like considering that, and then I can call back on you after that. But if that will, if it's a motion you want to make, then you can I would say that, as the discussions for general principles of modern rule say, I do believe that everyone's opinions have been articulated. And that discussion has been considered by all, especially with the viewpoints that we have in this room. So I would just reiterate that I did make a motion to close discussion following Representative Nevil’s points. You can object that and if so, then I'll make a motion to count the vote.

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. And then when privilege okay. Okay,

1:47:59

**Representative Miller:**

So appointed privilege as clarification, the processes, because it's been said in restated a bunch of times the processes that Representatives Zebrowski and then also myself as Lawrence Miller GPSA President have made is the appropriate process to bring an issue before the board because that is how this process works. Yeah, that is just a correct way to bring this to this forum.

1:48:19

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, point of privilege?

1:48:24

**Representative Concepcion:**

Representative Zebrowski, are we not only allowed to bring forth motion on reception, which you are you already had... \*indistinguishable\*

1:48:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

It technically, technically would be yes, but a motion hasn't been made yet. So if you'd like that, and you would contest that. Okay. Um, okay, so I made that motion. I'm assuming there's opposition to the motion to close discussion. No, okay, general consensus dictates that will close discussion and we will now vote on the amendment. Yes, vote on amendment 12 will be to replace it with the language proposed by Representative Zebrowski. A No vote will be to not replace the language proposed by Representative Zebroswki just provide a thumbs up whenever you're done voting and you'll be informed of the results

1:49:24

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

It’s in the channel. Okay, the votes are in the noes have it 8-3 and 0 abstentions, we will not be replacing the text.

1:50:04

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Moving to amendment 13. Representative Miller, will you please introduce this amendment?

1:50:09

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President this one is should be... It is replacing in the entire document, where's applicable where there's specific references of the university faculty and staff members, as in the document right now it is when they're referenced as solely as staff, not as administrative liaison, none of that just the word staff. It is changing that to refer to them as either university faculty or university faculty or staff and staff or university staff as applicable. Because, again, we have student staff members and sometimes language is used interchangeably and there should be clearance or whatever–made not confusing. Thank you.

1:50:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you. We'll now move into questions. Are there any questions on this proposed amendment? Seeing no questions on this proposed amendment, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on this proposed amendment? I want to make a motion to count by roll. Is there a second? Okay,Vice Chair Chandler,r could we close discussion to move into that roll call vote?

1:51:27

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Please say yay for accepting the amendment, and nay for not accepting the amendment. Representative Nevil.

**Representative Nevil:**

Nay

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Cierra, Nay. Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yay

**Representative O’Toole:**

Nay.

**Representative Delgado:**

Nay

**Representative Johnson:**

No

**Representative Sykes:**

Yay.

**Representative Miller:**

Yay.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Nay

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

The yays have it with a vote 8 to 2.

1:52:20

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, we'll now move into line item six, a vote on the holistic strategic planning committee recommendations. As a point of privilege, will you have enough time to stay for that? This will be the vote on everything.

1:52:33

**Representative Johnson:**

Can I just say yes?

1:52:38

**Representative Zebrowski:**

We all heard it

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, is that okay for everyone? Okay. So, yes. Okay. Um, I want to just do it formally. Are there any questions? Is there any discussion.

**Representative Miller:**

One question?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Sorry. Representative Miller, and then Vice Chair Chandler. Yeah.

1:53:03

**Representative Miller:**

As the question are we voting on the all the amendments or the entire document?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

The entire document?

**Representative Miller:**

Okay, thank you.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep. Vice Chair Chandler.

1:53:19

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler, a point of privilege to be clear what we're going to be voting on is the entire document.

1:53:28

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes, this is accurate. And now we'll move into discussion. Is there any discussion. Is there motion to count the vote. All right, so seeing that there's general consensus, Vice Chair Chandler, will you begin the roll call vote on line item 6.A the holistic strategic planning committee recommendations.

1:53:53

**Representative Nevil:**

Yay

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yay

**Representative Zebrowski:**

No

**Representative O’Toole:**

Yay

**Representative Delgado:**

Yay

**Representative Johnson:**

Yay

**Representative Sykes:**

Yay

**Representative Miller:**

Oh, my bad, no.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Yay

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

The yay’s have it with two nays and the rest yays.

1:54:44

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. Well, and that has passed. I'm congratulate Congratulations, everyone on that process. And those next steps will be informed to you as this makes its way up throughout the strategic planning committee process. Thank you for attending today. Representative Johnson and we will see you soon. We'll now move into line item seven, the chair report that is detailed in my email and I now stand for questions if there are any questions for my chair report. Seeing no questions, we'll now move into line item eight. Vice Chair Chandler. Do you have your report? All right, any questions?

Seeing no questions will now move into executive committee reports. Those are detailed in the materials that we sent out to you. So I would ask that line item eight. We close and move into line item nine comments for the good of the order. Are there any comments for the good of the order? Seeing none, I will now move into line item nine have closing roll call Vice Chair Chandler will you please begin closing Roll Call.

Final Roll Call – quorum was kept.

1:56:40

**Chair Rodriguez:**

This meeting is hereby adjourned on Thursday, February 1 at 8:48pm Hope you all have a great rest of your nights and Ciara by Chandler. We'll see you bright and early in the morning and I will be in Punxsutawney seeing the groundhog. Thank you everyone. Have a great day, guys.