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01:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I call this Friday January 26. Meeting to order at 9am Vice Chair Chandler. Would you take opening roll call?

01:50

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes. And actually can you please say here when I asked? That's no. Okay. Okay, we're doing roll call today. So you're here. Awesome. Vice Chair Chandler is here. Najee Rodriguez. You're here. Dallas. Okay. Nora. She's there. Andrew. Okay, Zeina. Okay. Brian, Giselle. Fiona. Lawrence, Hayden. Thank you.

02:38

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there anyone's name who has not been called?

02:42

We'll now move into line item two, which is the adoption of the meeting minutes from our past Sunday meeting that took place on the 21st. Is there a motion to adopt the meeting? Okay, seeing that that has been adopted. We'll now move into line item three adoption of the agenda. Is there a motion to adopt the agenda? Okay, seeing that the agenda has been adopted. We'll now move into line item four of public comment. Are there any students here for public comment? Seeing no students here for public comment, we'll now move into line item five of old business, which is the review of action item resolution one, holistic strategic planning committee amendments where we will be reviewing those, again, just as a disclaimer for how we'll go about this process. And just so everyone's aware, the ultimate objective here is to go through each one that has been sent out to all of you. So you all should be aware and informed of what amendments are being proposed. Once we decide on what at what point we're at on the amendments, we'll open up the floor for questions the person that will be introducing the amendment, followed by discussion and then in discussion, everyone will be able to contribute any final thoughts that they have, that maybe have not been since refined since the Sunday meeting. So this should be fairly straightforward for everybody. If there is further elaboration or context needed, obviously, that is going to be warranted. But we are going to be keeping the meeting in line with the guidelines that I set forth for all of you. So feel free to have those open. So you can validate whatever decisions are made on that part. But without further ado, I think we can get started on those amendments. And we'll be going down through them with the list. So let me go in and pull them up for you. So we have that on the screen.

04:41

Before we move into this line item, does anyone have any questions? Okay, that being said, we will now move into this motion this main motion which is the entirety of the amendments themselves will go down through we'll go through them line item by line item, if there is any opposition, it will be remedied through a vote which will be sent through the teams. So each one will be voted on. And we have those forms that are being made now, that should clarify how the logistics are. So we will now move into the actual review of the amendments. And as everyone can see up there, and we'll move into amendment number one, Representative Miller, would you please introduce this amendment?

05:23

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, the First Amendment that I bring before this board is a motion to reject the title administrative liaison and it's all the text that follows that title. And pretty much that is what the motion is the reason behind it is simply due for the fact that I had already expressed concern to potential integrated liaison in any unit, which what's called at any university senior administration that is not a vote, its faculty or student member, being so strictly recognized in our document is something that is that could be dangerous in the long term. And I felt the better, there's a necessity for them to be here because the administrative liaison historically has never been a member of the board and or have either Fee Board. And this is not something that we should start in this board.

06:17

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you. Representative Miller will now open up the floor for questions on the proposed amendment. Are there any questions on the proposed amendment? Seeing no questions on the proposed amendment. I will now close the floor and move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the proposed amendment? Seeing no discussion on the proposed amendment we will now move into voting on the amendment. Would you please send that vote and the Teams whenever you get a chance. You will be able to have access to that and once you do you will be informed and you'll be able to vote on that first amendment and if I could just get a thumbs up from whenever you have voted just let me know. Just keep them out.

07:52

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yeah, I haven't done so.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I didn't vote but there's 12. So I don't know what means. Did someone vote that is not a voting member.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

He did it twice. He? Clearly. I almost don't see. Do you want to clear the form real quick? You can make the name optional means you're going to be the only one that sees it. So if you want to do that, just to verify, yeah, that should just add the name. And then we can redo that to make sure that we have everyone. Is that number. Does that make sense.

09:13

Okay, so for the forms moving forward, we'll add a name section. So we're able to identify the voting member that Rayna will see. For transparency purposes. There's 12 votes. There's 12 voting members. I didn't vote yet so I don't mind clarifying what that is. Sorry, Rayna.

10:14

Okay, she's sending the new form link so go ahead and whenever you see that vote and that will be the conclusion of that and we will be doing that model for the next few amendments.

10:36

**Representative O’Toole:**

I don’t see a space to type a name, but I don't know if that's just me.

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

No, it doesn't have a space–sorry about the feedback–it doesn't have a space it just automatically collects your name. So you're good.

**Representative O’Toole:**

Oh, perfect. Alright, thank you

11:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thumbs up if you've voted. Motion to Amend fails 7-5-0. We'll now move on to amendment number two. Representative Miller, will you please introduce this amendment?

11:45

**Representative Miller:**

Point of order I'd like to be noted that amendment two and then maybe two alternative motion I like those two carry separately because you're required this one would fail to have that happen. Additionally, I'd like in the alternatives motion method is the word all which stroke through so that there's no there's no clarification. But just to bring up the motion anyways, it is Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. Motion to strike the following link from the glossary it is under the section or the definition for the under University Park Undergraduate Association. Currently the way that all the student governments are titled is university Park Undergraduate Association, something something what they do, the only difference is in the definition for UPUA. The language currently speaks at this specific line that says their core mission is to be the voice and advocate for all students. The first motion is to strike that language in its entirety. The reason why is because the University Park Fee Board is a little bit different than University Park Undergraduate Association and probably carries, a little bit more weight because represents all students, and the fact that the university undergraduate association between government listed and there is some language here that says that they are the voice for all students is simply it is false. It is at the end of the day, it is false. I understand that that is language that comes directly from what UPUA has in their own on their own website, and that it's completely fair for them to call it that however, it is false. And especially since it's coming from a university entity that is not a student organization. It is dangerous for everything because at the end of the day, they do not voice and advocate for all students. They voice and advocate for all undergraduate students at University Park and nothing but nothing more.

13:32

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I will now open up the floor for any questions to Representative Miller. Are there any questions on the proposed amendment? Representative Nevil?

13:43

**Representative Nevil:**

This motion right now. It’s just the first one?

13:49

**Representative Miller:**

Yes, it's striking that one sentence of their definition “UPUA is to be the voice of that for all students” leaving everything else as it is.

13:57

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any further questions for representative Miller? Seeing no further questions for representative Miller will now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the proposed amendment Representative Delena.

14:16

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena, UPUA appointee. I appreciate the nature of this amendment. However, I think that the alternative motion it's the fix is what Representative Miller fixes mistake by just putting an undergraduate so I personally I think that amendment is unnecessary.

14:35

**Representative Miller:**

Point of Order. Let's me retain the discussion to first.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, we can do that. On your request. Is there any further discussion on the First Amendment? Okay, and just for procedure, so you still want to vote on the first one before moving to the alternate motion because they're dependent on each other. Okay, so that being said, any further discussion before the floor is closed.

15:02

**Representative O’Toole:**

I'm sorry, what can you clarify? Sorry? Could you clarify into the mic what the first memo will be only because it's been a little staticky? Trying to hear that?

15:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I apologize for that. So the first amendment that will be voted on is striking the text that is right here. Correct. Representative Miller? I don't want to...

15:24

**Representative Miller:**

Yes, it’s striking its entirety, that is the first amendment or the first motion.

15:30

**Representative O’Toole:**

Okay, sounds good. Thank you.

15:32

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, I will now close the floor to discussion and we will move into voting. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, could you send that voting form when you get the opportunity and when you go ahead and do vote, just keep your thumbs raised? And that's how we'll know that you've all voted. Oh, of course, yeah.

Well, and I believe we're waiting. Okay, perfect. Go ahead and present that.

16:37

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay. The results are, the amendment does not pass seven to four. So we will now move on.

Chair Rodriguez:

Okay. And Representative Miller are we... Is that okay to modify and propose the alternate motion, officially?

16:56

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. The next motion that I bring for this board is the same thing. The only difference is instead of removing the entire line and the change the lines reads, there care, mission is to be the voice and advocate for undergraduate students taking out the word and replacing them with the word undergraduate. For the same reasons I mentioned in the first part.

17:23

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And will now open up the floor for any questions. Are there any questions on this proposed motion? Representative Nevil?

**Representative Nevil:** \*indistinguishable\*

17:42

**Representative Miller:**

Yes, clarification, can we make that adjustment now, strike the word “all.”

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes.

17:57

Representative Miller:

Their core mission is to be, and there's also missing the word “is”, which may have been my fault, but their core mission is to be the voice and advocate for undergraduates.

18:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, any further questions on this proposed amendment? Representative Johnson.

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson at large Rep. We've heard Representative Miller's piece on like, the language should be adjusted as should be. But I because I'm, I personally consider myself indifferent to this. So it'd be helpful if I could hear from some members should they be willing to have why they believe the language should be kept solely as it is?

18:39

Like, what's the issue with incorporating the word undergraduate?

**Representative Miller:**

From my understanding, at least in this section of the meeting was that would be considered discussion, instead of the questions. So if you have questions please direct them to me.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. Correct. Any other questions for Representative Miller?

19:03

Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion and I'll open up the floor for that. Is there any discussion?

19:15

**Representative Miller:**

Ask your question.

19:19

**Representative Johnson:**

I'm sorry, I misheard you. Any room for discussion. Right?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep.

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson, at-large representative. Repeat what I just said. Can anyone give their input? I would appreciate anyone giving their input as to why we should not incorporate the word undergraduate.

19:37

And through that, I'll delegate to an undergraduate representative. Okay, so Representative Concepcion.

19:45

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. Even with this amendment, it's technically still wrong because we technically represent undergraduate students at University Park. So it's amendment it doesn't actually rectify anything from legitimate perspective. But the mission of the UPUA is to represent all students to the best of our ability because frequently put into rooms in which they represent student voices and the word all really tries to encapsulate that in our mission and our core values. To me, this is just semantics. And quite frankly, I think all of the student governments could make me I can make the claim that they try their best to represent all students. So I don't really see the need to change this and it's honestly just changing it to be more inaccurate anyway.

20:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller and then Zebrowski

20:34

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. While I understand what Representative Concepcion makes the claim, and it may be easier for me to share screen on Zoom. But a while I understand what Representative Concepcion is claiming stances on that it simply is making it more accurate and while it is being nitpicky, we are dealing with something of an increased magnitude that he's dealing with, as we have had stated millions of dollars, millions and millions of dollars. So being nitpicky is important. So the other thing for it is that at the end of the day, it is more accurate because the University Park Undergraduate Association does not represent the voice for intentions of, of literally any graduate or professional student, which is for just sheer nit-pickiness the role of the Graduate and Professional Student Association across the university as an entirety. It does make me more accurate, honestly, I was on I believe that the chair would entertain a motion to amend the language to amend the amendment and say, the core their core mission is to be the voice, whatever, whatever for University Park undergraduate students, which would be the most correct. And if anybody of the undergraduate representative wants to do that, you're all in favor of supporting that. What's it called motion to amend by amendments that we want to be semantically correct.

22:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we'll go back into discussion based on representative Miller's comments. Um, so that is laid on the floor. But this is just general for any further discussion. Yes, Representatives Zebrowski and then Representative Nevil.

**Representative Zebrowksi:**

Oh, Representative Zebrowski GPSA representative. I would echo President Miller's concern that that we are dealing with millions of dollars here. So be precise in our language, we need to reflect the amount of money you're dealing with this aligned just with Chair Rodriguez's initiatives this entire year, frankly. And frankly, speaking of Vice President Concepcion, I like the idea of adding the piece of language about University Park in our core mission is to be the voice and advocate for undergraduate students at University Park. So I think that's a good idea. And can I move to amend the language to the University Park language?

23:04

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And a motion has been made.

23:07

**Representative Miller:**

Second.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And it has been seconded. Okay, so seeing that there's no opposition to that amendment, we can now move into just general questions related to that amendment to an amendment. Are there any questions related to that proposed amendment to the amendment? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion on the proposed amendment to the amendment as they just described and explained what that will entail is I think we can definitely get the language refined on paper, if that could also just be done. So we have for our record keeping purposes, but everyone is aware of the context that's been demonstrated and conveyed. So, discussion or questions can be relegated to that. Is there any discussion on that amendment to the amendment before it is voted on or call to vote?

24:06

Okay, so awesome. So, just for purposes of clarity would either Representatives Zebrowski or Miller be able to... Oh, sorry representative Nevil? Well, no? Will either one of you be able to restate your proposed amendment just so everyone has that clear idea? So, we don't have to actually write this out. Right now.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowksi GPSA representatives. The text would be “their core and mission is to be the voice and advocate for undergraduate students at University Park.”

24:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Alright, so it is the addition of at University Park you. Is that. Okay? Representative Nevil.

24:51

**Representative Nevil:**

Is it “their core and mission” or "their core mission?

**Representative Miller:**

“Their core mission”

**Representative Nevil:**

Okay, okay. I just want to clarify that.

25:05

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. So, this is the amended language that we will now be voting on. If this amended amendment does pass, it would then make the previous amendment redundant given that this would be the one that's adopted. So that being said, and seeing that there's no discussion I closed the floor on discussion and I'll now move on to the vote that will be sent by Chief Administrative Executive Alexander same process once you are done voting, just put a thumbs up in the air and we will know that you are done and it is in the channel as of now.

26:10

**Representative Miller:**

As a point of clarification. The language that would be quality a little bit different to the language it's on the voting for the language that is being held would be, “their core mission is to be the voice now for undergraduate students University Park,” rather than “their core mission is to be the voice and advocate for University Park undergraduate students.” So just as a point of clarification.

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Oh, I put it in before we changed it. That’s my fault.

26:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. And there has been that clarification that has been made. And we will now wait for the votes. Okay, feel free to announce that.

26:44

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

The yeses have it seven to four, and we will be changing definition to “their core mission is to be the voice and advocate for undergraduate students at University Park.”

26:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, so that amendment has been approved and will now move into amendment three Vice Chair Chandler, would you please introduce this amendment?

27:00

**Representative Miller:**

Point of Clarification? We need to go back. We didn't actually vote on it. We just voted on the amendment to the amendment. We need a vote.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Right. But that surpasses the former amendment meaning that if there's general consensus that I determined which is why I asked we can move to the next one. Okay, amendment number three Vice Chair Chandler, would you please introduce.

27:20

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee. So in this amendment are proposing I'm proposing to keep the term Student Fee Board Instead of Penn State student fee board from the glossary, I detailed that I would advise against adding Penn State to the student fee board as it doesn't significantly enhance the communication of our identity to our community or stakeholders, we don't interact with other universities. So would it necessitate having a prefix of Penn State. Also, I think we would all benefit from being as succinct as possible and trying to communicate. So.

28:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now open up the floor for questions for Vice Chair Chandler, are there any questions for the proposed amendment? Representative Zebrowski?

28:09

Representative Zebrowski:

Representative Zebrowski GPSA Representative: So Vice Chair Chandler is so this is the glossary section. This change will be made through the entire document.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes.

28:23

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any further questions? Seeing none, I close the floor for questions. We'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the proposed amendment? Representative Nevil.

28:35

**Representative Nevil:**

Representative Nevil, at-large rep: I kind of expressed this last on Sunday when you're talking about this means this semantic change that although yes, it makes it easier to talk about our entity as a whole. I think that it's important to clarify us as Penn State. It's not the norm for organizations around this campus to identify themselves as Penn State, even if they don't necessarily represent our university to other universities, as affiliates and important clarifying fact that helps us with branding. And when someone searches Penn State Student Fee Board branding, not just the Student Fee Board, it doesn't necessarily imply that and I think that adding that Penn State will help us when it comes to every form of branding. Just being holistic across the board.

29:18

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. Are there any further points for discussion? Representatives Zebrowski?

29:23

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representatives Zebrowski GPSA Representative. I like I can understand both Representative Nevil and Vice Chair Chandler's positions on this. When voting the only thing I would recommend is not so much the semantics of it. But keep in mind I agree completely with Vice Chair Chandler's goal of having a succinct, precise document. And just to reiterate, we're dealing with millions of dollars this document needs to be very well read. So I understand both individuals points, but I can very much appreciate Vice Chandler’s still making this document exceedingly clear and readable.

30:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

30:04

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, I would second what my Vice President Dallas Zebrowski has just spoken about because the way that students do rep refer to the student fee board and the way that the administration refers to it is the student fee board we don’t refer to as Penn State student fee board and introducing this division may cause confusion as people ask, what is the difference between the Penn State student fee board and the student fee board.

30:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion.

30:34

**Representative Concepcion:**

That's okay. I think it's been covered in discussion.

30:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right. Are there any other further points of discussion? Seeing none?

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Yes, Vice Chair Chandler, I would just add also the UPUA or GPSA do not have those titles in front of them. We understand that it's Penn State, and I'm sure if you Google UPUA, you would find our Penn State website. Penn State UPUA. Penn State GPSA. So.

31:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion.

31:09

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA Appointee. I actually fundamentally disagree with that point. We're currently taught like at a conference within the big 10 schools. And I think it would actually be nice to have a Penn State identifier in UPUA, I think it makes it less complicated for us to identify ourselves to other schools. So I don't think that point, I think that point isn't necessarily like legitimate in terms of the UPUA experience. And I also just think this helps with those who serve on the Student Fee Board are able to put that on their resume, just because this is a really kind of time intensive and not exactly very forgiving extracurricular activity, if you will. So I'm in favor of keeping as Penn State Student Fee Board and not changing it to just the student fee board.

31:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, represent...

31:51

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Point of clarification.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Point of privilege.

31:55

**Representative Zebrowski:**

For point of clarification, does the student fee board deal with entities outside of Penn State?

32:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

No, they do not. Representative Nevil.

32:09

**Representative Nevil:**

Representative Nevil at-large rep. I think the University Park Undergraduate Association likely when you Google, it comes up as ours because there aren't many university parks in the country. And if you've searched GPSA online, it doesn't come up to our graduate professional students association. So

32:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'm seeing no further points of discussion. We can now move into voting Chief Administrative Executive Alexander please send that voting link and just for clarity, so everyone understands the what you're voting on is if you want to keep the student fee board instead of Penn State student fee board. So a vote yes would be for keeping student fee board vote no would be reverting or retaining Penn State student fee board. Okay. And just do the thumbs up.

33:34

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, the no's have it eight to three. So we will be changing the semantics of student fee board to reflect Penn State student fee board throughout the document.

33:49

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, and we are now moving into the budget model taskforce amendments beginning with amendment four. Representative Miller, will you please introduce this amendment?

33:58

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Amendment four is a motion to amend the language and underneath the Budget Task. Budget model taskforce document under the section the section is recommendation and subtitle is and that is relevant is analyze the appropriations are kind of It wasn't something or that it's actually under the recommendation but types that I would recommend adding in some format. But this is the main gist is it is recommended that the university park fee board sets the maximum amount of funds the holding appropriations for there, after which excess funds will be asserted will be disbursed to offset the student initiated to offset student-initiated fee expenses until the appropriation reserves again falls within acceptable limits.

That is a something that I brought up on Monday on Sunday that we need to have a maximum for whatever was the reserve and so our maximum based off of the finance people because I'm a word guy, if our maximum is $2 million, then if as long as our reserve ends up hitting over $2 million in the next year, we will disperse enough to make sure that we Fall back within the acceptable limits of $2 million in our reserves, and that I believe, fulfills the purpose that was brought up by Chair Rodriguez as having reserves is a necessity. But it also shows it also gives us guidelines to ensure that we're not just collecting money in at some point, given that we don't have a deficit, you don't have a deficit and you're equal and you're making a profit. It's ensuring that a reserve is not just going to continue to make a profit, which would be what I consider a failure of our duties and students to make sure that we keep the student-initiated fee as low as possible.

35:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And we'll now open up the floor for questions. Are there questions for this proposed amendment? Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowski GPSA Representative. Just as a point of clarification. President Miller you're just suggesting the notion that we set a maximum amount not that literally, but $2 million?

**Representative Miller:**

Yes, that is right. That is why the language I have is it's recommended at the UPFB to be set to maximum amount. I'm not going to say that I know the budget in and out and I'd rather leave that to the people who do and then spent the the months and years thinking all this necessity.

36:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions? And you're checking Zoom Rayna right? All right. Okay. All right. Seeing no further questions. We'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the proposed amendment Representative Miller?

36:28

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Just as I guess it's a point of clarification, this would become its own point under recommendations, this wouldn't be added to any other recommendations, it would just be its own point.

36:41

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Seeing no further discussion, I will now close the floor and we will now move into voting. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander will inform you when that link is sent.

37:36

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

The amendment passes eight to three. So that will be added as an additional recommendation to the budget model task force recommendation.

37:45

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you, Chief Administrative Executive Alexander will now move into amendment number five of the structural and operational enhancement task force amendments, I'm going to make a motion to withdraw until there can be further discussion. Is there a second? Okay, I withdraw the motion and the motion is made redundant. And we'll now move into amendment number which is now five, the steering committee enhancement Task Force amendments. Representative Miller, will you please introduce this amendment?

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President I understand this, it looks a little bit complicated. There's a bunch of alternative motions, we'll be with them as we get there. The first motion that we should focus on is these it's under the section identify the way chairs of respective fee boards should be selected and removed. The action that I am proposing is to fully strike the entire section. I think that this needs to go back to the drawing board. There's there's a lot of concerns that I have with the with the way that it's currently going. And while I'm not opposed to the idea of modifying the voting method, as it is right now, I don't think it's right.

38:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, um, and just for clarification sake, I want to make sure everyone understands how this will go about. So the alternative motions, can you offer a little more context given. Okay.

39:04

**Representative Miller:**

So just going through for the alternative motions in that if my first motion to strike the entire section fails, it will be the they are specific parts. I don't know if we have a chance to bring up the the holistic recommendation documents. It is striking specific parts of it as alternative motion because there are concerns that I have, such as identifying the ways that the chairs are selected. There's language currently that says either UPUA or UPFB representative, my first our first alternative motion to my original motion is to strike that. If that fails, then I'm moving forward to strike either UPUA which then because it makes no sense that the University Park Undergraduate Association has anything to do with the commonwealth campus fee board, given that they are the government that has nothing to do with Commonwealth campus fees besides just a working relationship with the government and with the students as opposed to every other student government. And then as we move along. There's a alternative motion three is if that also fails, then at least add a GPSA Representative given that we have current members of our assembly in our constituencies that are on the coming of campuses, and it makes no sense that GPSA is, specifically not chosen or specifically not stated in this, given that UPUA has been specifically stated, if you find what's the saying it's UPFB representatives, that can mean anybody with the fact that GPSA is not regard related makes no sense. That's all for that section.

Moving on to alternative motion for there's identifying also the same thing, it is strike all references to the campus adviser the University Park Fee Board administrative liaison, UPFB advisor, UPAC chair or designee those things happen. They have no voting rights on the University Park Fee Board. In general, they are not voting members, and they are not selected by the student body, which is the reason that all of us are in this room. Because we are selected by the student body, it makes no sense. So it's strike that language and all of the sentences related to them.

Then we move to Section Five is striking to actually specifically which is under the administrative liaison which says or at the discretion of the delegated administrative liaison slash advisor of their respective board. And then also striking and approved by the administrative liaison slash advisor is a dangerous precedent to set that the administrative liaison slash advisor who was selected by a member of University Park Senior Leadership hasn't has any kind of discretion when it comes to approving the chair. And that is dangerous.

And then the first actually sub point A under Section five, or under alternative motion five talks about the removal procedures for the chair, which I'm fine with is can be started by a two thirds vote of the board or at the discretion of the delegated administrative liaison slash advisors. And that is again a dangerous precedent. Because ultimately, it is it we are selected because we are the students and we are the student body voice. If we continue to defer our power to university leadership, then it becomes there's no reason that we exists. And it's something that I've expressed last year that if they did not choose our recommendations we did not do it is not the student-initiated fee, it is just another part of tuition even if it isn't separate line item.

Section six talks about striking the final approval to remove the chair must be provided by the Vice President Student Affairs. Because, again, same thing that I said earlier, it makes no sense whether vice president Student Affairs has any way to say because let's say for example, we have Joe Blow as the chair and he's doing a terrible job and two thirds of the board was feeling however, Joe Blow is super tight with the vice presidents human affairs. Why does that one vote have the opportunity to supersede the vote of the entire student body here at University Park.

Section seven talks about removing the talks about the text that says the vice chair and the term in the event of the removal of the chair shall serve as the new chair for the existing term. I think that that's a bad precedent, you can actually slow down the process is what if Joe Blow. And his his vice chair Jane Doe sucks. What if they both suck. Now we have to bring up two separate motions and what if Jane Doe was tight with the Vice President yada yada so. So I suggest replacing that language with the vice chair shall serve as the interim chair until a vote for new chair of the respective fee board can take place at the next meeting of the respective fee board, which does not slow down the processes. If there is a meeting that needs to take place over the the meeting over the weekend. And that can take place the Vice Chair, it's highly likely that they will be voted as chair anyways. However, there's an opportunity for that to not take place. And so that's all of the motions. But ultimately, the first one is removed the entire section. And let's go back to the drawing board. Because I think that the way that the process is currently works works.

43:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right and also moving forward. And you've been doing good at this just as we move forward and discussion. Just always address the chair. So just for modern rules, just look at me as you speak. And I know it's going to be awkward, but the face is going to be objective and that's just how to maintain decorum throughout the meeting. So we will now move into questions for Representative Miller specifically on the motion to amend by striking the language the entirety of the language within the steering committee enhancement Task Force for identifying the ways that the chairs are selected or removed. Okay. Representative Zebrowski question for...

44:34

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowski GPSA representative. I was not on this task force. So would it be possible for somebody on the task force and maybe this goes into the discussion a little bit? Then I’ll hold my question.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

You can still ask the question right now and we so that those who could answer would be able to answer in discussion if you would like?

44:56

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yes. My question is, what was the thinking behind adding... UPFB board representative makes sense. But what was the thinking behind adding UPUA or UPFB representative?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And that's, and that's the question and it can be repeated towards the end of discussion. But if someone wants to keep that in mind to answer as we move down, that'd be awesome. All right, any further questions for representative Miller? Seeing no further questions for representative Miller, I will now close the floor for questions. And we'll now move into discussion for amendment five. Chief Administrative Alexander Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, once you send that form, please let everyone know and we can begin that voting.

45:42

**Representative O’Toole:**

Are we doing discussion?

45:44

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Is there? Yes. Okay, cool. Can I have a motion to recess the meeting?

**Representative Miller**:

Lawrence Miller. So moved.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

A second. Okay. Representative Concepcion.

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA appointee. That's simply untrue. We had representation from a variety of perspectives on the like steering, student fee board steering committee Task Force, I recall Representative Zebrowski being on several of those meetings. It's particularly when we discussed this and the out of class experience and asking questions specifically on this these topics. So I just wanted to rectify that, because I think that there was the ample opportunity for GPSA to be represented on this taskforce, and all of our meetings were made public, they were all on Zoom, all the notes were sent afterwards. And I consistently send follow up emails and summaries in that regard. So I don't I do not think that it is okay to say that this is a sort of a ill will of the task force because the task force did its due diligence and trying to get as many perspectives as possible. And I think that the conclusion that we came to with this amendment is one that we I would like to stand behind because I think that there might be some semantical improvements that need to be made. But the general consensus of this amendment is one that I think is moving in the right direction, and is one that I think we should continue to move forward with.

47:13

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, Representative Miller, Zebrowski after that.

47:16

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, we are sensitive to the concerns that were expressed by Representative Concepcion, especially regarding issues or matters of experiments as these meetings were, regardless of whether they did they did or didn't happen and whether they did or not, at the end of the day, we are all here in this room, no matter what happens, no decision can move past this board until all or a majority of the board voting board members of this board are in favor. At the end of the day, it literally does not matter if I didn't show up because I showed I showed it to most of the meetings that I was able to, it makes. It literally does not matter if I don't show it to any meetings, and I only show up to one board meeting if I have concerns and those concerns are valid, because in each specific concerns, we represent the constituency we are voted by our constituency to represent them at least for height levels to invalidate by the sheer to invalidate the concerns that are valid in expressed during these meetings. Makes no sense. Why are we having these meetings, if all decisions are going to be made in the task force.

Additionally, we would like to just quote unquote, set the record straight that there. We apologize, and we if there is ever been a misconception that the work that has been taking place in these task forces has been partially... miss... bless you. Thank you, I'm like Sorry. We, we understand what the cause is for and we'll try to correct the record. If there is a misconception that the work that has been taking place in these tasks forces for the past six months is unappreciated. At the end of the day, it is appreciated. There's a lot of work that has gone through this regard. However, that doesn't mean that it's perfect. You can work as hard as you can and be done well, at the end of the day, we want to speak done well, because this is not a document for us. This is not a document for the GPSA. This is not a document for the GPSA, this is not a document for the fee board. This is not even a document for that's going to impact most of the people in this room and on zoom right now. This is a document that's going to impact millions of dollars, it's going to impact real people, it's going to impact the way that university senior leadership and administration chooses from now on. And the fact that pretty much an entire government of the use of what's called of the campus has problems with it means that those problems are valid and I think it is under it is a necessity, it is a necessity to understand that hard work takes you so far. But that doesn't mean that hard work means that the work is good. We understand the effort that has taken place in this but that doesn't change the fact that we should all be open to making these changes. And that is why the work has been put in to make these changes because there is concerns that are valid regardless of attendance.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Zebrowski

50:00

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Could I have like five seconds to gather my thoughts because there's just a lot.

50:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, President O'Toole or representative O'Toole.

50:12

**Representative O’Toole:**

Nora O’Toole UPUA president, um, I just kind of wanted to touch upon a comment made earlier. Whether this isn't, saying this isn't a GPSA document. But this argument feels very much GPSA centric. I think when we're looking at the election of the chair, having a student representative from a student government is necessary. And when we're looking at University Park, UPUA is the representative body for the majority the students here, and UPUA is just very familiar with how these elections work. And so I really see no problem with with the current language given that we are the student free board. We are not GPSA Right now, we are not UPUA and so I highly encourage representatives in the room to vote to this amendment down. Thank you.

50:59

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Zebrowski first and then Representative Lawrence.

51:05

**Representative Zebrowksi:**

Okay, so yeah, Representative Zebrowski GPSA Representative. As a comment to President O’Toole’s statement. It was just decided that the UPUA within this document represents the undergraduate students of the University Park. That is 30,000 people. I think we're not the we're not diminishing their representation at all. But there's a second student government here University Park and it’s GPSA. And as a point of clarification. I I'm sorry, to Vice President Concepcion. But I wouldn't challenge the notion that I believe there was ill will in this task force. That's, I didn't say that my question. Unfortunately, I also have to contest some statements that were made about something else. But my point being is that to bounce back, the original question was, what was the original thinking for having a specific member of UPUA and not another student government such as GPSA? And that's not really been answered at this time. So if that could be clarified? Thank you.

52:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President, I will fully in willfully push back because I can against President O’Toole specifically, to the fact that any of these documents being these changes being made, I'm the GPSA President, I am making these changes because I feel that there is a there is not enough graduate student representative, especially given the comments that were just spoken, given the fact that University Park may have University Park Undergraduate Association, may by the numbers kind of most representation and representation in University Park, I've had this concern the entire year, and I'm expressing in every form that I possibly can. That University Park Undergraduate Association is not the student government of Penn State, there are four student governing bodies, they are all equal, they are all at every single table. And it is very dangerous to especially in this board, to have University Park. And honestly, I'd like to move to strike President O’Toole’s, comments regarding University Park, have University Park Undergraduate Association being the voice of Penn State, because it's dangerous. And I'll make that separate that separate motion, but it's a dangerous conception because there's a minority of of graduate students here on this campus, but they are everywhere. They are the students that are going in here, no matter what they're going to be the students on average, all of the Graduate and Professional Student Programs last longer than the undergraduate programs. At the end of the day, the changes that the the people that this is going to affect on any decision that we make is not going to be the undergraduate students. It's going to be the students who are in eighth year programs who are in a nine-year program. We're going for their PhD, we're at the end of the day to not pivot because of the fact that graduate school programs lock you in. And that is an important clarification to make. At the end of the day, University Park Undergraduate Association is not the student government. It is a student government. The change that I ended up making. The changes that I ended up making in the the members I end up bringing, as it stands right now, either a UPUA or UPFB representative states that UPUA is also able to provide an objective stance on campus fee board chair voting procedures, that makes no sense because they do not work with campus before and if nothing else, GPSA should be should be a part of this and it makes no sense to put those at the same thing because University Park Fee Board is not University Park Undergraduate Association and vice versa.

55:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, and to address a point in procedure, if there is a motion to strike something from minutes that would be done at the next meeting for the adoption, if that's okay, um, and Representative Concepcion, and then I have Zebrowski. And then if you have any additional new viewpoints, you can raise your hand. But I think a lot of these points are being adequately expressed by everyone. Representative Concepcion, my bad.

55:27

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion UPUA appointee. Firstly, I think that in general, we need to focus on the first motion, which is whether or not we're going to strike this entire language that is currently what we're in discussion for, from what I've heard from Chair Rodriguez. And as the person who chairs the UPUA General Assembly, I'm pretty sure we're having a discussion about whether or not we're going to strike this entire language. So all these questions about whether or not UPUA or GPSA if they don't really make sense in the context of this discussion. Secondly, I was a student who led this taskforce alongside Dan Murphy and I quite frankly, I am not interested in being sent back to the drawing board because GPSA doesn't agree but refuses to come to the meetings, I will not continue to make these edits and changes and overall core work into this document. And at the end of the day, this is going to be just a discussion about whether or not one group of students agrees with it or not, but refuses to engage with it. And ultimately, it's going to be struck down, I have no interest in participating in any more task force or strategic planning practices, if that is going to be the case. And quite frankly, I believe that at this point, GPSA opinions are being over represented, given the amount of undergraduate students who use these services and do a reaction here to represent it. So unless I see, I would honestly, I know that there's other people in the queue, but I would honestly need to close discussion because ultimately, we need to decide if we're going to this entire striking is going to pass or fail. But to be perfectly honest, I don't understand what the entire point of the strategic planning process is that this is what it's going to look like in the end.

56:56

Representative Miller:

Lawrence Miller. I second the motion to close discussion.

56:57

**Chair Rodriguez:**

There's been a second close discussion. Are you opposing that?

57:02

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Was on the Board for discussion?

57:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

There's been a motion made to close discussion, so will now enter a vote for closing discussion. That's what's going to have to happen. So is there a motion to count the vote? So we do not have to make a form? Yeah. Okay. Um, Vice Chair Chandler. Can you?

57:24

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Can I count? Yes. All those in favor of closing the discussion? Please raise your hand. All those in favor of the discussion? Please raise your hand. Okay, we have one. All those in favor?

57:40

**Representative O’Toole:**

Giselle and I raised our hands just FYI. Okay. Okay.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

There's three votes. Okay. All those opposed. Okay, so the those oppose win. We are re-opening discussion.

57:54

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Zebrowski?

57:57

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yeah, sorry. I have one last thing and then I’m done. So in regard to to GPSA being overrepresented, I would just double down on the fact that we have constituencies at these commonwealth campuses. So this, this isn't semantics like we literally represent people at commonwealth campuses. And I would just caution everyone when voting that, that there is another substantive issue that involves the vice president of student affairs, being able to remove a fee board chair that we haven't even discussed in regards to this amendment. And that's a substantive issue that needs to be discussed that needs to be tackled. So if we dive into this GPSA or UPUA issue. That's fine. But we still have the secondary issue. So it may be better to just take the document, go back to the drawing board just for efficiency sake. And finally, just, unfortunately, let the record reflect that my question about why the choice was made that UPUA would be a representative or a UPFB was was not being answered by anyone.

59:13

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative D’Elena. And then I will move to officially close discussion.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena, UPUA appointee. I think Representative Concepcion brought up a very good point. Well, yes, we have the differences between representation of student governments, we are first voting on striking the whole. Therefore, discussion should be pointed more towards that. Obviously, there are differences of opinions. I think striking it as a whole would be a mistake. A lot of work has gone into this. If we want to change it, we can change it was we go along with these amendments, additional alternative motions.

59:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep. And I'm also hoping for efficiency sake, that since the discussion was in general about this specific area that people will understand where the opinions or ideas are coming from and we will not have to each extensively for at least some of them move into that extensive discussion. Moving forward will now begin the voting process.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Point of clarification on this.

1:00:12

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Privilege.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Because we had a representative leave. How is this. Is his vote going to count? How will this shake out.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So quorum is still available and present. So we will be voting with everyone here. This is an official meeting and we've given adequate notice. I don't believe he communicated his vote to anyone before leaving, but that is we do have again votes that we do have amendments that will address the issues of absence right now. Since he's not in discussion, he could not vote remotely.

1:00:46

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege. As a question, does the alternative at large delegate get voting rights because of absence.

1:00:56

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Because of our governing documents, it has to be communicated 48 hours in advance unfortunately, Chief Administrative Executive Alexander is now sending the form, you will now be voting on the option to strike all of the language that is listed. Within the steering committee enhancement task force the identification of ways that chairs of the respective fee boards are selected and removed. This is the vote to strike the entire section. If this motion fails, we'll now move into the separate sections. I imagine that that would be more efficient since a lot of the viewpoints have been already expressed pretty adequately and for, again, when the larger issues I would ask that discussion be kept robust only when necessary and if new points haven't already been introduced. So we will now vote on this amendment as it stands. If it fails again we will move into the alternate amendments.

1:01:58

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, the no’s have it seven to three, we will not be striking the entire section will now move on to the alternative amendment.

1:02:05

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Section one, Representative Miller.

1:02:09

**Representative Miller:**

Section One is we've already talked about a lot strike either a UPUA or UPFB representative it takes away the University Park Fee Board the University Park of representation process in selecting the chair of the Commonwealth Fee Board.

1:02:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into questions on that section. Are there any questions for that section? Seeing no questions for that section. We'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on Section One of this alternate amendment? Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowski GPSA representative and again just trying to ask why either a UPUA or UPFB representative, why that decision was put into the document. It still has not been answered.

1:03:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other points for discussion?

1:03:05

**Representative O’Toole:**

I have a point of inquiry.

1:03:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Privilege.

1:03:09

**Representative O’Toole:**

Privilege. Nora O’Toole UPUA President, these I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but these three next three, like amendments are essentially the same thing. Is there no way we can condense it down into one and move forward?

1:03:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there that has been that motion to amend has been rejected. If you're formally making the motion, and if it's rejected, then there's a vote. If you're not formally making that motion, then we'll move on to section two upon this vote.

1:03:43

**Representative O’Toole:**

Okay, then I choose not to make the motion.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. Is there any other discussion? Vice Chair Chandler.

1:03:51

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler GPSA appointee, I do think it would be valuable to provide context as to the decision for either UPUA or UPFB representation just for the board. I think all of the deliberations and all the things that were created with this task force recommendation document was intentional. And I think it'd be really nice to share the thought process behind that because at this point, I don't think it's being communicated. I think it'd be valuable to hear that.

1:04:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any other points of discussion? Just some, yes. Does someone want to yield? Okay. Is there a motion to yield.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

I motion to yield to Administrative Liaison Dan Murphy.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

There's been a second so.

1:04:49

**Administrative Liaison Dan Murphy:**

Thank you, I figured I needed approval before I spoke, so thank you. I can only provide context from the Commonwealth Fee Board perspective, which is where this language lives in the CFB operating procedure. So, not checking the beginning. First USB, but it was borrowed to inform some of the complications here. So I can only speak to the CFB portion of it and not not how it interplays with UPFB’s process. From the CFB perspective. And note, I inherited this as part of my recent acquisition of the administrative liaison duties. But the decision to include the UPUA/UPFB representative was a nod to the fact that there is some is two part one, there's some coexistence and mutual responsibility between the two organizations that some level of accountability could be in place to make sure that the actions of one don't totally astray from the actions of the other, there was a thought that some level of balanced insight into the selection process could be important, especially because it is true that many of the UPFB members have a little bit more experience in navigating fee board responsibilities than some of the common will people or representatives do, given the campus allocating committees are quite different from the Commonwealth Fee Board. So that's one piece. But the second piece is it's my understanding that that decision was made at a time at which the GPSA was not as interested as engaging graduate students around the Commonwealth and including them in the conversations related to the graduate experience that exists. So that is just something that has not been revisited and scrubbed conversation is actually a point of discussion that I think is good and plausible to take back to the CFB as a consideration. And so I don't believe there was ill will or intentional exclusion of the GPSA in the origins, although it might reflect back the time that was made, the relationship that existed was perceived to exist between graduate students at the campuses, of which many are members of CFB and the graduate student GPSA.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Thank you.

1:06:58

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Are there new points related to that? We, because we have other amendments in which if it's more specific, it can be brought up for that discussion as well. If it's not general. Okay. All right. So section. We will now move into section one, that amendment for striking the language that you see there. A representative Chief Administrative Executive Alexander will send that voting link that voting link will be sent once she does that again, just do a thumbs up. And you again, we'll be voting on Yes to striking that language or no, not striking that language. And then following that, we'll go down the line.

1:08:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Point of procedure or point of privilege?

1:08:18

**Representative Zebrowski:**

My computer bugged out.

1:08:33

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

Okay, motion to strike either a UPUA or UPFB representatives fails six to four. So I guess we’ll move on.

1:08:47

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, we will now move into section two of that alternate amendment. And just so everyone has clarity on the procedural aspect of this, I'm operating under the assumption that these amendments have a second so that's why they're right there being considered. Um, we will now move into that section two, Representative Miller, would you like to introduce that or?

1:09:12

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President. Striking either UPUA for the sentence to read, it'll be members of the Commonwealth Fee Board and a UPFB representative, yada, yada, yada, or just prefer my yada yada yada, it's an ellipses. So the reason for it is exactly like was just spoken about by the administrative liaison from the Commonwealth Fee Board. We should not impose restrictions on them from governments that quite literally by even in their name, they cannot be a part of the process of commonwealth campus students. In general. That's just that's just not what it is. It makes no sense that they are any equal and valid alternative to a University Park Fee board representative. There's difference between us in this room and UPUA.

1:10:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

All right, any questions? Oh. Representative, O'Toole. Nevermind. Okay. I'll close the floor for questions. We'll move into discussion. Is there any discussion? Vice Chair Chandler.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Vice Chair Chandler. I do want. As Administrative Liaison Murphy mentioned that at the time when this these discussions were being held, the constituency in which GPSA was representing was exclusively at the time only only to like University Park, graduate and professional students, but GPSA is actively adding like professional students in the Hershey as well as other Commonwealth, especially with the budget cuts that are happening. They're more commonwealth campuses that are going to be represented by GPSA. Now, I provide that context only, you know, to, like, let everyone know, but I do think it's beneficial to not be so specific and to allow the nature of each board to like fill in. So I think these documents and recommendations aren’t supposed to be specific and allow for the unique nature of each board. And I think it'd be beneficial for this to represent and reflect that. So by stating UPUA, specifically, without having just any UPFB representation, I think would be making it more specific than necessary. Most likely it may be UPUA or GPSA, or any other UPFB. But I think it'd be nice for the document to reflect and allow the board to at the time to have that requisition.

1:11:51

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

1:11:52

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President real brief just add further clarification as what Vice Chair Chandler has said. The GPSA currently has representation from the campuses of Barron, we have the both Special Purpose campuses in the form of the Dickinson Law School and the University Park Medical School and then also the Hershey Medical School. And we are currently an actively basically attracting graduate students to the point where graduate students directors are reaching out to GPSA saying, hey, these graduate students need to be represented by GPSA, as clarification.

1:12:25

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion.

1:12:27

**Representative Concepcion:**

Point of privilege, are we discussing section two A, to strike “either UPUA”?

1:12:35

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That is correct.

1:12:38

**Representative Miller:**

Point of privilege can we share the screen possibly?

1:12:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. All right. And Representative Concepcion? Has your point been addressed?

1:12:52

**Representative Concepcion:**

Yes.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay. And is there any further? Yeah. Is there any further discussion? Seeing no further... good thing I didn't close that. Representative O'Toole.

1:13:11

**Representative O’Toole:**

Nora O’Toole, UPUA President. At this point, this would just take out any voice of a student of any student government in that process. And I think there's immense value in having a student in that process that knows elections and knows how a chair can be successful. And so this feels very much like well, if GPSA can’t have it, no one can have it. And I think that just like takes away value from that process of of, of that we're discussing right now.

1:13:40

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller, and then I'll motion to close the floor.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller's GPSA representative. Just for point of clarification, for the record, the makeup of the University Park Fee board is chosen in consensus between the University Park Undergraduate Association president and the Graduate and Professional Student Association President. Everybody on this board, to the chair, is chosen by the presidents of both student governments. There is not a lack of representation because the University Park Fee Board doesn't just grow up when people throw a handful of seeds into a room. They are chosen by the student government. And that is the reason why we're in this room. It's not achieved if GPSA can't have it, we're going to throw a hissy fit and waste everybody's time it is this needs to occur. And it makes no sense to only choose one half of the governing bodies that are made that make up the University Park Fee Board. That makes no sense.

1:14:36

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now close the floor for discussion and move into a vote on section two of that proposed amendment. Chief Administrative. Chief Administrative Executive Alexander has just sent that voting form out. Once you are done with voting, please go ahead and put a thumbs up. I'll go ahead and put the language on the screen again in case you need that clarification. You are... yes. Okay, so the language that you're voting. Okay, the language that you're voting on for Section two is yes strike either a UPUA or no do not strike either a UPUA.

1:15:17

**Representative D’Elena:**

Have I voted yet?

1:15:25

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

You have not voted.

1:15:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thumbs up if you voted. We're still waiting on three votes. We're missing one more vote.

1:16:59

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

It's 5.2. Amendment 5.2. is the form title.

1:17:13

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Well, those who voted voted. The amount is there.

1:17:20

**Chief Administrative Executive Alexander:**

So the yeses have it. Five to four, striking “UPUA.”

1:17:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA Representative. I withdraw my motion section three.

1:17:39

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there a second? Sorry, that's his sorry. That's his motion and his amendment. So that has been striked and this has been approved. Okay. We'll now move into section four of that modified amendment. Representative Miller, will you please introduce.

1:17:57

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA president. Basically it is removing references to and like sentences that contain the CFB advisor, UPFB Administrative Liaison, UPFB advisor and the UPAC designee as members of the voting or removal processes.

1:18:14

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any questions for the proposed amendment? Seeing no questions on the proposed amendment. We'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion on the proposed amendment Representative Concepcion?

1:18:27

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I really do not see the value in removing the advisors or administrative liaisons, whatever the official language will be in this document. As you've seen in this just in this discussion alone.

1:18:42

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion. Could you speak up just a little bit?

1:18:45

**Representative Concepcion:**

Yes, I do not see any value in removing the references and the importance of the administrative liaisons in conversation. As we've seen in the room just in the form of discussion, there is immense value in having this institutional knowledge but also in having advisors there to guide students through the process. Although UPUA and GPSA bring lots of experience to the table. We are elected bodies and students at the end of the day. And that could mean that a sophomore who has never been involved in any of this could become the president of UPUA or any of these other types of things. And we need guidance from advisors. And also, we have to remember that these people are being chosen at a time in which people are newly elected into their positions and have a million things going onto the guidance of an advisor, as well as someone to be there to push the profits along in a timely manner in which there might be many other things that the students are attending to is incredibly important. I don't think we should undervalue their importance in this process. And I think that's even been demonstrated today.

1:19:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

1:19:49

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA president. At the end of the day I completely agree with exactly what Representative Concepcion talking about in terms they are a liaisons, advisors, guides. They are not voting members. They are not they in a completely make sense for us to have them as my motion to start, my first amendment failed, they are a part of the student fee board. That makes no sense for them to be voting process. They add nothing to the voting price alone barrier, they add nothing to the to the voting process, and they should not have any kind of voice or say, when it comes to who's the chair, they should be there to be by the chair side to help them get to the next step. But they should, it makes there's no reason for them to have any kind of voting voice in the student fee board for the student initiated fee when it’s a student led process where the entire reason that we've been existing for the past seven years is because students wanted to be able to take back as little power that they have from the university. So I agree completely with exactly what Representative Concepcion has said. And I implore representatives to vote in favor of this striking.

1:20:58

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Zebrowski.

1:21:00

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representative Zebrowski GPSA Representative. I echo what President Miller said and the liaisons have very important role. But I do worry about chilling effect, which allow whichever liaison works in a particular stance with the board and feel for the members of the election committee who feel kind of swayed to adopt that. And just by the way, things have been going like when we had a question, we look right at Barry and Barry always has the answer. And I'm just worried about chilling effects kind of moving over the actual process itself.

1:21:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

1:21:44

**Representative Miller:**

Real brief. A point of privilege so for clarification, chilling effect is a legal term, it basically means if a person in power chills the voice of the people who are representing in this case as clarification it would be Barry as administrative liaison. As Professor some students here may not feel comfortable speaking out against Barry, because they feel that there may be some form of backlash, even to the point of he's going to disagree with me. And that's scary to have your quote unquote professors disagree with you. That would be what that is what is referred to as the chilling effect.

1:22:14

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative D’Elena

**Representative D’Elena:**

Representative D’Elena UPUA Appointee. While I understand the concerns, which which I also understand the administrative liaison are immensely knowledgeable and know about the processes that we may not know about. Additionally, as University Park Fee Board members, if we are not able to be confirmed to the student body to get them elected, democratic elected to represent the say of perhaps it was something from an administrative standpoint that perhaps we're not advocating fully and effectively as we should. I think you can guess while it is, at times very hard to disagree with professors and adult, some of them in the professional field. We are after all going to be going we were chosen to allocate resources, so we should start advocating for these voices even in the face of administration.

1:23:06

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Representative O'Toole, and then I'll motion to close the floor?

1:23:12

**Representative O’Toole:**

Nora O’Toole, UPUA President. I maybe just want to offer my own experiences with being able to lean on an advisor or administrative liaison of any sort. This past year, I worked with President Miller on selecting the at-larges and I've never stepped foot in student fee board. This was my first time and I had no idea how to approach this process. And so Barry, as an example, as he always does, and without fail, provided unbiased feedback that I asked him for and was able to give me just information that I think helped me pick candidates to help this board succeed. And so having a source like that, to lean on and to ask for advice for in a very unbiased manner. I think it's just super, very valuable and I think would do this board and injustice if this language was striked.

1:24:11

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is it a new point? Okay, can you make a motion to.

1:24:16

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA representative. Sorry, my bad GPSA President. I amend section four to basically strike and then go back and amend the language to specify that the campus fee board advisor UPFB administrative liaison, UPFB advisor, the UPAC chair serves on the selection committee in solely and informative process and solely in an informative manner with no voting rights.

1:24:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'm assuming there's a second to that. Okay. So we're now moving into a vote on that modified language. We'll make a form for that and then. Sorry.

1:24:57

**Representative Miller:**

Can I make a motion to vote by count?

1:25:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Oh, yes, yes. So

1:25:03

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller move to vote by count or whatever it is.

1:25:06

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, so we'll now move into a vote, essentially by roll call, which will be facilitated by Vice Chair Chandler on that vote.

1:25:14

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. Tim is not here. I'm here. I guess I'm in favor of the amendment. Najee. I skip you. Okay. Dallas?

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Oh, yes.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

That's a yes. And then

1:25:27

**Representative Miller:**

Point of clarification. We’re just doing the just the amendment to make the advisors to serve in a non-voting advisory role solely.

1:25:36

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Dallas said yes. Okay, Connor.

1:25:40

**Representative Kelley:**

No.

1:25:43

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay Nora.

**Representative O’Toole:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. Andrew... you have no voting rights... okay, Zeina.

**Representative Delgado:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. Brian is not here, Giselle.

**Representative Concepcion:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Zion.

**Representative Sykes:**

Yes.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. Lawrence.

**Representative Miller:**

Yes.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. And then Hayden.

**Representative D’Elena:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. So we have four yeses, and I believe the majority No. Amendment does not pass.

1:26:10

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We’ll now move back into section for the original amendment. Is there further discussion before moving to the voting on the original amendment? Seeing no further... Representative Sykes.

1:26:26

**Representative Sykes:**

Motion to count the vote.

1:26:30

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there a second. We will now move into a motion to count the vote. I will vote last. Apologies.

1:26:40

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Can you re-clarify what we're voting on?

1:26:42

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now be voting on the language specifically within section four. So it's going back to just striking those positions from the selection process in terms of the voting.

1:26:55

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay. So I say no. Okay. Dallas.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Yes.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, Conor.

**Representative Kelley:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Okay, Nora.

**Representative O’Toole:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Zeina.

**Representative Delgado:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Brian is not here, Giselle.

**Representative Concepcion:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Zion.

**Representative Sykes:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

Lawrence.

**Representative Miller:**

Yes.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

And then Hayden.

**Representative D’Elena:**

No.

**Vice Chair Chandler:**

And that’s a no, and then I guess majority no’s.

1:27:27

**Representative Miller:**

Clarification. To my understanding the only UPUA appointees are a Giselle and Hayden, correct.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

That is correct. Alongside representative Sykes.

1:27:41

**Representative Miller:**

Okay.

1:27:43

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Okay. Great. So that amendment has failed and will now move into section five. I believe this is the last amendment we can cover for this meeting. Representative Miller? Does anyone have a hard stop at 10:30? Okay. So I am going to make a motion to actually recess the meeting. Is there a second? Okay. So that means there doesn't need to be a formal conclusion of the meeting. What this means is we're technically entering a period where once we resumed the meeting, we would start exactly where we are. Now, once we do schedule that, again, I we have gotten through a really good... we've gotten through a good portion of the amendments. So I think that we can identify a time to be able to proceed with the voting and that will be done at your earliest convenience. And Rayna will be reaching out to see how we can go about making sure that's an efficient process. I just want to emphasize that we are really almost at the end of this process. So I really appreciate everyone's engagement and buy in. The work that is coming up with the appropriations in this really impactful decision making is on the horizon. So I just implore you all to remember that. And this process is really productive. And we are doing what needs to be done with our due diligence and discussion. So I would leave it with that since the meeting is recessed. Do you have formal things to say for the meeting?

1:29:12

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So are you predicting we'll have in an additional meeting or this will be picked up next Friday? Because I think this this format on Friday was actually way more beneficial and helpful than like Zoom.

1:29:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so I'd probably what we can discuss doing and I just want to get everyone. A general idea is that we can probably restructure our schedule that we have for reviewing fiscal year 25 operations and those modifications and those amendments. I would second that I do really prefer the in-person meeting especially as we finish and conclude these amendments. I do think virtual meeting at some point will need to be done to make up for fiscal year 25 modifications should that be necessary. With that being said, I informally adjourn this meeting and I appreciate everyone's attendance. Have a great weekend and Friday thank you everybody.