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02:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So I call this Friday, March 29 meeting to order at 9:06am. Vice Chair Chandler, will you please take opening roll call.

02:56

\*\*Vice Chair Chandler takes opening roll call and quorum is met\*\*

03:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there anyone's name who has not been called? Seeing none, I'll now move to chair remarks. And essentially, everything that I explained about the notes still stands, the link is on the email I sent you yesterday, so you'll be able to open that folder. Today, we'll be going over the units with flat funding proposals. To give you an overview of mostly what developments they've made since they've last submitted their documentation for what we need. Again, this is not a meeting in which we will vote. This is a meeting that is strictly informational, actual deliberation is to occur at the end of April. So this is why the notes of the questions are important because if we are going through each of the units and finalizing that vote for each unit before we also have to vote on the total amount, you're going to need to use this to make informed decisions and honestly it will just help with a general. That concludes the share remarks and only two line item to have the approval from the March 29 2024 board meeting. Is there a motion to approve those meeting minutes? So, is there a second.

\*Seconded\*

04:47

**Chair Rodriguez:**

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

\*Seconded\*

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And now that the meeting an agenda has been approved. Back to items that we'll be discussing, again are the standing funding appropriation strictly discussion, informational, we’ll then discuss the modified students that wage increases or fiscal year 25, followed by the chair report and discussion UPFB fiscal year 26 schedule in which we'll go over just the basics of what you can expect throughout the next few weeks as we exit this preliminary day that we're starting fiscal year 26. And finally, the $15 campus minimum wage referendum and then implications for student-initiated fee. That being said, we will now move into line item four of public comment, are there any students here for public? Seeing that there are no students here for public comment, we'll now move into line item five reports from standing committees, these are not yet established. So we will then now move into immediate action item and discussion within line items six. Again, this will give you an overview of the order in which we will review them in and basic explanation. If you have not opened the brief already, that is in the meeting folder that you'll be able to look over and it synthesizes and helps with the analysis, ultimately, of the proposal. I would encourage you to have that up as we go through this. And again, the next item I would encourage you to have is again that notes document. Are there any questions before proceeding? Okay, Representative Miller.

06:36

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. What's the document again called?

06:41

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So the documents that I sent yesterday, if you go to the bottom of that folder that I tagged, and you that should take you to a page where it has like Representative Zebrowski, Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Absolutely. And then for the one that was just gonna be meeting...

07:02

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yep. Any other questions? Okay, we will now move into line items six A are for the standing funding appropriations, which is the Bryce Jordan Center. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, you'll have five minutes to introduce and discuss this and then we'll open it up 10 minutes for questions and then discussion.

07:35

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Happy Friday, guys, welcome to day one or meeting one I should say of 26 appropriations. We're starting off with the Bryce Jordan Center. Like the Najee was implying, we have about four units today. And we kind of put the easy ones to start with. These shouldn't be too in depth. So we'll just highlight the main ideas. But the Bryce Jordan Center, in total last fiscal year as in fiscal year 25, we appropriated a total of $260,000. That is with an original request of $200,000. Plus the appropriation of $60,000 for the Drake and Travis subsidies. For fiscal year 25-26 the Bryce Jordan Center has increased, technically, increased their requested appropriations to $225,000. Now, when reading through the BJC proposal, and just looking back at historical variances and historical proposals from this unit, they've demonstrated, you know, a strong alignment to the UPFB budget model. Their main purpose is to allow students to enjoy entertainment and have access to entertainment, whether that's events or other artists that are coming to campus at a reduced cost. They have taken continuous efforts as of our last conversation with them to increase UPFB branding. And they have taken on the Penn State Music Group as their advisory board for the inner workings of getting that going. Now the big thing with BJC, obviously, two years looking forward, it's hard to forecast and project what events they're going to book. Those people might not even be on tour yet those artists might not even be famous yet for all we know. But what the BJC does, and if you look at the brief that is linked in the leading document, you can see their setup. The BJC categorizes each semester by seven events and all those events have varying priorities based on demand. So events one through three in their portfolio first semester, have an appropriated larger sum from their total distribution of money. Those events are saved for artists like Drake, Travis Scott or Bill Burr, who they know that students are going to gravitate towards, therefore they can supply a larger amount of subsidized tickets. However that will be added lowering the cost which is why they promote those. Obviously if the BJC does not go through that larger appropriation of money towards the first semester, they will just trickle down and distribute it as such for the last end of the semester, and then repeat the process until spring. So based on all these findings, and based on the BJC historic accuracy report and a trustful relationship with the UPFB, we have recommended that they get appropriated that increased $25,000 at $225,000.

10:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you, Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz. We will now move into questions. Are there any questions? Representative Miller?

10:33

**Lawrence Miller:**

GPSA President. Is it known as to whether the Penn State Music Group also includes graduate students?

10:43

**CPBE Kurtz:**

To my to my knowledge, I can't answer that. I'm not sure.

10:47

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I can answer that. It's an RSO. So that's open to all students, they just started like six months ago. So they ultimately, to provide context, I actually met with the executive team for the Penn State Music Group. Ultimately, what they're hoping to do is they're hoping to centralize student artists to be able to resource or... to be able to ensure that for example, SPA or other organizations can contract the students to pay them directly. It also has a committee that's dedicated to just like development and state manager, I'm trying to think of the word, Parks and Tourism Recreation management. They have a lot of those students that want to learn the industry, they have many dedicated to that. So the idea is that they will be able to just ask, you know, an executive committee of direct area and also a group of students that are within the group. Artist’s decisions when they need to make a decision based on a contract. It's really up to graduate students if they would like to join the group but as a registered student organization, it's not just relegated to UP students, it’s relegated to all.

12:07

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we'll now move into discussion. Is there any discussion Representative Miller.

12:16

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President, one thing that I would like to add, just like this recommendation, if it's possible, is that potentially we reach out to Penn State Music Group to say, hey, maybe have a spot for a GPSA Appointee or a UPUA Appointee to fill in the gaps board or also additionally, have a member of the Penn State Music Group serve as not so much an ex officio member, but invite them in to come speak with us or the future boards and kept abreast of what's happening, etc, to the best of our ability.

12:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I can make that note for sure. And I'm supposed to meet with Bill Stout to discuss this in further detail. But yeah, that can definitely be a note and also, just for transparency purposes, I'll upload my notes and documents also to that meeting folder, so you're all able to see the notes that I take. And you're able to see that I mean, I will bring those points up, necessarily. Okay, so that being said, we can now move into line item. Sorry, is there any further discussion? Seeing none, I will now close the floor for discussion. And we'll now move into line item six B of the childcare subsidy. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, you will have five minutes to introduce this and we'll move into questions and discussion.

13:43

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Childcare subsidy. I'd like to note that the childcare subsidy’s request for this fiscal year is independent of the previous four year provost fund/SIF split agreement that concluded in last fiscal year’s deliberation, however, we have received data that this split may be continuing at a fixed percentage rate. So if anything, this request would drop about 75% and UPFB would cover 25%.

14:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Point of privilege, I'll yield to AL Bram.

14:28

**AL Bram:**

yeah, that was a standing agreement. From now on it's always 25% UPFB and 75% provost fund.

14:39

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Okay, so on that note, I wouldn't go overboard with the childcare subsidy, given that this number will probably kind of talk about. As for the childcare center’s operations in relation to the UPFB appropriation and utilization that we have seen no changes in operations, all of them UPFB appropriations for the childcare center going strictly to childcare tuition. The center has seen gradual increases in student-family applicants here on campus, and they forecast that those increases will probably be stagnant for the next couple of years. Outside of that, the childcare subsidy has been working in families... Honestly, it's a great subsidy to have, you know, the community really appreciates you UPFB’s help with childcare, tuition, managing childcare centers operations as a whole. And at the basic needs unit, it really stands true to you know, the importance of our portfolio funded units. So based on these numbers of an apologize again, that miscommunication on the number itself, but they have typically requested flat funding.

15:57

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So we will now move into questions. Representative Miller.

16:00

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. Just making sure so the number that we're going to be funding is going to be the $51,591 or the $127,500.

**CPBE Kurtz:**

51,000

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'll make a motion to amend that. Is there one second? So the motion is attended to. That being said, Are there any other questions? Seeing none, is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, I'll close the floor for discussion. And I myself as Chair kind of intermittently come in as point of privilege just for context. But also keep in mind that a lot of the discussion that we will be having this seems like okay, we're going through this reviewing it, the discussion comes later on. So that's when you'll be of course expected to contribute. But for now, I think just asking questions, you know, really reviewing the material in terms of the discussion, and obviously, we just have to go through that as like a pattern parliamentary procedure. But in that instance, I would just discuss things that maybe you want to consider, etc. Knowing that we can respond, really, during that discussion period. Okay. That being said, we can now move into line item 6C, the University Park Allocation Committee, you'll have five minutes.

17:49

**CPBE Kurtz:**

UPAC. As we know you've had is a solely allocating committee. Their entire portfolio of funded unit is consisted of Recognized Student Organizations, RSOs, and we're going to expect them on campus on that same note, UPAC has reported a 33% increase in new organizations on campus since last fiscal year. And they have forecasted similar trends if not higher increases in new organizations within the next three years. They have also detailed two new fall and spring student staffing positions as well as one summer student staffing position that will aid their primary operations. And right now they're currently posted at $14 an hour. Now, as we discussed last semester, and in our budget model, we are pushing for $15 an hour minimum under the student needs-based budget model. So $15 per hour recommendation would add an additional $1,551 to the total appropriation. But given the size of their total request in that small of a number, I felt like it wasn't necessary to add that. UPAC has diligently been seen reporting and funding all of their portfolio, there's only a few standing funding appropriations that UPAC has internally which means every year every single RSO or new organization resubmits their requests to UPAC, resubmits their request to be funded by UPAC, and their portfolio does fluctuate year over year. Alright, so right here, I wanted to highlight the UPAC student engagement funds, which we coined as “programming” now. As you can see there, they're sending allocation of Movin' On Festival at $50,000. But I want to direct your attention to program that $2.9 million in travel $1.1 million. Now, just when I was looking over these to me, I was a little confused on what $2.9 million worth of programs means. However, after discussing and going deeper into their proposal, like I was saying they cannot necessarily forecast for organizations or new RSO and organizations are going to come to them for funding year over year. But what they can do is forecast approximately how much they want to distribute to their different internal categories, kind of like we do with our units of programming or student engagement funds, I should say. And we have had a trustful and they're accurate relationship with UPAC over the years. So after that discussion, whether you guys were concerned about this or not, I did not see a problem with the $2.9 million with no further explanation. So to sum everything up. Their FY25-26 recommended up requested appropriation at $5,257,200 overall recommended.

20:53

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will now move into questions. Are there any questions? Representative Miller.

20:59

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. Do we know how much they've spent this year?

21:04

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I could get that information from Fiona, potentially. Yeah, she gives updates but I can ask her that. Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowski, GPSA Appointee. UPAC doesn't do food. Why don’t they do food?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. So I want to defer that question to AL Bram or Saunders?... I think that's a really valid point. I have like heard that from various people to from my understanding it is a policy within their handbook and guidelines. That's like the core as to why they don't do it. As to why they don't do it. I don't know, I feel like that would be appropriate or successful offer or appropriation that we would provide. But that's ultimately... Administrative Liaison Bram.

22:10

**AL Bram:**

UPAC always has a large unspent amount. So when you when we say how much money have they spent this year, we will get hundreds of that because the organizations don’t use all of that. So just Just an FYI, that's always one of our largest areas of return. So I think they had $4.6 million this year, they might be close to giving all that out, but they might have several thousand dollars...

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Johnson

**Representative Johnson:**

Brian Johnson, At-Large Representation. So I realized I may be less informed than others on this, but can you elaborate more on the transition to a $15 minimum wage. I realize maybe irrespective of UPAC, but in general.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, I am making a motion in discussion to modify, they had $14 an hour. We're setting wages at 15. The motion can fail, but I will be recommending that they just move it up $1. Any other questions? Seeing no questions, we will now move into this. And I make a motion to amend the $14 an hour for each student staff position to be $15. And to add that additional cost of $1,551 to the total appropriation for forecasting purposes, knowing that with the forecasting, we'll get money back. However, incorporating that into their budget is important. So a motion to amend is on the table. And we can now move into questions on my amendment.

\*Seconded\*

24:05

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Thank you for that. All right. And we can now move into questions. Are there any questions? Representative Johnson?

24:17

**Representative Johnson:**

Representative Johnson, I guess, I mean more so to reiterate what I asked initially. Regarding that development, that wage question, I realized that might be less important than others. It was mentioned here. Can you just elaborate on that.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. So I actually have a presentation discussing that in more detail with statistics and cost of living and there's a formula that was created. The $15 minimum wage conversation comes out of one the referendum that UPUA had. 3000 plus students voted for that, but ultimately the pushes and once you see the statistics of what I compared to essentially to Ithaca College because they're like three or four percentage points off and cost of living. And that showcases the differentiation between our lowest wage all the way to the highest wages that we have. So that plays a role into it for sure. However, what I will say is, ideally, the presentation would happen before you know the amendment, but given the circumstances that exist with like the student push, I mean, once you see what I have, I feel like it's out like it's not in order, but I think it'll make a lot more sense is what I'm saying. And for this, this will be the only amendment that is made in terms of student staff positions. I think the Lion’s Pantry went up to $15. So I think this will be the only one and it was $14. Yeah, I was adding $1 just for like the principal and also like part of what we're trying to push for Yeah.

26:10

**Representative Johnson:**

So I understand the whole push there, and certainly with the referendum and UPUA. I get it fully. But, you know, there's a comment to be made regarding that we're assessing it with Ithaca College. New York? Related to cost of living expenses and such?

**Chair Rodriguez:**  
Technically it's Cornell.

**Representative Johnson:**

Cornell, right. That's vastly different. First and foremost, just irrespective of geographic differences, we also have to consider how it aligns with Pennsylvania state minimum wage. Right. When that was said, when you account for inflation, it's $10.67 now. So, I mean, I would question the goals that we're pushing, quote, unquote, when it doesn't really align in that sense when you account for inflation. So yeah, so just put that out there. But I'll certainly wait.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. And then discussion actually doesn't begin. So, we're still in questions. Are there questions related to that?

27:11

**Representative Sykes:**

Point of privilege. Related to like the state related aspect of that, Pennsylvania minimum wage that's like set to increase the next two years to be $15. So I think they're really just getting ahead of it.

27:34

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Yeah. Representative Concepcion

27:40

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA Appointee. I know Najee is going to touch on this further. But just for context, I think we've been, UPUA has been trying to have multiple discussions surrounding the university, including kind of leveraging what's been going on with the 19-credit policy. We just spoke to Provost Schwartz a few weeks ago about increasing and having student researchers being paid. And then ultimately, those researchers being paid $15 an hour. And we've also had other discussions with Housing and Food Services and the only reason they're not paying students $15 an hour is because they subsidize almost all of the student's meals, who work at those who work on campus. So I think this is really inseparably from the direction that we're moving towards. And I know that you'll get more details on the referendum, but I just wanted to provide some more context for how $15 is working across the university.

28:30

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Representative Miller.

28:33

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President. In support of the $15 allocation, the GPSA has already passed a resolution in support of a shift to university wide student minimum wage to $15. Now I fully support this.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? And given that it's an amendment to an appropriation, we will move into a vote by roll call and that will be the case for anything that involves monetary modifications or expenses. Vice Chair Chandler whenever you're ready, you may begin.

29:10

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts a role call vote and the amendment passes.\*

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We will modify the amount and have the additional $1,551. And that being said, we will now move on to line item 6.D which will be our last standing funding appropriation.

30:15

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Point of privilege, are we going to have a discussion on the UPAC allocation generally? Did you do that? Or did we just do your amendment to $15?

30:21

**Chair Rodriguez:**

You are correct. So, I will go back and move into further discussion. Thank you. Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Representatives Zebrowski, GPSA Representative. So, in regards to the UPAC allocation. GPSA, for our co-sponsorships has seen just a massive uptake in largely attended events and co-sponsorship requests for food in 1000s of dollars. I can understand why UPAC doesn't want to set up a food budget to have every RSO dipping in so they're meetings get pizza and stuff. But we're like GPS, we're having RSOs come to GPSA for symposiums where like 250-300 students are attending and they're looking for us to cover that entire food budget. So I'm wondering if like UPAC can start doing some of that because there's a difference between like the meeting with 15 people who want pizza and like these kind of symposium event style food like requests, if you will, that my discussion and can we like put something or at least bring them in here to talk about that. Do something about this? So that way GPSA’s budget is freed up a little bit more. So our co-sponsorships, we can kind of redistribute that?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. And to your point. Administrative Liaison Bram, would you be willing to reach out to Trevor Ward to get more context behind the food problem?

**AL Bram:**

Yeah, because it goes way back in history, I don’t know how much information that they will have. But I will see.

31:59

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, as a further question, is this just a remnant of former policies that were never changed?

32:06

**AL Bram:**

Well, I think it's been around for a long time. I don't know that it needs to change. I think it's worth exploring every year. UPAC has an open policy review. And so I think that's the appropriate forum to take this up. I'm guessing that it goes back to no individual benefits for students. It's very much like, you can't buy gear, right. You can't you know, everything has to be available for every student to be the same. But you should bring it up.

32:41

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And I'll make note of that, as well. Representatives Zebrowski. I can Teams message Trevor who is the advisor for UPAC anyways, to give him a solid answer on that. I mean, to contribute to that discussion, I think it's likely that it wouldn't make more sense to centralized where they go for food if I'm correct? It’s usually is the student governments for supplemental information, or supplemental funding, I could be wrong, but I think it's worth exploring. I think I'll reach back out to you with further information to the board once I have a solid answer of the question.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

And, yeah, just as a follow up on that. What GPSA’s seeing is just what you described, there's initial request to UPAC that doesn't include food, and then they come to GPSA. And we're actually running into the same thing that UPAC is that because we don't have the strategic foresight to see which groups are coming in what talks for this? We have to like, we're hedging on other RSOs coming to us for co-sponsorships, to have money available to deal with this food issue. When again, the events are so large that we've surpass the point where it's like benefiting almost individual students like this is food for 250 people at a conference.

34:00

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion.

34:03

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA appointee. To add some context on the UPUA side of things with co-sponsorships like we've seen a large increase in co-sponsorship requests this year. And we have started to change our guidelines. So we don't do food either. But we have like an entire process on our website. But I think people are really confused by the entire system of like funding. So if something could come out of this particular fiscal cycle of having a clear understand, like only maybe adding this to the website have both like the UP Fee Board, UPUA, and GPSA and like, clearly what which groups are funding what and what their requirements are. Is coming maybe back on the Fee Board might make more sense for students. I think they're having trouble conceptualizing who they can ask and what their goals are. So it's been since it's a problem that's been updated like across student governments and the Fee Board that that could be something we could work on together.

35:01

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Nevil and then Miller.

35:03

**Representative Nevil:**

Tim Nevil, At-large representative. I can provide some context to the background of food and the way that allocation works. So having, within Homecoming, so we receive funding from the student fee board. And because we received funding from the students fee board, then use that funding to pay for food at events. So we would pay for any money that came out of our standing allocation account. And the food that we paid for out of that account in the manner in which the procedures for RSOs are written. Currently, internal volunteers cannot consume any of that food. Which means that anyone that is a member of that organization cannot consume that food, because it is considered within the way the policy is written. Like Barry said, that is considered a direct kickbacks to the students. So I think if we're looking to really change how this is all built out that defining like that way that it's defined needs to change. Otherwise, UPAC will likely continue to not fund food allocations, because like you said, you have a symposium of 200 people, but if 175 of that symposium are members of that organization, the 175 there can't consume any of that food because it violates the policy written because they're hosting.

36:26

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Miller.

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President, two questions, or I guess a question directed towards UPUA. Have you all never paid for food?

36:38

**Representative Concepcion:**

Can I...

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representative Concepcion. I'm going to suspend a little we'll just open that I think this is a legitimate discussion that we can have.

36:49

**Representative Concepcion:**

There was a point in time, I think, a few years ago, where we were paying for food. But since I've been... this year we didn't pay for food. And last year, we didn't pay for food. Because we were getting like it just increased the volume of requests so much. And this year, we prioritize only funding large scale events with lots of with a lot of attendees. And usually we were funding things that were critical to making the event happen. So a lot of the things like either room booking or something or some sort of like marketing materials. And then I will say that a lot of events that we did funded have like a DEIB specific focus, and a lot of the times they were using the food vouchers from the PRCC. So that's kind of how we were able to navigate that, but we decided not to do food because it was it was just leading to like, there was no way we could prioritize which organizations to like support, given that there were so many increase in like, requests for our co-sponsorship.

37:43

**Representative Miller:**

Interesting. Okay, thank you. And then for point of discussion for this kind of unrelated. I again, in agreement of that, because you've seen especially like this year, all this news to me that GPSA may be the only like student governing body that does support food, we've started to see, specifically undergraduate focused organizations come to us as well, given that technically RSOs are open everybody. But we do like to see things that are a little more graduate student focused. And so that's what we're starting to see happening. And it'd be better if we can push some of the heat off of to UPAC, so that we can switch to a model that is more funding towards more mission critical objectives, rather than that, given our budget is relatively small for the price of many things. And then the very last thing going off of to what Representative Nevil’s comments were about how Student Enrichment is defined and explained, is there any way that we can open up a conversation, or at least over the next few weeks, bring forward an amendment to the handbook or whatever procedure to add in some sort of like explanation of what the Student Enrichment mean? Because I don't think that it's an enrichment if somebody who hosts an event and then also eats with their guests, rather than that. And honestly, if you leave it up to interpretation, that means that if we ever have food, no students can eat because that's reaching students.

39:09

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, I would add to that and say... I was going to state that I think we definitely can have that conversation. It's definitely a UPAC-oriented policy conversation, but then also the handbook itself, where we could clarify because we technically supersede UPAC, but having the discussion that would be critical. One thing that I would also state in relation to this is that it would be extremely helpful to have any data or research or examples from other institutions as to what they contribute to general food funds. Because the difficulty, at least from the GPSA side, even the data that you all have in terms of how many requests that you got for food and the expenditures that you might typically spend annually. I think that could be really a good starting point, logistically, once this process, if this were to play out, we would motion to amend the amount to add the line item ourselves dependent on. Right, I personally do not have the bandwidth to pursue. Besides, you know, asking Trevor, I can't guide that policy decision right now, just with my bandwidth. But I think this is something that's really important, student engagement is declining across the board, especially with events. Food brings people out, and it also gives them something to eat. I think it's a win-win personally, in my mind, but if anyone decides to delve into that, if you have that statistics and data from the UPUA and GPSA side, that makes what we potentially could do and argue a lot easier, because we know that there's demand, it's just a matter of affirming how much that demand is and how much we need to you know, appropriate, so it's not just a random number. Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

And this is like a like a PSA. On the GPSA side, I'm the one with all that data. So for UPUA and UPAC. If somebody wants to reach out to me, we can get a little task force together and get some numbers. And I guess, just like the my final comment on this to specifically what Representative Nevil said we're getting into a weird territory at worst if we're pro-student for $15 an hour but then being like you can't eat at the event. That's just a weird like, territory of the simultaneously being like pro-student and like, anti-student if you will. I understand why the policy has morphed the way it is, but to look at student workers and not like give some people food and not others it's just an optically it's not good.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I’ll motion to reinstate the rules. So we'll now move back into discussion with Representative O'Toole.

42:13

**Representative O’Toole:**  
Nora O’Toole, UPUA President. Maybe to add more context into why UPUA never funded food and this could help the overall conversation. On our larger scale, I think for University Park Fee Board and UPUA, our budget is to enhance student life through programming and advocacy. And by co-sponsoring events. We make that programming and advocacy possible, but I just don't ever think I really or UPUA saw food as a means or requirement to do that. And while it does enhance the event, I strongly believe it shouldn't be the main reason or aspect to the programming that's being done. So that's kind of why we don't fund food. I have seen, I do recognize there is an engagement problem. But I have seen a lot of events, students showing up taking the food and leaving in no means engaging into the programming that's been done. And so I do I do think there is an avenue for food that can enhance the programming, it's there's not really a good way that's being done right now. And unless there's another solution or better approach proposed, I don't think that food should be funded.

43:37

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Seeing no further discussion will now close to the floor for discussion and you will now move into line item 6.D which is a review of the Lion’s Pantry this will be our final standing funding appropriation. Chief Budget and Planning Executive Kurtz, you'll have five minutes to introduce this and we'll move into questions and discussion following.

43:58

**CPBE Kurtz:**

Lion’s Pantry has demonstrated major adaptations to their facilities under the recommended appropriations each year, just this past two fiscal years they've installed top shelf shelving and they had a full facility renovation. They added a freezer and cooling spaces with freezers and refrigerators throughout their facility. And they have ongoing plans and projects they wish to commit as well. They also do acknowledge the movement of the increase students staff wages, that is not recommended in their requested appropriation, however, Lion’s Pantry has been requesting flat funding for the past like three years now. And we have seen that they do take part in a lot of cost-sharing a lot of external funding, and somehow they are dealing with their decision to request flat funding and they're doing it very adequately. So all in all the Lion’s Pantry is expanding on campus, their outreach, their social media presence, their ability to spread awareness has been increasing. And we have noticed an increasingly positive reaction and feedback from the Penn State community with the adaptation of the Lion’s Pantry. So under that they have requested the usual $196,700. And we as the board recommend that same appropriation for fiscal year 26.

45:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, well, now moving to questions, I will start off with a point of privilege, however, with Administrative Liaison, Bram. Can you elaborate on the quote, that, I think Heide and the team wrote related to student wages where it says, “the team will support that recommendation without requesting an increase to student wages”? It's kind of contradictory. They say they acknowledged the movement to $15.

46:04

**AL Bram:**

I don’t know, sorry.

46:07

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, we can definitely clarify.

**Al Bram:**

Do you want me to ask them?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yea, that would be ideal. Right. Yeah. Well, I'm gonna motion to reconsider, because I would like to get clarification on that first. \*Second.\* Okay. Awesome. So this is reconsidered. I'm hoping if we have an answer, we can suspend the rules to review this specific action item. However, until we get that it's tabled. And then we can move into action item 6.E through I. What I'm going to do is I'm going to motion to suspend the rules again, which personally is not ideal, but I understand the need to do this. To just explain the wage classification scale and how these determinations were made. \*Seconded\* The rules have been suspended. And we will review this instead. And we'll strike this topic from the line item of the chair discussion. Okay, so with the university classification scale that we've been pursuing, and in line with the general costs, one thing I wanted to point your attention to is that Ithaca and State College were the most comparable and cost of living, which is it makes sense given that Cornell and of course the other universities comprise a lot of the local economy. And then State College, obviously, we know that the cost of living is increasing. With food and groceries, you can see the statistics, these were published in 2023. So this was the closest and accurate representation that I was able to get. You can see the percentage variations that exist within this chart, I of course, will send this out to you all. So you're able to see this in more detail. But just starting off, we can see that health cost, housing costs, food and groceries are, of course more expensive, thus impacting students more intensively, you can see it also compared to the national average, which of course, we don't necessarily align with, obviously, especially the health and the housing aspects are noticeably a little larger and variation. The synthesis to this, when we're considering the cost-of-living differences, the research that was undertaken was interesting, because we do have State College, which is very unique, insulated. So it was very difficult to be able to find a city or town that was comparable with the same standards, higher education. This was the closest that I could find the comparison being 95.4 and then 93.6, which is State College, and then Ithaca respectively. So obviously, the cost of living is higher in State College. The main thing that propelled this effort, I think, was we did receive a lot of requests that were specifically asking for like $13 and $12 an hour. So with the consideration of the implications, I know that we're not reviewing the larger units now. But what I will say is that these are particularly alarming to me, because I don't think anyone has, you know, really done the cross referencing of cost of living and in comparison to student wages to support. I get that this is definitely a more you know, politicized kind of realm. And that makes perfect sense to me. What I will say though, is that my main priority... I will be honest, this was Chat GPT, but I did have a statistics friend assist with this adjustment. If your statistics you can re-check this work, but I'm really confident in how this was produced. But there's actually an adjustment factor for wage variations that exist. I think statistics is really cool. So there's a formula that exists, and essentially what this was able to do. So there's context is that this is what Cornell's student wage scale looks like. The reason why this was ideal was because very differentiation of level is vague enough that it allows the unit leads to make their own decisions as to where they would place students. So for example, if there was a returning student, they could increase to a level two, which would then result in an increase in their wage if they are continuing and returning students, not only for retention purposes, but also just for recruitment as a whole, to get those students in the door, as a piece of contextual information, just so everyone's aware, there's been a lot of discussion about the issue of you know, there's other places on campus that, you know, we'll pay less. That's awesome. That's, that's fantastic. I hope that they will pay more, but we are not other places on campus. This is a student centric service that's supporting students. And I do want to remind everyone that the idea and the point is to make that push with the ability that we have, given that we employ around 4000 students, so units that don't pay that pay less, they will have the choice to okay, we realize that we are recruiting students, I mean, McClanahans pays $10. So you're getting paid an extra $2 or $3, to do research, or something else. I mean, I think there's an issue with that, especially with the statistics. So I will say that even though that there is institutional pushback, clearly, I mean, with kind of the implications that might arise elsewhere. That's the point ultimately, and I don't think that can form us into a specific box. So again, nothing about this is solid. But I did want to showcase kind of where this came from, in the percentage differences for the cost of living, given that. And obviously, I'll share this in more detail based on what Cornell defines their classification as which was based on the cost of living as well. So they did back that up with the statistics of the New York minimum wage, but also just the cost of living in Ithaca. The variations that would exist for Penn State would reflect that, it wouldn't necessarily be the most dramatic increase, but it would reasonably account for the variation that exists between the 93.6% and the 95.4%. Which is, again, you'll notice the difference $15 to $16.75. For level one, for example, the variation of this for Penn State will be $15.29 to $17.07. If you are adjusting it for inflation, and then cost of living in State College, which is similar, of course, to how Ithaca demonstrates their need and how they classify their student wages. So, you know, this is obviously the equation, so the cost of living index, and then the Ithaca cost of living, and then the living index of State College when they did and, I mean, if you know, math, I mean, I mean, AI did it so I mean, pretty sure it's accurate, and my statistics friends assistant within confirming. But feel free to double check that. Pretty sure it's accurate. And that's ultimately something that I think we will be discussing maybe board in the future, but I did want to offer explanation as to how they go about the retention aspect, and then the recruitment aspect and that's how they get students through the door. So we are vastly behind what would allow a student to be able to support themselves when it comes to food, health, and housing, ultimately, is I think the main argument here, as to whether or not this could fully be adopted isn't necessarily something that I am focused on primarily, this is just a push that we're trying to bring people in. I know that there's a lot of administrative factors that play a role into this. But hopefully that offers more context. With this, I thought it would be most prudent to showcase increases for our student staff that we will be hiring and as well as a contractual extension for Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, which we will be discussing later on once we get into that actual action item level, because there was reasoning behind this, but I did want to show you all I mean, just the fact that level three is, you know, $16, even if you still allow people to have level one or level two, just based on the talent and skill sets that students have, I just don't find it from my chair perspective, specifically, or my personal perspective of a representative if you're not find it appropriate, that we pay students less than, you know, a mathematical reinforced cost of living. With that being said, since we are in suspension of rules, we can open it up to any questions that anyone might have. I saw Representative Nevil’s hand first, and then Johnson, Chandler, Zebrowski, Miller.

56:13

**Representative Nevil:**

Can we get a copy of this document?

56:15

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yea, I can send it now. Again, it's it. I mean, it is the math is Chat GPT So you can look at everything else, essentially. But, yes, so I'll send this actually now. I think it’s prudent that I sent it now. Moving back into questions, Representative Johnson.

57:07

**Representative Johnson:**

At-large Representative Johnson. Your presentation, just so I'm clear, covered hiring wages at the various levels, right, minimum. And I think it also maximum, you're hiring wages, not living wages because there is a key distinction and terminology there. What we're considering this is hiring wages, and discussion goes relative to geographic locations versus living wages. I just wanted to clarify that question.

57:33

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yea, I would say in response. I think that for the consideration of this, I perhaps it would be helpful as point of privilege for you to clarify, or kind of your delineation question.

57:53

**Representative Johnson:**

Thank you, because I didn't even listen. I know you mentioned you know, there's a bit of discrepancy here related to the mathematics of it all. And I appreciate that I appreciate the work of you and AI and whoever else contributed to this presentation. But um, I appreciate the mathematics. But let's also look at facts, right. Living Wage is defined as for an individual, regardless of children, their ability to sustain a life, you know, cover food costs, health costs, et cetera. And when you look at information from United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, we know that, I believe, living wage to sustain life in Pennsylvania is $13.60. Whereas in New York, it is $15. So we account for that. That's how people usually determine these things as like what is a sustainable wage to promote in terms of policy in order to really ensure that students or anyone's life is sustainable, right, is able to live comfortably that is well above the poverty wage as well above anything we're considering. When we when we talk about $15 Minimum Wage institution, though and I realize a lot of individuals on campus are heavily in favor of this. Yes political issue but for young people, they love it. Because, hey, more money when you're cash strapped I get it. But look at this realistically look at facts, not just arithmetic, but also what qualifies...

59:28

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Vice Chair Chandler, Zebrowski and then Miller.

59:38

**VC Chandler:**

There are studies that state that students who are hired at their university have higher satisfaction with their university experience. We have seen that, unlikely McClanahan’s that pays a $10 wage... \*indistinguishable\*.... And so it's driving students to be hired off campus. And so it is an institutional goal to retain students to be renewed within the university to increase their satisfaction.

1:00:25

Chair Rodriguez:

Zebrowski, Miller and then D’Elena.

1:00:37

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So this the, I guess, what are we voting on for this? Just the notion that UPFB student workers would be paid those numbers?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

We would increase by $1. And then I'll explain in discussion, more introduction, the context behind Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, she just has to leave the room when we move into that.

1:01:01

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Okay. Because I had in regard to in regards to her contract, there may or may not be some more discussion on that, depending on like how it's described. Well, with this, I guess what consideration to the optics of giving UPFB student workers slightly more money than are pushed to just get the $15 an hour like, obviously, we know that that's like a policy decision that works among everybody else. But there is optically this weird issue where the leadership is getting like a little bit more money. And as we recently saw with one person who gave themselves a salary increase where everyone else lost out, there was little like political pushback. So I guess, how are we navigating this? Is this a concern? Like, what are we what are we doing?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so I would say recruitment has been an issue. So even when we were, you know, it was a struggle to find and identify students who'd be willing to invest the time. So first of all, just recruitment as a whole, and also ensuring that we have reason to keep them back. Because the whole point is that if the students that have come in as like a junior or sophomore, we would then allow that to, for retention purposes, gradually increase based on potentially the levels etc. Since we started at $15. I mean, the point, especially with the living classification, which I do have other thoughts on separately, but it does go from $15 to $17. And then I again in discussion will explain the level two classification of how I went about it. This isn't like solid, this was not voted on. This is just explaining the mentality of if we are making this push, we can remain at $15, which we had throughout the past fiscal year, but at least for fiscal year 25 and 26, the increase at least would remain the same unless they decided to change it. But I'm counting for fiscal year 25 and 26, as we move forward, because we'll have to build on the internal operating budget for fiscal year 26, as well. But hopefully, this provides contextual information as to, at least in my mind, when forecasting what wages to pay the students, this would be an appropriate starting point, because we are slightly above the minimum of what we are asking people to hire at. And we're also demonstrating that it's okay to, you know, if people are staying in if you need to retain individuals. This is a way that, you know, units and offices were able to do it throughout the years, if that makes sense. Representative Miller.

1:03:37

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President, I guess one of my questions... two questions, actually, one of them is we'd be dispersing this document to people as part of this level system?

1:03:52

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Eventually.

1:03:55

**Representative Miller:**

And then, are we going to be like considering the differences between, I guess, the living wages of like undergraduate students versus graduate students? Or do we want to like maintain it just be completely just the students?

1:04:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Well, actually, what Cornell does is for level four, this is where they keep graduate students. So it ranges from 17 to 25. Okay, for level four, and what we were told was 23 for graduate assistance with like, the what was common for my understanding Administrative Liaison Bram, that's the graduate students $23 an hour is that we...?

1:04:31

**AL Bram:**

We actually made a mistake then. So I don't know. I have to figure out.

1:04:35

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I know, some of the units like how do you hire grad students for hourly wages?

1:04:41

**Representative Miller:**

Yet, I know at the very least for what I've seen over, I guess, like all the students that I've talked to who are hired by the university or hiring some level around $20. It's really what graduate students are like taking that as like, this is good enough to do what I needed to do. So that I do appreciate the classification of like, grad students at the fourth level.

1:05:03

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. And that's just how...

**AL Bram:**

You were right.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Okay, cool. All right, so $23. And again, I just wanted to elaborate. I will say that with the cost of living and other things, Penn State is like insulated in a valley and poor students are being pushed out of downtown to be blunt, and being forced to move like 10-20 minutes off campus, rely on buses, etc. And that's a consistent problem. And wealthier students are able to reside downtown, leading to fewer obstructions. The students that are typically working from, you know, I think just discussions are the ones that obviously need the money to pay for their education. So I would keep that in mind as well, with the delineation that exists here, because I want to make that very clear, especially since State College is an anomaly within Pennsylvania as a whole, locally. Representative D’Elena and then we can move forward.

**Representative D’Elena:**

Point of Inquiry. Are we in questions or discussions?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Questions. Okay, we can move into discussion on this. What I would say though, is I would like to introduce these, do questions based on that, and then discussion. If there is discussion that events something, what I'm going to motion for is that you consider line items 6E through I in the single motion so that we can do questions and discussion collectively.

**Representative Concepcion:**

Point of Inquiry. Are we taking a vote on this?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes.

**Representative Concepcion:**

Okay, with those present, do we have quorum?

1:06:46

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yes. Representatives D’Elena?

1:06:47

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. Kind of go back to the referendum before we settled on the support that we received. Last time we did a referendum was in 2021. And we received 500 more yes votes for the $15 minimum wage than the divestment, which was the one referendum, there was a lot of support for it. It's really nice, despite the fact that it was arguably what I was kind of getting or when we were tabling, it was a more politically salient issue than the divestment. So the fact that it kind of paired very well was very much on track even shows more, or is slightly being politically salient. Also kind of, to another representative’s point, you know, why are we saying do it $15, but meanwhile, we're paying our people more, I think it's because the University Park Fee Board should be kind of viewed as, like the next step moving the status quo of kind of like, you know, alright, if people were saying that makes $15. That's our next step. It's not, we're not going to do it right now, for all, you know, universal minimum wage jobs. But you know, maybe that's a couple of years down the line, because we haven't entered $15 or more. And, you know, we're slowly moving that the rest of university is just moving that way. So it's kind of moving the status quo. And if we stay at $15, and everyone else is gonna save $15. So I understand the point 100%, but we're viewed as the next point on that.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

But I will now ask that we reinstate the rules. I make a motion.

1:08:14

\*Second\*

Okay. And we will consider this Chief Administrative Executive Alexander, will you leave the room? Okay. So I'll go into the discussion first, but ultimately, or introduction first, what Representative D’Elena said was, I think encapsulates a lot of the concept behind gradually increasing again, I hope what I'm saying makes sense in terms of if we approve this, this will also be able to go into effect when I reintroduce our internal operating budget for fiscal year 26. So that's my main consideration right now two years in advance, I do think fiscal year 25, raising that to $16, makes sense whatever the next board decides to do, if they modify that fiscal year 26 appropriation they can do so. But I want to make sure that there's at least a foundation for that recruitment. If we go through all of the percentages, it ultimately $1 ahead pans out to 6.6% for wage increase. This is the term that they would be effective for so our last meeting and then the last meeting of the next board. Moving into before we go into other discussion or questions with line items 6.H the consideration of an extension for Chief Administrative executive Alexander, to be quite blunt, we have nobody returning from the Executive Committee. She is the only source of institutional knowledge that we will have to help guide our processes that we did this year and ensuring that they're executed appropriately. The amount that is reflected there will reflect a larger managerial role. She's the one that's spearheading training for the board as a whole. In setting that up, she's the one that will guide the, you know, help guide the Executive Committee with the other students, staff members. And she also knows our processes. So instead of the dollar increase, it was $2 increase, and she will only be remaining until the end of December. So 10 hours a week until the end of December, we negotiated the importance. She has a high course load, but she's willing to, you know, invest time for 10 hours to make sure that the UPFB is functioning properly. And then with line item 6.I, by the time that she leaves, this would be effective for fiscal year 25. It would be a rehiring process, and we would lower that to $16 an hour. We’ll now move into questions. Seeing no questions will now move into discussion. Representative Miller,

1:11:02

Representative Miller:

Lawrence Miller, GPSA President, I would push back about calling it a 20% performance evaluation, I will call it an addendum to duties or something and just have that increase just be towards the $16. Because if I'm taking over, for example, Rayna’s spot or the Chief Administrative Executive spot, and the first thing I see like, oh, we just decrease my wage by $2. That's already disheartening, versus saying like there's a base of $16 and then there's because of this extra work or whatever that we've written into her contract, she got the extra $2 because of this training thing, I think would look better optically.

1:11:38

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah. Okay, yeah, um, I'll motion to make that amendment into strike “performance evaluation” with language that you provided. If you can summarize that, so we can or if you want to speak into the minutes?

1:11:57

**Representative Miller:**

So basically, like striking it striking $15 to $18 and replacing it with $15 $16 in line with 6E-G and then changing replacing the words “performance evaluation” to something like...

1:12:29

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So when you say a contractual extension, is she literally under contract until April 26?

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Yeah, so what that's when were you like are aiming to terminate the student staff and then bring on the new ones.

1:12:45

**Representative Miller:**

It's like a new extension of duties. That's the thing.

1:12:47

**Representative Zebrowski:**

So I guess we're... on the Penn State HR side, I think we're like combining two different things, on the Penn State HR side, does she need to have her contract extended? Or can she just not leave the position?

1:13:03

**AL Bram:**

I just wouldn't terminate her and I think that there's a way to change pay.

1:13:08

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'm just gonna strike that language. And I think we can just explain $15-$18 and adopt your amendment that you stated within the minutes to reflect that. And it's accepted us friendly, and then we can rectify that in the minutes... it was Concepcion and then D’Elena.

1:13:37

**Representative Concepcion:**

Giselle Concepcion, UPUA appointee. I'm completely in favor of this. And specifically, I think we've had a lot of issues in the past fee boards about just I think, the entire reason we needed a strategic planning, Strategic Planning Task Force in general, was because you just really needed a higher level of understanding knowledge and support. And so making sure that we can have that in the coming years is really important. Secondly, I would also like really like to emphasize, Representative D’Elena’s point about like being somewhere to have a direction towards. UPUA, when doing this advocacy, needs something to leverage I need something to like, sort of exemplify in order to get any make any progress with administrators. And that's the thing that we've seen this year, every time that we go with something that's already existed, that they can adopt and expand upon we are received much better than when we go and we just have like a conceptual idea that we'd like them to implement. So I think having this as an exemplar of what it would look like to really be incentivizing and pushing on, like robust student work with adequate pay is really important. And I think moving in this direction is where we need to be going so I just thought those are my points.

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Representatives D’Elena.

1:14:46

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. In addition to that, as well, you know, I was having a conversation with someone that's interested in the position, she you know, she's currently weighing whether or not she wants to be an appointee, or excuse me at large or student staff worker, and she says that she already gets paid $15 at her current job while she works on campus. But if there was an increase for some of the salary jobs, she would feel more comfortable leaving that job to come work here for the fee board as soon as that position, so it's just extra incentive an issue to recruitment as well. This is a pretty high level job and it should be paid. It's such an offer additional work Representative Concepcion said.

1:15:24

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Is there any further discussion? Representative Zebrowski.

**Representative Zebrowski:**

Dallas Zebrowksi, GPSA representative. So I'm not going to comment on like the leadership role of this pay thing, because I think that's getting off topic in regard to Rayna specifically. She deserved, like the $18 an hour to continue working like she did a great job, she deserved it. What I would like, though, is that after Rayna’s departure, in that interim, we create some sort of document to really justify that that drop from $18 to $16. Because well, I guess it will go back to the leadership thing, what I'm concerned will happen with the with the demographic cliff, and the projections of just lower enrollment, is that administration is going to push back and there's going to be less funds to like distribute to student workers, because there's less enrollment, like the whole thing is just kind of kind of spiraled out. And I think we could be like, a philosophical, like, goal to go towards. But I think when people start looking at budget sheets, that's going to break down very quickly. So with that said, I think that we need to, in our particular instance, really need to justify this jump to $18 and then dropped to $16, with like, hardcore evidence of why specifically, what Rayna specifically is bringing to the board, and then why a new person coming in can't necessarily fill that role in the interim, like in the immediate, but then over time, could go back to it. Because, yeah, I think that if we run into the issue, where administration is not going to bump up more than $15 and hour we are really telling with a pull with an optically bad political situation of paying internal Fee Board people more than the student workers are getting, and it just kind of stops, like the process just stops to get that more money. So that's my point.

1:17:42

**Chair Rodriguez:**

Miller, D’Elena. And then I'm gonna close discussion.

1:17:48

**Representative Miller:**

Lawrence Miller GPSA President, reinforcing what Representative Zebrowski just said, that's what I'm saying, for not doing performance evaluation to saying this is what your directl. These are those direct duties for $16 an hour she is doing this much more in this form of training and have my institutional knowledge to make sure that the next board is up for whatever that's going to be. That's what the $2 extra is worth. And so now we have some sort of a documented history of what is an increase to performance or like, what doesperformance actually mean? Above and beyond the duties of the task?

1:18:22

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I completely agree. My response and solution is I can add an MOU to our internal operating budget proposal for fiscal year 26, that stipulates those exceptions. Representative D’Elena.

1:18:35

**Representative D’Elena:**

Hayden D’Elena, UPUA Appointee. I'm not against this idea, I think it's actually a very good idea. But to me, like, you know, going and reference the 6.I know, between the 16-18. Imean, like that's, I don't think that's totally uncommon in the real professional world, where, you know, the where my mom has been working with our vinyl record, let's pick one for 30 years, for example. And, of course, your wage went up not only with the cost of living, but because she did a good job and because she's staying in the same position. But if they were to rehire in the same position, they wouldn't be taking on, you know, my mom's salary, for example, they would go back to a lower level. That person would have to work for good credence and credit. You get that. So I think that what's happening here, I don't think this has to be an overly long explanation. I think, you know, people should be able to say, oh, you know, Rayna not only did a phenomenal job, but she was here for so long. So that's why she got an increased pay as well. I don't think it's that stark of a difference beyond.

1:19:31

**Chair Rodriguez:**

I'll clarify that in the MOU. We have to move forward with voting. But I am going to close discussion and we will move into a roll call vote for live action items is E through I. As Vice Chair Chandler will explain a vote yes is to approve this motion, vote no is to decline this motion, this motion. Vice Chair Chandler, you may begin.

\*Vice Chair Chandler conducts roll call vote, and it is passed.\*

1:20:48

**Chair Rodriguez:**

So Action Item 6E through I passed as amended. And we will now move into line item six of the chair report and discussion. I explained the implication. I already explained the implications of dollar campus minimum wage for you all to have and consideration. For fiscal year 2026 deliberation schedule, we're going to keep next Friday with the flat funding proposals. And we're adding an additional proposal that will be more intensive so that we're able to break that up fairly and equitably. And also to ensure that discussion is able to be spread out amongst the time period in which we have these discussions. So make sure that you focus on the agenda, we will try to get those sent out on Sunday instead of Monday. So you have a whole you know, five days to review the materials. And I now stand for questions. Okay, seeing no questions, we'll now move into line item eight of executive committee reports. Are there any executive committee reports? Okay, seeing no executive committee reports. We'll now move into line item 10 comments for the good of the order. Are there any comments for the good in the order? See no general comments will now move into line item 11 of closing roll call by sheer Chandler and you may begin whenever you're ready.

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

1:23:50

**Chair Rodriguez:**

And I hereby adjourn this Friday, March 29. Meeting at 10:27am. Have a great weekend. I hope you have a great rest of your Friday as well. Thank you.