

# **Student Fee Committee**

## **Meeting Agenda**

Thursday, January 16, 2025 | 5:00 p.m.

Agriculture Science Room, LaSells Stewart Center | [Zoom](#)

### **I. Call to Order at 5:07 p.m.**

### **II. Roll Call**

- a. Sophia Nowers, *SFC Chair* - **present**
- b. Saegis Abbott, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- c. Lillian Goodyear, *Vice Chair* - **present**
- d. Dylan Perfect, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- e. Connor Chen, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- f. Madison Wusstig, *Member-at-Large* - **present**
- g. Katelyn Banks, *ASOSU Liaison* - **present**
- h. Kayla Ramirez, *Basic Needs Center Liaison* - **present**
- i. Angelo Arredondo, *Family Resource Center Liaison* - **present**
- j. Noah Roberts, *Memorial Union Liaison* - **present**
- k. Oliver Devereux, *Performing Arts Liaison* - **present**
- l. Emma Flick, *Recreational Sports Liaison* - **present**
- m. Sarah Khan, *Student Experiences & Engagement Liaison* - **present**
- n. Audrey Schlotter, *ASOSU President (ex-officio)* - **present**

### **III. Land Acknowledgement**

Let it be acknowledged that Oregon State University in Corvallis is located within the traditional homelands of the Marys River or Ampinefu Band of Kalapuya. Following the Willamette Valley Treaty of 1855, Kalapuya people were forcibly removed to reservations in Western Oregon. Today, living descendants of these people are part of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon and the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians. Indigenous people are valued, contributing members of the Oregon State community and represent multiple sovereign tribes among students, faculty, staff and alumni.

**Gallery Comment:** Up to 2 minutes per gallery member per item of business. Ensure that we are keeping within our time boundary. Committee members can motion to enter into a Gallery Comment on an item. Do not cede your time to the gallery. All public comment should be addressed to the Chair and there is a sign up

**IV. Approval of the Agenda**

- a. **Katelyn Banks** motioned to switch the presentations of SEE and ASOSU, seconded by **Noah Roberts**.
- b. **Saegis Abbott** motioned for an addition of 1 minute per member for opening comments, seconded by **Dylan Perfect**.

**V. Approval of the Minutes**

- a. **Kayla Ramirez** moved to amend the minutes during the Basic Needs Center presentation. The minutes have been amended.

**VI. Member Comments**

- a. **Saegis Abbott:** I would like to thank everyone for coming out to this meeting. Remind that each of us are representatives that are backed by the students, we have the obligation to represent what the students have sent us here to do. For myself a lot of students have sent me here, so if I am voting making comments a lot of that is opinions of my constituency.
- b. **Dylan Perfect:** I apologize for being late.
- c. **Angelo Arredondo:** I know we usually do this at the end, but in case we run out of time, I just want to thank everyone who made this possible, the staff who set everything up and our clerk for taking notes at the meetings.

**VII. Final Budget Proposal Deliberation**

*Each unit will have a total time allocation of 30 minutes, with the first 15 minutes used for questions and discussion by the committee, the next five minutes for public comment, and the remaining 10 minutes for committee discussion.*

a. **Family Resource Center**

- *Operating Budget*
- *Decision Package 1: Increased Student Childcare Assistance*

Committee Questions and Discussion

- i. **Amy Luhn:** We sent you the requested information, which was the wage information as well as the pay that was associated with the student employee positions. Are there any questions about that?
- ii. **Erika Woosley:** For the increase in student-based wages, the Family Resource Center, validated by FSS, determined that raising wages to \$17.10/hour with standard OPE adjustments would require an additional \$13,783, or \$0.20 per student per term. We are not seeking additional funding beyond the proposed 3.5% base budget increase. OLV student workers are getting \$1 more per hour for additional duties, including two hours a week of peer-to-peer mentoring, helping find resources or training opportunities, and managing the OLV centers when professional faculty are out.
- iii. **Dylan Perfect:** This is more of a consideration than a question. Since we're discussing wages, it might help to handle this as a specific item, like in the last deliberations, instead of weaving it into each unit presentation. After this presentation, I might motion for that to provide clarity. I also want to emphasize this isn't about competing with operational expenses but addressing each unit's needs first and revisiting this later. For the FRC, I'm convinced both the base budget and decision package are worthwhile. Childcare is critical and underfunded, so I'm inclined to support both.
- iv. **Emma Flick:** I am really inclined to support your decision. I did more research into childcare in Oregon, and I think it is powerful that we are able to support the FRC. I am very inclined to support you and this organizations choices.
  - a. **Noah Roberts** motioned to move to public comment, **Connor Chen** seconded.

Public Comment

- i. *There were no public comments to be made.*

- ii. **Noah Roberts** motioned to end public comment; seconded by **Katelyn Banks**.

#### Committee Discussion

- i. **Sarah Khan:** This is a question for Dylan, could you clarify as to what you mean by having the discussion later?
- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** My thought was to discuss this with each unit alongside their decision packages. Since it's a common issue across units, it might make more sense to centralize the discussion. For example, I wouldn't see us setting a minimum for the MU but not for Student Experiences and Engagement. To keep it focused, we could add an item after the presentations to deliberate on this and make motions for the decision packages then. The side benefit I see is that if we focus on the merits of the unit operating budgets and decision packages during the presentations, we evaluate them in relation to each other without them being seen as competing with the wage discussion.
- iii. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Would it make more sense to do it individually during the unit presentations? There have already been budget managers that have said that they do not want this and are not looking to increase their ask?
- iv. **Sarah Khan:** Yeah, that was my concern too. It feels more like something that should be decided per unit rather than applied across the board for all units. I'm just wondering how that would fit, especially in terms of the agenda.
- v. **Noah Roberts:** I don't have an opinion one way or another. But I would remind you that we must be out of here by 10, so make sure that it is within those parameters.
- v. **Madison Wusstig:** I think units should have the freedom to decide where and how to increase their ask. From what I've gathered, our general consensus as an SFC is to keep student fees low but reasonable for students. If units aren't asking for an increase, I'm not sure it's our place as a committee to push for one.
- vi. **Dylan Perfect:** If students are calling for this, is it our role to advocate for it? Unequivocally, yes. I ran on a platform advocating for wage increases, and students voted for me based on that. This

body represents the student voice. Every student registered for summer or fall term received an electronic ballot, and of those who responded, 89.2% said yes to a wage increase to reflect FY25 cost of living. Now we're talking about FY26, applying the same adjustment. To me, this is a clear mandate from the students. As for the question about giving it to units that don't want it, respectfully, it's not about the units, it's about the student workers. They need wages that cover basic living expenses so they can continue their education. If wages don't rise with rent and other costs, students may have to make tough decisions, like I did when I had to move out of my apartment. Lastly, it's been suggested we need a budget manager or SAB to propose the increase before considering it, but that's simply not the case. Per ORS 352.105, the recognized student government at each public university establishes the process for mandatory incidental fees, and we're an independent committee of that government. I will motion for what's in the best interest of our constituents and what aligns with the electoral mandate. This isn't about administrative preferences; it's about supporting student workers.

vii. **Madison Wusstig:** You brought up the election, and while it does represent student voices, fewer than 1,000 students responded to that ballot. It was also conducted during summer, when many students don't check their school emails. It didn't include incoming freshmen but did include students who have since graduated and aren't paying student fees now. So, it's not an entirely accurate representation of the student body. Regarding inflation and students struggling to afford basic necessities, I agree that livable wages are important. However, it's worth considering that increasing wages for student workers funded by fees also raises costs for all students, including those who don't work on campus or aren't paid through student fees. This increase affects everyone, not just those directly benefiting from higher wages.

viii. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I am not going to advocate one way or another. It might be interesting.

a. **Katelyn Banks** motioned to extend the discussion period by 5-minutes, **Saegis Abbott** objected.

- b. **Saegis Abbott:** Make it like a minute. There are a lot of opinions that can be shared and discussed but I would like to see more motions, given the fact we only have a limited amount of time.
  - c. **Angelo Arredondo:** We are spending time discussing if we are going to motion for something instead of actually doing it.
  - d. **Chair Sophia Nowers** amended the motion to finish the rest of the queue for a maximum of 2 minutes, seconded by **Katelyn Banks**.
    - i. *The motion carried.*
- ix. **President Audrey Schlotter:** What I was going to say is that, ideologically, whether wages are raised or not in this committee, it will still end up on the budget managers' desks, and it's their decision what to do with it. So, it might make more sense to leave it to them if they want to raise wages. I lost my train of thought.
- x. **Dylan Perfect:** I'll respond quickly. The idea that wage increases automatically raise prices is, respectfully, a tired argument and only applies on a very large scale. Decisions by this committee won't cause noticeable inflation, raising wages here is like a drop in the ocean. Studies show you'd need a significant wage increase within a sector for inflation to outweigh the benefits of higher wages. Marginal increases result in more take-home pay and effective value for workers. As for the cost of the fee, it's a system where 20,000 students each contribute a small amount, so when one student needs it, it's affordable. You can't bill one student the full cost of their job, it would essentially be a volunteer position.
- a. **Noah Roberts** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$22.43 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested Operating Budget of the Family Resource Center; seconded by **Connor Chen**.
    - i. *The motion carried with 12 ayes and 1 abstention.*
  - b. **Dylan Perfect** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$1.48 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #1 for the Family Resource Center; seconded by **Connor Chen**.

- i. The motion carried with **12 ayes** and **1 abstention**.*
- xi. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to add an agenda item after the last budget presentation, for the discussion of the proposed wage increase. **Emma Flick** objected, objection rescinded.*
  - a. **Emma Flick**: I'd say set the time for 9:55 to make sure we have enough time for comments and actually get out of here by 10. I think people here and the folks working in this building would really appreciate that.*
    - i. **Amendment adopted, seconded by Noah Roberts**.*
  - b. **Angelo Arredondo**: If this does not pass, do you plan to motion for every single unit? And can you clarify what a vote nay or yay may mean?*
  - c. **Dylan Perfect**: Yes, and I think that would just lead to the same kind of back and forth we had previously, which I'm trying to avoid.*
  - d. **Sarah Khan**: What would be the outcome or purpose of this discussion?*
    - i. **Dylan Perfect**: The idea is that if the committee wants to motion for this, I'd do it then, and we could address it collectively across the units. If the committee doesn't, we will just adjourn. Isolating it to the end allows us to focus on the other unit budgets without spending most of the time, like in the FRC presentation, talking about wage increases, which might not be as productive for other units.*
  - e. **President Audrey Schlotter**: It might make more sense to put it to happen right now. I think there are a lot of people here that came to talk about wages, and I do not want to have to keep budget managers here. I do not want to leave the most controversial thing to the end.*
    - i. **Dylan Perfect**: Have we resolved whether the President can object to motions?*
    - ii. **President Audrey Schlotter**: What was said was that it was irrelevant because there was already an opinion stating that I could make motions.*

- f. **Dylan Perfect:** I'm ambivalent about when we address this. I did see an advantage in addressing everything else first to dispel the notion that it's a competition between wage increases and other priorities. If everyone is approaching it neutrally and in good faith, maybe we will take a quick straw poll as a committee to decide?
- i. **Emma Flick:** In the interest in making sure all units have the full time. It would also be helpful in our discussions knowing that we have time to do that. Having it at the end would be beneficial. In respect of the unit presentation times and budgets.
  - ii. **Dylan Perfect:** I would like to proceed with my initial motion to have it at the end of the meeting, unless there is someone that objects.
  - iii. **Angelo Arredondo:** I agree that it should happen at the end to respect the items that each unit has.
    1. *Motion carried with **11 ayes and 2 nays.***
- g. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** moved to enter into a 20-minute recess, seconded by **Connor Chen**.

b. **ASOSU**

- *Operating Budget*

Committee Questions and Discussion

- i. **Nick North:** I sent you all a response from our SAB addressing other questions. It includes the student ticket committee's rationale for tickets and the data we used. On wages, I calculated what it would take to get two positions in SafeRide and advocacy up to \$17.10/hour, SafeRide drivers and advocacy interns. For SafeRide drivers, the increase would be \$0.15 per student, but we're not asking for it because drivers already receive a 20% premium on weekend nights. If they work one weekend a month, their average wage is around \$17.50, or \$17.80 if they work every weekend. For advocacy interns, we're restructuring to replace that position with a smaller team of peer advocates at a higher rate (around \$17.40-

\$17.50), so we don't need additional money for wages there either. Any questions?

a. **Dylan Perfect** motioned for a 5-minute reading period of the document; seconded by **Sarah Khan**.

- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** I appreciate you proceeding with that, especially since the process for getting this information has changed a bit. I understand you're not requesting it, and I'll save most of the broader conversation for later. But I wanted to clarify something for this unit specifically. The motion references \$17.10 as the base wage, with cost-of-living adjustments to avoid wage compression. Does this mean there would still be compression with the current calculation? And if the increase at the lowest level is included in the package, how much compression are we looking at? What would the highest wage be?
- iii. **Angelo Arredondo:** Are we asking questions just about this or anything? I asked about faculty senate last time. If you had all the slots filled, why are you asking for a reduction?
- iv. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Over the past few years, we haven't fully used the allocated amount. This year, we've outgrown how it's working. Historically, we've only used about a quarter of what's been allocated for Faculty Senate positions, so we're just trying to reduce spending where it's not being used.
- v. **Dylan Perfect:** I appreciate the answers, especially regarding the Office of Advocacy. I'm very curious about the broader model, as I was a few years ago. It's worth considering models with more autonomy, given the proximity of the Office of Advocacy to the same office it often helps students defend against. That said, I don't think this is something we'll be able to address tonight.
- vi. **Saegis Abbott:** I looked through all the numbers and compared the max usage or the game day with the most tickets used for each category. And went down through the request looking, and there was a couple that stood out as a little bit above what the max usage rate had been in the past. The first one was wrestling. I did not see a game that had more than 536 students at it. Is that correct? And in that case, there was a request for 2500 and I see a little bit of a discrepancy there. I think we heard some stuff about marketing,

but I was wondering, what the past, I guess, growth rates been, and is there a way to justify like a 400% increase in usage?

- vii. **Katelyn Banks:** We talked about the marketing plan and efforts to increase viewership for wrestling. Part of that means we need to provide enough tickets for them to grow their audience. If we only give them 500–600 tickets, they won't be able to increase viewership or participation in their efforts.
- viii. **Saegis Abbott:** Is wrestling allowed to move tickets from one game to another, or is it the same for each game?
- ix. **Nick North:** 2,500 per game, it is essentially a season ticket. I wanted to add a few things. The program has definitely shifted, I believe the committee's conversation was surrounding giving them a year to see if it holds water and then reconsider the amount next year. It is a very different program than it was in the past.
- x. **Saegis Abbott:** Okay, in that case, do they have a number of increases for that? Because right now it's basically requesting 400% increase over what was the max usage in the past two years. And that was really the question was on, can that level be justified?
- xi. **President Audrey Schlotter:** OSU athletics has changed a lot over the past year and a half. Last year, we entered an MOU that took athletics out of the student fee process and put it under this agreement. A committee with ASOSU and athletics representatives decided how many tickets to buy, and that's the number being presented today. This isn't about how many tickets we're buying now, it's about the overall athletics budget. For example, last year's Utah game had over 7,000 students attend, even though we only purchased about 6,200 tickets. Athletics has worked with us to provide more tickets at higher prices, as part of our relationship.
- xii. **Katelyn Banks:** We talked about how yes this is giving a lot to wrestling. This can be changed next year; this is not the end all be all. This is us giving them a chance to grow, they will not have the chance to implement the marketing strategy that they are looking to do.
- xiii. **Saegis Abbott:** I've been informed the current wrestling coach has been here since 2020, and the 536 attendance number is from 2022. I haven't seen a number above 500 since then, with 2023

attendance as low as 14 per game. I'd potentially consider going up to 1,000, which would double our best game in three years, but I'm not sure we could justify the cost.

- xiv. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I want to clarify that this committee isn't deciding on ticket numbers. If we wanted to decide that, then last year's SFC, Senate, president, and Board of Trustees shouldn't have approved putting athletics under the MOU or ASOSU buying tickets from the athletics department.
- a. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to extend questions for 5 minutes, seconded by **Saegis Abbott**. **Sarah Khan** objected, objection rescinded. **Emma Flick** objected. Objection rescinded.
  - b. **Sarah Khan:** Can we shorten that time?
  - c. **Emma Flick:** We still have 5 more unit presentations to be mindful of, please keep that in mind.
- xv. **President Audrey Schlotter:** This isn't an opportunity to debate ticket numbers, that was already decided by representatives from athletics and elected members through the MOU, which was approved by students last year and elected students this year.
- xvi. **Dylan Perfect:** There's a clear dichotomy between operational decisions and fiscal control, but it's subjective. If we just allocate \$35 million and call it a day, we're saying it's operational, but here we're saying specific tickets are already decided, it's operational. If we don't think the amount allocated matches the services received, cuts could be considered. Without a contractual agreement, as mentioned, athletics would need to accept reasonable cuts. I understand this might be controversial, but our fee is quite large. On another note, I wanted to address the Safe Walk program. I was disappointed to see it fall aside. The rationale mentioned high operating costs and low utilization rates, but to me, those issues are interconnected, one likely caused the other. This program came from a 2018 resolution by Senator Stephen Fox in the ASOSU Senate, who reached out to me, expressing disappointment. Many students feel uncomfortable using public safety escorts, finding them intimidating and conspicuous. I'd like to explore bringing back a scaled-down version of Safe Walk if demand is low, using fewer resources but still providing support for vulnerable students.

Additionally, I'd like to see more funding for the sustainability fund. Low utilization seems tied to the lack of an established allocation process, but investing in sustainability remains important. These are issues I think we should address alongside the upcoming wage discussions.

xvii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** ASOSU has a fund balance of about \$775,000, which is quite high. I know it's a holdover from the pandemic, but are there plans to spend it now?

a. **Nick North:** We have a few plans for the fund balance. The GTA position was an intentional spend-down, and \$100,000 is allocated to support sustainability initiatives like the micro-mobility program. Our goal is to keep fees down, reduce the budget, and absorb inflation costs to avoid adding to the balance. We're also open to exploring other options, like using it for larger equipment purchases or establishing equipment reserves.

xviii. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** *motioned to move into public comment; seconded by Noah Roberts.*

#### Public Comment

i. **Eliza Eckman, ASOSU Senator:** I wanted to address the athletic tickets. The MOU was created to allow discussion over ticket numbers, which were previously more out of our control. Now, with tickets directly under ASOSU, I believe SFC and the Senate have the right to debate the allocations. I was briefly on the committee deciding ticket numbers but was replaced, along with my teammate, by members from the athletics marketing team after expressing opposing views. To share some stats, only 19.79% of the 2,500 allocated seats for sports at Gill Coliseum have been used over the past two years. On Saturday, I also pointed out that we need to evaluate sports based on either historical usage or future projections. For gymnastics and wrestling, decisions seem based on potential future performance, but we haven't received this year's numbers, only past data. Judging these sports on inconsistent criteria doesn't seem fair.

- ii. **Emerson Pearson, ASOSU Senator:** I want to echo what Eliza said about ticket numbers. It's really concerning when we look at the historical usage. I also find it frustrating how, whenever an issue comes up, the response is often, "Well, this was already decided before you got here, and your job is just to approve it." Is this really a democratic process, or just ratification of what the units want? If the goal is to remove student input, it seems pretty effective based on Eliza's points. I haven't heard students advocating for these tickets, and we're told we can't touch it. Let's be real, are these tickets what students want? I'd say no. Students don't want to keep funding tickets that aren't being used. It's our obligation to reflect the actual benefit to students. I've never been to any of these games, and I know some students don't want to pay for something that doesn't benefit them. If we're being viewpoint neutral, this logic should apply to all items we consider, including wages.
- a. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to finish the rest of the queue at 2-minutes per speaker; seconded by **Connor Chen**.
- iii. **Katya Karlapati, ASOSU Senator:** The idea of looking at ticket sales this year and adjusting next year has already been said before, it's the same thing we heard last year. Yet, we're still facing the same issues of overselling, underselling, and overbuying. Since tickets are a significant part of the base budget, I think the SFC has a substantial right to vote on it and provide input on how many tickets are purchased. If we're not changing it this year because it's already decided, we should work to change it in the future.
- iv. **Shawn Durr, ASOSU Senator:** The sustainability fund was mentioned, and I'd love to share an idea for it, happy to discuss after the meeting or during deliberations next week. On tickets, everything said earlier is spot on. The "next year" approach is what we heard last year, and now we're back in the same spot, still discussing wages. It's frustrating to see no progress. Also, while we all like wrestling, do we really know 2,000 people who love it enough to justify overspending? We have the ability to address this.
- v. **Teaghan Knox, ASOSU Senator:** I agree we're not here to debate ticket numbers, but we are here to debate the budget. As a Senator, I don't feel comfortable voting on the ASOSU base budget

without modifying this figure based on the data provided. I've heard about increased marketing efforts for wrestling and other sports, but without current data to back it up, I can't support these numbers given the historical trends we've seen. Decisions should be based on the data available.

### Committee Discussion

- i. **Katelyn Banks:** I think Audrey's point earlier was about trusting the committees, like the one that handles ticket allocations, to have these discussions with students' best interests in mind. The process relies on trusting that these committees and SABs are working transparently and fairly, without hidden agendas. This is the first year the MOU has been in place, so naturally, there are rough patches. It's not perfect, but it's a learning process. As a committee member, I can say there are things to improve for next year, and everyone's input helps shape that.
- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** I'm generally on board with that, but it's hard to fully trust after the senator's testimony during public comment. This process is supposed to reflect our elected leaders bringing people together, but if selection criteria are based on the desired outcome, it's concerning. For example, a student-athlete elected by her peers and invested in this wasn't allowed to continue serving. Maybe I'm missing something, but that seems perplexing. As for ASOSU, it's the one unit where we have real operational control, which creates unique opportunities. Regarding athletics, I'll defer to anyone with a motion, but I'd like to see more funding for the sustainability fund. As I mentioned earlier, the low utilization is due to the lack of an allocation process. Since the initial \$100,000 seed funding was earmarked for micro-mobility, I think there's room to revisit and expand it.
  - a. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I appreciate all the work that's gone into this budget and that the athletic student ticket committee managed to reduce costs by \$181,000 from last year. After this discussion, it seems there may be room to decrease it further. Maybe the Senate will send the budget to mediation to renegotiate. Going forward, I think the ticket

committee should be established earlier in the year, take a more cohesive look at the numbers, and provide a formal report to the SFC and SAB to justify their decisions.

- iii. **Saegis Abbott:** Given concerns from constituents, senators, and others about athletic tickets and potential overspending, I recommend making a reasonable cut. A small cut wouldn't significantly impact the student experience, especially since the numbers I've reviewed are based on the highest usage rates. I propose cuts of \$800,000, \$500,000, or \$394,000 as reasonable options that wouldn't affect ticket usage based on the data I've seen.
- iv. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Thank you for the discussion, I really appreciate it. These comments would have been more useful at the SAB stage, where issues like Beaver Buddies, the sustainability fund, and athletic tickets could have been addressed earlier. Remember, student-athletes are students too, and they pay these fees. Many can't attend due to practice schedules, but they're impacted. Athletics had a 5.3% budget decrease, what other unit did that? Concerns about next year are valid, but this year's process was based on last year's SFC, Senate, and Board decisions. Undermining it now undermines their work. We can't keep delaying change, but it needs to happen in an organized way.
- v. **Emma Flick:** As an SFC member last year, I can say we aimed to put power in the hands of students, specifically ASOSU. Looking at the roll call of who participated in these deliberations and set budgets, I agree a more comprehensive report would be great moving forward. Since such a report wasn't presented, it makes sense to discuss this now.
  - a. **Chair Sophia Nowers** entertained a motion to recess for five minutes, **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** was moved, seconded by **Saegis Abbott**.
  - b. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** If you would like to motion for a reduction in the budget, we'd need to say an exact dollar amount.
- vi. **Katelyn Banks** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$71.89 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and

*Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget for ASOSU; objected by **Saegis Abbott**.*

a. *With no second, the motion failed.*

b. **Saegis Abbott:** I would like to make a motion first.

vii. **Saegis Abbott** *moved to enter a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of motion to suggest a fee level of \$64.49 in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget of ASOSU. This reflects about a \$500,000 cut to athletics; seconded by **Dylan Perfect**, objected by **Katelyn Banks**.*

a. **Katelyn Banks:** I do not think that is reasonable.

viii. **Angelo Arredondo:** What exactly are we voting on? Can I have those numbers in writing?

a. **Saegis Abbott:** Yes, so the number is \$64.49 which reflects about a \$7.40 cut per student per term. Reflective of cutting wrestling and gymnastic tickets down to a level that is matching with the maximum past usage plus a good amount for increase? I will send that in the chat as well.

ix. **Katelyn Banks:** What are the numbers exactly? How much total money?

x. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Could we get a calculation from FSS on how much \$7.40 is multiplied out by the number of students? It would be \$500,240.

xi. **Angelo Arredondo:** The \$64.49 reflects that you want to cut the athletics tickets? Or are you trying to cut something else?

a. **Saegis Abbott:** All cuts are directly to the athletics line items.

b. **Katelyn Banks:** So, this would be a cut for the overall budget, not for the specific tickets?

c. **Saegis Abbott:** Do you want to index number?

d. **Steve Hoelscher:** It probably be useful if you could make the motion in the way in broadly the area.

xii. **Saegis Abbott** *moved to enter into a binding roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$64.49 in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operational budget of ASOSU. This reflects a \$500,240 cut to MGV 360 ASOSU Athletic Tickets index on the budget; seconded by **Dylan Perfect**. **Katelyn Banks** objected, motion rescinded.*

- a. **Katelyn Banks:** I am concerned about the amount of time that we are taking up with this and the impact it may have on other units. There is a 5.3% decrease in our requested budget.
  - b. **President Audrey Schlotter:** This feels really janky to me. Has anyone seen the numbers written out? Can we take time for this? That is my plea. This feels very unreasonable. Especially as we do not have a representative from athletics here at the moment.
    - i. **Angelo Arredondo** motioned for a 5-minute recess to get the numbers, seconded by **Saegis Abbott**.
  - c. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** The proposal by Saegis represents a 15.04% reduction in the ASOSU base budget. Any motions
- xiii. Saegis Abbot moved to enter into a roll call binding vote to recommend a fee level of \$64.49 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget for ASOSU. This represents around a \$500,240 cut to the athletics line item based on a conservative estimate of reducing tickets down to historic usage rates plus a certain growth amount; seconded by Dylan Perfect. Objected by Noah Roberts.*
- a. **Noah Roberts:** We have very different opinions on the board right now, and I don't think we can, in good faith, reach a decision everyone agrees on. If possible, I'd recommend we officially suggest sending this to mediation. I don't think we have the authority to send it directly, but if we've spent this much time on it without resolution, I'm not sure more discussion will help.
  - b. **Angelo Arredondo:** So, in order to send the unit to mediation we have to reject?
  - c. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** We cannot send to mediation. We need to recommend a fee level to the Senate. It is not written that we can send things to mediation.
  - d. **Katelyn Banks:** I just want everyone to consider that this is also a negotiation with athletics. Depending on what we decide, athletics could push back, start selling tickets themselves, or allocate them elsewhere, which could result

in students having to pay for tickets. I feel like we're spiraling into something bigger than we can handle, and I think it's important to consider where this could lead.

- e. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Do you all know what happened when the Student Fee Committee defunded athletics at UofO? It led to student athletic tickets being taken out of student control, becoming a mandatory fee decided by administrators. If students want any autonomy over tickets, we need to be careful how we vote today. Secondly, I saw the numbers, this year, 871 people attended a wrestling event, and there were 15,000 unique users for student athletic tickets overall.
- f. **Emma Flick:** I also object. When making any sort of decision you must consult the stakeholders. I don't think that they can necessarily say they can represent all stakeholders in this decision. I would recommend that it goes to mediation.
- g. **Sarah Khan:** I also object, we also had an opportunity to address these concerns during SAB sessions, we had the opportunity to talk about this. It is important to remember that we are an echo chamber. Just a reminder especially when thinking about viewpoint neutrality.
- h. **Connor Chen:** We need everyone who is involved to be at the table.
- i. **Dylan Perfect:** I object on the basis that we may be taking too much time, and I think it is necessary to get to a vote to move on.
- j. **Saegis Abbott:** I continue with my motion.

*i. The motion failed with 4 ayes, 8 nays, and 1 abstention.*

xiv. **Katelyn Banks** moved to enter into a binding roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$71.89 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget of ASOSU; seconded by **Connor Chen**. Objected by **Saegis Abbott** and **Dylan Perfect**.

- a. **Saegis Abbott:** While there are comments about time, based on the initial deliberations, we intend to pass every other decision package and base budget left on the docket, which

could take about 15 minutes. This is the largest proposed cut to student fees or process change requested by multiple student constituents. I'm here to represent those student voices, many of whom aren't equally represented in student government. Yes, there's an echo chamber, but I'm not part of it. Frankly, I'm disappointed to see continued funding for things that, over the past five years, haven't delivered what students are paying for. Students won't tolerate that.

b. **Dylan Perfect:** It's concerning that a qualified woman was removed from the committee, seemingly for opposing athletics' goals. If there's evidence to disprove this, I welcome it, but paired with the fact that the athletics budget shifted to only cover tickets at the same amount as before, it seems the budget should have been lower. While there's been a reduction, we need to ensure this fee structure is justified. A decrease beyond 25% might backfire, so I won't second the motion. Let's proceed with the operating budget and let votes reflect our positions, but I hope someone follows up with the Senator to address this issue.

c. **Katelyn Banks:** I will continue with my motion.

i. *The motion passed with **5 ayes, 4 nays, and 4 abstentions.***

xv. **Dylan Perfect:** I would like to motion for a \$0 decision package. Changing MGV 310 from "Office of Student Governance" to "Student Government Advisor" would restore a system where funds went to student government, allowing them to negotiate with the Office of Student Affairs and the Dean of Students. This ensured advising avoided previous pitfalls, like conflicts of interest. This change wouldn't alter the advising model but would allow student government to set safeguards and negotiate position details before funds are transferred, giving them leverage rather than leaving all control with the Office of the Dean of Students.

xvi. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to propose a \$0 decision package for MGV 310, changing the "Office of Student Governance" to "Student Government Advisor"; seconded by **Saegis Abbott**. Objected by **Katelyn Banks**.

- a. **Katelyn Banks:** We're at 7:45 right now, and this isn't giving equal time to the other units. It's still unfair to spend so much time on this one unit when others also deserve discussion. Speaking for myself, I have questions for the other units, and we won't get to them if we keep focusing on this.
- b. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** Are there other objections? Seeing none we will go to a vote.
- c. **Angelo Arredondo:** What are we voting on exactly?
- d. **Dylan Perfect:** If you vote "yes," MGV 310 will be renamed to "MGV Student Government Advisor," as it was before being changed a few fiscal years ago. If you vote "no," it will remain "MGV Office of Student Governance," which is an administrative entity under the Dean of Students.
- e. **Nick North:** I am happy to work outside of this, I have no issue re-naming indexes.
- f. **Dylan Perfect:** I would maintain my motion because, legally, I believe it's important to specify how the index is defined when we pass it. Previously, the Office of the Dean of Students used the index as justification to say we couldn't decide where the funding went.
- g. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** The Office of Student Government does not exist, and there is no money transferred to the Dean of Students.
- h. **Dylan Perfect:** Point of Information, it is an office it is not under the Student Government constitutionally. It is not reorganizing an office; it is just changing a budget template that we are passing. We can have a decision package that alters an index.

*i. The motion **passes with 5 ayes, 3 nays, and 5 abstentions.***

xvii. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to raise the sustainability fund to \$10,000 for FY26; seconded by **Angelo Arredondo** for discussion purposes. Objection by **Katelyn Banks**.

- a. **Katelyn Banks:** I feel like we're monopolizing the time, particularly one person on this committee, and we're not

giving enough time to the other units. Everyone deserves a chance to contribute.

b. **Saegis Abbott:** Not addressing any individual members was in the decorum section that we all agreed to at the beginning.

c. **President Audrey Schlotter:** If we wanted to add money to the sustainability fund, it should have been done in the SAB.

i. *The motion failed with **5 ayes, 6 nays, and 2 abstentions.***

xviii. **Katelyn Banks** motioned to move all ASOSU discussion to the end of the meeting; seconded by **Saegis Abbott**, objected by **Dylan Perfect**.

a. **Dylan Perfect:** I had one more substantive motion, and I think it would prolong our meeting to bring up ASOSU twice.

b. *The motion **passed** with **11 ayes, 1 nay, and 1 abstention.***

c. **Performing Arts**

- *Operating Budget*
- *Decision Package 1: Travel Expense Reallocation*
- *Decision Package 2: BARD Theatre*
- *Decision Package 3: PRAX Student Ticket Accessibility*

Committee Questions and Discussion

i. **Chair Sophia Nowers** entertained motion to limit committee question to 10 minutes; **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** was moved, seconded by **Saegis Abbott**.

ii. **Olin Hannum:** We did ask FSS about the cost to increase, which would be about \$9,500 or 14.1 cents per student per term, about 1.4% of the overall budget. Was there a specific question about PRAX in addition to that?

iii. **Dylan Perfect:** I do not have any more questions at this time.

iv. **Noah Roberts:** With the two decision packages with no dollar amount, do we need to officially make a motion on those? So, would that be a zero-dollar decision package?

v. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** They were brought forwards in the SAB so yes. Do you anticipate an effect in the attendance by moving the Music à la carte event to PRAX?

- a. **Peter Betjemann:** That's a great question, but I can only answer anecdotally. We haven't tracked attendance for Music à la Carte. Attendance seems steady, but there's some debate about whether noon in PRAX is the best time and place for it. It's convenient for off-campus attendees since it's closer to parking, though not ideal. Since it's a program of the School of Visual, Performing, and Design Arts, not of PRAX, that decision ultimately rests with them.
- vi. **Noah Roberts** motioned to move into public comment, seconded by **Saegis Abbott.**

#### Public Comment

- i. *There were no public comments to be made.*
- ii. **Noah Roberts** motioned to close public comment; seconded by **Saegis Abbott.**

#### Committee Discussion

- i. **Emma Flick:** I said this on Saturday, but I'm really excited about the budget you've put forward. I'm especially happy to see the success of the practice student tickets and its accessibility. It's a great addition to our campus. Overall, I'm very excited!
- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** There was a question during the last deliberations about ensuring safety and resources for addressing interpersonal violence, harassment, and related issues in programs like band and other communal or competitive activities. I know we're low on time, but I think it's important to address this. Is there any information not yet shared with the committee about what OSU is doing, to tackle these systemic problems?
  - a. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to amend the rules to allow for ceded time for Performing Arts to answer one question, only this one case; seconded by **Saegis Abbott.** Objection by **Madison Wusstig.**
    - i. **Madison Wusstig:** I just want to be equitable with time and remind all committee members to be equitable with the time that we all share.

ii. The motion **passed with 6 ayes, 4 nays, and 3 abstentions.**

vii. **Dylan Perfect:** The question focuses on the group environment for students in programs like band, specifically addressing concerns about safety, harassment in the workplace, and incidents of interpersonal violence. This was brought up during the last deliberations, particularly regarding how peer institutions address and respond to these issues. Could you speak to your focus in this area, what steps you take to mitigate such risks, and any improvements made to strengthen those efforts?

a. **Olin Hannum:** As the Director of Athletic Bands at OSU, I oversee the marching band, which includes about one in 90 undergraduates. With 300 members, my resources are similar to those for a large lecture class like O Chem, since the band is a class students register for. Given the history of issues in performing arts, especially marching bands, our profession has increased awareness and efforts to prevent problems like sexual violence. We go beyond what's typical for a large class. While I can't comment on specific cases, I've generally been happy with OSU's structures for handling these concerns.

b. **Oliver Devereux:** As one of the drum majors in the marching band, I help plan the leadership camp that happens before classes start. Band camp is vital because it's where new members, especially freshmen, form their first connections. With 50% of our rehearsal hours happening during camp, fostering safe and healthy relationships is crucial. Last year, I introduced a leadership camp with resources for section leaders on both musical and interpersonal skills. We also brought in two guest speakers: one from the Center for Fraternity and Sorority Life to discuss decision-making, power structures, and anti-hazing, and another from the Center for Advocacy, Prevention, and Education (CAPE) to adapt their training for our group. This training focused on supporting survivors, addressing rape myths, and creating a safe community, with added content

tailored to our program's needs. I understand concerns about sustainability for these initiatives after my leadership ends, and it's something I've considered and worked to address.

viii. **Noah Roberts** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$9.90 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget for Performing Arts; seconded by **Saegis Abbott**.

a. The motion **carried** with **12 ayes and 1 abstention**.

ix. **Dylan Perfect** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$0.00 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #1 for Performing Arts; seconded by **Noah Roberts**.

a. The motion **carried** with **12 ayes and 1 abstention**.

x. **Dylan Perfect** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$0.00 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #2 for Performing Arts; seconded by **Noah Roberts**.

a. The motion **carried** with **12 ayes and 1 abstention**.

xi. **Noah Roberts** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$0.43 per student per term for Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #3 for Performing Arts; seconded by **Connor Chen**.

a. The motion **carried** with **11 ayes and 2 abstentions**.

d. **Recreational Sports**

- *Operating Budget*
- *Decision Package 1: Building Reserves*

Committee Questions and Discussion

i. **Leah Hall Dorothy:** I want to acknowledge that in the last meeting, I should not have answered a question directly to a committee member. I value each member's role and the committee's communication protocols and will ensure my future communication reflects this.

- ii. **Troy Snow:** For recreational sports, addressing compression would cost \$176,270, or \$2.61 per student per term. In response to the question about interest or investment returns on building funds: last year, we earned about \$158,715 in interest, which was higher because we used those resources to pay off the cost of Student Legacy Park. This year, the year-to-date interest is about \$17,000. Regarding the \$182,000 mentioned from the gallery, that amount is for the Student Facility Improvement Project. It's listed on the fund summary as an expense but isn't a transfer out.
- iii. **Madison Wusstig:** Could you repeat that number of the amount for compression?
  - a. **Troy Snow:** Per student is \$2.61.
- iv. **Katelyn Banks:** You mentioned \$2 million in revenue, including memberships from non-students. I'm curious if you have an estimate of how many memberships that includes or how much revenue it generates? I think it's great that community members can get memberships, and I'd love to hear more about that.
  - a. **Troy Snow:** We went down significantly in Covid, we are now trending to be above 400,000 this year. We have made efforts to build on these memberships.
- v. **Dylan Perfect:** It was \$2.61 accounting for compression, what was the aggregate?
  - a. **Troy Snow:** \$176,270.
- vi. **Madison Wusstig:** Do you have a rough estimate of how much of the projected \$400,000 in revenue over the next few years will go into building reserves versus other areas?
  - a. **Troy Snow:** That revenue is focused on addressing operating costs, with the goal of generating additional income to help keep student fees low. It doesn't specifically address building or equipment reserves.
- vii. **Noah Roberts** motioned to enter into public comment, **Saegis Abbott** seconded.

#### Public Comment

- i. **Emerson Pearson, ASOSU Senator:** I want to express my disappointment with Rec- Sports, particularly the budget manager's

comments during the last deliberations. I found it shocking that they essentially said they would take money allocated for wages and use it elsewhere because they disagreed with the political agenda many students have pushed for. ASOSU exists to address issues students care about, and dismissing those priorities disrespects the entire organization. The suggestion that they could ignore allocations and do what they want threatens the integrity of every dollar in the budget. I also want to address an issue of ableism from earlier tonight that deeply concerns me. I was tone-policed, and as someone on the spectrum, I've experienced ableism before in ASOSU. Despite this, a committee member, Madison, rolled their eyes as I spoke and is now laughing at me. Laughing at ableism is gross, and this behavior needs to be addressed. Ableism remains a problem in ASOSU, and it cannot continue.

- ii. **Noah Roberts** motioned to move into committee discussion, seconded by **Katelyn Banks**.

#### Committee Discussion

- i. **Dylan Perfect**: I want to briefly address the last speaker and say I'm sorry you experienced that. I hope we can make this a space where all students feel welcome, regardless of personal identity. I'd encourage us all to reflect on how we show up in these spaces and consider the impact of our actions, not just our intentions. Regarding the budget, I appreciate Rec-Sports for providing responses after the last meeting. While we might disagree on the best path forward, having the information needed to openly debate, vote, and reach consensus is essential.
- ii. **Madison Wusstig**: I don't want to spend too much time on this since we're here to talk about fees, but I feel like I need to address the last comment. I saw a gallery member making another committee member visibly uncomfortable, and I think it's important to point that out. I just wanted to advocate for that student because they seemed like they needed support. What I said wasn't about someone being on the spectrum, it was more about keeping things civil and professional. I think we need to be mindful of each other, especially if our actions are making someone uncomfortable.

As someone who's also neurodivergent, I believe it's okay to step in and say something if needed to make sure we're respecting everyone here.

- iii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I want this committee to maintain an atmosphere of mutual respect, even when we disagree. Let's keep our discussions focused on the issues and avoid making them personal. If you're having an issue with someone, please bring it to me as chair, and remember that we have processes through ASOSU and the university to address and resolve concerns.
- iv. **Connor Chen:** I just wanted to take a moment to talk about what I really enjoy about Rec Sports, especially the intramural program. I've mentioned before how accessible it is, it's just a flat \$20 fee to play one sport or every sport on the roster. Plus, one-day tournaments and e-sports tournaments are all free. Something else I've always appreciated is their commitment to showcasing adaptive sports. Some of my most fun tournaments have been playing goalball and sitting volleyball. Since not many people sign up, that's where I've earned my championship shirts. If you're free on a weekend, I'd recommend checking the schedule, playing sitting volleyball, and learning the rules of some great adaptive sports!
- v. **Katelyn Banks:** During your unit tour, I was really impressed by how much student employment happens and the technical skills you're teaching students. Just wanted to say, great job!
- vi. **Sarah Khan:** I'll never forget the rock wall and the comments you made during the tour. It really shows how much you care about the students and how well you take care of the space. It's amazing!
- vii. **Dylan Perfect:** Under normal circumstances I support the operational budget and the decision packages. I do believe that, I am speaking in broad terms, autistic people's entire experience is being accused of making people uncomfortable. It does not change the fact that it is not an excuse. Kindness costs nothing. There is a way to raise a concern, and when it is pointed out the implications of that concern, to respond to that with kindness. I would entreat us all to respond to those things with kindness. I support the budget and hope to move to a vote.

viii. **Sarah Khan** motioned to close committee discussion, **Saegis Abbott** seconded.

#### Motions

ix. **Sarah Khan** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$131.03 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 as the requested operating budget for Recreational Sports; seconded by **Noah Roberts**.

a. The motion **carried** with **12 ayes and 1 abstention**.

x. **Angelo Arredondo** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$0.59 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #1 for Recreational Sports; seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**.

a. The motion **passed** with **12 ayes and 1 abstention**.

xi. **Chair Sophia Nowers** motioned to recess until 8:40, seconded by **Sarah Khan**.

#### e. Memorial Union

- *Operating Budget*
- *Decision Package 1: Events Manager (0.70 FTE)*
- *Decision Package 2: Project Coordinator*
- *Decision Package 3: Student Experience Center Building Reserves*

#### Committee Questions and Discussion

i. **Chair Sophia Nowers** entertained a motion to reduce Committee Questions and Discussion time to 5 minutes; **Saegis Abbott** was moved, seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**.

ii. **Deb Mott**: The Memorial Union extends its gratitude to students who dedicate their time and effort to student governance. These students show admirable commitment to understanding university operations and advocating for a living wage. I've shared additional thoughts in an email earlier today, and I encourage you to read it. For those considering the financial impact of raising the MU's base pay rate for student employees to \$17.10, the cost would be \$101,400 or \$1.50 per student per term. Additionally, per a member's request, I've provided space allocation and assignment

information, as well as updated details on the Project Coordinator for Facilities, should there be further questions.

- iii. **Dylan Perfect:** I may need to follow up on the email situation. I think I got it forwarded to me. Trying to see where the information on the space allocation is.
- iv. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** What is the need for the decision package on the SEC building reserves?
  - a. **Deb Mott:** The SEC building, now 10 years old, is starting to show wear and tear, which is happening earlier than expected and is consistent with other newer buildings on campus. For those who use the space regularly, you can see things starting to fall apart. The original reserve rates were meant to gradually increase over time, but they aren't enough. This is the first request for the SEC building reserve in its 10-year history, and we need to build it up more because we'll be spending more in the next two years than we're bringing in.
  - b. **Angelo Arredondo:** The email was sent to the official SFC emails which many of us have difficulties accessing.
- v. **Saegis Abbott:** Is the building reserves also earning interest?
  - a. **Deb Mott:** The interest rates change frequently and are set by the State of Oregon Treasury.
- vi. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** *motioned to move into public comment, seconded by **Katelyn Banks**.*

#### Public Comment

- i. *There were no public comments to be made.*
- ii. **Saegis Abbott** *motioned to move out of gallery comment, seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**.*

#### Committee Discussion

- i. **Emma Flick:** I wanted to briefly address decision package #3, the SEC building reserves. On Saturday, some of our board members were unsure about this, but I want to encourage support for it. Coming from Dixon, where I've seen the costs of maintaining facilities, I can say it's not cheap. If the MU is asking for these funds

to keep the SEC building functional, I trust that they genuinely need it. The SEC is heavily used, not just by ASOSU, but also by students as a great study space. I personally use it between classes and think it's important to maintain it. I'm glad to see the MU taking steps to care for this building and ensure it remains in good condition.

- ii. **Sarah Khan:** I just wanted to say how much I appreciate you all. As the SEE SAB chair, I've spoken with members of the SAB and my cultural center, and everyone has so much praise for the MU. We're constantly using your rooms, making reservations, and benefiting from all the accommodations you provide. We're so grateful for everything you do! I also want to clarify that I abstained on decision package number three last time because I panicked when I heard "Cultural Center," but I've realized I can vote on that. Apologies for the confusion!
- vii. **Dylan Perfect:** I appreciate the collaborative effort and the data provided, which allows for meaningful debate and informed decisions, even if we may not agree. For Decision Package 3, I'm conflicted. The information provided clarifies the process for students navigating it, which is valuable. However, my concern lies more with the Division of Student Affairs. As a member of the steering committee for pilot cultural lounges, I've seen how grassroots student efforts struggle to secure adequate spaces, such as the limited conference room in Snell Hall, now set for demolition. While the ISL space in the MU is better, the \$42 million Student Experience Center feels like it hasn't fully delivered on its promises. Because of these broader issues, I'll abstain on Decision Package 3, as further investment seems contrary to the issue that I see there.

viii. **Sarah Khan** motioned to move out of committee discussion, seconded by **Angelo Arredondo**.

#### Motions

- i. **Sarah Khan** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$96.06 per student per term for FY26 for the requested operating budget for the Memorial Union; seconded by **Angelo Arredondo**.

*a. The motion **carried with 11 ayes and 2 abstentions.***

ix. **Angelo Arredondo** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$1.50 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #1 for the Memorial Union; seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**.

*a. The motion **carried with 11 ayes and 2 abstentions.***

x. **Emma Flick** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$0.74 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #2 for the Memorial Union; seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**.

*a. The motion **carried with 11 ayes and 2 abstentions.***

xi. **Connor Chen** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$1.48 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #3 for the Memorial Union; seconded by **Madison Wusstig**.

*a. The motion **carried with 8 ayes, 1 nay, and 4 abstentions.***

f. **Basic Needs Center**

- *Operating Budget*
- *Decision Package 1: UHDS Memorandum of Understanding for Champinefu Lodge Space*

Committee Questions and Discussion

- Kayla Ramirez:** Nicole is on zoom, and she should have sent out an email.
- Nicole Hinds:** I apologize if this wasn't shared more broadly. I want to remind the committee that you have full discretion to not pass this decision package, it's not necessary at this time. We know there's interest in supporting our unit, but this package, at 10 cents per student per term, would add \$6,760 to the Basic Needs Center's base operating budget.
- Angelo Arredondo:** If you want this to be necessarily not voted for, why did you bring it up?
  - Nicole Hinds:** Students have expressed interest in helping the Basic Needs Center and seeing our budget grow, and this seemed like the right size place to create that opportunity.

- iv. **Madison Wusstig:** For the alternative decision package, since we're discussing a lower budget, I got the sense from the last meeting that while this money may not be immediately needed, there's still interest in seeing the BNC grow. Is there any direction for how this money would be used, like for potential new programs, or would it simply go into reserves?
  - a. **Nicole Hindes:** We use our budgets flexibly to meet dynamic program needs over time. This added resource budget would help cover the costs of the additional square footage and associated expenses under the MOU. If this isn't passed, that's okay, we can adjust and make it work within other areas of our budget.
- v. **Sarah Khan** *motioned to move into gallery comment; seconded by Noah Roberts.*

#### Public Comment

- i. *There were no public comments to be made.*
- ii. **Saegis Abbott** *motioned to move back into committee discussion, seconded by Sarah Khan.*

#### Committee Discussion

- i. **Saegis Abbott:** After reviewing things, I would be happy to pass either decision packages. I think the BNC has done an amazing job of stewarding the funds we've given them, and if they can use the money, that would be acceptable.
- ii. **Dylan Perfect:** I think the director's answer helped me answer where I am at. The best use of this incidental fee is to give back to the students who need it. I think anything that can lighten the load in terms of the operations, I think that would be a less than a quarter that it is. I am inclined to approve the decision package as proposed.
- iii. **Connor Chen:** As it currently stands it seems that most of us are in support. If you guys want to see something truly incredibly, go to the BNC on Wednesday. It is incredible to see the number of resources they can get. Doing my few first shifts, I was amazed

about the amount and quality of stuff. It was awesome to see, and a part of my schedule I always look forward to.

- iv. **Sarah Khan:** I really appreciate everything we've learned about the BNC this semester, and I'm especially grateful for how much Kayla has shared with us about training, staff, and operations. You've been incredibly patient, and it means a lot.
- v. **Madison Wusstig:** I want to echo how important the BNC is and the incredible work you all do. You make resources that feel inaccessible, accessible to students, and it's reassuring to hear how many students know about the BNC. That said, I'm leaning more toward supporting the alternative decision package because I firmly believe every cent matters to students. Cutting down even \$1 can make a difference, as the price tag is often a barrier to higher education. I trust the BNC and appreciate how thoughtful and humble this request is.
- vi. **Katelyn Banks:** I think what the BNC does is great, just hearing that and your initiatives I think it is cool how students are able to do that and that it is very student lead. I wanted to share the same support.
- vii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I appreciated throwing in the BRD the recognition of the student leaders across campus. Not only to support the students but to foster a community of students who are there to grow with each other.
- viii. **Kayla Ramirez:** I just want to thank the committee for your kind sentiments. I also want to emphasize that I couldn't serve in my role as a leader or on this committee without the incredible support of my team. They are my driving force, and we work tirelessly to ensure that our community and values are reflected in our programming. Hearing that this has been effectively conveyed to the committee means so much. Thank you.
- ix. **Dylan Perfect:** I think it's important to maintain equal standards across the board. For me, the 14 cents here feels worthwhile, as it provides valuable services. I'm comfortable supporting it for that reason. I am supporting \$0.24.
- x. **Angelo Arredondo:** I echo everything, thank you for the work you do.

xi. **Katelyn Banks** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$21.55 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget for the Basic Needs Center; seconded by **Dylan Perfect**.

a. The motion **carried with 12 ayes and 1 abstention**.

xii. **Dylan Perfect** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$0.24 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #1 for the Basic Needs Center; seconded by **Angelo Arredondo**.

a. The motion **carried with 11 ayes and 2 abstentions**.

g. **SEE**

- *Operating Budget*
- *Decision Package 1: \$1.25 increase to SOA Grants*
- *Decision Package 2: \$2.50 increase to SOA Grants*
- *Decision Package 3: \$5.00 increase to SOA Grants*

#### Committee Questions and Discussion

i. **Chair Sophia Nowers** motioned to have a 4-minute recess; seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**.

ii. **Eric Beeler**: Madam Chair, per the committee's directive, Student Experiences and Engagement has reviewed the impact of increasing the base student wage to \$17.10. Including associated compression and OPE adjustments, this would require \$155,354 total, equating to a \$2.30 per student per term increase in the incidental fee. I emailed this information, along with some club details, to the committee earlier. Regarding club funding, I compared fiscal year 2023 to 2024 and fall 2023 to fall 2024 for context. Additionally, I provided a breakdown by category. However, I found inconsistencies due to undefined category definitions and the ability for clubs to select up to three categories without regulation. For example, Bird Nerds identified as leisure and hobby, environment and sustainability, and culture, while the Amateur Radio Club chose leisure and hobby and international. To address this, I distributed funding proportionally across the selected categories, which may result in slight discrepancies with

SOA grant allocations. My aim was to give a clearer picture of funding by affiliation. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

- iii. **Saegis Abbott:** Thank you for putting this together. I saw the graph earlier when you sent it, and it looks good to me. Based on that, I would support the decision package of \$2.50, it seems like a fairly equitable distribution.
- iv. **Noah Roberts:** I wanted to say relatively the same thing. This is almost exactly what we are looking for.
- v. **Katelyn Banks:** So, you had talked about student feedback and how you address student needs, what is the process for getting that feedback?
- vi. **Eric Beeler:** Is there something specific? We are a pretty big group.
- vii. **Katelyn Banks:** I noticed in the BRD that you mentioned goals for meeting student needs, and I was curious about the metrics you use for that. Specifically, how do you gather feedback, especially from clubs or other groups? What does that process look like?
- viii. **Sarah Khan:** As I mentioned before, we focus more on qualitative feedback and networking rather than just numbers. Since we're talking about clubs and what students want to see, we prioritize direct connections. Much of our work this year has been through the SAB, which I chaired.
  - a. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** motioned to extend the time for Sarah to finish her statement; seconded by **Katelyn Banks**.
- ix. **Sarah Khan:** We ensure there's at least one SAB member from each department and rely on networking. For example, as someone from a cultural center, I ask my peers to reach out to their friends and other employees, and we share that feedback within the SAB. We also let people know they can join our meetings. Our focus is on what students actually want, not just arbitrary numbers.
  - a. **Saegis Abbott** motioned to extend the time by 1-minute, seconded by **Noah Roberts**.
- x. **Saegis Abbott:** So far, we've concluded fall term and are now into winter term. How much of the current fund balance has been used? Does it look like it'll be enough to support clubs through the rest of the year?

- xi. **Eric Beeler:** Are you asking about the SOA grant funds? I don't have that information available right now, but I can follow up and get that information to the group.
- xii. **Noah Roberts** motioned to enter into public comment; **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear** seconded.

#### Public Comment

- i. **Adison Rowe, ASOSU Senate:** I originally got involved in ASOSU through club funding. Two years ago, I attended a Senate meeting after clubs had overspent \$100,000 and asked for support. While that issue has since been fixed, I've always supported club funding because it filters through fewer hands. Each dollar given to clubs directly funds their events, making it much more impactful than money allocated to other programs. Based on the projections shared, clubs have only spent about 10–15% of the SOA grant funds halfway through the year. Even if policies are relaxed, I find it hard to believe they'll spend the remaining 85% in the next few months. Even doubling that spending rate would leave significant funds unused. With this information, I find it hard to justify decision package two and feel decision package one is more reasonable. There might be more to the story, but based on what's in front of me, it seems like we may be overshooting this slightly, even though I fully support giving clubs more resources.
- ii. **Narmeen Rashid, ASOSU Diversity and Inclusion Director:** As a club president, I can say most of our major activities and events happen later in the year. Many cultural clubs also hold their big shows towards the end of the year. Using only 15–20% of funds in the first term is typical because clubs save their budgets for those larger events. I support the \$2.41 decision package because it would greatly help clubs. We all aim to host bigger events and having that additional funding would make a big difference.
- iii. **Noah Roberts** motioned to move back into committee discussion for only 10-minutes, seconded by **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear**. Objected by **Dylan Perfect**. Objection rescinded.
  - a. **Dylan Perfect:** I would like to amend that to be 5-minutes.
  - b. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I would reconsider 8 minutes.

c. **Noah Roberts** amended motion to be 8-minutes of committee discussion. The motion passed.

- iv. **Emma Flick:** I have been seeing a lot of members of clubs really wanting funding, so I am happy to see the increase. It would be interesting to see clubs being able to meet and talk about some of those restrictions.
- v. **Madison Wusstig:** I would like to see more funding for clubs. My only reservation is that I don't think that more money would mean that more clubs get it. It seems to be first come first serve that get the money, certain clubs have more access just based on knowledge. I don't think raising the price will give clubs more money. I have seen this money run out time and time again.
- vi. **Oliver Devereux:** If you have not seen a cultural event, they are phenomenal. They can be expensive but at a great benefit. When we are looking at promoting diversity and celebrating that, I think this is a good.
- vii. **Dylan Perfect:** The current model of club funding review, residing outside of Student Government, is an anomaly compared to peer institutions, which impacts how clubs are recognized and penalized, as we've seen in past examples. While this isn't the space to fully reestablish that system, I think it's a conversation worth having in the future. For now, I lean toward decision package one because it seems sufficient based on utilization rates, balancing advocacy for student needs with responsible cuts. If decision package one is passed, and there's interest, we could explore reallocating a portion of the \$1.16 per student per term directly to Student Government, as U of O does. If this goes to mediation, it's something ASOSU might want to consider, but for now, I'm comfortable supporting decision package one.
- viii. **Emma Flick:** I think that I am in support of decision package #2. While I understand the arguments and I think that is a big part of our job, clubs and organizations are some of the biggest parts of this campus. To the student body in general, not just those in clubs. Cultural events really are amazing and help widen horizons, I think that I have changed leaving them. While I do commend the fiscal

responsibility of the members of the board, I urge them to consider that you are investing in the community.

- ix. **Madison Wusstig:** The cultural events are amazing; it is an investment in our cultural communities. I want to echo my support for decision package #1, we should cut back where we can. Students and cultural clubs, there are other grants that clubs can get, student fees are not the sole place. I do not want to put the burden on other students' shoulders, and we should be fiscally responsible.
    - a. **Dylan Perfect** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$110.25 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for the requested operating budget for SEE; seconded by **Noah Roberts**.
      - i. The motion **carried with 12 ayes and 1 abstention**.
    - b. **Dylan Perfect** moved to enter into a roll call vote to recommend a fee level of \$1.16 per student per term in Fall 2025, Winter 2026, and Spring 2026 for Decision Package #1 for SEE; seconded by **Saegis Abbott**.
      - i. The motion **carried with 11 ayes, 1 nay, and 1 abstention**.
  - x. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to take the remaining ASOSU conversations off the agenda, seconded by **Katelyn Banks**.
    - a. The motion carried and ASOSU is struck from the agenda.
- h. **Student Wage Conversation**
- i. **Dylan Perfect:** I want to emphasize the importance of funding student wages, as I discussed earlier with the Basic Needs Center. Our roughly \$500 fee covers an extensive range of programs and student workers, which is unique compared to institutions like U of O. While not everything funded is a basic need, supporting student workers is critical. A third of students on campus are student workers, and even those who aren't always have the opportunity to apply, which can significantly improve their economic situation while in school. The budget committee's analysis shows that, adjusted for inflation, the proposed wage increase to \$17.10 is functionally worth less than the \$15 wage increase passed in 2022

due to significant inflation. At \$6.90 per student per term, this investment in working-class students and overall student success is invaluable. I strongly support recommending this to the Senate.

- ii. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I just forwarded a fee summary from our FSS team that includes all the wage information that was presented tonight. With the \$17.10 added to all the units, there would be a 3.37% increase overall, we are below the fiscal responsibility threshold of 4%. I appreciate the work and advocacy of some members of this committee and members of the senate on this issue of the base wage. I do have some concerns because it did not go through discussion within the SABs. I want to thank units for getting us the numbers.
- iii. **Noah Roberts:** I want to echo the sentiment shared earlier and acknowledge the importance and necessity of this proposal. However, as a representative of the SAB, I feel obligated to vote no on this part of the process, like my stance last year. This isn't to diminish the commendable work done by this committee, the Senate, or the budget managers who have collaborated with us on this. But since it hasn't been fully reviewed, particularly by the board in the MU's case, I find it difficult to approve it as a representative for that board.
- iv. **Emma Flick:** I want to echo Noah's sentiments and truly commend everyone who worked on this. The effort and dedication you've put in is incredible, and I don't want to diminish that in any way. However, as someone representing my board, and knowing this hasn't gone through them yet, I don't feel comfortable moving forward. Additionally, understanding that an increase in student wages would have a broader impact on our budget beyond just wages makes me want to discuss this further with my advisory board before making a decision.
- v. **Vice Chair Lillian Goodyear:** Really quick to summarize for everyone, without the \$17.10 there is a fee increase of about 1.88%, but with it is an increase of about 3.37%.
- vi. **Madison Wusstig:** So, where is this number coming from? Is this just like an estimate of what it would look like for all student units?
  - a. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** It is an aggregate of all.

vii. **Dylan Perfect:** I want to highlight something about one of our committee members that some of you may not know, it's public information, so I'll embarrass Angelo a little. He served on the Electoral College this year. The difference between that body and this one is that we're not pledged electors. We're here in a representative capacity, spending hours deliberating and making decisions. This doesn't diminish the role of the student advisory boards, but we need to recognize the role of the Student Fee Committee. Over 90% of students supported a wage increase this year, reflected by 1,300 signatures and an election result, yet wages haven't increased. With that in mind, I want to do right by those students and honor their voices as much as I can.

viii. **Dylan Perfect** motioned for \$6.90 per student per term for Fall, Winter, Spring of FY26 divided up with the FRC being \$0.20 per term, ASOSU at \$0.15 per term, Rec-Sports at \$2.61 per term, MU at \$1.50 per term, SEE at \$2.30 per term, and Performing Arts at \$0.14 per term; seconded by **Saegis Abbott. Madison Wusstig, Sarah Khan, Katelyn Banks** objected.

a. **Madison Wusstig:** I think my position on this is clear, but I object because while \$6.90 per term might not seem like much, students will see it as roughly \$20.70 per year. Over five years, assuming we continue adjusting for inflation, it could amount to over \$103, possibly more if base minimum wage increases persist. That cumulative cost is significant for students.

b. **Dylan Perfect:** Point of order, I know that filibustering is prohibited by the rules, and we have to be out of here by 10. I would on that basis say that we either extend our time and accept the consequences or move to a vote.

i. *The vote was a **tie with 5 ayes, 5 nays, and 3 abstentions.***

c. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** I ask the members who abstained if they would like to reconsider. Or if anyone who voted would like to reconsider the motion?

d. **Dylan Perfect** motioned to reconsider the motion, seconded by **Angelo Arredondo.**

- i. The motion **fails** with **5 ayes, 6 nays, and 2 abstentions.***
- ix. **Chair Sophia Nowers:** The motion failed. I would recommend to the Senate that if this is something they feel strongly about, vote the budgets down and send them to mediation.

**VIII. Chair Announcements**

- a. Elections are open, apply!

**IX. Member Comments**

- a. There were no member comments.*

**X. Public Comment**

- a. There were no member comments.*

**XI. Adjournment**

- a. Adjourned at **10 pm.***