ASOSU Senate Meeting
Second Winter Session of the 84th Senate
January 14th, 2025 | 6:30pm
MU 104
Zoom: https://oregonstate.zoom.us/j/93577674659?pwd=6scPXxEc9bAiQlYjLniQT5YoxLLZd4.1
President of the Senate
Zachary Kowash
SEC 288

I) **Roll Call/Quorum ~ 6:32 pm**
   a. Sen. Acar – **present**
   b. Sen. Allen - **present**
   c. Sen. Becquer – **present**
   d. Sen. Durr – **present**
   e. Sen. Eckman - **present**
   f. Sen. Gomez Silva – **present**
   g. Sen. Hostetler-McLaughlin – **present**
   h. Sen. Ikehara – **present**
   i. Sen. Jones – **present**
   j. Sen. Karlapati – **present**
   k. Sen. Knox - **present**
   l. Sen. Lau - **present**
   m. Sen. Lewandowski – **absent**
   n. Sen. Morales – **absent**
   o. Sen. Pearson – **present**
   p. Sen. Raschkes - **present**
   q. Sen. Rowe – **present**
   r. Sen. Wright - **present**

II) **Swearing in of Senators/Proxies**
   a. There were no senators/proxies to swear in.

III) **Approval of Minutes**
   a. The minutes were approved as written.

IV) **Approval of Agenda**
   a. Sen. Pearson** motioned to add a reading of the Shared Governance model to the end of New Business; seconded by **Sen. Acar.

V) **Gallery Comments**
   a. A gallery member asked to speak a prayer.
   b. **Vice President Kowash**: As a reminder, ASOSU does respect freedom of expression and

values gallery feedback. OSU and ASOSU do not endorse any one particular religion.

VI) Executive Branch Reports

a. Tanner Maynard – Nontraditional Student Affairs Coordinator

i. **Tanner Maynard, Nontraditional Student Affairs Coordinator:** Before winter break, we completed a toy drive with the Veterans Success Center, delivering several boxes of gifts to the FRC for student parents. We also submitted the student parent priority registration proposal to the registrar, which is under feasibility review, and I'll follow up this week for updates. This term, I've reconnected with the FRC, BNC, Veterans Success Center, and other partners to confirm their priorities and ensure ASOSU is ready to support their goals. We're exploring collaborations, including a graduate-focused recreational event with the Graduate Success Team and refining plans for the veteran skills showcase. The diversity team is planning an international dishes event, inviting cultural centers to participate without added obligations. I'm also working on a graduate-focused midterm pizza and movie night for February 14. We're finalizing permissions, catering, and venue options like the Graduate Commons, and expect booking availability updates tomorrow. Any questions?

1. **Sen. Acar:** Have you had the chance to talk to people about priority housing for families?
2. **Tanner Maynard, Nontraditional Student Affairs Coordinator**: That's an interesting point. The International Student Affairs Coordinator has been looking into the issue, as there is a significant backlog, for about a year, for family housing. This is partly because students with children cannot live in residence halls, which makes sense since those spaces aren't suited for kids. However, family housing units can't discriminate based on family status, leading to overflow and contributing to the backlog. There are ideas being discussed, like creating a bulletin to list available housing options in the area or identifying landlords sympathetic to students. For instance, seniors completing their degrees with time left on their leases might allow lease assumption. We're reviewing the legal aspects of this. It might also help to reach out to the University of Oregon to compare family housing policies and see if this backlog is tied to state laws. This is a broader issue affecting the entire state, not just our university. Addressing it will take time and continued effort, but we are aware and working on solutions.

VII) New Business

a. First Reading of SR 84.06 - "Implementation of Door Flanges to Bathrooms"

i. **Sen. Karlapati:** This is the project that we largely worked on during fall term. We talked to Rachel, the library building manager, and she had mentioned that it would be helpful if ASOSU endorsed her in the idea so there could possibly be more funding for it. This may help her in her way of funding and support for this. Since we want to implement this throughout OSU, we thought this was a good place to start.

ii. **Sen. Durr**: This is just the library, just Part 1, we have several buildings that we are working on this with. I don't know if there is any strong opposition to

forgoing a second reading, but I would be willing to forgo one.

iii. **Sen. Gomez Silva**: So, it is not like if we do this to the Valley Library, it's going to expand into other building?
    1. **Sen. Karlapati**: We are already in talks with other building managers. So, this is just our first step saying we endorse her and then we'll put out more resolutions or bills later on for different managers. On a second note, I usually don't want to skip a second reading regardless of the bill.
    2. **Sen. Durr**: The library would take care of their own building, so it would be just them at the moment. The rest of the buildings, we're still working on that, and we want to see how their funding goes.
    3. **Sen. Gomez Silva**: The money was not my concern; I was just making sure that it would expand to other buildings.

iv. **Sen. Rowe**: If we do have a second reading, I think that we should add more people to the send to list. More people for general OSU and not just facilities. Ultimately, after this passes, we could just email it to them after the fact anyways. If we want to pass it tonight, I am not against that.

v. **Sen. Acar**: We also did reach out to the MU, and they said they would look into something similar.

vi. **Sen. Eckman**: I was wondering if you could expand on the sustainable and low-cost solutions, like provide an example next time or if you already have an idea of what that is?
    1. **Sen. Karlapati**: It was something that the library manager had already done. They are low cost because it is just a piece of plastic that is stuck on, it was not anything expensive. Sustainability wise, I think they just last a long time, they also do not really degrade in any way.

vii. **Sen. Knox**: What was the driver behind the initiative? Was there a lot of feedback by the students that it was an issue?
    1. **Sen. Durr**: The reason these were spurred on was specifically because of the gender-neutral restrooms. That was something that students felt they needed in that specific restroom. If you're asking about the expansion of gender-neutral bathrooms to the rest of the library, that was not her intention.
    2. **Sen. Karlapati**: We have seen positive effects. This was mostly from Rachel; she was saying that she did get pretty good feedback from people that used the first-floor bathrooms. If building managers liked this idea and were willing to expand, she encouraged us to reach out to different building managers. We thought of it as a good sign and something students wanted.

viii. ***Sen. Pearson*** *motioned to add an agenda item to discuss the Judicial Council meeting that took place yesterday to be added to the end of New Business. The motion* ***passed****.*

b. Discussion and Reading on the OSU and Recognized Student Government Commitment on Student Engagement in Shared Governance. (link!)

i. **Vice President Kowash**: For some background, Adison, Audrey and I had the opportunity to sit down and review our shared governance agreement along with

the Student Bill of Rights as is defined within our statutes. We kind of concluded that there wasn't anything we saw within these documents, but we'd like to open it up to all of the branches of our student government. There is some language in our statutes, where it dictates what exactly must need to happen if we were to change one of these things. We'd be working with our partners in shared governance to change these documents.

ii. ***Vice President Kowash*** *entertained a motion for a 5-minute reading period,* ***Sen. Gomez Silva*** *was moved; seconded by* ***Sen. Ikehara****.*

iii. **Sen. Ikehara:** So, is anything changing with the documents?
    1. **Sen. Rowe:** The recognition requirements changed in May, and the big change is that OSU President Murthy can now unilaterally recognize or de-recognize student governments, which is a big deal since it used to require a board vote and more steps. I only found out about this a week ago, though others might've known earlier. While we don't technically have to review this in statute, I think it's relevant to shared governance and OSU's Bill of Rights, so I wanted to bring it up. There aren't any big action items for today, but it's something to keep on the radar moving forward.
    2. **Vice President Kowash:** This is just a review to make sure we're all on the same page with the requirements we initially set for ourselves. I don't think our governing documents mention changing the recognition requirements, as that seems more like a Board of Trustees or President Murthy decision. We likely don't have much control over it. It could be seen as a conflict of interest.

iv. **Sen. Knox:** It looks like Faculty Senate Standing committees must have student representation, at least that's how I read it in section 5.2. I was wondering if this is still being followed if you have any insight?
    1. **Vice President Kowash**: Audrey is working with them. There's been some confusion, but we're making sure we align with the requirements for Faculty Senate, including getting students on committees. It's government, things can fall through the cracks sometimes. But we're working to fix that, including with our Cascades partners.

v. **Sen. Pearson**: I find it particularly concerning that the recognized student government can be unrecognized without student consent. It's our student government, and the ability to de-recognize it on a whim suggests a need for change. I'd like to see advocacy from the Exec on this issue and possibly a resolution stating that this is a serious problem.
    1. **Vice President Kowash**: Audrey and I will be bringing this up in our conversations with President Murthy. I believe recognized student governments are covered under Oregon statute, so it might be more difficult for Murthy to de-recognize.
    2. **Sen. Pearson**: There isn't a definition of recognized student government in Oregon law, so that leaves some ambiguity. That's how President Murthy has been able to say she can just de-recognize one and recognize something else. Since there's no definition, theoretically, she could

recognize anything as the student government. It's not great that this can happen without students' consent.

3. **Vice President Kowash**: I will be sure to bring that up.

vi. **Sen. Lau**: I remember last year in the Senate, we were working on that document to get ASOSU recognized. Was the intent of this recognition just to ensure there aren't multiple student governments on campus?

1. ***Sen. Lau*** *ceded 5-minutes to* ***Matteo Paola***
2. **Matteo Paola**: This policy started being drafted about two years ago. It was similar to the version shared with the Senate last year but very different from what President Murthy adopted in May, which I only found out about last week. The original proposal allowed the Board of Trustees to rescind recognition of student government with a 50% vote. When Joe Page and I, as president and SFC chair, reviewed it, Joe raised concerns and suggested raising it to a two-thirds vote of the board. That's where things were left. The policy was shared with the Senate last year for feedback, but it disappeared until May, when last-minute changes were made without apparent consultation with student government. The goal of the policy was to define the role and duties of a recognized student government since state law only refers to them as being able to recommend the collection of mandatory incidental fees without further details. I always thought the best approach would be to have the state define this, not the board. However, it seems the board delegated the authority entirely to President Murthy, who then added the unilateral ability to rescind recognition. My primary concern is that this change happened without any input from student government.

vii. **Sen. Pearson**: This is a question for Zach and Charlotte, if there is any way this could be added to the Policy Platform for there to be an expansion of what recognized student government means? If there is any sort of world where the de-recognition comes, I would like it to come from the students. I would like to see that any public university that derecognition of the student gov can only be predicated on the consent of the students. In that event I think there should be a way for students to do that. Is there any sort of, could you see that being adopted into the lobbying platform?

1. **Vice President Kowash**: Yeah, absolutely, we're developing our lobbying platform. Our current priorities are more higher education funding, better access to health care, and environmental sustainability, but that's definitely something we could add. It's really interesting that you brought up the recognition of student government. Thank you for pointing that out.

viii. **Sen. Eckman**: Last year I know that the Student Government committee did look at a document, and it says we sent it to the Senate to be approved, but I'm not sure what happened. I was also wondering if anyone knew what minimum participation by student constituents in an election is?

1. **Vice President Kowash**: I don't have the number off the top of my head and would need to check the minimum requirement. I don't have much

more to add other than I'll look into it.

2. **Sen. Eckman**: I could try to find the old document from last year if people are interested.

ix. **Sen. Durr**: In the Student Bill of Rights, Zach, do you know what qualifies as a common interest under postulate two? I'm not sure what qualifies as a common interest. Also, more generally, regarding website 5.2.6 about screening committees and finding student perspectives for employment. Has anyone heard of them actually doing that?

1. **Sen. Ikehara:** I have done it on a per job basis.
2. **Vice President Kowash**: Yeah, I know that a lot of student leaders are usually involved in hiring processes for faculty, other positions, and student-led roles. I've been part of several hiring committees, so at least for student leaders, that seems to be happening.

x. **Sen. Knox**: There are the 2 things that are posted, and they seem different, can someone explain the difference?

1. **Sen. Rowe:** Technically, statute mandates that the Pro Tempore, President, and Vice President review shared governance and the Bill of Rights every fall term, though we missed it this winter. These are separate from the recognition requirements, which are their own issue. However, recognition requirements are still very relevant to shared governance. While they differ from what's defined as shared governance on the website, the concepts are similar.

xi. **Sen. Pearson**: A concern I've noticed with shared governance is that the burden seems to fall mostly on students, not the university. Students are expected to handle outreach and communication, but I haven't seen much effort from the university to involve us in decisions that impact us. For example, policy changes in SEE affecting club funding and events upset many students, as they weren't consulted. During fee deliberations, a university administrator told us, "If you put money toward student wages, we won't use it on that." That doesn't feel like shared governance but more like being told to approve of what's given. Shared governance should be reciprocal, not one-sided. I'm not sure of the solution, but this issue deserves another look to see what can be done.

1. **Sen. Durr:** In the event that the university does not recognize us anymore, what happens?
2. **Vice President Kowash:** I do not know either, let's not get to that point.
3. **Sen. Pearson**: The most plausible response would likely be legal action. Historically, ASOSU has sued the university before, and if they randomly decided to de-recognize us, I think that's what would happen. Thankfully, I don't think any of us see that actually happening, but I do think it highlights the need for a statutory change in Oregon State law.
4. ***Sen. Pearson*** *motioned to move to the next item. The motion passed.*

c. Discussion on the Judicial Council Meeting

i. ***Sen. Rowe*** *motioned to take a 5-minute recess, seconded by* ***Sen. Pearson***.

ii. **Sen. Pearson**: The Judicial Council met yesterday to deliberate on a request to injunct a bill, which raises several issues. First, this is not a power granted to

them by the ASOSU Constitution or statutes. They cannot halt legislation or award themselves such powers, as legislative policy must go through the Senate and be signed by the President or overridden. The Council chose to proceed with the injunction based on its own policies, which they authored. These policies claim the authority to halt actions or decisions, yet they overstep their bounds by blocking valid statutes, not actions taken by ASOSU members. Additionally, their justification of "harm" violates their impartiality, as determining harm is not their role. This undermines their function as an unbiased body. Further concerns include their use of "sealed writs," which violate public meetings laws requiring agenda transparency. Agendas should allow the public to assess their interest in attending, but hidden content prevents this. In past instances, the JC claimed they didn't have to follow public meetings law, which was later confirmed incorrect by the Oregon Government Ethics Commission. They've also issued opinions contradicting constitutional provisions and resisted statutory compliance. The bill in question relates to a contentious political issue, heightening concerns about impartiality. Given that the Council's policies require Senate consent, I propose we revoke this consent and demand the policies be rewritten to align with state law and the ASOSU Constitution.

1. ***Sen. Pearson*** *ceded time to* ***Matteo Paola.***
2. **Matteo Paola**: The meeting was confusing, and a lot of issues came up. Some JC members said the Council is non-binding, but at the same time, claimed the Senate is bound by their decisions, which doesn't make sense. The majority opinion on SB 84.16 wasn't properly voted on, and parts about committee selection were added later without discussion or approval in a public meeting. This violates JC policies and state law. The JC's policies are outdated and have been used to avoid public meetings law until OGEC corrected them. Even at this meeting, proper procedures weren't followed. I didn't see the finalized majority opinion until after it was released. I think the Senate should call all JC members to testify and investigate what's been happening. These actions show a pattern of not following rules or being transparent.
3. **Sen. Pearson**: Is it your opinion that given the policies were last amended in 2017 and following that a new constitution was created, does that make it so that the policies are not in compliance with the current ASOSU Constitution?
4. **Matteo Paola**: If we're expected to follow our own policies, which we're not, those policies should comply with the Constitution and statutes. Right now, they don't, because they reference things that no longer exist under the current Constitution or statutes. By following these policies, we've been adhering to rules that aren't in compliance with the Constitution or statutes.
5. **Sen. Pearson**: In that case, would you say the decision reached yesterday was constitutional or unconstitutional?
6. **Matteo Paola**: I'd say under that metric, it's probably unconstitutional. Separately, it also violated Oregon Public Meetings Law, which doesn't

inherently make it unconstitutional. However, the JC itself has previously held that decisions made without full compliance with public meetings law are invalid.

7. **Sen. Pearson**: Overall, it seems that under both the standards of our current Constitution and the JC's own policies, the decision is unconstitutional. Additionally, the decision itself is unconstitutional based on the history under the current Constitution.
8. **Matteo Paola**: Based on the JC's past rulings, decisions violating public meetings law should be invalid. Last year, the Senate passed a divestment resolution, but it was invalidated because the title wasn't on the agenda 24 hours in advance. If this opinion violated public meetings law, it should be held to the same standard.
9. **Sen. Pearson:** So, would you say that there has been a political sway when it comes to this issue?
10. **Matteo Paola**: More so in general an appeal to authority. If someone in authority submits something to the Judicial Council, most members tend to assume that person is correct. That was applied to the same ruling on divestment as well.
11. **Sen. Pearson**: I wasn't aware that the Judicial Council policies were not under this Constitution. So, would it be accurate to say that, since we have a new Constitution, the JC policies no longer apply?
12. **Matteo Paola:** I think that would be fair to say.
13. **Sen. Pearson**: I propose the Senate formally state that no consent has been given for Judicial Council policies under the current Constitution. We do not recognize former policies from a previous Constitution, as they are illegal and unconstitutional, violating public meetings law and impartiality. The Senate also does not recognize any injunction of bills or statutes, which remain as they are on January 12, 2025. I can phase that as a motion as well.

iii. **Sen. Eckman**: Are there specific instances you could point out where the current Policies don't align with the Constitution or Statute?

1. **Sen. Pearson**: With the wording, what is described is that injunctions can be issued when the Council believes an action by an ASOSU member is harmful or illegal. Determining "harm" violates the duty of a judicial councilor, as harm is subjective and not fact. This is a legislative matter, not one for an impartial body like the JC, which rules on facts. The policies also contain elements. For instance, Section Eight references a House of Representatives, which hasn't existed for years. Since the JC policies defer to the Constitution and statutes, they must align with our current governing documents. The current policies, last updated in 2017, are not in compliance, and it's likely there were issues even at that time. We need a new JC policies document that reflects the current Constitution and statutes, and this must be voted on and affirmed by the Senate.

iv. **Sen. Eckman:** On page 19, it states that 2/3 of the Council must agree for a

decision to pass. I'm wondering how the JC is currently interpreting this for their body?

1. **Matteo Paola**: I'm not sure how many councilors have read the full JC policies, but we haven't interpreted how to apply this rule to ourselves. If we interpret it the same way as we do for the Senate, it would mean two-thirds of the current membership, not just those present. In this case, only 50% of the Council voted to injunct the bill, as three members were present and two voted in favor.

v. **Sen. Durr**: Where can I find these JC policies? I have not read over this, but if they have not been updated in 6 years that is concerning. I will say the sealed writs did concern me quite a bit over the summer. It is often hard to have students have their voice heard if things are not advertised and groups are not following public meeting law. In this section it says that the Judicial Council shall consist of at least 5 members. Does that mean they need at least five members to operate?

1. **Sen. Rowe**: Shall is a confusing word legally, it typically means a promise or contractual obligation. So, it should have five members, but that doesn't mean you will be violating the constitution by having less than five.
2. **Sen. Pearson**: Shall, means it is designed to operate as such. What it is supposed to be. The lack of meeting that designation does not mean that it cannot operate. Quorum I believe is three members.

vi. **Sen. Rowe**: Does anyone have the JC opinion where they ruled on the 2/3rds? I cannot find it.

1. **Vice President Kowash:** It is on the website.

vii. **Sen. Acar**: I wasn't here during the summer; can someone explain to me simply what the point of a sealed writ is?

1. **Matteo Paola**: Sealed writs are only mentioned in JC policies with not much detail. Recently, the JC has interpreted writs as either sealed or unsealed. If it is unsealed, the submitter's identity and the inquiry's details are public, and deliberations are sometimes held publicly. Before the last meeting, when public meetings law wasn't followed, the entire process was held privately. If unsealed, then it is public information.
2. **Sen. Acar**: What is the point? Why would something be sealed or unsealed?
3. **Matteo Paola**: That goes beyond my time here, so I do not have an answer.

viii. **Sen. Karlapati**: Why was this a temporary injunction rather than a permanent injunction?

1. **Matteo Paola:** I'm not sure if it was written in the majority opinion, but I think they wanted to leave some wiggle room. Part of their reasoning was that the Senate didn't collaborate enough with the President and the board on the bill, making it invalid. They left room for if that collaboration happens in time. They also chose a temporary injunction instead of a permanent one.

ix. **Sen. Karlapati**: It seems like the opinion is saying that the bill should be invalid because it involves a community member. So, I don't see how a temporary injunction would fix it?
    1. **Sen. Rowe**: I imagine they'll hear a writ to figure it out. Typically, how judicial proceedings work is they'd just say you can't have a community member on this committee, and the JC would rule it violates the Constitution. It would still exist in statute, but in the past, they've tended to just strike the whole section from statute. I think the temporary injunction was just to give them time.
    2. **Sen. Pearson**: Point of Information, the striking of something is in no way stated in something they should do. That would be an over extension of their abilities.
    3. **Matteo Paola**: The JC did not explicitly vote on whether a community member can serve on a committee like that. The only vote held was on a motion to injunct the bill. There was no vote on the written opinion. I don't even recall much discussion about whether a community member can serve on the committee. We were repeatedly discouraged from discussing writs under consideration since we hadn't officially voted to hear them yet. The issue about the community member was just added to the majority opinion before its release. Nowhere in ASOSU documents does it mention striking clauses. In the absence of specific guidance, I assume it would default to how other courts operate. Courts don't remove laws from statute; they simply rule on their legality. For example, if the Oregon Supreme Court declares a law illegal, it remains in state law but is ruled unenforceable.

x. **Sen. Pearson**: If there aren't any more questions, I have a motion to make on this. It seems clear there's a lot of concerning stuff going on. To summarize, we have a document being used to justify decisions, even though it has no bearing because it's from a previous government under a Constitution that no longer exists. We now have a new Constitution approved by voters and signed by the President. The university agrees with the constitutions, yes?
    1. **Matteo Paola:** Traditionally, the University President signs constitutions. For the most recent version, the Office of General Counsel kind of refused to ask for the President's signature. However, the Constitution was presented to her, and she more or less agreed to it. There was never a statement like, "I don't acknowledge this."
    2. **Sen. Pearson**: So, it was acknowledged as valid. It's a new Constitution, functionally a new government system, and the previous JC policies reference a body that doesn't exist anymore, so they're not applicable. A new document should have been drafted and approved by the Senate, but since that didn't happen, there are no valid JC policies, and they can only follow the Constitution and statutes.

xi. **Sen. Durr**: I am very much in favor of having a document that is up to date. So your motion would be to de-recognize the JC?
    1. **Sen. Pearson**: No. The motion would clarify that they currently have no

JC policies, that we don't and never have recognized the previous ones, and that they need to write new policies for Senate approval. It would also state that we don't recognize their recent decision, as it's based on powers they don't have, making it illegal and unconstitutional.

2. **Sen. Durr:** So, the JC would have to write their own policies and submit them to us for approval? Would there be any legal issues operating without a judicial council, or for as long as it takes them to rewrite their policies?
3. **Sen. Pearson**: We wouldn't be operating without a Judicial Council. They still have the powers granted to them by the Constitution and statutes. This is like what would happen if we lost our standing rules, we'd need to write new ones, but in the meantime, we'd default to our governing documents: the Constitution, statutes, and the Democratic Rules of Order.
4. **Sen. Durr**: What would be the process of approving that?
5. **Sen. Pearson**: I think we would just have to have that conversation. We can delegate the Student Government committee to help with that and see if they want help from the Senate in general. I see it as more of a collaborative process. By the time it gets to our floor we would have already had conversations. But if there is some issue, we would just reject it and work with them and point out why we did so.

xii. **Sen. Karlapati**: Within the majority opinion, the first whole part of having a community member and a sitting member is not their problem?

1. **Matteo Paola**: I couldn't tell you the exact issue that led to the injunction, but there seemed to be speculation that emailing the President and Board of Trustees wasn't sufficient notification, because you have to notify in "good faith," which isn't what state law says. Part of their determination was that we notified them but not sufficiently, and the other part was that we're supposed to collaborate with the Board and President on any process change. My dissenting opinion would have been that state law says collaboration happens after finalizing the process to collect mandatory incidental fees. Finalization is after the Senate passes the fee bills, the President signs them, and then meets with the OSU President to collaboratively present the fee request to the Board.
2. **Sen. Karlapati**: The opinion says the problem was a lack of good faith effort, but who determines that? It seems very subjective, and I don't see strong arguments in the opinion for why it wasn't good faith. We've always had the right to amend and pass bills, and the committee was just making recommendations, not submitting new fee bills.
3. **Matteo Paola:** It is not exactly clear to me. A councilor keeps saying the Judicial Council is non-binding but expects the Senate to be bound by their opinions. I'd encourage a Senate subpoena to ask other councilors what they think "non-binding" means. If the JC isn't binding but makes binding decisions, I don't see how they interpreted the bill.
4. **Sen. Karlapati:** What does nonbinding have to do with this?

5. **Matteo Paola**: The whole argument about whether it's a change to the process hinges on whether the committee is making binding decisions or just recommendations to the Senate.

xiii. **Sen. Ikehara**: I am more confused at what the motion is? Wanting them to re-write their documents?
   1. **Sen. Pearson:** I have not written it yet, what I intend the motion to say is that the JC currently has no policies, as the existing ones are non-applicable. We'll notify them of this, recommend they draft new policies for Senate approval, and clarify that the recent decision based on unconstitutional and unlawful policies is not recognized. While we could review past decisions made under these policies, it's not practical. Instead, we'll make clear that we don't recognize any injunction of valid statutes, as the JC doesn't have and cannot have that power.
   2. **Sen. Ikehara**: Why do they not have updated policies?
   3. **Sen. Pearson**: They don't have Policies currently because the document they're using was last updated in 2017, before our current Constitution was created in 2021–2022. The new Constitution established a new government system, so the old policies no longer apply.

xiv. **Sen. Durr**: I wanted to add on to what Katya was talking about earlier with the Opinion. I also had an issue with the focus on a "good faith effort" to notify the University President and Board of Trustees. We had just overridden the veto last Tuesday, and this writ and meeting happened within the same week. What constitutes bad faith effort when we had less than a week to act? The Senate passed the bill in December, partly because the amendment removed the timeline requiring a recommendation by three days ago. We had until this time next year to get the committee's recommendation and notify the Board, so I imagine this writ was submitted before that was clarified.

xv. ***Sen. Pearson*** *hereby motioned to clarify that the ASOSU Senate does not recognize the referenced ASOSU Judicial Council policies seen on the ASOSU Judicial Council webpage, last updated as of 2017, as they were never confirmed or consented to by the ASOSU Senate, as Constitutionally mandated, and do not comply with our current Constitution nor Oregon state law. The Senate instead calls for a constitutionally and legally valid ASOSU Judicial Council Policies be drafted and presented for consent to the ASOSU Senate. The ASOSU Senate does not recognize the injunction of the Statutes seen in Majority Opinion on No. 25.035.c. and instead maintains that the Statutes remain as they have been enacted as of January 12th, 2025. seconded by* ***Sen. Durr.***
   1. **Sen. Eckman**: Could put something in there about the recognition that the committee could have invalid participants. In the line with the JC's decision. That could be a separate motion. That was one of the main problems I had so I would like to have that in there.
   2. **Sen. Lau**: In terms of us actually saying this, does this do anything necessarily for the process?
   3. **Sen. Pearson**: I'd answer that with a question: does the opinion have any impact if it's based on a document that doesn't apply? I think the answer

is no. So, in a way, this motion doesn't have material impact either, since the opinion itself doesn't. What I hope the motion achieves is that it can be sent, maybe by the records clerk, vice president, or pro tempore, to the JC, asking them to draft Judicial Council policies for us to approve.

4. **Sen. Lau**: If we are sending to the Judicial Council we should attach a PDF of the Judicial Policies.
    a. *The motion **passed** with **11 ayes** from: Sen. Acar, Sen. Allen, Sen. Durr, Sen. Eckman, Sen. Hostetler-McLaughlin, Sen. Ikehara, Sen. Jones, Sen. Karlapati, Sen. Lau, Sen. Pearson, and Sen. Rowe; **3 abstentions** from: Sen. Knox, Sen. Raschkes, and Sen. Wright.*

xvi. **Sen. Eckman**: My motion was just that the Senate recognizes that the composition of the committee cannot include community members. Let me know if anyone has any changes they'd like to suggest.

1. **Sen. Pearson**: Can you clarify the justification for this? To me, a committee is made up of its members, so it depends on how we're defining "community member." There seems to be a gap here. For example, if we confirm someone to the SFC, they come to us as a community member, but once confirmed, they're part of the SFC. How is this different?
2. **Vice President Kowash:** In our constitution it states that a member of ASOSU has to be a fee-paying student, but I will look at that and get back to you.
3. **Sen. Rowe**: I do not think we have to do that. If we could just make a motion to change the statute, we wouldn't need to pass bills. You can recommend I don't appoint community members, which I'm fine with. Five people are picked randomly, but they need Senate confirmation, so we can just not confirm community members. If preferred, I can stick to appointing students?
4. **Sen. Eckman**: I wasn't saying we had to do that. I was more suggesting we recognize this part of the injunction. The previous motion made it seem like we disregarded the entire thing.
5. **Sen Pearson**: When it comes to the motion, the main point is that they can't issue an injunction, not that we're rejecting all their arguments. A motion could affirm that community members cannot be on the committee, state our intent not to confirm any community members, and express our expectation that the pro temp board won't appoint them either. It's more about affirming our belief and intent.

xvii. **Sen. Wright**: When we are talking about community members, we were talking about OSU students, at random?

1. **Sen. Pearson:** No as in non-students, other Corvallis residents.

xviii. **Sen. Durr**: What if we amended the bill?

1. **Sen. Rowe**: I'm fine with that. Honestly, if the JC wants to keep their policy, they can. We don't necessarily have to make a statement on it. They probably will keep it, but there's a definition of office, and we can

always work on an amendment later if needed. I'm not sure if we want to address it right now.

2. **Vice President Kowash**: I don't think we can amend a bill that has already been enacted. If we're motioning to ignore it, any changes would need to take the form of a new bill.
3. **Sen. Pearson**: I was going to say the same thing, Zach. We'd need another bill since it's in statute. Personally, I think it's fine to handle that later. Taking the time to draft a bill and vote to skip a second reading doesn't seem like the best use of time right now.

VIII) Committee Reports

a. Budgets
   i. **Sen. Eckman:** We met last Friday in the conference room, and we talked about the timeline with the memo for the base wage recommendation.
b. Student Government
   i. **Sen. Pearson:** We have a recommendation; it has gotten a little delayed. We are most likely going to be meeting on Mondays from 11 am to 12 pm. We will be presumably getting some follow up on the injunction.
c. Campus Improvements
   i. **Sen. Karlapati:** We are back brainstorming and doing the whole flaps thing. We were thinking about possibly helping fix windows, sheds on top of bike racks, putting the Beaver Bus on Google Maps.
d. Outreach
   i. **Sen. Lau:** Tentatively planning for a town hall. Planning to substitute for our Week 6 meeting. Inviting questions. Tabling for the event and social media outreach. We are again working with CEL for their day of service, there are the morning and evening shifts. If you could take a quick second to like the messages in whether you are available for the morning or afternoon sessions.
e. Standing and Special Rules Committee
   i. **Sen. Pearson:** Rules wise it has taken a while to figure out when we are meeting, but we will hopefully be meeting next week.

IX) Gallery Comments

a. There were no gallery comments.

X) Old Business

a. There was no old business.

XI) President of the Senate Announcements

a. Schedule 1:1s for W25 with me
b. Schedule office hours
c. ASOSU Elections are happening!
d. Paper only fee deliberations; thoughts?
   i. **Vice President Kowash**: I have been really relaxed about the Democratic Rules of Order. I think it is important to follow it very strictly during deliberations. I will be doing a lot more specific points of order and following the secondary speaking list as well. Do you all feel you have the information to make decisions, or should we have budget presentations again? I have spaced out a time where we can have budget presentations if we want.

1. **Sen. Acar**: What is the meeting on Thursday?
2. **Vice President Kowash**: It is the final deliberations on the student fees, so they will be taking their final vote. On Saturday they did a lot of preliminary, nonbinding votes and unit presentations.

ii. **Sen. Acar**: I think I would be good without presentations.

iii. **Vice President Kowash:** I was going to have it structured so that the first day would be the readings of all the seven fee bills. On Thursday ASOSU, SEE, and PRAx, and then next Thursday the rest of them. I do think it will be beneficial for us to ask those questions to budget managers on that first day and have them come back with any information you might request.

iv. **Sen. Durr**: Regarding the presentations, I don't feel the need to see them again. However, I'd like to see any information the SFC requested but didn't receive. There was a long list mentioned Saturday, and I'd definitely want to review anything they didn't get.

1. **Sen. Hostetler-McLaughlin**: I was not there on Saturday so I would enjoy the presentations.
2. **Sen. Ikehara**: I just want to echo what you said about having budget managers there to answer questions. I think that would be really helpful. There were questions I wasn't sure if I was supposed to ask or not. I agree with everyone else and feel like we don't need to see the presentations again.
3. **Sen. Knox:** The SFC presentations were recorded. I think the information I would like would come from the information requested from the budget managers.
4. **Sen. Pearson**: Having the budget managers there is really important. I do not need the presentations.
5. **Sen. Hostetler-McLaughlin:** If you did not attend Saturday's meeting, hypothetically, how would you be able to view Saturday's meeting?
6. **Vice President Kowash:** The SFC meeting was recorded. It is eight hours long, but if you speed that up 2x, that is four hours.
7. **Sen. Rowe**: I'm just extending the offer. If anyone needs help with the BRDs, as I know I'll need help with some specific things, the budgets committee seem really good at that. If you want to talk to someone about specific questions, I'm open to talk too. Even if you don't have an hour, maybe you have 15 minutes to meet with someone, get informed, and talk it through.

e. **Vice President Kowash**: In gallery comment it will be 20 minutes total, 2-minutes per gallery member. Senators can motion to extend that, but I think that is a good baseline. Ceding time back and forth takes quite a bit of time and we do not want to be wasting students' time or money.

i. **Sen. Knox:** Who counts as a gallery member?

ii. **Vice President Kowash:** I was going to expand on that.

iii. **Sen. Pearson**: I think ceding could be reasonable, for example, for members of the SFC or others with relevant knowledge, like SABs or interested groups. An informal guideline to not overdo it might help, but overall, I think there's still

merit to ceding.

iv. **Vice President Kowash**: I can agree with that. My field deals with impossible circumstances, so if it's an SAB or SFC member, we can address that.

v. **Sen. Rowe**: I'd like to see two and a half or three minutes. I'm fine keeping the 20-minute time limit, but when I first attended a Senate meeting, I had three minutes, and it wasn't enough to make my point. That was three years ago, so I'd prefer a little longer. That said, it's not a hill I'll die on, I don't care that much.

f. **Sen. Jones:** This is more of a technical question. During SFC, a lot of people abstained from votes because they worked in different departments. For example, I have a friend who works in DCE. How would that work in this case?

i. **Vice President Kowash**: I'd recommend abstaining in cases of financial conflicts of interest, like if you work for a unit. That's the standard the Student Fee Committee used for abstaining, but ultimately, it's up to you as a voting member.

ii. **Sen. Rowe:** You do have to abstain in cases of legal conflicts of interest. For clear clarification, you can check with OGC. Generally, if you financially benefit from voting on something, like voting to raise your own wage, you're legally required to abstain.

iii. **Vice President Kowash:** If you are going to be in ASOSU next year or have an inkling of it by the time FY26 begins, then abstain.

g. **Sen. Pearson**: I think it is important to have gallery members voice their opinions. There were thousands of students that were not able to show up to deliberations and I want to make it as accessible as possible. I think that the gallery is perhaps the most important voice in the room.

h. **Vice President Kowash:** We can cross that bridge when we come to it, I do not think wither of us are going to budge on this. Regarding gallery comments, this was brought up during the Student Fee Committee meeting, and I want to address it here: all comments should be directed to the chair. Back-and-forth exchanges with gallery members aren't helpful for deliberations. Please address me as the chair when speaking, and budget presenters should do the same when responding to questions. I'll make sure they understand this to keep discussions focused and avoid unnecessary arguments.

i. **Sen. Durr**: Just to clarify, if you plan to run next year, you abstain from the ASOSU vote?

ii. **Sen. Rowe**: ASOSU has separate budgets, including pay. You don't have to abstain on a unit's fee bill since it doesn't determine your pay. But if voting directly on your pay, you must abstain. An exception is if a memorandum sets pay for all units, including ASOSU, then you'd abstain. Statutes, not fee bills, usually set pay. If you vote to raise wages for SEE and you work there, you don't need to abstain unless a statute applies.

iii. **Sen. Ikehara**: If I am going to benefit from club funding or a worker unit, does that mean I have to abstain?

iv. **Sen. Rowe**: You only have to abstain if you'll directly benefit financially in FY26. For example, if your club uses club funds, you don't have to abstain from increasing club funding since you're not personally being paid. However, if you work for Clubs and Orgs and approve a decision package to raise wages, you

might need to abstain if you'll still be there when it takes effect.

i. **Vice President Kowash**: So, for paper-only deliberations. Several senators have approached me about this, and it's something I've been considering. This would mean I'd print out the fee bills, BRDs, and other materials for you to use during deliberations. During recesses, breaks, or reading periods, you'd still be allowed to use a laptop or computer to look up statutes, the Constitution, or the Democratic Rules of Order, as that's clearly helpful. I want to make sure everyone stays focused during meetings, which has been an issue in the past, especially when others are speaking.
    i. **Sen. Pearson**: I'm going to push back on that for a few reasons. From a practical perspective, while physical copies are helpful, tools like *Ctrl+F* are my best friend to find things. I use both paper and my computer during Senate meetings. Computers allow access to notes, supplementary info, and multiple documents we may not know to print. Printing everything we might need feels like an undue burden. Last year during fee deliberations, exact wording from the statutes and Constitution was necessary, and having them available on a computer was critical. Electronics also improve accessibility. Computers help me stay organized. I agree everyone needs to stay focused, but I don't think limiting access to tools is the way to do that. The harms of restricting electronics would outweigh the benefits.
    ii. **Vice President Kowash:** The way I'm looking at this is I've asked you all to pay attention, and I'm still having issues with people not paying attention. I really don't want to be your mom, but we need to do our due respect for the students.
    iii. **Sen. Durr**: Since, as I understand it, we now have the ability to amend fee bills on the floor, and the injunction against SB 84.16 is no longer valid, that bill is in place. With that in mind, if we can use laptops for introduced bills, I think it's valuable overall. Being able to amend them on the floor without relying on a red pen to mark changes makes laptops helpful.
    iv. **Sen. Karlapat**i: To clarify, this is just for the fee deliberations, so it would only apply to the fee bills. I also wanted this, but I didn't mean for it to become a long argument. Whatever everyone decides is fine. I just think we need to be more mindful during Senate meetings. I know I'm guilty of getting distracted by my computer since everything's on there.
    v. **Sen. Ikehara**: For me it would be nice to have a computer. It is helpful for me to be able to search things up.
    vi. **Sen. Rowe**: If some people prefer to use paper, maybe they can reach out to Zach, and we can seat them together to avoid distractions from screens. I know it happens to me in class if someone in front of me is on their screen. As an option, I'd also suggest a single-device policy. If people prefer that, it could solve the issue, but I'm not too pressed about it.
    vii. **Sen. Acar**: Give us the first meeting, and if it goes badly then we can go from there?
    viii. **Sen. Knox**: I'd suggest that we all agree, even if it's not an official policy, that when someone's talking and you don't need to reference something, computers should stay closed unless you actually need to look something up. I'm not saying we should self-police others but just a general policy.

ix. **Sen. Lau**: I think, in general, we could say no phones during fee deliberations. There's nothing we need on our phones for this, and from an audience perspective, it doesn't feel very respectful.

x. **Sen. Pearson:** I would be in favor of no phones, unless your computer dies.

j. **Vice President Kowash**: Okay, no phones. Please just pay attention. We are handling $35 million. This is a big responsibility, and we have to do it right for the students. So, no phones. Laptops only when needed.

XII) Gallery Comments

a. There were no Gallery Comments to be made.

XIII) Senator Comments

a. There were no Senator Comments to be made.

XIV) Advisor Comments

a. **Keri Simonet:** Put facilities link for reporting any broken windows and such! It is in the Teams chat.

XV) Adjournment

*Meeting adjourned at **9:01 pm.***