ASOSU Senate Fee Deliberations
Winter Session of the 84th Senate
February 4th, 2025 | 6:00pm
SEC 354
Zoom: https://oregonstate.zoom.us/j/93577674659?pwd=6scPXxEc9bAiQlYjLniQT5YoxLLZd4.1
President of the Senate
Zachary Kowash
SEC 288

I) Roll Call/Quorum ~ 6:00 pm

a. Sen. Lidya Acar – **absent**
b. Sen. Mercedez Allen – **proxy Isabelle Bare**
c. Sen. Ryan Becquer – **present**
d. Sen. Shawn Durr – **present**
e. Sen. Eliza Eckman – **present**
f. Sen. Alexa Gomez Silva – **proxy Joe Wolf**
g. Sen. Kieran Hostetler-McLaughlin – **proxy Dawson Yang**
h. Sen. Marisa Ikehara – **present**
i. Sen. Destiny Jones – **present**
j. Sen. Katya Karlapati – **present**
k. Sen. Teaghan Knox – **present**
l. Sen. Camryn Lau – **present**
m. Sen. Christina Lewandowski – **proxy Ben Adams**
n. Sen. Donovan Morales – **proxy Carlos**
o. Sen. Emerson Pearson – **present**
p. Sen. Nathan Raschkes – **present**
q. Sen. Adison Rowe – **present**
r. Sen. Leah Wright – **proxy Roman Patchell**

II) Swearing in of Senators/Proxies

a. ***Isabelle Bare*** *was sworn in as proxy for* ***Sen. Allen****, they will be referred to as* ***Sen. Bare*** *from this point on.*
b. ***Joe Wolf*** *was sworn in as proxy for* ***Sen. Gomez Silva****, they will be referred to as* ***Sen. Wolf*** *from this point on.*
c. ***Dawson Yang*** *was sworn in as proxy for* ***Sen. Hostetler-McLaughlin****, they will be referred to as* ***Sen. Yang*** *from this point on.*
d. ***Ben Adams*** *was sworn in as proxy for* ***Sen. Lewandowski****, they will be referred to as* ***Sen. Adams*** *from this point on.*
e. ***Roman Patchell*** *was sworn in as proxy for* ***Sen. Wright****, they will be referred to as* ***Sen. Patchell*** *from this point on.*

III) **Approval of Minutes**

a. There were no minutes to be approved.

IV) **Approval of Agenda**

a. *The agenda was approved as written.*

V) **Gallery Comments**

a. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Good evening. This process has been incredibly difficult for everyone. Last night, I couldn't attend the Senate or mediation for both personal and mental health reasons. Like many of you, I hate not just this job but what it has done to my life. We now have until Tuesday to decide what ASOSU will stand for: an organization that works together or one that makes symbolic budget allocations. I acknowledge the harm this process has caused, but we must preserve ASOSU's relationships with those who can enact real change. I ask you to pass the Rec Sports budget and vote down the MU and Performing Arts budgets—not because we don't support wage increases, but because these funds won't be used for that purpose. If either budget passes, I will veto it. If President Murphy rejects it, the process starts over, which we cannot afford. We've fought hard to raise wages for some student workers, but we're jeopardizing our ability to help thousands more. Let's not burn the relationships we need to make lasting change. Thank you.

*b. **Saegis Abbott** asked to speak a prayer.*

VI) **New Business**

a. There was no new business to be talked about.

VII) **Old Business**

a. SB-84.20 - "ASOSU Incidental Fee Allocation Bill"

i. There was no discussion to be made.

b. Vote on mediated SB-84.24 - "MU Incidental Fee Allocation Bill"

i. **Sen. Pearson:** The workers under the incidental fee were described as 1/10th of all student workers, but it is more than that. This covers 1000 jobs, which is more than 10%. I also wanted to ask some questions to Audrey about the decision to veto. How many students and student workers did you reach out to before making the decision to veto?

1. **President Audrey Schlotter:** Only like 20 or 25.
2. **Sen. Pearson:** 25 is not a representative sample size. We've also seen petitions with 200+ signatures and past petitions with 1,300, showing strong student support for wage increases. In contrast, there hasn't been enough student outreach for these vetoes compared to administrative outreach, which is concerning. If the issue is ensuring funds go where they should, why veto SB-84.14, which aimed to enforce that? Instead of abandoning advocacy because units resist, we should hold administration accountable. Student government shouldn't just approve what the administration presents. Without broader outreach, continuing to veto is rash. I urge everyone to consider the data and follow through on their campaign promises.

ii. **Sen. Durr:** Could you elaborate on some of the changes that made to the MU bill?

iii. **Sen. Becquer**: I would say that the MU was a true mediation. What happened

was that instead of cutting wages entirely or implementing them to the fullest extent, a middle ground was found. Most of the arguments had been centered around people who are not student workers and would be making less than $17.10, so we lowered to an amount that would not impact that. The decision package #3 for the SEC was cut in half also. The net result was lowering the fee by a little and the idea was to lessen that area of friction.

1. **Sen. Durr**: Was the MU amenable to the $16.95 ?
2. ***Sen. Durr*** *ceded 5 minutes to* ***Deb Mott***
3. **Deb Mott**: I did some quick analysis of step ranges for the university. The bottom 25% of full-time wages for the different positions are all in the same range of what we are paying students. $16.43 up to $21. When I look at these numbers, there are some hard truths. If I am paying 5 students $20 bucks an hour, I have one year, maybe 6 terms to pay them at that and then they are gone. We never stop training. I would consider looking at entry level professional staff coming here. Student positions don't have minimum qualifications like the professional staff positions do. Bringing in a full-time staff is going to be a business decision that provides a more consistent service over time. Not cutting those positions, but not tasking them with the responsibilities that they have now. That is why I am not asking for the $16.95. I have to look at the long term and the services we provide to the community and students

iv. **Sen. Durr**: I imagine that was mentioned during mediation?

v. **Sen. Becquer:** No, the number was picked at mediation, now there has been new analysis.

vi. **Sen. Patchell:** I would like to challenge Sen. Pearsons numbers on the statistics. I am an environmental economics and policy major. I focus on Statistical regression and my research is being considered for publication, which has helped me understand what kinds of data are appropriate to use for quantitative policy analysis. Listening to what I have heard about those statistics, I have a few concerns. The survey that was put out, I do not think it is appropriate to use for quantitative analysis because of the wording of the questions. The survey was intended as a qualitative almost temperature check for how the student body is feeling on the issue, which is an appropriate use.

1. **Sen. Pearson:** I think we are referring to different things; the quantitative numbers are from the elections that occurred early September, not what I was talking about earlier.

vii. **Sen. Patchell**: I understand, that is what I am referring to here. The wording for when you are doing surveys, in order to mitigate response bias you have to make sure that every tradeoff is clearly outlined. Survey research is hard, you need to ensure that the wording makes it appropriate for statistical analysis so the results are not biased. Second, you were saying earlier that the number of students who voted in the survey was 750, and you were saying that would be representative of the total student body correct?

1. **Sen. Rowe**: At the time of the survey it was 18,000 students. 669 students voted yes, and 81 voted no.

2. **Sen. Pearson**: Is the number of students who are eligible for paying student fees. Online and Cascade campus students do not pay the student incidental fee. They are not voting students.

viii. **Sen. Patchell:** For 18,000 that would be true that it is representative if it was a random sample, but it was not. Because the survey was sent to all students, but only 750 responded. That means there is only a 3% response rate on that, which is very low. You would not be able to find a scientific study that would site that low of a number. A low response rate raises the concern of nonresponse bias, which may cause students to be unwilling or unable to complete the survey. The main concern is that when using statistics, you are using an appropriate sample and making sure that all of the methods are mitigating bias. I do not think it is an appropriate argument and would employ the Senate to disregard these figures.

ix. **Sen. Jones**: I would like to ask everyone to be respectful of everyone's time. This is a long and drawn-out process, and very draining. Like many of you all I have exams and another job. I hope you listen to those who actually have a degree and are in this field professionally.

1. ***Sen. Jones*** *motioned to limit the discussion to 10 minutes per bill; seconded by* ***Sen. Adams****. Motion carries.*

x. **Sen. Ikehara**: I was hoping to see the numbers that you had gotten and shown earlier? I also would like to see the numbers from Roman if possible?

1. **Deb Mott**: I can talk through this to make sure that everyone can understand it.

xi. **Sen. Raschkes**: I wanted to echo what Audrey, Deb, and our proxy's points on statistics and want to refute Senator Pearson's remarks. It's selfish to push for a high student fee increase for partisan reasons, especially when those graduating won't bear the cost. This only adds to student debt and burdens the 24,000 students still here. OSU is already expensive, and rising living costs make this worse. The ongoing Senate-mediation standoff is harming students. With deadlines approaching, leaving units unfunded is irresponsible. We can't force unit managers to raise wages, and it's outside our authority to do so. Our job is to allocate funds, not set wages. Fee increases disproportionately impact international, transfer, out-of-state, low-income, and returning students, many who are already struggling. While Oregon law caps student fee increases at 5%, that percentage has a bigger impact as fees increase. A 5% hike on $500 is far more than on $100. Wages vary by job because of different skills and experience, making a flat wage increase unrealistic. Higher fees could lower enrollment, limiting OSU's accessibility to only wealthier students. Most of us ran on reducing fees and this does the opposite. I want to limit fee hikes to keep OSU affordable and growing.

xii. **Sen. Pearson**: Sure, non-response bias is always a risk, just like in elections. But we also have petitions with hundreds of signatures and 1,300 students who signed to make the election happen, all in support. Meanwhile, there's no numerical evidence showing significant student opposition, just speculation. It's frustrating to be called selfish for advocating for students when I've spent over a year fighting for them, hearing their struggles firsthand. I've seen student

workers struggle for fair pay and respect, witnessed union-busting, and watched past Senates fail them. Yet, every piece of numerical data I've seen supports wage increases. There's an echo chamber in ASOSU that dismisses student voices in favor of authority figures with vested interests against wage increases. No one's perspective will change here tonight, so let's vote and get it over with, so students can once again be disappointed. There's overwhelming evidence of student support, yet the focus remains on critiquing advocacy rather than presenting real opposition. I also believe we need to swear in one more proxy.

xiii. ***Sen. Pearson*** *motioned to vote; seconded by* ***Sen. Jones****. Objected by* ***Sen. Durr****. Motion rescinded.*

1. **Sen. Durr:** I object because we have these numbers, but I have no clue what they mean.

xiv. ***Sen. Durr*** *motioned to extend the discussion by 5 minutes, seconded by* ***Sen. Becquer.***

xv. **Sen. Durr:** Deb if you would be able to explain this?

xvi. ***Sen. Durr*** *ceded 5 minutes to* ***Deb Mott***

1. **Deb Mott**: This salary schedule outlines pay ranges for different positions. The lowest step starts at $16.94/hour, and wages increase with qualifications, certifications, and experience. For example, a full-time custodian starts at $16.94, while an AV tech, requiring three years of experience, starts at the same rate but can reach $18.93. We have student techs earning more than that, but turnover is a challenge. While we're fortunate to have high retention, students eventually graduate. In contrast, full-time employees stay for five to seven years or longer, providing more consistent service. For example, a custodial coordinator earns around $20.55–$21/hour, requiring two years of lead work experience. Some student workers are close to this, despite having fewer responsibilities. Similarly, a full-time admin program specialist can handle more work than four student operations specialists working 20 hours each. These are the financial realities I have to consider when making staffing decisions.

xvii. ***Sen. Knox*** *motioned to extend discussion by 2-minutes, seconded by* ***Ben Adams***

xviii. **Sen. Knox:** Do these positions also have benefits? When you put that into your calculation does it still make financial sense?

1. **Deb Mott:** Yes, because I do not look at it year by year

xix. **Sen. Durr**: So, this is proposed, correct? not current?

1. **Deb Mott:** No this is current. This is full-time staff we hire with minimum qualifications and who need to have at least one year of experience.

xx. ***Sen. Durr*** *ceded 1 minute to* ***President Audrey Schlotter***

1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I just want to highlight this as an opportunity to advocate for real change. This is horrifying, Deb showed me this earlier, and it's tough to process. We have a voice as students, and instead of raising wages for just a few, we could push to raise all wages on campus.

xxi. **Sen. Kno**x: If student wages go up, does that give the SEIU bargaining power? If they are seeing students make more. It is hard to predict wages five years out for unions because I think they just renegotiate to get these rates because they were already lowered? This only started in November.
    1. **Deb Mott:** That was the mid contract raise.
    2. **Sen. Knox**: How confident that this scale will remain for the next five years?
    3. **Deb Mott:** I honestly hope that these numbers will get substantially higher.

xxii. ***Sen. Adams*** *motioned to vote on SB-84.24 "MU Incidental Fee Allocation Bill, seconded by* ***Sen. Wolf.***
    1. *The motion* ***passes*** *with* ***9 ayes, 7 nays, and 1 abstention.***

c. Vote on SB-84.25 "Performing Arts Incidental Fee Allocation bill"
    i. **Sen. Rowe:** This one came back from mediation unchanged.
    ii. **Sen. Yang:** I was excited when some of these bills first passed and shared the news with friends in these departments, who were also supportive. While it's valid to question survey methods, the opposing side has provided no data of their own. The data we do have overwhelmingly supports wage increases, if it were close, errors would be more concerning. Many students I've talked to, both workers and non-workers, are excited about this, especially given the current economic and political climate. Friends in the Performing Arts department are looking forward to seeing what happens next.
    iii. **Sen. Eckman**: The reason I voted the way I did was in part because the $0.14 per student per term would not actually reach the $17.10 minimum base wage like originally thought. I do not know what the minimum base wage would be if the 0.14 was implemented but I hope this would be a step towards achieving at least a $16.95 or around that.
    iv. **Sen. Durr:** I remember when we were in the MU for one of these meetings, the Performing Arts budget managers said they would be able to work with the money. So that is good, because they will work with the money that we give them.
    v. ***Sen. Lau*** *ceded 2 minutes to* ***President Audrey Schlotter***
        1. **President Audrey Schlotter:** For Performing Arts, the budget managers that are here aren't like actual budget managers, and the unit is a bit different in that way. The two people who came and presented don't have any fiscal authority over where money goes because it is within an academic unit, and it goes to the dean. I spoke with them about these steps, and he stated they would not be able to and they won't. Not to say that the budget managers are null and void, but more so that they do not have the authority to do that.
        2. **Sen. Knox:** Did they provide any other information why they cannot, and they won't?
        3. **President Audrey Schlotter:** There are people within the unit who are not fee funded; it would separate the divide within people doing the same job. You would have someone who is not fee funded being minimum

wage and the other being paid $17.10.

4. **Sen. Knox:** Is there a reason they could not change the other positions wages?
5. **President Audrey Schlotter:** That comes back to ENG funds and tuition, there is no funding for it. To my knowledge the wages they were planning have been decided for a while, it is like a circle. There are people who are making minimum wage.

vi. ***Sen. Becquer*** *ceded time to* ***President Schlotter***

1. **Sen. Becquer:** In the final Senate discussion, I remember them saying that they checked with someone above them and they were averse to that. They were not present at the mediation, as they had an event. I think there is a greater structural problem there as well. The reason why we do not know what to recommend is because we do not have a partner in this discussion. For example, we have Deb who allowed us to ask questions. Is there a reason why someone could not be delegated?
2. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I could not answer why we are structured this way. The dean is very busy, and it would be that this was a delegation to the people that know the most about the unit but they do not have authority over the unit. Even when we did have someone from the unit come, it did not matter to this group. I do not think it would have mattered if the dean came and gave that information to you all.

vii. **Sen. Becquer:** We know that that is not true, we stepped down from the $17.10 in the MU. There are bills that we have considered that have and have not included wages. Middle grounds are a possibility. The difference between the system now and the one you said we might not need, is that we would know what the real number is that is the most practical and feasible. We are just currently oscillating between the two possibilities. We have nothing else to go on and that is a structural problem.

1. **President Audrey Schlotter:** I agree. I think this is something that we should address when we do the SFC process improvements task force.

viii. ***Sen. Adams*** *motioned to vote on the mediated SB-84.25 "Performing Arts Incidental Fee Allocation Bill", seconded by* ***Sen. Bare***

1. *The motion* ***passed*** *with* ***11 ayes, 5 nays, and 1 abstention.***

d. Vote on SB-84.26 - "Recreational Sports Incidental Fee Allocation Bill"

i. **Sen. Durr**: Could you put the updated version in the Teams chat?

ii. **Sen. Ikehara**: I would like to pose a question to President Schlotter, I am wondering if there is a compromise we could come to in terms of wages. Is there any value that you would be willing to pass?

1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I would send that to Rec-Sports. I would raise student wages 100% if I knew that it would be spent on that, and that is a reality. I have a moral disposition for charging students if they are not guaranteed to get it. That does not mean it is the end of the conversation. It is an opportunity to build relationships and get that to a comfortable rate.

iii. ***Sen. Ikehara*** *ceded 1 minute to* ***Troy Snow***

1. **Troy Snow**: We have already increased of $16.76, and we would need to do an additional analysis.
2. **Sen. Ikehara**: If we make it back here would that be able to be presented to us?
3. **Troy Snow:** Yes.

iv. **Sen. Pearson**: Would you sign a bill that enacted an accountability mechanism that ensured that these would be applied?
1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: No.
2. **Sen. Pearson**: Why did you veto SB-84.14 which sought to ensure that student's money is spent on what it is allocated for?
3. **President Audrey Schlotter**: Which one was that?
4. **Sen. Rowe**: That was the "Fiscal Responsibility Act" which included the backup clause for if the senate did pass fee bills in time.
5. **Sen. Pearson**: Analysis of discrepancies within the indices was the main purpose.
6. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I would refer back to my veto memo.
7. **Sen. Pearson**: Why isn't this rationale being applied to all indices, particularly in cases where allocated funds don't match actual spending, as SB-84.14 aimed to address? You argue that students shouldn't pay for services they don't receive, yet discrepancies in indices suggest funds aren't being used as intended. If consistency is the goal, will you veto every bill with a margin of error in the operating budget, or is this selective enforcement?
8. **President Audrey Schlotter**: Don't all critiques and questions have to be presented to the Chair? I think this all comes down to operational control. I am not going to address some of the more outlandish questions because they do not have a place in this meeting. We are collaborating. I do not think there is a very collaborative approach that has been put forth by the Senate.

v. ***Sen. Pearson*** *ceded 3 minutes to* ***Matteo Paola***
1. **Matteo Paola**: I'm disappointed that collaboration seems to be a one-way street. Senate is expected to work with the President and administrators, but that isn't reciprocated. Senators have been cut out of discussions, like with the 24-hour pilot program, and told they can't be involved. Two years ago, as president, we successfully raised wages across all units with little pushback. Now, we're being told it's impossible, with shifting justifications and questionable legal arguments. Vetoing bills at this point, when the deadline is today, is also disrespectful to the process. Additionally, last year's Judicial Council effectively staged an illegal coup, violating Oregon public meeting laws to overturn a constitutional amendment that 90% of student voters approved. In other cases, the Judicial Council has invalidated decisions for similar violations, yet they've exempted themselves from the same standard. Blame is being unfairly placed solely on the Senate, while other parties have contributed to these issues. Many of these problems

could have been avoided if the Senate still had its full authority or if that illegal decision was revisited. It's frustrating to see accusations of authoritarianism applied so selectively, with little accountability from others involved.

vi. **Sen. Adams**: One reason this process has been so unproductive is that we keep relitigating multi-year arguments every time an issue comes up. I've mostly observed from the outside as a proxy, but I hear things, and it feels like we're stuck in a cycle of ideological ping-pong with no middle ground. Every meeting, someone brings up something from last year, even though most of the Senate wasn't here then. It's like everything gets pulled into a black hole of past debates, making it impossible to focus on the present. This isn't a problem we can solve right now, but moving forward, ASOSU should focus on addressing issues as they are today instead of being trapped in overarching ideological battles that divide us.

vii. ***Sen. Knox*** *motioned to extend discussion by five minutes, seconded by* ***Sen. Pearson***

viii. **Sen. Knox**: Last year there was an accounting error with wages and there was not enough money allocated for the wages discussed in the SFC process. This year, does that include a correction for the under allocation last year? Is it just moving up off of the lower figure? Closing that deficit or just 3% off of the $16.20?

1. **Troy Snow**: It was 3.5% off, so there was no correction.
2. **Sen. Knox**: Would you be against a correction? Or is that something that you are not interested in.
3. **Troy Snow:** We are not requesting additional funding at this time.
4. **Sen. Knox**: Is there a reason or a rationale behind that?
5. **Leah Dorothy Hall**: At this time we have set our wages at a rate that is in step with the skills and experince of the student employees. The same thing that the university does from an HR perspective. That is why we are where we are.

ix. **Sen. Yang**: I just want to briefly say that past decisions being brought up isn't irrelevant or harmful as those decisions directly impact the process we're dealing with now.

x. ***Sen. Yang*** *ceded 1 minute to* ***Dylan Perfect***

1. **Dylan Perfect**: It was mentioned that the President spoke to 20 students. Meanwhile, we had a referendum where more students signed the petition and voted than the total number of students who would actually get wage increases. And now all I'm hearing is, well, is that high enough? 90% of those who voted said they wanted wage increases. Respectfully, I just don't get it. We've heard from administrators talking about HR and fairness for these positions, but there's not a single professional staffer in this room making anywhere close to $17.10 an hour.

xi. ***Sen. Adams*** *motioned to vote on the bill; seconded by* ***Sen. Ikehara.***

a. The motion ***passes*** *with* ***10 ayes and 7 nays****.*

e. Second reading of SB 84.27 - "Financial Referendum on Normalizing Cost-of-Living-

Adjusted (COLA) Student Employee Wages for Fee-Funded Units"

i. **Sen. Rowe:** Just a note, I added two suggestions. One accounts for the changes we didn't just approve. The other ensures ASOSU communicates with the Board of Trustees in advance of this being passed.
ii. **Sen. Pearson**: One thing, I personally would not want us to vote on this today because I would like to have a meeting with more Senators present. I would also like to push for there also consideration of a referendum question for non-athletic travel funds, and an enforcement mechanism.
iii. **Sen. Durr**: I also would not be in favor of voting for this tonight. I know you mentioned we would tell the board. I think that would need to be done before this. The idea is that we get this bills today, we have until Tuesday to get these passed. If the election closes the 28th, that is already a couple weeks behind.
iv. **Sen. Rowe**: Rather than waiting for the referndum. As soon as this bill passes, then the elections committee will communicate with the Board of Trustees of the referendum.
v. **Sen. Durr**: What happens if the Board of Trustees says it is not feasible?
vi. **Sen. Rowe**: Then they say it's not feasible. The student government still formally submits an incidental fee request, and if the board changes its mind, they can hear it. But if they say it's not feasible, there's ultimately nothing forcing them to reconsider.
vii. ***Sen. Durr*** *ceded 3 minutes to* ***Dylan Perfect***
    1. **Dylan Perfect**: That's mostly correct, but I wouldn't say students are just out of luck. ORS 352.105 states that budget fees from the recognized student government, if within the 5% threshold, limit the board's discretion. They can use that information, but there's ambiguity around the timing of requests and the board's ability to set deadlines before approving annual fees. Last year, multiple attempts to pass a wage increase within student government were blocked. A referendum on the same cost-of-living formula passed and was sent to the board. However, the board and administration essentially said they had already set fees for the next year and would revisit it later. That response wasn't ideal, as the cost-of-living adjustment loses value over time. Ideally, this process would prevent that delay so students receive an effective wage increase sooner.
viii. **Sen. Raschkes**: Question regarding the PA and the MU fee bills, what is the timeline going to look like?
    1. **Sen. Rowe:** Maybe we will talk about that at the end. Monday we would have to have a mediation committee meet on Monday or over the weekend. There is not an ideal plan, and that is the best that we got.
ix. **Sen. Raschkes**: What happens if we cannot override it?
    1. **Sen. Rowe**: That is why it would go to mediation, nobody knows.
x. ***Sen. Ikehara*** *motioned to add discussion for future meetings at the end of old business, seconded by* ***Sen. Wolf.*** *Motion carries*
xi. **Sen. Knox**: This is the same thing that was copied from the last referendum, is there interest in maybe someone or a third part that could make sure the wording

could be as impartial as possible? That is just something I would propose.

xii. ***Sen. Yang*** *ceded 3-minutes to* ***Dylan Perfect***

1. **Dylan Perfect**: I'll partly respond to the last speaker's question. I don't know the specifics of impartiality or sample size, but last year's referendum was valid. The ballot initiative process in the Constitution required Judicial Council approval. We petitioned them for permission to collect signatures, complied with their suggested language changes, and proceeded accordingly. So, unless the language has changed, that third party was involved and approved it. As for resolving this process, we're in uncharted territory. Much of the procedural obstruction over the past year has led to this standoff, where the Senate can only ratify what's presented. Realistically, neither side has real legislative power. The Senate and president both have yes/no ratifying power, leading to this back-and-forth. The only way forward is either full agreement from the president or a two-thirds Senate override. After that, this should go to the students to decide, and given that 90% supported it last time, I expect a similar outcome again.
2. **Sen. Knox**: I was not suggesting it was an illegal process, but one of the proxies expressed concerns. I was suggesting more someone who has professional experience with surveys.
3. **Dylan Perfect**: I was just responding to a normative concern. There could be some sort of empirical analysis.

xiii. ***Dawson Yang*** *ceded 2-minutes to* ***Matteo Paola***

1. **Matteo Paola:** I'm not opposed to having a third party review this, but to I don't know if the JC is the most impartial body. I also want to emphasize what Dylan said: this whole situation is a self-inflicted injury. We shot ourselves in the foot and then acted like someone else did it. The illegal JC meeting, the misinformation in the statement to the board, and the fact that the student government committee requested a correction that never happened, it's all disappointing. It's frustrating to see the lengths some will go to in order to block student advocacy and silence students. That said, I do agree that a third party should review this. But at this point, I trust the student body to make a better decision than I trust student government to.

xiv. ***Sen. Lau*** *motioned to finish the queue and then table the discussion until the next meeting; seconded by* ***Sen. Knox*****.**

1. **Sen. Jones**: I was going to ask if the vote today is to vote, because I have not had the time to review this.

xv. **Sen. Raschkes**: Did you say you would Veto this bill?

1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I don't know.
2. **Sen. Raschkes**: I agree with tabling until the next meeting

xvi. **Sen. Pearson**: I do think it would be good to have a third party review it. I believe the last one had an issue with bias in the wording against wage increases, and I would love to see the enforcement of neutral language in the referendum.

f. Discussion of the timeline and future meetings

i. **Sen. Knox**: We cannot meet before Sunday according to OPML.
ii. **Sen. Rowe**: I would recommend sending out a when2meet and going from there?
iii. **Sen. Raschkes**: In order for this to work, since we know you will veto it. Is the only way you approve this is to remove the wages?
    1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: Remove anything that has been said it will not be able to be used by the budget managers.
iv. **Sen. Lau**: We have the town hall from 6-8, but the room is booked until 10. So, 8-10 is an option on Tuesday.
v. **Sen. Pearson**: Not to be a pessimist, but I would say we should find a time for Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday. If the veto's are not overridden, then that means we would need at least two more meetings on top of that.
vi. **Sen. Rowe**: It sounds like we might send out a when2meet and we pick a senate meeting Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday.
vii. ***Sen. Durr*** *motioned for a Senate meeting on Sunday from 6-9 am, motion rescinded.*
viii. **Sen. Knox**: Audrey, you have expressed your intention to veto them, is there an approximate timeline for when you may be able to do that? I don't think we can meet until we have officially gotten a veto.
    1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I don't.
ix. **Steve Hoelscher**: Pragmatically, you have categorized all correctly. There would need to be a senate meeting to receive the veto, and override, mediation, and then another meeting. It is possible to do back-to-back meetings as long as they abide by OPML.
x. ***Sen. Knox*** *motioned to have a meeting at the time that most senators are available. Motion rescinded.*
xi. **Sen. Raschkes:** Since we know it is going to be vetoed, we could just motion to reconsider the vote and not pass it anyways?
xii. **Sen. Pearson**: What I'd say is that there's time for discussion when the full Senate considers the veto override. We're getting too caught up in this question and honestly wasting time. Can we just send out the schedule? I'll make a motion to schedule at least two meetings and send out the winter meeting times for Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday if no one has motioned already. Then we can end this meeting.
xiii. ***Sen. Pearson*** *motioned to find meetings times for Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, seconded by* ***Sen. Yang****.* ***Sen. Adams*** *objected. Objection rescinded. Motion rescinded*
    1. ***Sen. Adams*** *ceded time to* ***President Audrey Schlotter***
    2. **President Audrey Schlotter**: If you reconsider and there's a good-faith effort to meet with budget managers and relevant parties, and you reach an agreement that makes a wage increase feasible, I won't veto it. If you talk to the right people, I'll set up a meeting. You can meet with the Dean of Liberal Arts, talk to Deb, as long as there's good faith on both sides, I won't veto it. And we can be done.
xiv. **Sen. Becquer**: I'm fine with more mediations. There's been a lot of talk about exhaustion, but I'm on the mediation committee and doing okay, so I can help in

that way. That said, this is exactly what happened with the MU. The $16.95 fee was a compromise based on their arguments, and we responded in good faith. I get that there are new arguments, and for consistency, I'm willing to hear them. But a bad-faith actor could keep adding new concerns indefinitely. I don't think Deb is acting in bad faith, but you can see how this process could be abused. This is already a compromise. If we're being consistent, we mediated, responded to concerns, and reached a number.

1. ***Sen. Becquer*** *ceded 2 minutes to* ***President Audrey Schlotter***
2. **President Audrey Schlotter:** The stipulation I put in is a doable number, but I get that it puts budget managers in a tough spot. I think we can all agree that I don't want to spend money that won't be used, and that's a reasonable stance. But more than that, I care about the people involved because this is tearing people apart and affecting their mental health. If finding a solution would make this easier on everyone and save us a meeting, that's what I'd push for. If people are willing to sit down and have a real conversation with everyone at the table, I support that.

xv. **Sen. Yang**: I attended many mediation meetings, and almost all ran to their time limit and some could have used even more discussion. Elected Senate members made real efforts to find compromises, with some successes and failures. I'd find the argument that these agreements are impossible or uncertain more convincing if this hadn't already been done before.

1. ***Sen. Yang*** *ceded 2 minutes to* ***Dylan Perfect***
2. **Dylan Perfect**: By design, the legislative branch can't unilaterally conclude it, but the executive can. The Senate only has ratification power, severely limiting its ability to act. This is a game of chicken where either side can back down. On good faith negotiations, the argument wasn't about compromise itself but whether the wage increase package is doable. What determines that? The only deciding factor is whether the budget authority is willing to allocate the funds. This process worked in FY23. In university labor negotiations, good faith is legally defined, and this approach wouldn't pass muster. That alone is enough to challenge the process we're in now.
3. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I don't think mediation sets anyone up for a good faith conversation. I have been on the budget manager side and when we were negotiating, Nick spoke only once. It is not a conversation, it is legislating who gets to talk when. If you have been, it is not a dialogue, more talk and not finding a middle ground. You can send it but I will veto it.

xvi. ***Sen. Pearson*** *ceded 3 mins to* ***Dylan Perfect***

1. **Dylan Perfect:** We're debating what counts as a negotiation. If meeting exactly in the middle isn't enough, and only one side's willingness determines the outcome, then this is just voluntary misappropriation of funds. Even if both sides reached a true compromise, how did we get to a point where a committee of elected student representatives now has to split decision-making with unelected administrators? No other

government works this way. That's fundamentally undemocratic. I urge the Senate to consider what students elected them to do and act accordingly.

xvii. **Sen. Pearson**: This isn't about feasibility, it's a conversation where budget managers just refuse to budge. There's no can't or why, just a hard won't, which isn't negotiable. If the administration actually engaged in good-faith negotiations instead of just saying no, that'd be different. But these bills already hit compromise levels. So I think we stay the course. One side has already compromised, and the other is just digging in. Mediation proved that. There's no real path forward when only one side is negotiating.

xviii. ***Sen. Ikehara*** *ceded 1 minute to* ***President Audrey Schlotter***

1. **President Audrey Schlotter**: I have work I need to get done, but Teams me what happens and if anyone has any questions.

xix. **Sen. Ikehara**: I wanted to ask the MU, PA, and Rec Sports budget managers. If we were to do what the President recommended, are they amicable to negotiating?

1. **Deb Mott**: I am waiting for a response. So, I cannot speak right now.

xx. **Sen. Knox**: The president's argument is that we shouldn't allocate money that won't be spent, which I agree with andI don't want to either. But from my experience on the budget committee, unit budgets always have fluctuations. Positions go unfilled, unexpected costs arise, and fund balances exist for a reason. Looking at MU's multi-million dollar budget, these discrepancies fall within a reasonable margin of error. Worst case, if the money doesn't go to wages, it essentially funds the SEC reserve package we already cut in half. I'd prefer it to go to wages and want that intent stated, but since this budget is nearly the same as the initial proposal, I don't see the issue.

xxi. ***Sen. Durr*** *motioned for a 5-minute recess after finishing the speaking queue, motion rescinded.*

xxii. **Sen. Adams**: I was going to ask the same thing, I don't even know what we're talking about right now. We've already decided not to vote tonight so what's the point of this discussion? It's been almost two and a half hours, and everyone's clearly exhausted. It feels like we're just going in circles.

xxiii. **Sen. Pearson**: I strongly agree with Ben. This discussion isn't going anywhere. People have homework, places to be, and we've already had so many meetings this week. Also, what are our hours even at this point, especially for those on mediation? We should just figure it out and wrap this up. I'd support a motion for two meetings at the best available times on Sunday, Monday, or Tuesday based on availability.

xxiv. ***Sen. Pearson*** *motioned for two meetings on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday; seconded by* ***Sen. Knox***. ***Sen. Durr*** *objected, objection rescinded. Motion carried.*

1. **Sen. Durr:** I just want to make sure we all understand, this means we're still moving forward with votes that will be vetoed, so there will need to be another meeting to overturn those vetoes**.**

VIII) President of the Senate Announcements

a. **Sen. Rowe**: I just want to reiterate what a compromise looks like. The Senate pushed for $17.10 across all units. What we got was a 17-cent increase in one unit, a partial increase in another, and nothing for the rest. If that's not meeting halfway, I don't know what is. This isn't a solution that makes everyone happy, but if these bills can get signed and sent to the Board of Trustees, I'd love to be done with this.

IX) Gallery Comments

a. **Noah Roberts:** I'm not entirely sure where you all landed on mediation or the potential mediation committee. But if it happens, I'd encourage the chair to communicate that decision, especially to those who need to be on the committee, but also to anyone interested in attending. That should go out as soon as possible.

b. **Dawson Yang**: There's been a lot of discussion tonight about outreach and the best ways to gather input from students. I think it's just as important for each senator to do their own outreach. Talk to friends, co-workers, and fellow students as much as possible. Especially since opinions can be contentious, getting direct feedback would be valuable.

c. **Dylan Perfect**: Is there a meeting being scheduled?

   i. **Sen. Rowe**: Yes, we are sending out a When2meet for Sunday, Monday, Tuesday and the top 2 times on different days will be picked.

d. **Dylan Perfect:** Most administrators here have been around for years, and I've worked closely with some in the past. Honestly, that's been a frustrating relationship. Earlier, it was interesting to hear confirmation of what many already assumed, in that much of this is coming from above. To the acting vice provost and student affairs administration, regarding engagement with student government and shared governance, this whole situation is a prime example of chickens coming home to roost. As someone who's been in student leadership longer than most, I strongly encourage a return to good-faith engagement and real shared governance. We need a democratic process where students can actually make decisions, so we don't end up in this situation again. Because right now, it's hard to see how this has been working. I just hope things improve moving forward.

X) Senator Comments

a. **Sen. Durr**: It was heavily implied earlier that much of the blame for this situation falls on the Senate. I want to make it very clear, this is not solely the Senate's fault. Shared governance means shared responsibility, and that includes shared blame. That doesn't mean equal blame, but it does mean other parties bear responsibility too. The idea that we are here only because of the Senate is ridiculous. This situation is bigger than just us.

b. **Sen. Becquer**: I generally agree with Sen. Durr, this is just where we are in the process. It was contentious in the SFC, barely failing by one vote, and it's been contentious all the way through. This issue has been ongoing for years.

   i. **Dylan Perfect**: Student Government is Student Government. I pulled Valley Library data on committees going back to 2014, and there was even a committee on committees.

c. **Sen. Becquer:** This isn't a new issue. It's likely been contentious at multiple points in history, just like it is now. This has played out in past governments the same way we're seeing now. There's no one to blame.

d. **Sen. Adams**: I get the federal government metaphor, but I really hope the Senate doesn't replicate how Congress operates. The great thing about student government is that we're

just normal people, no re-elections to worry about. It gives us more room to make rational decisions and just be normal, well-adjusted people. I hope we take advantage of that.

e. **Sen. Knox**: If people are interested, I'm still open to a third party. It seemed like an idea no one was against, but I'm not sure how feasible it is. If anyone has suggestions on who to reach out to, let me know.
f. **Sen. Becquer**: Just for clarity, are you suggesting we put out a new poll to students or design a new one?
    i. **Sen. Knox**: I'm suggesting we have someone review the current wording, check the language and look over the bill to make sure it's good.
g. **Sen. Durr**: Just like the federal government, a third party never works. That is supposed to be a joke (we are in a two-party system).
h. **Sen. Pearson**: I actually disagree with you, Ben, people do know who we are. I was playing League of Legends the other day, and someone from OSU ended up in my random game. They recognized me because of student government, and honestly, that was the worst thing that's ever happened to me.
i. **Sen. Rowe:** Registration closes tonight! Encourage anyone to register. Our elections Vice Chair is here, anything to say?
    i. **Connor Chen**: If you're going to run, read the election packet. We'd rather not issue minor violations so do your due diligence. Ask us any questions at ASOSU Elections email.

XI) Advisor Comments

a. **Keri Simonet**: I just want to say that while I have concerns about the process, my biggest concern is your mental and physical health. Please take a step back this weekend and practice some self-care. Watch the Puppy Bowl or the Super Bowl. And if you need anything, reach out. Just take care of yourselves.

Adjournment ~ 7:27 pm