

Student Assembly on Income Inequality

Tuesday, April 14, 2015
5:21 PM

This document contains two transcriptions, the first begins at 5:00

Ian- Hello everyone thank you for coming out we appreciate this great turnout this a student assembly like ian said everyone can vote, this works best if everyone engages and we attempt to make decisions as a student body

Nick- if you all have this packet I am going to be talking about this a bit, there is a comparison between the president that makes 358 an hour and the highland worker who makes 9 dollars an hour

Sam-

N- contradiction because some people make less than that

Total compensation is the total amount that a person gets which includes benefits, it is a standard for economic analysis

There are folks on this campus who are payed less than 14.17 an hour, they are subcontracted through either

20.64cents an hour is living wage – but many usubcontracted people do not make this
the ratio is growing between highest and lowest workers,

Sam-

The faculty line is adjusted for inflation; faculty have only gotten a 4% range over 10 years.

Nick-

Macalester decides using peer groups, which is made of 40 other liberal arts schools. This is how we make comparisons.

Sam-

Look at comparisons of Mac's compensation for our president compared to our peer group. Ours is much higher than the median of our peer groups

Mac is 31st in what we pay our full time faculty; below the median.

Nick-

We are not second with other compensations. I won't go over these now. Slide 14 shows what economists think of this. There is scholarly literature about presidential compensation. There is only a weak link between pay and performance. They set it at different percentiles which causes salaries to skyrocket

Sam-

Our proposed fix is to establish a maximum pay ration. Now we want this to be an open forum to discuss income inequality in society at large and at Macalester.

Ian-

Now anyone can speak. Is this mic working? Walk up the the mic...

(mic makes noises, doesn't appear to be working)

Feel free to come up to the mic. You will have two minutes

Guest-

Check check, how is this? Hello, okay. My name is Paul Scott, I'm a 1986 grad from Macalester college. I support this motion wholeheartedly. I wrote an op-ed for the Star Tribune, and I was shocked how much the president is making, considering I am asked to donate each year. What I find interesting, the founder of Macalester made \$55,000 a year in today's money. I stopped donating. I think Macalester has begun an important conversation. It may seem "pie in the sky" to a lot of people, but I think that tying the top wages to the bottom wages is important to look at and pragmatic. I am all for bringing up the lowest paid workers, but I'm not reluctant to talk about the highest paid workers. I've been told it's time. The top paid workers at Macalester are working five times the state median.

Guest 2-

(10 minutes have passed)

Nick-

Those quotes from economists are talking about their econometrics studies to see if there is a link between performance and pay. There is no link in all studies I've been able to find. Bri Ro was not able to come today, but we did invite him. He has an ACM thing. But we did invite him. It's a study abroad thing.

Illana-

Hi everyone, can you hear me? I'm a sophomore, thank you all for coming. Something that I wanted to bring up is that we need to think about whether these issues, and the things that are occurring, corresponds with mac's values, and what it sells as what Macalester is all about. Lots of articles are coming out daily about income inequality and that it is more invasive than we had previously thought. Class is rarely talked about at Mac. This is gaining motion because students are talking about. What is income inequality? Decline of middle class, despite productivity being at it's highest productivity today. This has been increasing as businesses do a "race to the bottom." However, to combat this Mac established a "red pay ban" to \$14.70 an hour, but this does not include subcontracted wages.

Guest 3-

Hi, my name is Isac Martin, I work for a workers center in the Twin Cities. I applaud what we're doing today. I'll talk about what's happening in the Twin Cities. Tomorrow fast food workers are going on strike, trying to take a piece of their economy back. I invite you all to support fast food workers tomorrow. There will be a ction at the McDonalds on Lake Street, starting at 5:30am. Show your support. IN the afternoon there will be a huge rally with workers and students from across the Twin Cities, getting together to take their economy back. We're hoping you'll come out to support. There will be a van coming from Macalester. Please show up, I applaud what you're doing here today too.

Miranda Adams-

Hi, I'm a senior. I was going to make a motion but we have a few speakers. We should say thank you to the people who organized this, it's really awesome they're doing this. I'm excited we get to vote on this, and vote yes? Right? I think it's really important to do this because we talk a lot about global citizenship, and we need to stand up to those values, because there is a ripple effect that what we do here impacts those in the global community.

Megan Renslow-

I'm going to ask some logistical questions. I've heard rumors about how different numbers are being discovered? Could you talk about those numbers? There is a discrepancy. I'm also wondering why the ration of 18:1 was chosen? Just interested in logistical math stuff.

Guest 4-

I want to question the absence of anyone of any subcontracted workers here today. I think the conversation should involve them as well.

Guest 5-

I have two fairly simple questions. Is the number \$14.17, the minimum for Mac employees, is that indexed to inflation? Because it seems strange to have a minimum that isn't automatically adjusted as prices change. Also, if we limit the maximum pay to 18:1; if we pass this, does that mean we want to reduce Bri Ro's wage? Or would we raise the minimum pay?

Ian-

A resolution is just a call to the Administration. This doesn't change anything, it is just voicing our concern.

Guest 6-

I'm Hannah. I agree that economic inequality is a huge problem. I also believe that there are a bunch of factors that contribute to that that have to do that. Related to education, race, and job outcomes. I don't understand why you're specifically targeting Brian Rosenberg in this, considering he brings in a lot of financial aid to enable students to attend this school. How do you think limiting his salary as an incentive to bridge issues of income inequality in the future? How will you use this power and money to work for these issues in the future?

Ian-

If someone could make a motion, that would be great.

Nick-

I motion to put this on the floor...

Many-

Second

Nick-

We are not trying to limit Bri Ro's pay. We are trying to limit it to 18:1. We are simply trying to establish an 18:1 ratio so when the top gets a raise, the bottom gets a raise too. There should be no need to index

this to inflation. I think I got to all previous questions...

Illana-

This is just a clarifying thing as to why subcontracted workers aren't here. They are a huge voice that should be here, but we didn't want to jeopardize someone's job by speaking out here. Which is why we don't have subcontracted workers here.

Jenny G-

Can we clarify if this is a bill or a resolution? Because it has both on this document.

Sam Doten-

To clarify that, so, this is both a bill and a resolution so the motion encases both of them as one unit. I'm going to go through the legislation so we all understand it. We're calling to reduce the income inequality ratio to 18:1 by 2020. We are also calling for all subcontracted workers to have their wages be \$14.17 an hour. If this raises, the income inequality ratio would already drop to 25:1, so we're almost there. This is a pretty pragmatic approach. This is a longterm accountability so we all rise together. Paul Wellstone said, "We all do better when we all do better." This legislation would make sure that we all rise with the tide.

Ian-

To address the previous point of order. The constitution says that a Student Assembly can make a resolution, but not a bill. I'm interpreting this as a call for...so essentially what must result is that we cannot force MCSG to make an "Income Inequality Commission." But as specified in the constitution, we can support resolutions which are calls to action, not force of action.

Tristain-

I notice that we are calling to have contracted workers increased to 14.17 by 2020. According to inflation, faculty could have had their rates increased several times by this point. I am suggesting...wait...nevermind. I may have misread this. When it says that we want to renegotiate wages for subcontracted workers, are we saying that that is the current number, but we will raise the wage of the contracted workers to whatever we think is necessary in 2020? Because unsubcontracted workers wages could have increased by then.

Sarah-

Hi I'm clarifying something about the rally tomorrow...

Ian-

That's not relevant to the document at hand.

Sarah-

If you support the document at hand, I do suggest you support the action tomorrow. I can hook you up with a ride if you want. For the document, I'm wondering why we're waiting until 2020 to start this? \$14.17 per hour is not living wage right now, so it will be even more in five years. We should start this next school year! I just can't understand that people who work to Macalester not live in poverty, since we're so wealthy. I don't read this proposal as a personal attack on Brian Rosenberg. Let's discuss this as an issue of equity. We want to give people living wages. It's not about whether or not we like Brian Rosenberg, it's about a living wage.

Jose-

Hi, I'm a senior. I first saw this last weekend. I saw some really alarming numbers. I'd like to hold a contrary opinion. I do think we should pay those who pay the least more, I'm all for that. This resolution was made under the assumption that the ratio is 40:1. I did a little research, and realized that the ratio was arrived at making really poor assumptions. I'll right an op-ed later. If we assume that Brian Rosenberg works 40 hours a week, and that his job ends when he leaves the office. When making other assumptions, like that he works 70 hours a week, that wage inequality ratio is only 20:1. So we should consider that. We should try to figure out how we're going to arrive at these measures, and everything should be very transparent.

Nick-

I would like to clarify why we're using 40 hours a week. This is an IRS form about the highest paying employees. On this IRS form it says that Brian Rosenberg makes 40 hours a week...unless Macalester is lying on their taxes.

Guest-

I think that's a strategy of creating wages of the lowest workers, and tying it to the highest paid workers. But there are loopholes that the highest paid workers can be worked around. But I move to amend the motion by proposing that the bottom paid workers at Macalester be moved up with inflation.

Ian-

You need exact wording. Once he write it up fully, he will represent it.

Joe K-

Is this working? I'm Joe I'm a junior. This is a really important conversation. I have a general question about people who have worked on the issue. Have you reached out to the Administration? Bon Appetit? The Highlander? I think more conversation should be happen before such a large statement. Just a suggestion.

Jim Hoppe-

I can't vote but I met with those who wrote this. I am concerned with how some of the numbers are arrived at. We agree to disagree. Some of these numbers may be distracting from the larger issue. I am also concerned with the 18:1 ratio. If we do this, we would be 38th out of 40 of our peer colleges. I am curious how this 18:1 came into play. The only two below us would be a Jesuit college, that doesn't pay employees, and the other one the president had worked for less than a year. So lets be cognizant of these numbers.

Guest (who made amendment before)-

The amendment that follows the fourth "whereas"...I would like to add "Macalester College must adjust this minimum wage based on inflation."

Ian-

Can you bring it up here? Just to clarify an amendment was wage on the fourth whereas where minimum wage is discussed. An addition would be made that says that Macalester College must adjust this minimum wage based on inflation.

Illana-

Technically, you can't make an amendment on the whereas section...? We can't do that right?

Ian-

In previous LB meetings we've done that. So I think we can do that. If you wanted to change the number, they could change it. I will be accepting amendments for whereas and be it resolved clauses as well. Now we'll just be discussing based on the amendment.

Illana-

I think that is a wonderful idea, but I see the whereas as the "fact about Macalester" section, and I think it should adjust, but I think it should be added to the resolved section. That it be added to the second resolved. Adding "adjusted for inflation" after \$14.17 an hour. I think we should put it in both sections not just one.

Tristain-

I too think that adjusting for inflation is important for any change to wages. But, the whereas seems to be based on a premise, or something that is accepted, and including a "must" or a statement of unambiguous obligation in a premise when in fact it is not an unambiguous obligation would be incorrect. Therefore, we should not support this amendment but support an identical working located in the resolved section.

Ian-

Tristan brings up a good point. The whereas is a statement of fact, so saying that living wages be adjusted to inflation is inaccurate. Someone should make a motion to vote on the current amendment. So someone has to move to question to see if we're voting on the amendment.

Nick-

I'd like to respond to what Jim Hoppe said...

Crowd-

He can't do that! Ian!

Ian-
Oh whoops ...

Nick-
I'd like to move to question...

Ian-
Okay, any objections? Now we have to vote to vote. All those in favor of voting on the amendment at hand, please stand. We will move to question if it's two thirds or higher. All those in favor? All those opposed? All those abstaining? Okay we are now moving to question. We will immediately vote on the amendment at hand. All those in favor of adding this to the whereas clause, please stand if you support this?

Illana-
Could you reexplain this?

Ian-
..All those in favor please raise? All those opposed? All those abstaining? Okay, the amendment does not pass. We will now continue discussion now. Feel free to discuss inflation or add a different amendment now.

Jose-
I just want to point out that whenever you're calling for action, you need to be very specific if what you're asking for, is what you want. There is no clear cut inflation every year. What if there is a huge recession coming up? Then wages are cut? I'm not going to keep commenting on this, but please be specific on what you want. Even economists won't agree what this means. Just saying "inflation" is totally inaccurate.

Sam Doten-
Hi everyone, I just want to build off of what Jim Hoppe just said. I just touched base with him. What Jim was talking about is that he was assuming those at the bottom are being paid \$9 an hour. But if wages are raised to \$14 an hour, then the top compensation would be just over \$540,000. Which is also the median for Macalester peer group. I have comparison data if you'd like to look at it.

Lucy W-
I'd just like to point out that if wages are increased without decreasing Bri Ro's salary, which is most realistic, this money will have to come from somewhere, the college's budget, which is primarily driven by tuition costs. I'd also like to make an amendment to change the title to just be called "Resolution," not "bill"

Sam-
Move to question!

Ian-
Any objection to moving to question? This is just to remove the words "bill" and "and"

Tristain-
I object, I don't understand the difference between a bill and resolution.

Ian-
A resolution is a call to action, you can't make anything happen with a resolution. It doesn't make any change happen. It's asking that a change be made, and that students want this. A bill would change specific things in the bylaws, or the responsibilities of MCSG members. Okay since there was an objection, we'll be voting on whether or not to move to question. All those in favor? All those opposed/ All those abstaining? Okay. We are now moving to question, meaning we immediately vote on the amendment at hand. It's removing "bill" and "and" from the title of this resolution/bill.

Guest-
Point of information?

Ian-
The vote has already started so I can't do anything now...All those in favor rise?

Rothin-
Reexplain what the amendment is, no one understands what this is.

Ian-
Okay all those opposed...no talking no discussing! All those abstaining please rise.

(confusion ensues)

Ian-
I'm confused about why you're confused. But I'll explain. The amendment was just changing the title of the bill. This is being requested in response to what I said that this is a resolution and not a bill. So now we've returned to discussing the amendment.

Illana-
That was an awesome use of time...
(people groan)
We should be more informed on what we're voting on next time. But I'd like to say that only raising wages at the bottom addresses income inequality, is wrong. We shouldn't be scared into raising the living wage of people on campus because we think it will be raising the tuition. What does multiculturalism mean when our policy at Macalester disproportionately impacts people of color, immigrants, women, Latinos? I think we need to keep the ratio for accountability. It would provide transparency and clarity.

Lucy-
I wanted to clarify the difference between a bill and resolution. The bills change the bylaws. A resolution is a recommendation to the LB and to the Administration.

Rothin-
Point of order, Lucy can't make an amendment.

Lucy-
Okay, I'll just make a clarification. If you make it just a bill, this would change the bylaws, whereas a resolution makes a recommendation.

Ian-
If you want to make this a resolution, please remove "bill" and "and" from the title.

Chris Pieper-
My question was about the last amendment. If you change the title, doesn't it change section one and section two?

Ian-
No, it would just change the title. I'm saying you would also have to change "section one" and "section two."

Chris P-
I think a lot of people voted against it because of confusion.

Ian-
I would remind everyone that we have forty minutes left, we should limit discussion to specific changes to the legislation specifically.

Nick-

I'd like to make an amendment to change after "14.17" and "adjusted for inflation using the BLS's yearly unchained CPI measure."

Ian-
It would add the words "adjusted for inflation using the BLS's yearly unchained CPI measure."

Chris P-
Move to question

Ian-
All in favor? All those opposed? All those abstaining?
(mic goes crazy)

Crowd-
Turn it off! There's an off button!

Ian-
Okay, the amendment has passed, so the document now reads after the second resolved clause, "the minimum wage Macalester college allows is \$14.17 per hour adjusted for inflation using the BLS's yearly unchained CPI measure." Now that we've voted on this amendment, we'll continue discussion.

Lamont-
I am in support of this bill for the sake of renegotiating these wages due to the importance of the living conditions on this campus. I would hope that our employees are paid based on their work. Especially considering I frequent Café Mac everyday, which helps me through the day, working on things that Macalester values like global citizenship.

Joe K-
I asked a question a little while ago about what discussions happened before hand, can someone please respond to my question?

Illana-
We met with Brian Rosenberg and David Wheaton. We talked about these issues, presented our data. It seemed clear that we needed to take another venue to make progress on this issue. We thought if we made it clear through student voices this matters.

Nick-
We met with the head of the Compensation Committee, which is how we found out about the use of peer groups. We met with the president, who said that we should talk to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees listens when we speak, and this resolution would be a clear step in that direction.

Sam Doten-
I just want to recentralize us about why we're having this in the first place. The Student Assembly represents the collective will of the student body. We have the power to send a strong message. I think even if we don't agree on exact details, we can agree on the process. Let's take action on our values today. It's no mystery that rampant income inequality is a stain on our moral fabric. We study this in our classes, systems of power and domination. We have a moral obligation for ethical behavior as global citizens. We can't turn a blind eye as how income inequality plays out in our own community. This will get us a step closer to aligning our values with our actions.

Megan Renslow-
So, I have one quick thing about the whole bill, resolution thing. My understanding is if we vote on this as a bill, then the section one "ensure followthrough..." we'd have to do that right?

Ian-
I'm interpreting this as a mislabeled document that cannot actually make changes to MCSG. So I'd interpret this "it be enacted that this would happen," I am interpreting this as a mislabeled suggestion. Those changes are suggestions in my understanding of this.

Megan-
I voted yes on the resolution thing, so I can't make an amendment, but I'd suggest someone does.

Rothin-
I think this is very important that this discussion is had with people like the president and the trustees. But I think the contested figures are important to the discussion. Because the figures are contested, I think this would undervalue the weight of the resolution to the trustees, especially since the school doesn't view these figures as legitimate. I think if we're saying that the schools figures are wrong, then we should say that. We shouldn't dismiss how these numbers work, because it will have a lot less weight than we think.

Ian-
We only have 30 minutes left, so unless someone wants to make an amendment, lets move this to question. If someone wants to changes something, lets change it, if not, lets vote.

Tristain-
I originally voted yes to remove the "and bill" section, but if doing so would invalidate the part about MCSG creating a commission to continue the momentum and progress on this issue, then I think we should not make that change. Second off, whether or not 18:1 is competitive or not, according to different interpretations of whose measuring what ratios, I think that who works 18 times as hard or as valuably as the people who work at Café Mac or as custodians, or as other low level support staff at our college? These people are exceedingly important to the running of the college. I'd also like to move to question.

Rothin-
So now we're voting on whether to cut conversation or to vote immediately on the document as it stands.

Ian-
All those in favor? Opposed? Abstaining? Motion does not pass, discussion will continue

Lamont-
How are funds allocated for different - whether they're contracted or subcontracted workers? Also, I would like some information on what kind of documents are being presented to the president that prove or suggest strongly our position on reallocating funds on campus- whether that's a mathematical report, or some sort of track plan for the school? I believe that this would be one of the strongest ways to get our point across, considering how many strong mathematical students at Mac.

Nick-
We'll have to wait for that until the contract negotiation period, which should happen at the latest, according to the resolution, by 2020. Also, to clarify on the numbers, we want to raise the lower wage to \$14.17 and lower the highest raise to the median of our peer institutions.

Haley-
I just want to address a point that the Administrators don't approve this measure. But, I think that this presents a question of how we decide who gets to decide who gets to make major decisions on campus? This is our tuition, we should get to prioritize the workers on a living wage! My mother did not make a living wage when I was growing up, and we could not afford a car to come to Macalester. No workers at Macalester deserve this. We need to demonstrate that we value the workers on campus. Taking funds from highest paid workers on campus is a cost effective way to do that.

Ian-
According to the MCSG bylaws, this has to end at 7pm. So we need to vote before then

Chris P-
I disagree with you (Ian). I think that this is a bill because we are also making MCSG create a commission on income inequality.

Ian-
I agree with that, but the Student Assembly does not have a power to create a bill.

Guest-
So it doesn't matter what it says?

Valentino-

Hi, I think this is a really valid resolution, I know there are questions of numbers, and we should suggest that, but we only have 20 minutes left, so I would like to amend the resolution to remove the bill part, since we don't have the power to do that. Then I think we should vote on it. I want to make an amendment to remove the bill part.

Ian-

So, are you changing the title and the word "enacted"?

Crowd-

Yes yes yes

Ian-

Okay, we would remove the word "bill" from the title, and change the words from "being enacted" to "being resolved." Is every one clear on what the amendment is. So discussion will now be just about the amendment.

Guest-

Move to question

Ian-

Okay, all those in favor? Opposed? Abstaining? Motion passed, amendment passed. Now we're back to discussion on the resolution.

Muath-

Move to question

Crowd-

Second

Ian-

Now we'll vote on the resolution. All those in favor? We need to get a number here. All those opposed please rise. All those abstaining please rise. Alright the resolution has passed. Before we leave - has everybody signed in with their ID number. You have to.

This transcription begins at 5:21.

21	Tristen Rauch: Hello I'm Tristen, I have a simple question of clarification on this resolution. It asks that the income inequality is to be reduced to 18:1, is that measured in total compensation or based pay? The next section talks about wages not total compensation. If someone could clarify that please? IC: The microphones are not acting up, please move up. Nick: Yes, it includes total compensation. Eric: I'm from the religious studies department, I also graduated in 1996. I'm glad to be segregated from the democratic proses. Inequality eats brains. If a non-living wage is a zombie wage. Look at Finland, they put equality of outcome than excellence. The result was a better education. Think about as students . Nick: Those quotes from economists was studying a link between performance in pay, there is no link that I can find. Prez isnot here as he is at another function. Ilana: Hey everyone, I'm Ilana. I'm a sophomore Thanks for coming. People are bringing up numbers, we should think about whether this system of low wages is what Macalester is all about. Part of this is because its hardly talked about. Part of why these things are gaining motion is because people are talking about. Income inequality is about low wagesfor the working people and high gains for the top. Mac is taking some steps away from this, but it falls short because it doesn't take into work to sub-contract workers. IC: I'll hold my hand up next time your running out of time.
29	I just wanted to let you all know that there is a strike going on tomorrow to support fast food workers and across the twin cities starting at 5:30. In the afternoon at 4:30 there will be a big rally across the twin cities to demand better wages. There's going to be at least one van going there and back. Please show up and I applaud what you're doing here. IC: I encourage someone to begin a motion soon to discuss the document. Miranda: We should thank the people who organized this. I'm excited that we're here to vote on this today. We talk a lot about global citizenship but we should also think about our community. Meghan: I'm a little bit of a downer, asking logistical questions. I heard rumors about how these numbers are being discovered, why are the numbers different? Why 18:1 was chosen?
33	Iloa: Are there anyone here representing the subcontract workers? James: I had two fairly just simple questions, is the minimum wage adjusted to inflation? It seems strange to have a minimumthat doesn't adjust. Are we changing the Presidents pay or raising the minimum Hannah: I agree that economic equality is a huge problem, I also think that there are a bunch of factors that need to take into account race and certain other privileges. I don't understand why BR is being targeted. As a financial aid officer, I'm wondering how you expect a cap on the salary will really impact inequality. Nick: I motion to approve this bill. We're not talking about limited PR pay. This is a target by 2020. We're trying to establish an 18:1 ratio about the lowest pay to the highest pay. Ilana: why subcontracted workers aren't here, we didn't want to jeopardize someone's job, for that reason no subcontracted workers are here. Can we only discuss legislation? JG: Is this a bill or a resolution? IC: I'm going to let people to speak first. I'm just going to go through this legislation, if you look past the introductory and resolve content, we want a 18:1 ratio, \$14.71/hr., if there is no change of compensation but this minimum wage. This ratio is a long-term strategy. We all should rise with the tide. IC: TO address the point of order, this is both a resolution and a bill. The constitution says this is a call for action, butthis is a call to action not a force of action. Tristen: I saw in the document that 2020 is the goal for 14.71. I suggest that the subcontracted employees have there pay... actually no. Are we saying that we're limiting the pay of subcontracted workers to this number? Or can it go higher?
44	Sarah: Hi, I'm a senior. The 430 rally start in Northrup mall... IC: I'm sorry you can't talk about that during this vote. Sarah: My biggest curiosity is why we're waiting to 2020? 5 years 14.71 will not be a living wage. Its absurd to me that people who work here, a wealthy institution, live in poverty. I don't read his as an attack on BR, moving forward we should look at this as a mission of equity. We want to give living wages. Jose: I first saw this resolution last weekend as well as some alarming numbers. I'm not arguing that we should pay the lessthe least, but this resolution was made that the current ratio is 40:1. I was alarmed when I first saw this, this ratio was calculated with poor assumptions. They assume BR works 40 hrs. a week, also it assumes his job ends when he goes home. If you assume he works 50-60 hrs. a week then the ratio falls to 20:1. We should make this ratio transparent.
49	Nick: I would like to clarify this, this is the tax form we looked at which states BR works 40 hrs. a week. I think this strategy is a good one. There are ways of getting around giving more money to the top. I move to amend this moton that the bottom pay of the workers will be adjust to inflation. IC: If you're making an amendment please write that done. Joe: I think its great we're having this debate. I have a question, have we reached out to the highest paid and employers? Shouldn't we talk first before having radical action. Jim Hoppe: I want to make a suggestion, I also am concerned about these numbers. My advice that these numbers will distract from the debate. I also have question of 18:1 ratio, we would pay the president this ratio then we'd be at 38 out of 40. These ratio and numbers distract from the larger issues.
54	JG: Are we talking about the amendment? The amendment which follows the 4th whereas, right after "highlander bookstore are excluded..." Macalester college must adjustthis minimum wage based on inflation.
55	IC: An amendment was made on the 4th whereas, right after the number \$14.17? Is there a second? Ok a second has been achieved IC: In previous LB Meetings we've made adjustments to whereas clauses. I'm going to accept these amendments and start a new speakers list.
57	Can you repeat the amendment? Ilana: I think it's a great idea but I see whereas as a fact about Mac, I think we should move it to both sections, not justthere whereas. Tristen: I think that adjusting for inflation is important for wages, the whereas seems in the writing of the bill to be a premise, including a must or unambiguous obligation in a premise would be incorrect. We should not support this amendment, but move it to the resolved section. IC: I recommend we move to question, vote, then make a motion to move it.
00	Nick: Move to question. Any objections?

	IC: We have an objection, we need to vote in order to vote. Stand if you want to vote and wait if you don't. Nays have it. Alright, we are now moving to question and voting on this amendment. Please stand if you support...
	Ilana: Wait where is this going?
	IC: All those in favor, please rise. Nays have it. We will now talk about this resolution.
04	Jose: Anytime you're calling for action we should be sure we should now about what we're talking about. I feel like we should be more critical of what we want, you can't get an exact rate of inflation.
	Sam: I just wanted to build off of Jims statement. What Jim had interpreted with this ratio would assume the lowest paid is still getting minimum wage. If the lowest paid is 14.17, then the Presidents pay will be in the median for our peer group.
	Lucy: I wanted to point out that wages are increased without presidents wages drops, all of that only comes from school budget. I move to amend the title of the resolution to a "resolution to..." removing the words "bill and" from the title.
	IC: Any seconds? Any objection to moving to question.
	Tristen: I object, what is the difference.
	IC: A resolution is a call to action, it doesn't change anything per say. A bill is made for the bylaws. We're going to vote about going to vote. Yays have it. We will now vote on the amendment at hand. Alright, nays have it. Amendment fails. The amendment was going to change the title, moving back to the discussion. I think it's a good idea, someone should come up and propose it. Also about the wages, income inequality is more than increasing the lowest paid wages. If we stay with the ratio then it completes a method of equality that will provide clarity.
	Lucy: I wanted to clarify the difference. I move to consider my amendment...
	RD: You can't reintroduce the amendment right?
17	CP: That last amendment would have just changed the title right? Isn't this going to go against what is actually in the bill.
	IC: We have 40 minutes left, we should limit discussion to specific changes.
	Nick: Make an amendment, after the second resolve clause.
	IC: The amendment would change the second resolve clause, the addition would be "adjusted for inflation using the BLS yearly unchained CPI measure.
	CP: I move to question.
	IC: all those in favor please rise. The amendment passes. Yays have it. The document now reads, minimum pay... adjusted for inflation using the BLS unchained CPI measure.
	I am in support of this bill due to the importance of our living conditions on campus. The employees should be paid something that reflects their responsibility.
	Joe: Can we clear up the question I asked earlier.
	Ilana: we met with a lot of high paid staff and BR, it was clear to us that the avenue of discussion was not going to lead to change.
	Nick: We met with the president, he said we should meet with the trustees, the trustees listen when the students speak up.
25	Sam: I want to centralize us to the topic. It bears reminding that the student assembly is collective will of the students. We can send a strong message. We can agree on the process of collective will even though the numbers are in contest. Its no mystery that income inequality is a blight on this society. We are called to be global citizens and have a positive impact in our community. I'm glad we're here and expressing our will.
	Megan: I have one question about this resolution, if we vote on this as a bill then the section one... this would have to be enforced right?
	IC: While this document says this going to happen then I see it as a mislabeled suggestions.
	Rothin: I think it is important that this discussion was had, because these figures are contested then it will impact how the board and trustees view the resolution. We shouldn't dismiss how these numbers work.
	IC: We have thirty minutes left, unless someone is going to make an amendment then we should move to question.
	Tristen: I voted yes but I want to argue that if this bill is invalidating some of this wording inside. I think that... who worked 18 times as hard as café mac workers or custodians, these people are important to our campus and I think that... I move to question to vote on this bill.
	IC: Any objections? All those in favor please rise. I count not 2/3rd, nays have it.
	Lamont: I have a number of questions, how funds are allocated to wages of subcontracted workers, also information on the information of what is being brought to the school. I believe that because we have a number of resources to get this message across.
	Nick: The way funds are allocated is determined in the contract later. Raising the bottom wage to 14.17 will bring the 18:1 ratio.
	We have a say of where our tuition is going. We should prioritize where our money is going. The workers and their children should not have to suffer from not making a living wage.
	CP: I interpret this bill as requiring MCSG to follow this bill.
41	Valentino: I support this resolution. I suggest an amendment to change the wording from the resolution that implies a bill.
	IC: We would remove "bill" and "and" from the title, change "enacted" from final resolved clause to "Be it resolved", and change Section one and section 2 labels will be changed to "resolved"
	M2q
	IC: Yays have it. Motion passed and amendment passed. Now back to the resolution
	M2q on the resolution.
	IC: All those in favor please rise.
	79 for, 11 against, 1 abstain (approximated total, awaiting administrator confirmation)
	Resolution passes

6:48