



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – LA CROSSE
STUDENT ASSOCIATION

235 CARTWRIGHT CENTER 1725 STATE STREET LA CROSSE, WI 54601 (608) 785-8717

Student Senate Agenda

Date: March 5th, 2008

Time and Location: 6pm in Cartwright 339

I. Call to Order

II. Role Call

| Name | Role Call | Quorum 1 | Quorum 2 |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Allen, Jeffery | x | x | x |
| Armstrong, Vanessa | x | x | x |
| Baalbaki, Ibrahim | x | x | x |
| Bayer, Allison | excused | | |
| Cerwin, Nicholas | x | x | x |
| Cooper, Mitchell | x | x | left early |
| Csargo, Nicholas | x | x | x |
| Decker, Rourke | x | x | x |
| DeShong, Robert | x | x | x |
| Eck, Calie | x | x | left early |
| Fuhrmann, Eric | x | x | x |
| Groshek, Matthew | x | x | x |
| Hammen, Derek | x | x | x |
| Hastings, JennieLynn | x | x | x |
| Hockett, Joshua | x | x | x |
| Holzem, Natalie | x | x | x |
| Kahl, Erik | x | x | x |
| Klotz, Melissa | x | x | x |
| Kohl-Riggs, Arthur | x | x | x |
| Maly, Tabetha | x | x | x |
| McCaigue, Kelsey | x | x | x |
| Moua, Keng | x | x | x |
| Navarre, Stephanie | x | x | x |
| Rome, Jacob | x | x | x |
| Ruplinger, Melissa | x | x | x |
| Sackmann, Valentine | x | x | left early |
| Savaglio, Britta | excused | | |
| Schooley, Jillian | | x | x |

| | | | |
|--------------------|------|---|---|
| Syafitri, Sonia | x | x | x |
| Thiel, Chuck | x | x | x |
| Thompson, Amanda | late | | x |
| Trimborn, Steven | x | x | x |
| Vang, Nou | x | x | x |
| Van Winkle, Joshua | x | x | x |
| Vice, Katie | x | x | x |
| Wallace, Karly | x | x | x |

Others: Singh, Ringgenberg, Cikara, Knudson, Perket, Smith, Robinson, Chapiewsky, Bergman.

Guests: Elena Bantle, Adam Conlin, Kathryn Sanders, Carrie Wisinski, Jacie Gamroth, Alexandra Wardwell, Beth Crook, Kelly Johnson, Kevin LeFevre, Jason Strngstalien, Jesse Todd, Neal Nettesheim, Chelsey Strohleirch, Patricia Ries, Matt Michalshi, Jason Larson, Adam Blattes, Lynn Lodahl, Matt Boyer, Kevin Hundt, Guy Wolf, Casey Giltner

III. Approval of Minutes

- a. Hammen/Ruplinger

IV. Approval of Agenda

- a. Hammen/Furhmann

i. Ammendments

1. Move line item H to top of discussion because one of the candidates is here and they should speak because there are a lot of things to go through tonight.
 - a. Hammen/Van Winkle
2. Add Gamroth to line item C
 - a. Bjorn/Van Winkle
3. Removing item Academic Building video

- b. Agenda approved

V. Guest Speakers

- a. UW-L Environmental Council, Elena

- i. I am a UWL student, we are here to show support for the UWL green fund. We have been working on this since last semester in a class. It would allow students to invest in renewable energy by paying a \$5 fee every semester. There are many other schools that have simillar student fees. UW Greenbay and Stevens Point. Eight years ago Northland college initiated, student government has it at \$20 a semester. It would reduce energy costs. If we don't take action student bills will reflect the energy increase. The global movement to confront climate change is underway and UWL is not doing anything. We must be leaders in environmental movements today so that our children don't have to. What could you buy with \$5 a semester? The people you see here arent all members of that initial class group but we are all students who support the green fund

ii. Discussion

1. How many students did you actually talk to?

- a. We have 300 signatures. I can tell you the reason we want the referendum is so that we can talk to students.
2. can students opt out if they want to.
 - a. Bjorn can explain why it cant be done.
3. why do you think we need to start a \$5 fund when we could just change it without that money?
 - a. We don't have that money. We are told purchasing environmental sustainable stuff is not cost effective.
4. what if tax payers see the pool of money we have and ask why they should give us more money?
 - a. I don't see that as any different than any of the other student fees on campus.
5. what other activities have we done in the past to try to reduce our emmissions?
 - a. We just signed the declaration and that was free. I am not clear on what we have done in the past.
6. have we sent out statistics to the student body on what we can do? We can start doing the small stuff rather than jumping the big. Is there stuff you have done?
 - a. We have done tent state, signed the declaration. One of the clauses is that it will come back to senate so you can make sure it's effective. If it's not doing anything then it can be taken away.
7. could the Pepsi fund be used to start this?
 - a. That is one of the things the money could go towards, but the committee is going to decide if it spent on these projects.
 - b. We have been in contact with Gunderson Lutheran and the city jail and they are doing things towards environmental sustainability. These groups don't do things unless they are cost effective, so we can look at them for leadership.
8. do you have any out line or plan for projects?
 - a. We have been talking to the people that installed solar hot water heaters, and in the future we are looking at building new dorms here. We found we could save the money to install solar hot water heaters in two years with the \$5 fee. They tell us solar hot water heaters have a great pay back. Solar panels we would probably want to wait on as they get cheaper.
 - b. We have looked at governement grants and that's something we would use to supplement it.
- b. Neal Nettesheim, Provost Search and Screen Committee Update
 - i. We brought 4 candidates last year, the search and screen committee couldn't come to a consensus on a candidate. We decided to make a new search. We have 3 new provost candidates coming to campus. We

- ii. Last round we had about 520 evaluations from the campus through the open forums, about 20 student evaluations. I think we have to get out there and say it if we really like a person. We need help picking out the most student centered applicant. I really hope you get this out to your constituents. We have had a real great pool. Get out there to the open forum. I know some of the senators got to meet them and think that is very beneficial.
- iii. Discussion
 - 1. Are there going to be any open forums that aren't during class times?
 - a. No. I have no control over that. It's not like we are ever going to find a great time to do it.
- c. Jacie Gamroth, Public Intoxication Ordinance.
 - i. It was introduced last year around January when students weren't here. With something like this it should have taken the whole month. With student input we were able to make it much better. I want to tell you that on Monday we will have a public intoxication forum at 6pm since I put a sunset clause on it last year. I am not sure if the mayor is coming. 100 citations have been given, the average age has been 33.
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. What are the provisions, what changed?
 - a. At first it was really vague definitions. You could get a ticket for red eyes, stumbling, etc. a big change was we adopted the definition of disorderly conduct, so that was raising the bar. Also you have to fail a sobriety test. We changed the first time to a warning and an educational class for an hour and then it is off your record. There have been only one repeat offenders.
 - 2. before this ordinance was passed was there a ticket?
 - a. Before it was just disorderly conduct. The point was to make an alternative citation that doesn't look that bad on your record. And the first violation is just a warning.
 - 3. the first version of the ordinance wouldn't fall into as a substitution for a disorderly conduct ticket, so what was the intent?
 - a. I can't tell you from my standpoint, but it seems like it was to have one more ticket for disorderly people. Then we tried to change it to be a substitution.

VI. Officer Reports

- a. Fred
 - i. Isn't here because he was lobbying in Madison and going to an undergrad research event. He wants you to go to the open forum.
- b. Bjorn
- c. Others

- i. Perket
 - 1. we did hire a new PR director as well as a City Affairs directors. I have also been working with a senator to set up 3 times next week to have an unbiased election information session. We will talk about what senators do, time comitments, how to run a campaign. We just want to get all the info out there. We want to make sure we are proactivley going out there to recruit people. We want to be as informative as possible.
 - 2. if any of you want to be there we are also fashioning a Q&A session. Talk to us after the meeting.
- ii. Social Justice Director
 - 1. Having a Q&A session during coffee hour. Free coffee and tea and snacks.
- iii. Gender Issues
 - 1. Tonight there is a lot of stuff going on. If anyone gets out early go to Isis.
 - 2. next week Monday at 7pm in Valhalla is Ellen Bravo.
- iv. UC
 - 1. Remember if you havent gone to an event yet Building Unity is coming up. It's a Friday through Sunday in April.
 - 2. we need people to fill workshops yet. If you want to teach a workshop, you can do it with someone else.

VII. RHAC Report

- a. Last week we finalized the members of the election committee. We elected a new RHAC rep. We had a cool event for charity, raised \$2,250 for the food pantry.

VIII. Advisor Reports

IX. Committee Reports

- a. Student Fees
 - i. Ammended bylaws and sent them to Lef Affairs.
 - ii. Reviewing student tech fees.
- b. PEPSI money committee
 - i. Have a good idea of how it will be allocated.
- c. Joint Budget and Planning
 - i. There was a big budget lapse, trying to figure out how hard campus will be hit. Right now it seems like \$3 million dollars. We talked more about these unfended mandates that we have to pay. A lot will come back to us.
 - ii. We need to know that right now the university is paying for a lot of things we don't have consistent funding for, and in addition there are these budget cuts. We will have to cut a lot of things.
- d. Org Committee
 - i. Stay after.
- e. Gen Ed

- i. Approved two art methods courses with some stipulations. Also working on the gen ed package.
 - f. Academic Initiatives
 - i. Close to making a decision for budget stuff.
 - ii. Approved the allocation of money to send students to the White Privelage Conference. It is April 2-4th. Applications due Friday before spring break.
 - g. Campus Housing planning committee
 - i. Will be coming in to present ideas and give you an over view.
 - h. Library Committee
 - i. Discussed budget, they are broke.
- X. New Business
 - a. Approval of Spring 2008 Election Commission
 - i. Hammen/Wallace
 - ii. We met to start coming up with candidates for the election commission. We were not able to fill all of the at large members positions. We did have about 13 people for at large members. Only two have said for sure they can fill the seats. In the UWL SA elections by laws it states that we have to appoint the entire election comission. We are already past the 6 weeks that this was supposed to be done by. I don't know if we have the resources and the time to reemate before spring break. I might bring this back later in April to ammend these by laws. If anyone would like to rewrite these with me let me know.
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. Call to question
 - a. Objection
 - b. Should we discuss before we vote on it.
 - i. No one was discussing anything.
 - 1. I don't really get it.
 - 2. Bjorn-explained process and bylaws for
 - 3. Yes that explains it
 - 4. How are these selected students supposed to do what the BOD could not do?
 - 5. Have a smaller group concentrate on it
 - 6. SA is supposed to choose because they are more knowledgeable
 - c. Point of information—there are two non-returning Senators on the list
 - 1. What are the qualifications?
 - 2. They cannot be a part of Student Association in any way because they cannot be biased.
 - 3. Not a big deal since SA still has to approve them

4. They do not have to be approved by Student Association
- d. Point of information
 1. These committee members are supposed to be unbiased, how do we assure that?
 2. There is a stipulation saying that SA can remove them from the committee
 3. How long does this take?
 4. As long as it takes the committee and SA to remove them
 5. What does this committee actually do?
 6. They oversee elections
 7. They deal with issues concerning elections
 8. Not in favor of having SA approve the committee since it would just lengthen the process
 9. Do not feel confident that committee will be able to find candidates
 10. With enough support, confident they will be able to find members
- e. Call to question
- f. Quorem
- g. Objection
- h. Vote-passed unanimously
- b. Resolution in Opposition to Chapter 17 & 18 Committee Recommendations
 1. open ruplinger/trimborn
 2. reason this is coming forward is because UC is doing this in response to administration having head over non-academic conduct
- ii. Discussion
 1. move to suspend the rules – information has to be submitted to the webstie by March 10th, so it's tonight or not

Motion to suspend rule Allen/Fuhrman
- iii. Suspended... moves back into new business.
 1. Don't see how this is a proper justification for proposed change
 2. What kind of punishment would fall under this amendment for what type of misconduct. Anything non-academic: drinking ticket, or any other trouble with the law. During spring break you get into a fight and get a ticket, this policy could have it brought up against you. As for what could happen depends on the administrator
 3. Perspective: Concern is double jeopardy. Processes in place, this is not a legal process, but students are awarded due process. Are able to have a hearing if dislike decision. Clean up language so we can apply this to unsafe situations with

community. A gentleman was found guilty for pornography and endangerment of children. In current chapter 18, they cannot say you can't work with children. They have to encourage individuals to take themselves out of the process, rather than taking them out of the process (working with children in the future). Safety issues more than anything, respecting double jeopardy concerns.

4. If this was in place, I would not be here right now. I made a mistake, but I would like to protect student rights. I wouldn't be here, so respecting Dean's thoughts, this is not in our best interest.
 - a. Pt of information: is there any process in place for criminal background checks for children programs, etc.
 - b. Yes, there are checks in place for certain programs, but not for all.
- iv. you might be here, you might not. This would be a hearing. I don't feel this would be "kicked out of school" setup. This isn't for an every time you get in trouble off campus threatening with suspensions/expulsion. This is on a level basis. Even when your not on campus, you are still representing the students, and I think your still breaking the student conduct that you signed as a student.
 - a. We have a student conduct, this falls under that policy, you are still held accountable off-campus currently
2. Like it or dislike it, but if you don't like it, amend it. It's important to say something here tonight. Pat Brady, head legal council does not support these changes. Clarified that she has concerns on the changes, not that she is not in support.
3. We need to make a decision – what is the specific language. what can and what can't there be action on? Can action be taken on drinking tickets? Someone needs to do something if it's happening 3 times in one week. There are people out there looking for our best interest. Will these changes, when put in the wrong hands, still hold up and not work to our disadvantage. What can the new changes do?
 - a. Can send document. Language is not specific as to action.
4. Pat Brady has not always been on the side of students
5. If something came up, it doesn't immediately go to you ar suspended/expelled. Many steps in between. And after the steps, there can be a hearing where a students voice is then heard. It's possible for expulsion, but doesn't mean that you will be if you do *anything*.
6. I assume that there are different lines of severity, but I'd like to think that more serious threatening crimes are included in our recommendatoin with this document.

7. no matter what, I don't think the system has the time or resources to go after people for parking/drinking tickets. Trying to target real offenders. I don't know how necessary this is. I agree with the fact that Pat Brady is on and off of our side, so how can we trust her? If we are going to send something, it should be for certain type of conduct, but I really don't think they will waste their time with "5 drinkign tickets" but if they do, we hav ea process.
 - a. Pt of information: doesn't university send you a letter for getting a ticket? Depends on where it occurs, if it's off-campus, no. you may get a contact, but not necessarily conduct.
 - b. How do they get that info? Police reports.
8. does anyone know what examples of punishment there would be? It could be suspension, but what would lead to that?
 - a. Pt of information: uw system website says our goal is to promote safe and productive learning environments. most stduents do not engage in type of misconduct these changes would address.
 - b. Pt of information: order of punishments was listed – there are 7 steps in the process... but is the old document. Question answered
9. echo former senator concerning infraction severity. What is what level, way too long to define that.
10. the institution should have no effect on my private life off this campus. That's ridiculous. They don't pay my rent, I do, so they should not have any say, it's our private life. Although you have chances to appeal, it's not guaranteed. I was almost kicked off, and there is no guarantee that it would not have happened even after appeal. I wish there was more time so we do not have to approve this today. I would like to put more emphasis on more serious matters. So if anyone can amend to the more serious clauses, that'd be appreciated.
11. understand that administration is not trying to kick people out for unsever events, but this gives them the power that they can do it. Simply having that power is not something I'm comfortable with. If this is supposed to go after very serious crimes, it needs to be stated as that. If the purpose is to go after serious crimes, why is it not stated that way?
 - a. Difficult to say severity of crime. Judgment piece comes into that, and that's an issue. Can't say non-alcohol issues, because that eliminates combination circumstances. Too hard to define
 - b. This doesn't make sense if I make a mistake in another state, country, etc. not comfortable with university knowing everything about my life.

12. agree with former senator. Voting in the blind right now. We haven't seen this document (most of us). Too vague and I don't feel good about voting. I don't think this is going to be a good thing to go through with this. If we don't have more clarification on what crimes and punishments, then I don't think they should be able to do this.
13. university has access to police blotter. Would like to say respectively, that yes we do all make mistakes, but being here is a privilege, and having to face punishments for actions may cause more responsibility.
 - a. Move to amend: decker/holzem
 - i. Therefore be it resolved, UW-L Student Association opposes any amendment of Chapter 17 or 18 that do not implement safeguards that explicitly specify the categories and/or degrees of severity of misconduct to be placed under the purview of these disciplinary proceedings, and furthermore to limit said offenses to those that endanger the safety of the campus community
 - b. Discussion
 - i. Grammar (to be done later)
 - ii. Is pretty good. Says we don't approve a document that doesn't specifically say what you can be punished for, and how you can be punished. I support the amendment and document.
 - iii. Basically what all been saying. Call question
 - c. Passed – note 2 abstentions
14. that changes a lot.. student honor code read. Doesn't matter if its in your home, could harm others, and you represent the university, so you are responsible for you actions no matter where you are. Like amendment.
 - a. Call the question – objection
15. I don't totally understand if we want the 2nd and 3rd whereas? Still necessary with amendment?
16. couple points of clarification, like adjustment. Timing of proposition. Did not have sufficient time to react to this. Same boat as administrators. Been under review since 2004. Committee in 2005 said changes need to be made. Really trying to push this through.
17. this is not about on-campus housing and privileges, this is about conduct code. Chapter 17 and 18 address behavioral things about being a student. We don't have time to deal with every alcohol violation, talking about the more serious ones. Severity is real important.

18. I had to talk to dean's office twice in a few months, so they do pay attention. With amendment I support
 - a. Call the question – objections
19. all understand that this is something we can't just send to the website and be done with it. Looking at UC minutes, and we agreed to actively campaign against whatever we send out. Not sure how la Crosse voted. You have obligation with passing this.
20. been going through core principals. More skeptical: read part of "update".
21. falls more under false identification, not alcohol. Much more important. What paula said, talking about student conduct – I don't feel that this falls under infringing legal representation and due process, and double jeopardy
 - a. motion to striking 2nd and 3rd whereas clauses vanwinkle/decker
 - i. still have legal representation on legal issues. Was about to move exact same motion.
 - b. Discussion
 - i. Being neutral as possible, wording does say that you are not allowed to have third party represent you in initial hearing. Only you by yourself regardless of severity.
 - ii. Understand amendment being made, I do think that do-process says you get fair and full trial, but I think that this is getting at something different. I don't think I support that one, but do support double jeopardy. Recommend changing them.
 1. Amendment to keep 2nd whereas wallace/cerwin
 2. Discussion
 - a. Understand concern with do-process, but think it can be used broad enough.
 - i. Call question – passed, note 3 abstentions
22. id's is a serious violation, but the motivation for it in this case was the alcohol, and the motivation for crime does not pose a danger to campus community. In any case, it is a serious crime, for travel safety etc, so we should be concerned about student rights.
 - a. Call the question – passed, 4 abstentions

XI. Discussion

- a. Approval of Board of Directors Members
 - i. PR: Amanda Perez

- ii. City Affairs: Casey Giltner
 - 1. Same process for both positions, 3 applications including resumes and cover letters, interviews with all 3, chose Amanda Perez because of past experience
 - 2. Only one applicant, no prior direct experience, drive and motivation
 - 3. Discussion closed
- b. Spring 2008 One-Shots
 - 1. Hammen/Cerwin
 - 2. Fuhrmann: explanation of one-shots and process, explained one-shot document, emphasized the fact that there have been multiple committees before it goes to Senate, explains line item by line item of each one-shot request:
 - 3. Trekker Outdoor club wanted a first aid kit, recommended that there be somebody trained in First Aid on each team
 - 4. Women's hockey wanted money to complete the remaining balance to purchase a goalie blocker (previous money came from a reallocated one shot)
 - 5. Mens lacrosse needed balls, a defensive stick and head, and practice net, 30 balls to be donated to the womens lacrosse team
 - 6. martial arts club pulls their request for a one shot because they requested a Rubbermaid storage shed, but since one shot was submitted their storage shed was broken into again, they decided to move gear to somewhere more permanent and safe
 - 7. Waterski team, Senator Fuhrmann abstains from talking, Senator Van Winkle takes over to explain it, they requested a trailer to transport their gear, much debate in Apportionment, emphasis should be given to waterski team whenever they need it, for their entire season, outdoor connection wanted to rent it out at will, stipulation requests that waterski team has the main use and maintenance, where for location?
 - 8. Mens and womens volleyball requested travel expenses to be paid by a one shot to go to the national tournament
 - 9. Mens and womens tennis needed a new shed, they will build it themselves
 - 10. Baseball wants a roller and roller cover for their tarp that was previously allocated via a one shot
 - 11. Swimming requested a new digital time clock for practices
- ii. Discussion
 - 1. There is a process that must be followed, that is why I voted against this
 - 2. Current transportation? Many cars, unsafe, packed into truck, sticking out of sunroofs
 - 3. Fundraising? We are not able to directly do this, but we are getting it at or below cost

4. Insurance? Barry our risk manager was excited and not too worried about the risk aspect
 5. Whose trailer would it be? It would be waterski teams unless we do not need it, could be rented out when waterski team does not need it
 6. Believes it was not intentional and just a miscommunication, no deliberate intent on fraud
 7. Is waterski allowed to put shelves into trailer? Under REC sports, so it would be their say
 8. Skeptical at baseball at first, but felt need was there, by not giving them this one shot it would waste student money since there was already an investment made and this roller and roller cover will expand the life of the tarp, by punishing them it is punishing students, not baseball since it is students' money, SAC-C already funds the volleyball teams
 9. Why are we not funding the martial arts club if they got broken into again? They pulled their request, something more permanent
 10. Why are we not funding the volleyball teams? Are they partially funded? Not sure what their plans are
 11. Understood that baseball had a miscommunication, just wanted to have them follow procedure, wants to show repercussions, they deserve and honest but just wanted, wanted to not open a can of worms since travel is expensive and there were no real requirements to going to conference tournament.
 12. sets a bad precedent for others, shows we have a weakness
 13. do not want to fund travel, slippery slope, they have other source of funding
 14. They were unsure the mistake was made
 15. Does this mean that travel is not covered? Travel can be covered, the one shot must benefit the campus somehow, long term being the key
 16. Who shows receipts after purchase? Business office does the oversight
 17. Lets keep repeating ourselves
 18. Lets allow baseball to purchase this now, make sure this doesn't happen again, have Apportionment clarify in the future and use this as a learning experience
 19. Apportionment realizes there is a lack of communication sometimes with one shots, in the future there will be process improvement, we don't want to hold baseball fully accountable
 20. We have a varsity team, why should we pay for the club team to go to nationals
 21. We've had a great discussion
- Motion to close discussion Ruplinger/Holzem

- c. Resolution Creating an 'Environmental Sustainability Reserve'
 - 1. csargo/wallace
 - a. Authors speak:
 - b. Step by step through whereas's, explaining them all
 - i. If need further explanations, please see authors individually
 - c. Feel like our administratoing and the UW system has not stepped up and the students can and voice where we want to go.
 - d. Want to make it less of a burden for students and community members
 - e. Feel students should have a voice in this fee, which is why we want an advisory referendum, so we need to listen to students.
 - f. Thank you for listening
 - ii. Discussion
 - a. Pt of information. Therefore #4: is there a precedent for giving members of orgs outside the committee voting rights outside of apportionment? No. other committees? No, could do it through bylaws. Need to amend bylaws to do this? Yes, would have to be. Look into it.
- 2. not saying don't support renewable energy. In support of all that. But my concerns are we just got done going through how we have a lot of deficit on campus, and we have a need for money now. Money is going to come from students, so although see need, students are going to have to pay a lot in near future, and it just went up. We are in a process of adding on fees here and there, and it really adds up.
- 3. concept of advisory referendum bothers me. Just do a referendum. We should vote how constituents feel, so if we vote against them that says something. What the students say should be what happens and be done with it. Don't need to micromanage voice.
- 4. Apportionment additions – you need to trust them. Needs to be a voice, but your adding 5 votes to a small committee. Overpowering. Need voice, but not additional 5 votes.
 - a. Pt of information: rational of putting on voting members vs. just as informational base?
 - i. That's what we came up with as committee. Can be changed.
- 5. in support of this. Green and sustainability are huge and we're way behind our times. We need to do something for ourselves. Need to take matters into our own hands. It really is testament to the power we have. Become model to other uw's and the community, along with StPt. And GB. Plus media attention which could turn into more funding. Plus businesses could

- make donations for projects. In the end this could be the start of something monumental for this campus. \$5 is less than average meal combo at the cellar. Don't see a problem for students to give it up for something so responsible and great.
6. echo a former senator on referendum. Saving money on this. Who are we? Is the university not going to charge us as much then? So that might not be a valid argument. Stronger if we get something in here, if fees decrease they'll cut rates by so much. Other thing is there is this advisory committee can take the funds and move away from SA committee and form their own thing to do what they want. Should always be controlled by SA, not another organization. We have other committees besides apportionment, could SSB look at this? Get other members from other committees to come in and look at this. Needs to stay in SA, and look at this overall. Is this in the best interest of students?
 7. echo a former senator. Voting rights makes me nervous. Where could that lead later on? Would like to see env. council in an advisory role. Not voting, but their presentations guides thought processes. Like to see more of a grass-roots effort on this to get the message out there. Not sure if there has been reach-out yet, cuz hall council is pretty crucial. 300 names on petition is impressive and great, but not enough
 8. For this resolution. Concerns have been around, but not brought to us, no one has taken the time to look at it. It's for the better of future students.
 9. echo former senator. Green isn't just huge now, but also for our future. University campuses are historically places for social change. Famous quote, insert here (ghandi?)
 10. should have straight up referendum. Would like advisors in non-voting role for Env council reps.
 11. not that I'm not for green, but timing is really difficult. JPB keeps talking about how we don't have money. As former senator said, might be cheaper, but university won't change fees, just shuffle that extra money too. Soo much money, that putting another fee out there is adding to a current problem. Wrong time for discussion.
 12. how much is too much? We keep seeing increases for students, and I support this, but when do we stop with little changes? I'm worried about trend of adding small little bits to seg fees.
 13. couple sessions ago we saw graph on public funding. Trend shows downward, and not changing. The financial problems are going to continue, so no reason to not do this now. In 5 years they'll pay themselves off, and it takes away from deficit sooner if we act now than later. I like the idea of grants. Did the other UW's receive grants? No, but they received

14. few years ago an international protocol, every country needs to reduce greenhouse emissions by 5%. We haven't dropped as a country, but have increased. This is our chance to make, only a small change here, but could trigger a big reaction. Our government isn't doing it, so we should.
15. echo former senator. Important to act on this now.
16. timeline is set up for grass-roots campaign. Many will be campaigning for this while you campaign for you seats.
17. echo a former senator. Thank you for staying here for 3 hours plus, and thanks for the statistics
18. isn't whether we support or not. It's whether we want to give students right to vote on this. Not wise to go against students. Is it right or not to bring to students? I think it is. System set up for after that. Voting or non-voting on apportionment, that's up to this group. Campus planner should be a voting member on this. That person has to ultimately approve of this anyhow.
19. structure for apportionment, that's because there may be a special committee set up specifically for this. Someone now has to be deciding on this at least until something more formal can get set up. Time yielded:
 - a. brought up about allocation procedures. Subject o final approval of SS. I trust SS to do something only beneficial to students.
 - b. On group composition of apportionment. We should have rhac member on it. It affects ResHall people. We can have them all be non-voting. Nothing is static. Anything you want to bring forth, it's not offensive. Want to make sure all concerns addressed. It's fluid and can change.
 - c. When is the time, the time is now.
20. ECHO of now, or no time soon. We're asking students so up to them.
21. if we are not comfortable having extra member on apportionment, consider having environmental director on board. With talloires and this there may be much use for a position like that.
22. global warming scares me. It is an issue now and we need to deal with it now
 - a. pt of information: not just deciding for referendum, but also for council? Right this is for everything? Yes
 - i. time yielded. – member of env. council and talloires committee. Appreciate acknowledgement that students need to make progress with this issue. A way to start dealing

with that. We underestimate how much students and individuals want this. Over 1400 signatures for talloires. Testament that students want this. Really a measure invest in renewable energy. Costs are going to continue to increase, so I do think a grass-roots movement brought this to us. Not new, not innovative, bring us up to speed. Across sate and nation, more is being done by students. ECHO other senators comments. Take a stance and responsibility.

b. Move to exhaust speakers list eck/hammen – objection

23. how much is too much. Pepsi fund could go towards these things. Are we going to start having an accessibility and campus climate fee every year?

24. I'm excited about this, students elected environmentalist leaders, and that shows support for it.

25. Res. halls funded by students who live in res. halls. Then it should not be paid by all students, but through those fees. Not all students on campus.

a. Pt of information: isn't it not just res. halls. Right, but shouldn't look at res. hall projects, different funding

26. not speaking out against efforts. Easy to get signatures.

Difficult to get student to voice and back up something.

Understand signatures, but first time I had heard of this and same with my constituents. Educate students and get them to raise up their voice.

27. agree with former senator. Res. hall comments. All for economic sense. Not sure like environmental comments. But if this is just for student body, table rest of resolution, and implement after if students want it?

28. referendum? Suggest advisory referendum or regular referendum. Contemplate and bring next week

a. motion to close discussion – groshek/hammen

i. passed, 1 abstention

motion for 5 minute recess hammen

division – 22-12-0

Quorum – role call

d. Resolution Supporting a Graduate Student Speaker at the Graduate Student Commencement

1. wallace/kahl

2. shocked never been a grad student speaker. Not sure why? A disconnect.

3. emailed grad students and they wanted a speaker

ii. Discussion

1. came up last year, and were confused why didn't have a commencement speaker. Pretty cut and dry

- a. motion to close: rome/hammen
 - i. acclimation
- e. Draft of The Constitution of the University of La Crosse Student Association (non-action)
 - 1. wallace/kahl
 - 2. presentation of changes – separate PowerPoint showing major changes
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. article V, b. page 5. comes from a lot of misunderstandings. Basically I know, after talking with a lot of people, DOC is not the group, and to clarify that DOC is a coalition of groups, MSO's etc for backing. A place for them. So technically not a group. Picking 4 people from something that isn't a group can cause a lot of problems, and that's where the issue arose. Just want to inform people. Streamlining might not be the best way to go about doing this. Why are we taking away from students who don't have a big voice on campus. There is a lot more to it and I think someone is going to bring this up and talk to you (senate). Might not be the best solution.
 - 2. judicial branch – while like veteran people on there and 2 year term. Concerned that it would be a very small pool of candidates. Come in later in college career, and would mean some couldn't do other student things such as study abroad. Already can't fill election commission, so...
 - 3. concerned about athlete spot elimination. 570 student athletes, which is 14.5% undergrad population. 1 senator per 500 students. At least 1 senator. 518 multicultural seats – support that but feel we should get at least 1 seat. A lot of senate money goes into senate, so athlete opinion should be voiced.
 - 4. like overall changes. Page 8, section VIII, impeachment. Flaw to it. Shouldn't be removed upon being indicted, should only be removed upon being convicted. Happy to help rewrite section.
 - 5. oath, page 7. at least given with country tradition, religious objections, should make it an affirmation rather than an oath.
 - 6. thanks Rome. Membership. Some gaps as far as representation. Where are they represented if not in a college. – you get put in a college by interest.
 - 7. judicial issues. But moving on – Greek life. Growing greek community, so concern for representation. Seeing that university lists those orgs as important, I think we need at least one representative on the senate.
 - 8. new orgs that come on and deal with cultural diversity, if there is a difference and more representation, how would they be able to achieve a position?
 - 9. concerns from others:

- a. goal of senate is to present needs of student body, which isn't just academic councils, but community of cultures. Need extra organizational groups.
 - b. Goal of this was to create more efficiency with senate. This would then shut out more voices to make it flow easier. So this is a concern.
 - c. How should we organize this, vs individually. How can you define groups for equal representation? Throw ideas on entire structure.
10. environmental issues, so maybe we should have an environmental council senator represented. Very beneficial especially the way our campus is, and looks to possibly be continuing to go.
 11. need an athletic voice on here.
 12. judicial branch, page 11, mediation: seems like they are acting as parents. This is supposed to be us being more mature and developing. I do not think that the court justice should be holding hands and settling roommate disputes. A waste of student time.
 13. mediation good idea. Might not be needed, but? Maybe a great idea? Kind of like it.
 14. page 5, make-up of senate: are we changing make-up/amount of senators? Based every 2 years. 1 per 500 senators. How many would we have? 28 total. Shrinks it down, not sure we want to go that route. But actually I talked to someone from somewhere, how do we set up our senate, cuz they're having problems.
 15. greek life: 1 case, but falls over all cases – I feel organization senators were the most important role than college senators. More personal and more important. Would like to see them stay on along with grad and some others.
 16. responding to some of the stuff. Don't have to have a senator, can send people to senate, and if they step up like exemplary Env. Council, then your voice can be heard just as well. Deal with issues before they come up, and be proactive. Greeks and athletes are also represented as students in college. Ways to be involved, not guaranteed seat. Focus on getting orgs to be more effective representing selves to senate, rather than having a senator to deal with issues when they come up. Want orgs to have to come and push issues, much stronger than 1 senator pushing for stuff.
 17. back to mediation- came from landlords seeing issues between tenants. It should be available for all students.
 18. only senators can propose resolutions? A senator would need to sponsor it.

19. structure: should each get their own seat. Bring own value to the table. Retake policy, everyone for it until we heard from a diversity point of view.
 - a. Pt of clarification: not everyone was for the resolution.
20. if some orgs weren't on here, things wouldn't be brought to us, or to them. Think of stuff that may not be thought about in general.
21. mediation: great idea, don't do anything right now anyhow. Part of growing up is using resources. Bad concept to say no you are grown up and should figure it out for yourself
22. completely re-written. Do we have to dissolve current SA and the get a new one? Perfectly OK and we can go on as we are.
23. also consider how we would implement this kind of thing. Elections at same time of constitution approval. How would that work?
24. like idea of representation as percentage of colleges. La Crosse isn't very diverse, so might be nice to over represent them.
25. explain SAH seats: SAHH – biologies and physical sciences, math. SAHP- sports sciences
26. didn't know env. council existed. Helps that pres and vp are on them this year to bring them up. Hard if no representation.
27. each community has a representative. Don't think it should be based off of ratio or portion. Will take away and marginalize (like DOC). Fed gov't – house of reps is done proportionally, not senate. Hard for 4 people to represent (12?) orgs.
28. DOC seats are very important representing already marginalized aspects on campus.
29. mediation – not comfortable with it – might be more qualified people on campus for this role. Would this fall under job of someone else such as testing and counseling? This mediation thing is Dean's office idea. (M. Johnson-Sage and M. Myamoto). Why not have students deal with student problems. Cool idea, but might be disconnected, or maybe I'm off base saying that. People enjoy their ra's so cool idea
30. lots of problems with senators not being able to get to constituents. Very direct link for DOC orgs, not so much for colleges. Don't like that line of thought.
31. Env. council bringing issues to student senate – things represented every single meeting in here. Other things by BSU for example is not an issue, but a daily occurrence. Passing budgets and discussing one-shots are not single group issues, but more of a well rounded daily thing that can't be limited to a single occurrence.
32. don't feel a need to downsize. Members are good because they get different thoughts from going to faculty and committee meetings. Understand that in order to be more efficient would

- like to downsize, but we have a good crowd with a lot of feedback. Size is appropriate.
33. lot of orgs, not fair to say one has been in here a lot so more involved, but I'm in my org talking to them weekly, so we have fewer issues, but there for them when they do. Would not have talked to a student mediator.
 34. think about the fact that certain orgs can't have members here and do other things due to smaller sizes.
 35. students have other outs, mediation not necessary and how would students know about it? DOC senators do have ea lot more direct contact with constituents than college senators.
 - a. Motion to exhaust speakers list – objection
 36. disagree with organizations. Won't always have executive members who are in orgs such as env. council. Not a good idea to have senators representing multiple areas such as CBA and athletics.
 37. big problem with senate that no one represents all the people they are supposed to represent. By continually adding, that is not going to change. Trying to make ways to make SA more broad ranged. Athletes able to talk to their CLS senator. Should represent everyone in your group, regardless of what else they are in. not doing our jobs of getting out there. Could have an email account. Rework committees. Trying to solve big problem with small little issues. Shouldn't be this disconnect. Would have SO many organizations.
 38. don't know how feel about seats in senate, all I know is regaining political activism in this group. If we downsize the body, then we are going to get people who really want to be here and they are going to be active. The people here a lot of the time come and listen, and it stops there. Supposed to be representing and acting, and talking to constituents.
 39. don't mean to offend anyone, but the positions with a high turn over rate are not normally college/school seats. This year we had many seats with a high turn over rate. It is a concern that we have to reassign seats due to this turn over rate each semester. It is frustrating to bring people up to speed each semester. Some seats have a higher turn over rate and this may help have senators talk to their students more per week. I talk to many SOE students each week and many students are more informed and are contacting me about concerns so they are becoming more well known about issues on campus. Students now are paying attention on a variety of issues.
 40. Kahl and Csargo close discussion
 41. Passed

- f. UW-L Student Association Resolution Supporting Priority Policies for the Governor's Task Force on Global Warming
 - 1. Fuhrman/Moua open discussion
 - 2. Introduction of resolution by author – explanation of the task force for global warming. The issue is that the task force is holding a public hearing on March 19th, so therefore this is spring break and students won't be here to express their voice. this resolution is an opportunity for students voices to be heard at the task force hearing, therefore having the opportunity to ripple from our campus, to the state and then the federal global warming agenda. Asking for support.
 - 3. needs to have a stronger therefore it be resolved paragraph
 - 4. appreciate that this is being brought to students attention. This is something that could be debated however I think that this is a good resolution and I support it.
 - 5. echo previous senator however needs more discussion on this despite it being late
 - 6. DeShong/Decker to close discussion
 - 7. Passes with one abstention
- g. Resolution Conveying UW-L Budget Priorities for the UW System
 - 1. Hammen/Wallace to open discussion
 - 2. at the student reps meeting which includes all system student reps. UC passed their budget priorities and this was forwarded to student reps. Therefore the president and vice president have brought these priorities to senate to get some input.
 - 3. 6% over 6 years? The support for VA tuition should be funded by state GPR and the students should not be supplementing this when the state promised this and passed it off and I don't agree.
 - 4. can we put this in our own order? We can priorities this list and I encourage senate to do this as this would allow for us to support the most important on the list and are most important to UW-L students.
 - 5. as a beneficiary of the VA tuition process, there is no support from the state and UW-L is currently waiving tuition for these students. I object to #1 as this does not make sense with UW-L G,Q &A. asking for additional funding is not responsible as there is no money to ask for.
 - 6. #8 is from GPR is from not for GPR
 - 7. #1 concern with how this happened to be a priority and there is no real reason for this decrease. #3 in support of the Veteran's tuition, the Gov. was here and in support of it and it is important to have the state really support this and not just say they support this. Not sure how they can have #1 and the rest of the list.

8. #4 refers to the two year institutions and will move to strike UW-L from this. #9 needs to be explained. Inclusion Excellence Program is kind of like Plan 2008
9. In the therefore be it finally resolved, that this will be sent to the UW system reps group, however they have no voting authority on this document and if they were to have a voice this would be a conflict in regard to UC being here for us to voice our concerns. Make UC aware of this and your concerns
10. make bullets instead of numbers
11. #6 not a lot of information about this at this point so information will be emailed to everyone
12. #3 should be moved to #1 if we rank these. This was discussed at Joint Planning and Budget and this is a concern in regard to how much the institution may have to spend for returning of vets.
13. Hammen/Eck close discussion
14. Passed

XII. Announcements

1. chapter 17/18 will be on D2L. UC Director will be here the rest of the week and we can talk about the budget priorities
2. a letter to the raquet was written in regard to a previous article however it was not printed and the Editor was not happy about the letter to the editor.
3. thank you for support for Polar Plunge and special thanks to Vice for support
4. March 26th John D. Palmer will be speaking about the myth about asian minorities
5. Safe Spring Break party next Wednesday in the Cellar
6. Check email for the application for the White Privilege Conference and the deadline is next Friday
7. if you need volunteer hours see Kahl
8. Hillel is having a meeting on Friday with food at 6:30pm. Email Kohl-Riggs for information
9. If you know of anyone who can be on the Election Commission let Armstrong, Bergman, Ludwig know
10. Monday the DOC will be meeting about the constitutional changes at 4:30pm.
11. coffee hour at 3:30pm in the Diversity Center
12. thank you for being here

XIII. Adjournment

1. hammen/Wallace to ajourn at 11:20pm

