



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – LA CROSSE
STUDENT ASSOCIATION

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

Student Senate Minutes

Date: April 30th, 2008

Time and Location: 6pm in Cartwright 339

- I. Call to Order
- II. Role Call

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

Thompson, Amanda	1	1	1
Trimborn, Steven	1	1	1
Vang, Nou	excused		
Van Winkle, Joshua	1	1	1
Vice, Katie	1	1	1
Wallace, Karly	1	1	1
Total	27	31	30

Others: Ringgenberg, Cikara, Singh, Chapiewsky, Giltner, Perez, Perket, Robinson, O'Brien, Ludwig, Bergman, Smith

Guests: Chia-Chen Yu, Anita Evans, Nik Nelson, Kelliann Blazek, Ramani Kutty, Jennifer O'Neill, Kevin LeFevre

III. Approval of Minutes

- a. Ruplinger/Thiel
- b. Minutes approved, one abstention

IV. Approval of Agenda

- a. Fuhrmann/Wallace
- b. I sent out some emails and I know it is getting long but I did add Student Tech Fee Committee Bylaws and Student Services and Buildings By-Laws...any objections?
 - i. None
- c. Also added approving the referendum results and the transferring of money...any objections? none
- d. Can we move the library resolutions to A and B?
 - i. Yes
- e. Agenda approved

V. Guest Speakers

- a. Anita and Chen-Chia, Director of Murphy Library
 - i. Good evening, I appreciate this opportunity to present the current financial situation. Two weeks ago the faculty senate passed the resolution. I want to highlight some of the major financial crises we have.
 - ii. The budget has been flat since 2001
 - iii. The increasing prices for the subscription fees. They have risen about 10% inflation rate.
 1. The increase in subscription costs have risen. Some of you need them to finish your assignments. In 2007 it increases about \$48,000. Another increase was electronic resources. Many of you have the ability to get all the info through electronic resources. In 2004 we subscribed to 70 resources, but we have had to cut it to only 50 at a cost of \$481,000. Since 2001 we have many different majors and programs added to the university. Many require the majors or schools to subscribe to certain electronic resources. The American Chemical Society, we paid about \$21,000 before and now we pay more than \$30,000. So the library had to cut many of the electronic sources and many journals and periodicals. This increased the

request of the interlibrary loan. The costs of the requests has increased about 115%. The committee has worked very hard to think about any way to manage the crises.

- iv. The best way is to find additional funding. The other solution is if we do not get an increase is to charge fees for the interlibrary loans for faculty and students as well. This is the last thing we want to do. That's why we are here today.
- v. These resolutions were passed in faculty senate very recently. The first one is one that is being heard around the UW System. This is an initiative to look ahead and have different ideas considered by the chancellors and provosts groups. They came up with key items that should be put forth. This would go forward to the regents and then go through the budget process. This would actually be new money added on to the budget. What happened is for the first time they established a pool of money for the shared electronic collection. The money has been flat so we need to cancel some options.
- vi. We have to other resolution which has to do with local funding. Some of the increase in students increases the money we have to pay for the subscriptions. We have \$30,000 worth of requests in books that we won't be able to order. You really need this and this is a core service and essential to your success.

vii. Discussion

1. How do you base your decisions on what you cut?

a. We consult faculty and make a decision in that regard.

Karly Wallace, Higher Education Act and FY09

- viii. HEA- Higher Education Act. It hasn't been renewed in the last 10 yrs. Some of the things it wants to do is simplify the FASFA. 1.5 million students don't fill it out, maybe because they don't know how to do it. 2/3rds of the info entered in the FASFA is already in your tax return. They also want to eliminate the drug question. 2,000 have been denied financial aid because of that. The HEA also wants to preserve good programs available for low income students. It hopes to implement Child Care Access for parents in schools. Right now it takes more than 9 months to enroll. It would like to improve the collection of hate crime data. Also supporting the Pell Grant, which is a grant that is awarded to low and moderate income students. 5.3 million Students got it last year and they want to increase it because it has been losing value as time goes on. Also increase the federal grant aids.
- ix. Fiscal year 09- Currently LEAP, SEOG and the others are supposed to be cut completely. We need more funding. USSA is lobbying for an increase in these programs and keeping them from being cut.

Natalie Holzem, Women's Issues

- 1. One of the nice things you have at these conferences is you get to break into groups and it makes you aware of the issues that affect you and the group you identify with. Lots of the times policies that affect everyone affect women differently. Some of the issues that affect

women across the country on different campuses are child care centers, women's health services (the price of birth control have risen double the price, emergency contraception are not offered on some campuses), visibility of a women's center (some campuses don't have one), proportions of women in math, assault and harassment (one in four women will be assaulted in college)

2. Steps of action- getting the people who care about women's issues into office. We got compassionate care for rape victims and alcohol as an intoxicant. These are safety issues for women in college. Senate at UWL- we have a standing women's issues committee, it would be nice to get that off the ground. Also taking to students about these issues as well. These are important to more than half the students on campus. The gender issues director- Kristin has done a lot this year. We have MUASA, ALANA, Students for Choice, etc.

Kelliann Blazek, DREAM Act

1. I am doing a project for a semester paper and many people don't know what undocumented students are. They are students that don't have a proof of residency. They are in a sort of legal limbo. They receive free education for k-12, but for college they are not able to apply for financial aid. Over 65,000 undocumented students graduate from college every year. The Dream Act would provide federal aid to undocumented students and the path to gain citizenship. The major deterrents is it would cost 60 million to implement it. So states have taken their own initiatives. Five years ago a bill was proposed in WI but vetoed. I am sure you all took the campus climate survey and one of the populations we are trying to focus on is immigrants.
2. Discussion
 - a. What other way can students get a social security number?
 - i. There is no other way than through citizenship.

Ramani Kutty, Affirmative Action

1. Affirmative Action is policies and programs that provide equal opportunity to minorities. In 1961 President Kennedy established affirmative action in the workplace. Affirmative Action still exists in our state. One of the biggest myths is it hires unqualified people and employers have to fill quotas. The purpose is to provide a more level ground for minorities and women. White women are the population that benefit most from affirmative action. It is also involved in New Zealand. U.S isn't the only country to use this system.

Jeffrey Allen, Leadership Development

1. I want to show you numbers of education's overall share of the entire budget. It's not a lot. I want to show you some of the sites and things we did while in DC. We need good leaders because no one steps up. If you don't have a good succession in leaders you would lose a lot of the continuity in your org. How did you get involved? I consider everyone in here a leader on this campus. Some people have that drive and that passion, other times someone approaches you and asks you.

Networking is important in recruiting leaders. These are all things we don't think about a lot of the time. That passion you can see in an individual makes you dig deeper and go further. Ginger Bread Person Activity- non gender specific: in order to get people interested in doing what you want you have to know what they think are important. It can change at any point in time. In talking to an individual and knowing what they are into you can reach them better. I encourage you all to go home and make your own little ginger bread person. Some people put this on a white board so they can change it. A good leader knows these details and what motivates an individual. The more you know the more you can connect. You want to ask how they got people involved, the tactics that they used, did they do anything in high school, what else are they doing on campus? Give them something to do before the next time you meet with them. Give them a task to do so that they know you are serious about the commitment and bond between them. Most important is you have to know the answer to any question you ask them. If you ask them what motivates them, you need to know what motivates you. Our leadership not only grew, we were able to bond while we were there. We were stuck in airport the first day and missed the first day of the conference, but it didn't matter because we bonded. I thank you for giving myself and other the opportunity.

VI. Officer Reports

- a. Fred
 - i. A video on UW-L stadium referendum. I would like to thank everyone who was involved on the referendum. We had more people turn out for that than for the student elections.
- b. Bjorn
 - i. There are some directors who aren't here who still want to give their report, so we might break off into that later.
 - ii. Thanks to all who helped with the referendum.
 - iii. Need a motivational speaker for the student orientation in the Fall. You can talk to Chuck afterwards.
 - iv. The Green Fund- I forwarded the results and Sharon sent me an email to let me know it would be included next year.
 - v. Campus Life Survey- 19.84% student return. Thanks to everyone who helped get students to do it.
 - vi. Last senate meeting next week. Following our meeting, the new senate will be having their meeting.
- c. Others
 - i. Tanmaya
 1. Program in Baird Hall about Privilege and society at nine.
 - ii. Kyle
 1. Elected Joe Hine for faculty senate. Tomorrow I will be in Madison and will see if we can get to our representative's office. See if we can get something done their.
 - iii. Natalie

1. Elections for UC last weekend.

VII. RHAC Report

- a. As of last Thursday RHAC is adjourned. I didn't know what to do with myself last week.

VIII. Advisor Reports

- a. Lauren

- i. If you have any documents on the senate computers you need to get them off because I am having them cleansed. I think we will have to have some rules because they are so junked up right now that you cant really use them. Also get anything in the fridge or mail boxes. If stuff is there it will be donated. Even if you are coming back next semester you need to get it out because they clean the offices over the summer. Next week's meeting will be fun.

IX. Committee Reports

- a. Academic Affairs met for the Collegiate Readership issue, the main thing we were worried about is how to not charge students that live in the res halls. We want to see if there any suggestions.
 - i. Discussion
 1. I think we could combine it into one with RHAC. There is a way to do it; we just need to work on it next semester.
 2. I was not impressed with the results of the program at all. I can't see charging a student \$5 a semester when they might not have accessed any of those papers. We have been accumulating fees this semester. As consumption goes up, so does the price. I wasn't in favor of the programs.
 3. One student is getting \$40 worth of the paper, others are paying for it.
 4. We have the internet to use for national news. Maybe we should give back to the local paper, get the La Crosse Tribune.
- b. Student Tech Fee
 - i. Budget approved.
- c. UCC
 - i. Been some changes to the REC Major, some new courses. Same with math and geography dep.
- d. Leg Affairs
 - i. Most of the time was spent on reformatting by laws. You will be getting a template for how your committees should do that.
- e. All of the committee chairs need to write up a end of the year report, all of the chairs need to contact me at the end of the meeting.

X. New Business

- a. Formation of the University of Wisconsin- La Crosse Campus Community Enrichment Fund Ad Hoc Committee Resolution
 - i. Klotz/Fuhrmann
 - ii. Discussion

1. Should we have the groups that appoint come to us for approval to get on this committee? I don't see why people would get denied.
2. About submitting with the application, I move to remove the application from this because I want the committee to be able to adapt the application to what it has to go through and limit them.
 - a. Allen/Decker
 - b. Discussion
 1. I think that is the right way to go, I think it should be flexible and not micromanaging.
 2. Call to question
 1. Acclimation
 - a. Amendment passes
 - c. Move to amend the bylaws under membership for the student membership: each member shall be appointed by their respective organization with final approval by Student Senate
 1. Klotz/Ruplinger
 2. Discussion
 1. It seems like micromanagement to me and time consuming.
 - a. I think it was just going off of that senate should appoint people to committees.
 2. I think it is important to remember that this committee is going to be giving away a lot of money; I don't think it is unreasonable for senate to approve the members.
 3. Ideally I would like to see all of the students come in at one time, it would be the vice president that gets everyone all together.
 4. Right now, at large members are appointed by the vice president and students don't vote on it.
 5. We could give the chair of the committee the right. We could just vote on it.
 6. I want to know if you are ok with it just saying "nominated" instead of "appointed".
 - a. Passes, one abstention
3. Call to question
 - a. Objection

4. Quorum #1
 - a. 31 people, meet quorum
5. Point of info
 - a. Are the bylaws included?
 1. Yes.
6. Can Leg Affairs do anything with the bylaws?
 - a. The charge that senate gave the Pepsi committee is to bring everything back to senate, so the committee would have to change the bylaws first.
7. I would like to see some actual discussion on this.
8. I feel like we discussed this last week.
9. It still bothers me that we look at as small minded projects, there was a lot of discussion about it being a negative. It bothers me with the amount of money and time going into this.
10. I don't think it is senate's authority to go in and change that. It is up to the committee. I don't want to go in and lock it in. lets give the committee the opportunity to do what they need. I feel like that would be micromanaging.
11. Is there anything in this about reviewing it in like two years about how they allocating the money and if it is effective?
 - a. There isn't anything.
 1. I think that is something to think about.
12. point of clarification
 - a. Isn't the committee just recommending where the money should go?
 1. it goes to senate first and then the chancellor
 - b. So every single time it is happening it us coming to senate.
13. I am not sure why the chancellor is calling the first meeting when senate is supposed to be dealing with it. Motion to amend the initial meeting to say that the vice president shall call the first meeting
 - a. Rome/Holzem
 - b. Discussion
 1. I think that is the right way to go. Call to question
 1. Acclimation
 - a. Amendment passes.
14. I don't think you can correlate the impact of the project and the size to the price. It doesn't seem reasonable.
15. I like the idea of keeping \$70,000 in there. We could change it do say it is a reserve and it could be appropriate to use. We could say it is highly suggested, or you need to build up the reserves. But I don't think we need to say how big or small the projects need to be.

16. Given that it has to come back to us every time, we will be comfortable with it. Call to question
 - a. Passes, 28:1:2
- b. Elimination of the Seven Meal Plan Resolution
 - i. Allen/Ruplinger
 1. Please consider the effects to all students. I know we thought people on this plan were idiots, but consider students in the res halls who have to be on a meal plan.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. The main reason it was brought before senate was because we knew it wasn't a decision we could make on our own. We need to keep in mind who it could effect.
 2. I talked about this with the DOC and we figured out that many students in the res halls coming from different backgrounds, they have to be on it. Many of them can't eat a lot of the food because of their customs. Many of them you can't distinguish if it is meat or not. There is no better solution, it is not costing any students anything extra. If you are worried that students are making a bad choice, then we need to make sure that they know what they are choosing. DOC feels the same way about it.
 3. Was there a lot of student input with the contract when it was extended?
 - a. No there wasn't
 4. Seeing that when the contract was extended there was no student input, I struggle with taking away their options when they didn't have a choice.
 5. To most of us here \$20 may not feel like a big deal, but it is for others. There is no reason why we should take away their choice.
 6. To me it sounds like we are settling. It doesn't seem like an option that we should offer. If we do vote this down I hope that we keep looking into other options, maybe we could find something cheaper than this.
 7. Is the university obligated to have 4 options?
 - a. Right now it is in the contract, we would have to amend it.
 - b. It does specify those 4 options.
 8. Is it RHAC policy?
 - a. No it is a university policy, an amendment to the contract.
 9. I hope you can see this from a different view point. It is hurting every individual that has no other option than to be on this plan. Let's pass this and use it as fuel to the fire, and use it to get what we want. If we eliminate this then people will be angry and do something about it. Let's have them create a

10. I talked to some of my constituents and they were disturbed that people think we shouldn't let people make stupid choices. I think the real issue is the obligation to get a meal plan. I don't understand how Chartwells in good conscience can force students to pay significantly more.
11. I am upset with Chartwells. We could have more grass roots efforts to get rid of those meals. I think we could save on both time and money. I don't think there is any benefit and the cost is too high.
12. I think students are getting really ripped off. I think if people knew that this was happening they would be a little more weary. I think the reason we have to have meal plans for people in the dorms is because if not it would cost students a lot more. It was a way to save money for the majority of students. When all the construction is done, is this something we could move out of?
 - a. Yes, potentially.
13. So this is a way to protect students until our growth on campus is put into place. We might as well just get rid of it so that we can save the student's money.
14. Has it ever been proposed that everyone on campus could have the on campus block plan?
 - a. We have had those conversations, probably not. Chartwells only gets paid when students actually eat a meal on block plan. When everyone doesn't eat the meals on the plan, they don't make their revenue figures.
15. In the future we should maybe go to some place that offers other options. Carol College has a point system, and if you have extra points you can use it to buy bulk food items at the end of the year. Although starting an uproar sounds like a great idea, that takes a while and we would have a time where students would be dissatisfied. Maybe we should come up with a plan and then try to get rid of it.
16. Maybe we should look at other plans and look at a combo of block and daily meals. That is something we need to tackle real early next year so that it could get into the budget.
17. It's been bugging me, the transfer hours. It doesn't seem like they have the student's best interest in mind. I asked what the deal was and they said they relied on the walk in grad students and faculty, and that student's don't mind waiting. I think the sooner we can get on a different contract where meals don't expire after a week, the better.

18. A lot of times people blame Chartwells, and they shouldn't. The contract was signed a long time ago. We are here to serve all the students, not just res hall students.
19. I have never been a fan of Chartwells, an idea is going up only \$15. I agree with people's concerns that people don't want to be on them. The best financial option isn't always the cheapest financial option. This is far greater an issue than this. If you have been down stairs there are signs about problems with people using other's id's and stuff like that. I would like to see it go away, but I think from the numbers I see, it is ridiculous.
20. Can you ever change the price of the 7 meal a week plan?
 - a. The structure for that is in the contract, every quarter the price escalates. After 7 years of escalations, prices get higher.
21. I don't think anyone could survive on 7 meals alone. We are trying to get rid of this option, but if we are only increasing it 50 cents per meal, then financially that is your best option. I think it would be better for everyone. This plan is costing the administration a lot of money. There are only 42 people on this out of 2,600 students on meal plans.
22. I will vote to eliminate this, I think we need to work with Chartwells because they have been doing a good job with more options.
23. Everyone has issues with Chartwells, right now the issue is the 7 meal plan. We need to keep it on task.
24. I have seen how Chartwells works at 3 other universities. The way it works here it is very efficient. The 7 meal plan is a last resort, I don't think they get the benefit. If it was made obvious that the 10 meal plan was better, then maybe students wouldn't be on it.
25. We are talking about students as though they are ignorant. I think students are well informed of what they are signing up for. The phrase keeps coming up that we are ripping students off, but they are deciding this. Eliminating the 7 meal plan would not be a catalyst for change. I don't see the point in taking away student's choice. They are perfectly capable of making their own choices.
26. It's not the cost of it, it is the quality. Call to question
 - a. objection
27. I am in favor of giving the students the option, if it is being utilized it is up to their discretion.
28. We don't have to pass this in order to fuel a fire. It is not a matter of financing, it is a matter of not wanting to eat here. Eliminating the 7 meal plan is not going to make it cheaper. There are a few amount of people who are on this plan, possible the amount of people who don't want to eat here.

There are people who can't eat the food here because of religious or other obligations. A rip off is charging students \$20 more than they need to be.

- a. You can opt out for religious reasons.
 - 1. I think that needs to be publicized more.
 - 29. we are talking in circles, move to question
 - a. Schooley/Klotz
 - 1. Quorum #2
 - 1. Point of parliamentary procedure.
 - a. This is out of order.
 - i. If you want to challenge me on it you can.
30. Move into a vote
 - a. Roll call

Name	Yes	No	abstain
Allen, Jeffery	1		
Armstrong, Vanessa		1	
Baalbaki, Ibrahim	1		
Bayer, Allison		1	
Cerwin, Nicholas		1	
Cooper, Mitchell			
Csargo, Nicholas		1	
Decker, Rourke		1	
DeShong, Robert	1		
Eck, Calie			
Fuhrmann, Eric	1		
Groshek, Matthew		1	
Hammen, Derek	1		
Hastings, JennieLynn		1	
Hockett, Joshua		1	
Holzem, Natalie	1		
Kahl, Erik		1	
Klotz, Melissa		1	
Kohl-Riggs, Arthur		1	
Maly, Tabetha			
McCaigne, Kelsey			
Moua, Keng	1		
Navarre, Stephanie		1	
Rome, Jacob	1		
Ruplinger, Melissa		1	
Sackmann, Valentine	1		

Savaglio, Britta			
Schooley, Jillian		1	
Syafitri, Sonia		1	
Thiel, Chuck	1		
Thompson, Amanda		1	
Trimborn, Steven		1	
Vang, Nou			
Van Winkle, Joshua	1		
Vice, Katie		1	
Wallace, Karly		1	
Total	11	19	0

1. Fails 11:19:0

c. Stadium Reallocation Referendum Results

- i. Fuhrmann/Rome
- ii. Move to question
 - 1. Move into a vote on the resolution
 - a. Resolution passes 25:0:1

XI. Discussion

a. Resolution for Advantage Wisconsin: Growing the Research Infrastructure (Library Component)

- i. Klotz/Syafitri
 - 1. I feel that the library has the most basic and vital resources that the university has. Due to budget constraints we have been cutting resources and hour of operation.
- ii. Discussion
 - 1. I am in support of this document. I feel that as a place of higher ed, our library is essential. It is sad that there are so many problems with the library.
 - 2. Does the library state how much more money they need?
 - a. This is more stating that there is a problem that needs to be addressed.
 - 3. I want to point out that they have been going to every other funding source. They have been doing their resources; I think they are coming to us as a last result. I think if we don't have resources, grad students won't want to come here. A lot of the time if we need an interlibrary loan, it doesn't come in time for your project.
 - 4. There is a list of 4 major priorities that UWL is requesting, they are requesting for 9 million dollars.
 - 5. I don't think there is any reason not to support this.
 - 6. motion to close discussion
 - a. Fuhrmann/Hammen
 - 1. Discussion closed.

b. Resolution for UW-L Support of the Library Budget for Acquisitions and Access

- i. Fuhrmann/Wallace
 - 1. It's the same concept and I don't see why we wouldn't support it.
- ii. The last one was on a statewide level and this one is one a more local university level.
- iii. Discussion
 - 1. My thing with this is it has differential tuition funding on there. I don't think we should start looking down that route yet. I am in favor of removing that.
 - 2. I agree, we have differential tuition in academic initiatives and they have dealt with it. We are just looking at taking on a student fee.
 - a. Faculty senate passed this resolution as well, so we just put it on the agenda as is.
 - 1. I don't know if they have a plan to get a fund.
 - 1. I want to make sure we are not supporting raising tuition. When you say faculty senate passed this, do they support the document or do they support us supporting it?
 - a. I just want senate to see what they passed.
 - 3. I serve on academic initiatives oversight committee and they have come to us in the last two years asking for money and we haven't supported them because we feel that students shouldn't fund something they should have.
 - 4. If in the last therefore be it resolved, if it just said UWL supports increasing the budget, would it be like saying it is up to you to figure it out?
 - a. We have a meeting on Friday and we are open to suggestions.
 - 5. The university should be footing the bill for that. If we do that, it will be an increase in student fees. Motion to close discussion.
 - a. Rome/Hammen
 - 1. Discussion closed, one abstention
- c. By-Laws of the UWLSA Board of Directors
 - i. Bayer/Rome
 - ii. I think they are pretty simple. The position descriptions haven't really changed since the last time. Compensation has been approved through HR and they are ok with it. It just needs senate's stamp of approval. A lot of it was pulled from the UWLSA constitution. The main reason for doing this was for compensation and needing to change positions with different things going on.
 - iii. The only other major change is in Section 3 of article 2, it says you can't be a senator and be on the board. We discussed that at length.

iv. Discussion

1. The stuff that was taken out of the constitution was a constitution that we never passed. As it stands, the constitution that we have already included the directors so there would be overlap. I do support having bylaws for the board, but in discussion of this we should see if there are things we want to look into making changes in the constitution and if that is the case we should put this off until next year.
2. These didn't exist before, so there is nothing to compare it to.
3. Under uncompensated work, is it including secretary?
 - a. Secretary is not included in the board.
4. What is the procedure in adjusting minimum wage?
 - a. That is just an example up, there, it is not binding.
5. I want to make a reference to the fact that the get out the vote coordinator is only a position every other year, and only a voting member every other year.
6. Eligibility has been discussed before, I think that if someone is more qualified and can do a better job then they should not be limited. I suggest that the vice president and president can decide what they want.
7. I support that a senator shouldn't be a director, because the balance of power is shifted. I personally think the board shouldn't be able to speak on senate issues. That is what senate is here to do. It is a different branch of government. I don't feel like one person should be able to serve on different bodies of government.
8. We have had an experience this year with someone who had to make a decision on whether he would fulfill his senate duties or his board duties. It is a power and time conflict. I think it has also been a crutch for past presidents and vice presidents because they just rely on senators to fill these positions instead of doing the pr and looking for other people.
9. About the affirmation, I like the concept, but it makes us feel like we are more important than we are.
 - a. All the senators have to take the oath.
10. When will this happen?
 - a. I assume right after they are approved by senate.
11. I would like to see the addition of the environmental sustainability director, especially with the passing of the green fund and signing of the declaration.
12. I strongly oppose giving the environmental council a seat on the board. I think we are adding additional fat. The green fund will only be dispersed once every two years.
13. Other directors promote other things through senate. It is clearly an important position.

14. There wouldn't be composition for next yr if there wasn't that position added. We have discussed this before and we are wasting time.
 15. I support an environmental director. Environmental council has brought quite a few resolutions to the floor, so there is a need.
 16. Last time we had this discussion the general agreement was that it should be a senator position.
 - a. It was knocked down by legislative affairs.
 17. If we feel it is important enough to make that position then that is what we need to do. We have to decide if this is something we want to focus on. We can have that discussion next year. It wouldn't be a paid position. Move to exhaust the speakers list
 - a. Fuhrmann/Hammen
 1. Speakers list exhausted, one abstention.
 18. A lot of orgs have been asking for senator spots. Where do we draw the line? That is why it would have to be a director spot instead of a senator seat.
 19. If we did do the board position I would like them not to be paid next year because this year we used as a model to determine the pay rate, and I don't want to just give them an arbitrary number.
 20. One thing that has changed since we have had the last discussion is that we are no longer a member of UC who had an environmental position. If we want to have a lobbying force on that then this would be it.
 - 21.
- d. Resolution Appointing UW-L Environmental Council Members to the New Academic Building Steering Committee
- i. Fuhrmann/Klotz
 - ii. I put the resolution that was passed in 2005 so if you haven't read that it is online. It was set up that environmental council would suggest people to be on the committee. It is vital the students on this committee are here over the summer. The previous resolution says students will be elected in October, but it is essential that there are people elected for over the summer because it is essential that students are on the committee. It also says the people elected need to give monthly reports. I didn't know that before but it will be done this year.
 - iii. Discussion
 1. Are there other student members on the committee?
 - a. That is something that should be addressed by senate as well.
 - b. Originally there weren't going to be any students on the committee, so environmental council drafted this document.
 2. It bothers me that we are building a new academic building and there are no students from senate on their.

- a. I can ask if they would like to have two students from senate on there as well. I will get back to you next week.
 - 3. Are there any members from SAPA on there?
 - a. No.
 - 4. I agree that student membership isn't adequate to meet the needs, but we want to get the new members on there now. We need to deal with this now. Move to close discussion
 - a. Fuhrmann/Hammen
 - 1. Discussion closed, one abstention.
- e. Resolution Supporting Repayment of the Funds Reallocated for Phase I of the Stadium Complex Project
 - i. Decker/Hammen
 - 1. This is a lengthy resolution; there are a couple clauses towards the end that I would like to address. I think this affirms that the foundation works for us. This resolution affirms that there is no hostile relation between us and the foundation. A great deal of this was taken from the email that Bjorn sent out a couple of weeks ago. It gives a detailed history of what happened. It says that we view this as a loan and that it should be repaid in the form of building the strength center.
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. I take issue with the phrase that senate will oppose all future foundation requests until the loan is repaid.
 - a. It doesn't state that, it just states the opposition.
 - 1. If we were to propose a referendum, would we have to take a vote no stance?
 - 1. Yes.
 - b. So I think this would be locking us into a position.
 - 2. I found it interesting that I talked to a large group of students who did vote yes, but they did express that what could we do to make sure that the foundation holds their end of the bargain. They were disappointed that they were put into this position that there is no guarantee that there will be a phase two. They expressed their frustration and they want to make sure that phase two gets done in a timely manner. I told them that the foundations priorities were the academic building and then phase two. The students don't want that to be a drop out until the building is done. They are still frustrated with the fact that they were put into this position just like we were.
 - 3. It is easy to say that the building and phase two should be at the same time, but if we don't get the money in time for the building then it will go away and taken by another university. If we are fundraising for too many times at one time then we might loose the building. I don't think the foundation liked the

position they were put in by the contractors either. We need to be sensitive to that.

4. I appreciate the idea that this resolution is taking, but last week we entered into an agreement with the foundation, we passed it, so I don't understand why we would need to do it again. We went into this knowing that they would do their best and try. We knew there is nothing else we can do. We made a binding agreement and it is counterproductive to pass this and try to demand more from them.
 5. How long has the foundation been around?
 - a. Since the 60's
 6. How often has the foundation hit the mark?
 - a. Often.
 7. What they are saying is they will pay us back and then go and make sure this gets done. I don't know why we are still talking about this. Motion to close discussion.
 - a. Rome/Hammen
 1. Discussion closed
- f. Resolution Supporting the Creation of the Joint Committee on Environmental Sustainability
- i. Fuhrmann/Wallace
 - ii. Last week right before the meeting, Joe asked if he could get senate's approval to form a committee. I think we should a committee to support the formation of this group. Right now the bylaws has 3 student members on the task force, they want more.
 - iii. Discussion
 1. I think you are right, I think students are moving towards this more than anyone else. If faculty and staff are looking to do this then we should do this.
 2. We are already passed a resolution for Chancellor to sign the declaration. Motion to close discussion.
 - a. Groshek/Hammen
- g. Resolution Establishing Rules for Campaigning on Election Day for Student Association Elections
- i. Rome/Fuhrmann
 - ii. I spoke with Marcia Johnson-Sage about the campaign rules and that is how this came about.
 - iii. Discussion
 1. It says to make those boundaries known to all candidates. Would we be able to extend this to referenda participants as well?
 - a. I think it should be done.
 2. I feel like as lengthy as a process it is, I feel like there are a lot of other issues and maybe this is something we can do right now but we need to make it a priority to look at it next year.

3. I like the idea of election day to be able to define the boundaries, but I agree there is more that needs to be looked at. I guess that is on the next administration to get that done.
4. In regards to the campus publicity guidelines, wouldn't that have to be changed as well?
 - a. Well this is just looking at the SA bylaws, not at the campus guidelines.
5. In the campus guidelines they have rules as well, I want to make sure it is covered under both and not have them be different guidelines.
 - a. I know that there have been talks about that as well.
6. A lot of the things that needed to be worked out couldn't be done this year.
7. I am wondering if the statement is too general. Can no one campaign on campus? Does this give other people loop holes? Just food for thought.
8. If there are other things that need to be amended, we could charge the commission with that. If the election commission could just establish their own rules, then the publicity guidelines wouldn't have to worry about the whole election process.
9. I agree it's too vague and there was a student court case that had many recommendations.
10. Motion to close discussion
 - a. Klotz/Hammen
 1. Discussion closed.
- h. Resolution Amending Section 4.543 of Student Association Election By-Laws
 - i. Decker/Fuhrmann
 - ii. It's only changing a few words.
 - iii. Discussion
 1. Motion to close discussion
 - a. Hammen/Theil
 1. Discussion closed.
- i. Student Services and Buildings Committee Bylaws
 - i. Klotz/Wallace
 - ii. There aren't a lot of extremely big ones, but there is just a lot of language that needs to be changed. We took the student tenant out of there because it has been vacant for 6 years. We included club sports. The biggest change is in regard to membership. We decided to make 5 student senators and added environmental council member because we don't know a whole lot about environmental initiatives, it is important because the green fund affects us. We also clarified the faculty and advisor members on the committee. We moved the legal aid service because we understand that it goes through senate anyway.

- iii. Leg Affairs just did structural stuff, we changed the convener of all committees to the vice president will convene it until a chair is appointed.
- iv. Discussion
 - 1. Is there anyone left on environmental council or are they are all serving on other committees? We don't need to load committees with every student that feels like they have something to say. We need to look at this and I think we are putting a bandage over a bullet whole.
 - 2. Motion to close discussion
 - a. Hammen/Van Winkle
 - 1. Discussion closed.
- j. Student Technology Fee Committee Bylaws
 - i. Fuhrmann/Sackman
 - ii. The biggest changes are the membership, we threw a grad student on because we thought it would be better. Other than that it is the same as last time.
 - iii. We changed the make up of the voting members but not the amount of voting members. Nothing too extreme.
 - iv. Discussion
 - 1. I trust the committees and it seems like the changes were minor. Motion to close discussion
 - a. Hammen/Thiel
 - 1. Discussion closed, one abstention.
- k. Stadium Reallocation Referendum Results
 - i. This is a very straight forward resolution, the results of the referendum, and what it was on.
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. Is this time sensitive?
 - iii. motion to suspend the rules and move it into new business
 - 1. Rome/Fuhrmann
 - a. Item K is moved to new business, one abstention

XII. Announcements

- a. We created a t-shirts, please let us know if you want one by Friday.
- b. I would like everyone here to give a big thank you to the senators who attended the GA this weekend. They stayed for 12 hours. It was really interesting because it was intense to watch. You could hear cheering and shouting from the room.
- c. Don't forget Colby tomorrow night.
- d. BSU is having their second bash at 8 in Port O Call
- e. When you email Lauren email your t-shirt size.
 - i. Please don't let them be made in sweat shops.
 - 1. We need them by next week so the answer is probably no.
 - a. I guess I am not getting one of those.

- f. Entertainment Committee needs 6 to 8 students for the National Conference of Undergraduate Research Committee. Our next meeting is the last day of school.
 - g. We have a senate facebook group.
- XIII. Adjournment
- a. Hammen/Fuhrmann
 - b. Meeting adjourned at 9:25pm.

