



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – LA CROSSE  
**STUDENT ASSOCIATION**

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

---

**Student Senate Minutes**

Date: May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Time and Location: 6pm in Cartwright 339

- I. Call to Order
  - a. 6:00 pm

II. Role Call

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

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

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

Guests: Lots of new senators, Katee Jo Neumann, Nik Nelson

### III. Approval of Minutes

- a. Ruplinger/Thiel

### IV. Approval of Agenda

- a. Fuhrmann/Hammen
  - i. Agenda approved

### V. Guest Speakers

- a. Katee Jo Neumann
  - i. Undergrad research proposal, I submitted mine last spring and mine and many others were tossed out because we were missing elements in the proposal. Mine was not tossed out because of those reasons but because mine aligned with program development as opposed to research. I never got to be considered for the money that is needed to do my research this summer. I am asking you if you have any extra money in your reserve funding so that I can complete my project as planned. Over the past three years I have traveled to Jamaica and this summer I am working with another intern and we are assessing the schools and what they need. I am researching how non-profit orgs start up and also work with my advisor to set up some service learning opportunities for students to work in Jamaica. I am asking if you would be willing to fund or help fund my project. I have gone to other orgs as well.
  - ii. Questions
    - 1. How much money?
      - a. I asked for the max of \$2,000 but I am cutting corners and condense. Anything will help.
    - 2. Why did you choose Jamaica?
      - a. It started with the alternative spring break and it kept growing. It's also cheaper for me since I have friends there that I can stay with.
    - 3. What will you be doing?
      - a. I will be working with a program that help other non-profits like Rock House Foundation that rebuilds schools. I will be working on assessments of the

- schools and working with the teachers and students to get a true assessment of what the schools need.
4. Why do you feel that it would be appropriate for this body to overturn the undergrad research committee by giving you money?
    - a. My argument is that mine wasn't a legit reason to be tossed. I believe that research is something that you do something with afterwards.
  5. Did you fully understand the criteria when you applied?
    - a. I thought I did, but they didn't give me a specific reason why they rejected my project. My advisor took it as a slap in the face and feels awful that she might have taken me in the wrong direction.
  6. point of info:
    - a. Are there students that sit on this committee and if so can we hear from them?
      - i. One student sits on the committee.
    - b. There was a letter sent to the research committee and an apology was sent back saying that they would change the procedures for next year but they can't change it for this year.
  7. What are you doing to bring it back to UWL?
    - a. My advisor will work with me to set up service learning opportunities for our students in Jamaica. We could expand it to other majors in the university.
  8. How senate works is it takes a few weeks to get to the appropriate committees. This is really weird for the whole body right now because this is our last meeting.
    - a. After speaking with Paula earlier today I got wind of this situation and I would say your best bet would be to talk to the academic initiative oversight committee. We don't have multiple weeks to complete this program. There time frame and process is a little bit different.
    - b. I still think it is good that you came in because your concern fits into the larger picture that we need clearer avenues to file an appeal, there is no accountability for those groups, it is good for senators to know that this is a process.
  9. Did you ever have a chance to meet with a committee and explain this?
    - a. I actually just got in contact with a person that could review this with me. I applied right after spring break.
    - b.

VI. Officer Reports  
a. Fred

- i. I was going to give the traditional “follow your dreams” but I don’t want to give that false sense of security so I will save my comments for the end of the meeting.
    - ii. I did take Kyle and Derek to a conference and got them in contact with other representatives of the state.
  - b. Bjorn
    - i. I got a thank you card from the Child Care Center and they thank senate for giving them the money.
  - c. Others
    - i. Kyle
      - 1. Thank for approving me for the Fall.
- VII. RHAC Report
  - a. No report.
- VIII. Advisor Reports
  - a. The t-shirts will be here on Friday and they will be in the office and in your mailboxes. Come get them next week. Take all of the stuff out of the office that is yours.
  - b. The last and final best dressed of the year goes to Eric Kahl, he has worn his Greeks every single week. The other one is JennyLynn.
  - c. I want to thank you for a wonderful year. Have a safe summer.
- IX. Committee Reports
  - a. TEGC
    - i. We realized we dealt a lot with the program changes and the committee was passing them through and they wound up causing problems for a lot of education students. We revamped what our committee was all about.
  - b. Gen Ed
    - i. We kept running in circles. They are going through the assessment piece. It is long overdue.
  - c. Academic Initiatives
    - i. We want to explain what it is and what the requests were. Academic Initiatives has been going on since 2003 and utilizes the differential tuition. We funded through the diversity component to send students to the White Privilege Conference. We start sending requests out as soon as committees are formed. We like to have them in by the end of March. we granted \$170,000 to Campus Climate, Undergrad research \$23,000, Grad research \$23,000, International Ed \$160,000, Academic Advising \$423,329, Library \$0 (we saw the history of the library and we felt that since we have 7 points of emphasis and we felt that the library’s request was too specific and was something the university should fund), DRS \$12,500, Diversity Recruiter \$72,693, Violence Prevention \$7,000 (we wanted to show them that the university had interest in this, they were applying for a grant and the grant providers wanted to see some contribution from the university).
    - ii. Right now the university would match the funding and next year they will no longer be doing that. We used some safe numbers to give us a

little bit of leeway and we have a reserve that we have been using. It will be depleted in the near future. The main thing we did was we looked at how much we funded last year and we tried to sustain that. We told them that they need to work on scaling back because in the future the funds aren't going to be there. We have had some by laws that make it difficult for the committee. We were supposed to have a report submitted over the summer to the board of regents, it is up for review. We were able to get an extension. We want to make sure we have a good set of bylaws in place for that. With the board coming it is very important.

iii. Questions

1. Is there any chance of getting funding anywhere else?
  - a. After the next two years the university's funding will be gone. We have told the groups to look into alternative ways of funding. We are looking into the Pepsi fund for Campus Climate. Right now everyone pays about \$55 a year in tuition, if we wanted to keep funding the way we do then it would have to increase to \$150.
2. Why did you give advising a large chunk and none to the library?
  - a. Advising is positions and it is a lot easier to say no to online journals than to cut two advisers. It is more positions and that is why it is so high. Advising also requested an increase in a position but we didn't grant that.
3. Why was the undergrad research more than others' percentages?
  - a. Last year we granted them \$23,000, the additional increase was for some extra publications and grants. They also put together the journal of undergrad research. There was additional printing and traveling. The bulk of it was wanting to increase the amount of the award.
4. Undergrad research is what brings a lot of students to colleges. Will it stay the same or increase?
  - a. It depends on the committee and looking at the same outlook from this year it would be difficult to increase it, unless some of the other groups go somewhere else for funding or decrease their requests.
5. Why are we requesting more positions if the reserve will be depleted?
  - a. Any requests for positions we didn't grant them that.
  - b. When they made their requests we didn't know that this was going to happen at the time of their requests.

- c. In the letters we sent to all the groups we informed them of what was going to happen, but we didn't want to be the ones to cut positions.
    - 6. Thank you for all of the good work. Good luck.
  - d. Apportionment
    - i. Thanks to everyone who came every week. I will have an end of the year report to the administration.
  - e. JMAC
    - i. Created an equity scorecard.
  - f. Quorum #1
- X. New Business
  - a. Resolution for Advantage Wisconsin: Growing the Research Infrastructure (Library Component)
    - i. Motion to package items A and B
      - 1. Hammen/Fuhrmann
        - a. Rescinds his second
    - ii. Fuhrmann/Hammen
      - 1. They are asking for different things.
    - iii. This one is straight forward and we can agree that the library needs funding and that it should come from the state.
    - iv. Call to question
      - 1. objection
    - v. Call to question
    - vi. Unanimous consent (means acclimation, same thing)
    - vii. Resolution passes.
  - b. Resolution for UW-L Support of the Library Budget for Acquisitions and Access
    - i. Fuhrmann/Wallace
    - ii. Move to strike "differential tuition funding"
      - 1. Allen/Decker
        - a. I don't think that this early on that senate should be supporting differential tuition.
        - b. I concur with Allen and it seems to be redundant because GQA is already differential tuition funded.
    - iii. I agree but I also know that no money will come from GQA. We have already had to strike some stuff from GQA. There is no money that could be flexible. I think we need to have a broad conversation about this.
    - iv. The committee thinks that all three should be stricken and that senate needs to know what is going on and that we need to take action.
    - v. Amendment to the Amendment
      - 1. Wallace/Decker
      - 2. Motion to amend the amendment of the amendment to take out "the following among..." and then add "of funding" at the end.
        - a. Fuhrmann/Van Winkle

3. I feel like if we strike all of this aren't we making it worthless? We aren't providing any clarification.
4. If we are going to strike the first point we might as well strike them all.
5. I feel we are limiting the means of which to find the funding.
6. Call to question
  - a. Passes, one abstention.
- vi. I understand voicing concern about taking the teeth out of this resolution, what needs to happen is a university wide group needs to come together to see what to do. If anyone has any ideas that would be nice. We could direct this towards Joint Budget and Planning committee since they will be meeting over the summer.
- vii. Do you want to amend this to charge the committee?
  1. I don't think we can charge the committee, but we can forward it.
- viii. We can discuss sending it, but I feel that if we are going to pass it then we need to set something. If we want to make this document worth while.
- ix. Motion to amend it to add "therefore be it further resolved; charge the task of bringing this resolution and the issue of the library to the floor of the Joint Budget and Planning Committee to the students of the committee." And "therefore, be it finally resolved; that this resolution be forwarded on to Chancellor Gow, Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Council, and any other individuals deemed necessary".
  1. Cerwin/Schooley
    - a. I think this is what we were talking about.
    - b. I think it is necessary
  2. I think we should add "library funding crises" to it. Hopefully they can come up with a resolution for this. Call to question
    - a. Objection
  3. This might be included under those individuals: Bob Hetzel and the provost Cathleen Enz Ficken.
    - a. Is there any objection?
      - i. No
  4. I'd like the powers that be to rearrange the first sentence if they don't feel it is grammatically appropriate. Call to question.
    - a. Objection
    - b. We will fix grammatical things later.
    - c. Call to question
      - i. Amendment approved.
- x. Call to question on the document as a whole.
  1. Resolution passes.
- c. By-Laws of the UWLSA Board of Directors
  - i. Hammen/Wallace

- ii. Motion to amend Article 3 section 2 and add letter J, environmental sustainability director and also add under Article 4 section 1 sub clause F (sent the info the Bjorn earlier)
  - 1. Hammen/Ruplinger
    - a. Since we pulled out of UC we no longer have a presence at the capitol. We keep getting requests to have environmental sustainability members on committees; I think this would eliminate that. It is our responsibility to have this representative for the students.
  - 2. I think having the director position fits better than having a seat on senate. My only concern is that it may be a relevant area for the position to be on the student services and buildings committee.
    - a. We talk about building a lot, anything that happens to the buildings has to be approved. I think it is a very legit place to put that.
  - 3. I wish that these two wouldn't have been made at the same time because I am not in support of the possibility of the director being paid next semester. I am frustrated that this wasn't sent out to senators ahead of time because it is a substantial chunk; I hope that next semester something like this would be sent out next year.
  - 4. I agree that this position should be paid for.
  - 5. I wish this would have been sent out earlier, but I am in support of this position. I think this position is a good idea because it doesn't just stand for one org; it is for all of the students.
  - 6. I would embrace the position especially looking back at last year. The person would be very busy and if the discussion for compensation wouldn't be until the spring semester then I am in support of it.
  - 7. I see this as a trial period, we are just leaving the option open to plan for it, it doesn't mandate us to pay it.
    - a. I think it would be irresponsible of us not to leave it open to payment, it is allowing the opportunity for senate to take that up. We aren't in UC anymore, senate could look at re-appropriating the money for travel to that.
  - 8. Call to question
    - a. Objection
  - 9. This director would have to attend the student services and buildings committee, but in our bylaws it states it would have to be a person that was appointed from the org.
    - a. Your bylaws haven't been approved yet, senate could change it tonight.

10. Last GA, they passed a resolution to have the leg affairs staff member work on these issues, so since we dropped out we need to focus on them ourselves.
11. I brought this up with my constituents and they were against it because they don't see how it would be relevant to them. Call to question
  - a. Objection
12. I wanted to address what the previous senator said. Actually one of the reasons to have this position is for that person to work at the state level and take a look at reversing that and encouraging universities to develop this so that they can save money, so the position would be working to save the university money. Call to question...no objection...

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

Syafitri, Sonia	1		
Thiel, Chuck	1		
Thompson, Amanda			
Trimborn, Steven	1		
Vang, Nou			
Van Winkle, Joshua	1		
Vice, Katie	1		
Wallace, Karly	1		
Total	26	3	1

- a. Amendment passes 26:3:1
- iii. Do we need to add the environmental director as a voting member?  
And I don't think the get out the vote coordinator should be voting member since they are only there every other year.
- iv. Motion to strike Get Out the Vote Coordinator and add the Environmental Director.
  1. Schooley/Fuhrmann
  2. Are we also getting the get out the vote coordinator as a non voting member?
    - a. That is the intent.
  3. I don't like this because you are still involved as a coordinator.
  4. I understand that concern, since the get out the voting member only exists every other year, then they only get to vote every other year. Does the chair or the board in the proposed by laws?
    - a. The chair is already a board member. So they would have to give up their voting rights.
  5. I move to say the chair only votes in circumstances when there is a tie, and bring back the get out the vote coordinator as a voting member.
    - a. Fuhrmann/Hammen
      - i. That is parliamentary procedure.
    - b. If it is implied then we should not have to write it.
      - i. It does say in the bylaws that they follow Robert's Rules.
    - c. Call to question.
      - i. Passes 27:0:3
- v. Move to add to Article 2, Section 3, under eligibility, "unless the president and vice president deem a candidate from either the legislative or judicial branch more qualified than the other applicants"
  1. Wallace/McCaigue
    - a. I think we should trust the president and vice president.
    - b. I think they know what they are getting into.
  2. I understand the concept of being better qualified, but I don't think that is the issues. I think the issue should be if someone

- should have their hands in both. Keep separate duties separate and provide opportunities to other people.
3. if you are a senator and you want to be a director, then give up your senate seat. You don't need to be double dipping in both. We talked about how we pulled out of UC and directors will have to do extra work.
  4. I think we should give other people a chance. Let them have an opportunity, you would take away a position from someone else.
  5. You don't have to be a director to work on the issues, the board is working on the issues of the senate. There should be more collaboration. the purpose of the board is also for leadership development. Breaking the separation of powers is unnecessary.
  6. I agree with that.
  7. We have three branches for a reason. They are accountable to each other, and it looks bad if you are grabbing for power.
  8. With this clause it gives the potential for the entire board to be senators. The sentence before the proposed amendment came directly out of the current constitution. I have heard talks from the up and coming officers to take senators if they can't find anyone else. Then the power is all in spot.
  9. There are a lot more leaders on this campus than those of us sitting here sitting right now. There are more student leaders to reach out to; the responsibility should be on the pr to get that out there. Call to question.
    - a. Vice/Decker
      - i. Passes, one abstention
    - b. Voting on the amendment
      - i. Fails, 1:24:5
- vi. Move to amend under Section E under Compensation, "directors will be paid at the current minimum wage rate"
1. I think that it is implied.
  2. Is there any objection to changing it to federal minimum wage?
    - a. Objection
      - i. State minimum wage is higher
      - ii. There are different minimum wages in each state.
  3. Move to amend it to say "current Wisconsin minimum wage"
    - a. Decker/Kohl-Riggs
    - b. I don't think there was any ambiguity, I don't deem it necessary. Call to question
      - i. Division
        1. Hand vote
          - a. Passes, 19:4:7
- vii. Point of info

1. Is it possible that the county or the city would have a different minimum wage?
  - a. No.
- viii. Right now the CFO is already a voting member of the apportionment committee. If the CFO became the chair then they would be a non voting member unless there was a tie. I believe they should be the chair of the Apportionment Committee.
- ix. Move to add “if a member of the executive branch....”
  1. It is already there because that is what the amendment already means.
  2. Then how will that be enforced?
    - a. The leg affairs committee reviews what senate does, and the student court.
    - b. The senate has to approve the directors. It would be obvious if a senator was trying to be a director.
- x. Call to question...no objection...

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

Savaglio, Britta	1		
Schooley, Jillian	1		
Syafitri, Sonia	1		
Thiel, Chuck	1		
Thompson, Amanda			
Trimborn, Steven	1		
Vang, Nou			
Van Winkle, Joshua	1		
Vice, Katie	1		
Wallace, Karly			1
Total	28	0	2

1. Passes, 28:0:2

- d. Resolution Appointing UW-L Environmental Council Members to the New Academic Building Steering Committee
  - i. Hammen/Syafitri
    - 1. When this committee was established the chancellor wanted one student on the committee and one alternate. The chancellor gave senate the job of appointing the members on the committee. The resolution passed that the two members should be from environmental council. Every time these people get approved they have to come to senate.
    - ii. Now with this environmental sustainability director, we have the communication, I don't think there should be any concern.
    - iii. Both of the people appointed will be on senate.
    - iv. For the student services and buildings committee, can it be the same thing were senate just appoints people?
      - 1. The process is different.
    - v. Call to question.
      - 1. Passes, 3 abstentions
- e. Resolution Supporting Repayment of the Funds Reallocated for Phase I of the Stadium Complex Project
  - i. Hammen/Ruplinger
  - ii. There were people that thought this resolution states we wanted all of the money paid back, it states we only want the \$750,000 back, not all of the funds from phase one. This has nothing to do with the foundation itself. In appealing to a certain segment of the fan base, and loose the strength center, then I would be offended by that.
  - iii. I see this as counterproductive to the resolution we already made with the Foundation. There is no guarantee that they will get all the money, but they will do the best that they can. I don't think it achieves any goal that we want. I think it is extremely counterproductive.
  - iv. This money that was allocated was going to go to phase two either way, they will not come back and ask us for any more money. They clearly stated that. I don't think they would do anything with any other intention than to help the university.

- v. With a new academic building in the plans then this resolution would limit any future actions.
- vi. If they were to come back and ask for money because of the academic building, and if it came down to us losing a 44 million dollar because we were too high strung then that would be very detrimental to the university.
- vii. I think we have made clear our stance.
- viii. The REC earmarked to send to phase 2, so I am confused to what he said.
  - 1. I was told that the money was redirected had been intended to improve the REC itself.
- ix. That money is there to make improvements to the REC; it didn't really have an intention.
- x. Call to question
  - 1. Fails
- f. Resolution Supporting the Creation of the Joint Committee on Environmental Sustainability
  - i. Klotz/Moua
  - ii. Call to question
    - 1. objection
  - iii. Could you clarify what this is doing?
    - 1. Two weeks ago Gow asked for senates ok to create this committee so I wrote this resolution to offer a formal ok.
  - iv. What is the charge of this committee?
    - 1. That is something the chancellor will develop.
  - v. Call to question
    - 1. Unanimous consent
      - a. Objection
    - 2. Passes
- g. Resolution Establishing Rules for Campaigning on Election Day for Student Association Elections
  - i. Allen/Hammen
  - ii. Call to question
    - 1. Objection.
  - iii. I think they should all be done at once.
  - iv. I second that. I know there is a lot of concerns and this should be voted down and dealt with next semester.
  - v. Call to question
    - 1. Fails, 4 abstentions
      - a. Division
        - i. Fails, 6:19:5
- h. Resolution Amending Section 4.543 of Student Association Election By-Laws
  - i. Decker/Wallace
  - ii. Call to question
    - 1. Objection.

- iii. I understand wanting to look at these all in one chunk next semester. If you disagree with it then vote no, but if you want to just vote on it next semester then vote for it and we can reevaluate this next year.
- iv. Call to question
  - 1. Passes, 2 abstentions.
- i. Student Services and Buildings Committee By-Laws
  - i. Ruplinger/Trimborn
  - ii. On number 8, the director has to serve on the committee. In the bylaws it just has one member appointed by the directors. Now we have to change this. I understand that we are paying the director, but now they are serving on 3 committees so far, I wonder if we are stretching them too far. The director needs to be added in there, we could add them as a voting member or as a non voting member.
  - iii. Point of info
    - 1. In the bylaws it says attend, does this automatically mean they are a member?
  - iv. There are so many different things we can do
    - 1. we can move the environmental spot to non voting
    - 2. we make it a director
    - 3. We leave it and move the director and make it non-voting.
  - v. I view the environmental council spot as not so much needed, if we could move that to non-voting. Strike the member and add the director as needed or as called upon, because they would not have to attend every single meeting. Amend this to strike the one member of the environmental council as well as the non voting members and add the director as needed by the committee.
    - 1. Trimborn/Klotz
    - 2. I think we might be making it a bigger deal than it needs to be. If they need to be referenced the committee can ask them because it is an open meeting. I don't see us needing to do this.
    - 3. since it says it in the bylaws I think it is important since a lot of this stuff would come through. I do think we need to make up for that other position.
    - 4. I am in opposition to this because I view the director and their role as more as a consultant rather than a member.
    - 5. I think it is a great idea; the director would be really busy. I would make it an FYI that one of those 5 should be at large.
    - 6. I understand that but 2 members of staff serve as consultants already.
    - 7. When we make the director as a non-voting member, doesn't that make them have to attend that meeting?
      - a. As needed by the chair.
    - 8. Do we want to put it in writing or do we not want to put it in writing. It helps mesh the new bylaws if we say how they attend the meetings. We could just vote on that right now. Call to question.

- a. Passes, 2 abstentions.
  - vi. It is not necessary REC sports, so I think it supposed to be the staff. I think we should push for at least one more at large member. Move to move to add one at large member.
    - 1. Fuhrmann/Cerwin
      - a. We can debate whether it should be one or two, but it is important to keep the membership the same or more as before.
    - 2. Call to question
      - a. Objection.
    - 3. I like the idea, but one of the problems is we meet a lot. There were several times we were nervous about meeting quorum.
    - 4. The environmental seat would just be an additional student seat? Were there 5 or 6 students this past year?
      - a. 5
    - 5. So by putting this in you are adding a spot?
      - a. Yes.
    - 6. You are throwing more students into a committee and it would be more difficult. Throwing another member would cause problems in the future.
    - 7. The more people you add the more people can miss and still meet quorum. It would be beneficial to have more as large as well. I just think it would be good for relieving pressure.
    - 8. Call to question.
      - a. Passes, 1 abstention.
  - vii. Call to question
    - 1. Passes, 30:0:0
- j. Student Technology Fee Committee By-Laws
  - i. Hammen/Sackman
    - 1. This is our last line item.
  - ii. We don't deal with environmental council so we don't need them. The main changes: we changed the amount of colleges that are represented. All of our bylaw changes will be sent to Leg Affairs.
  - iii. Call to question.
    - 1. Objection.
  - iv. This means that the CFO could be a member of this committee, and the chair of the Apportionment committee, I want people to be aware of that. Why are we making the dean of students select the members?
    - 1. We didn't mess with that one. Before there were issues with meeting quorum and the dean was there to help appoint qualified people.
    - 2. We didn't want it to be a wasted committee. Our dean was very helpful with that this year.
  - v. Paper was a hot topic this year.
  - vi. Call to question.
    - 1. Passes, 30:0:0

## XI. Announcements

- a. Kyle: I want to thank Fred and Bjorn for your service to the university, I would like to present plaques to you both.
- b. Larry & Lauren: one of the things we did at the beginning of the year is we talked about what we expected from senate, so I would like to go around and say what we learned this year.
- c. Fred & Bjorn: wanted to thank our advisors, at every single point when we had a question they were always there. We got them some gift certificates, Larry gets \$50 to the food co-op. we got Lauren a \$50 gift certificate to TJ Max.
- d. Bjorn: We have a few more announcements. It has been the tradition to give the new president and vice president gifts. I don't want Kyle to drive his car from Coate Hall to Cartwright so I will fix your bike so that you won't have to drive your car anymore. And a binder full of everything we did this year.
- e. Fred: I wished I had a blanket all year long for my naps on the couch, so I got you a UWL blanket.
- f. Kyle: I felt like giving Bjorn something and I saw a cloth bag at Walmart. And a bunch of conservative memorabilia.
- g. Derek: I will be treating Fred with a good grill out.
- h. Don't forget to take your name plates out, you can keep the name part, leave the metal thing.
- i. I want to thank the board of directors this year. The bylaws tonight are what we started last summer.

## XII. Adjournment

- a. Wallace/Allen
  - i. Meeting adjourned at 9:27pm.

