



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – LA CROSSE
STUDENT ASSOCIATION

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

Student Senate Minutes

Date: December 5th, 2007

Time and Location: 6pm in Cartwright 339

- I. Call to Order
 - a. 6pm

II. Role Call

Name	Role Call	Quorum 1
Allen, Jeffery	x	x
Armstrong, Vanessa	x	x
Baalbaki, Ibrahim		x
Bayer, Allison	x	x
Cerwin, Nicholas	x	x
Cooper, Mitchell	x	x
Csargo, Nicholas	x	x
DeShong, Robert	x	x
Frenner, Rachel	x	x
Fuhrmann, Eric	x	x
Groshek, Matthew	x	x
Hammen, Derek	x	x
Holzem, Natalie	x	x
Kahl, Erik	x	x
Klein, Ryan		
Klotz, Melissa	x	x
Kohl-Riggs, Arthur	x	x
Langhoff, Andrea	x	x
Liebzeit, Konrad	x	x
Lynch, Kathleen	x	x
McCaigue, Kelsey	x	x
McManus, Aron		
Moua, Keng	x	x
Navarre, Stephanie	x	x
Nell, Ryan		
Putnam, Sarah	x	x
Rome, Jacob	x	x
Ruplinger, Melissa	x	x

Sackmann, Valentine	x	x
Savaglio, Britta	x	x
Schooley, Jillian	x	x
Syafitri, Sonia	x	x
Trimborn, Steven	x	x
Vang, Alexandra	x	x
Van Winkle, Joshua		x
Wallace, Karly	x	x

III. Approval of Minutes

- a. 11/14/07 Meeting
 - i. Ruplinger/Fuhrmann
 - ii. Approved
- b. 11/28/07 Meeting
 - i. Ruplinger/Cerwin
 - ii. Approved

IV. Approval of Agenda

- a. Hammen/Kahl
- b. Approved

V. Guest Speakers

- a. None

VI. Officer Reports

- a. Fred
 - i. Any senator that will not be able to serve next semester please let us know.
 - ii. Leaving for board of regents meeting tonight. Present growth quality and access agenda.
- b. Bjorn
 - i. Chartwells using many more Styrofoam plates. The reason is people are stealing dishes and they had to resort to using Styrofoam. It's not just a student problem, its also a faculty problem. Please let your constituents know. If people don't stop stealing dishes, they will transition into Styrofoam because they cant be spending \$20,000 a year to replace them.
- c. Others
 - i. Chief of Staff
 - 1. will be talking about restructured position descriptions
 - ii. Social Justice
 - 1. Deadline for Awareness Through Performance is tonight. Will be on 27th and 28th of Jan. have to be here a wk before classes start.
 - 2. we had the first coffee day today, hope next time more of you show up.
 - iii. Shared Gov

1. 207 callers today. Last count we had over 50% of the calls.
 2. There was a letter sent out regarding the issue, neither of our two representatives signed it.
 3. Got a lot of stuff done at GA this weekend.
- iv. UC
 1. Call in, thank you to everyone who called.
 2. Compassionate care for rape victims call in coming up.
 - v. USSA
 1. Thanks to everyone who called in for Higher Education act, it passed.
 2. Soon be sending out Leg Con info.
 - vi. Grass Roots
 1. No report
- VII. RHAC Report
- a. Increased attendance at Winter Formal
 - b. Tomorrow night last meeting.
- VIII. Advisor Reports
- a. Spring team building, save weekend of Jan 26th and 27. Also need 5 people to be part of coordinating group.
- IX. Committee Reports
- a. CAPS meeting on Friday at 2:15 at 325 Graff.
 - b. Academic Initiatives
 - i. If applied for stipend for J-term should get email today.
 - c. Org.
 - i. Going through proposals
 - d. Apportionment
 - i. Looking at non-allocable seg fees.
 - ii. Second semester looking at budgets. Need subcommittee chairs. Budgets due to business office on the 12th.
- X. New Business
- a. Resolution Granting Organizational Status to Hillel
 - i. Cerwin/Fuhrmann
 - ii. Quorum called.
 - iii. Move into discussion
 1. If the resolution is approved it will be meeting the 13th in the basement of Cartwright.
 2. Call to question
 - a. Resolution passes.
 - b. Point of parliamentary procedure
 - i. When would be the right time to suspend the rules?
 1. Can do it at any time but best to do it when we get there.
- b. UW-L Student Association Resolution Declaring Partnership with Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt, Germany
 - i. VanWinkle/Hammen

- ii. Discussion
 - 1. Call to question
 - a. Objection
 - i. We can't pass a resolution that doesn't have complete sentences in it. We need to fix the first sentence.
 - 2. Get rid of first line. Could say we like the exchange of global ideas.
 - 3. Motion to delete first whereas
 - a. Wallace/Trimborn
 - i. Discussion
 - 1. I think there is merit in what that sentence is trying to say. I think we could put our heads together for a couple of minutes and come up with something.
 - 2. Move into vote
 - a. Motion fails
 - 4. Motion to amend to: In an era where borderlines are no longer barriers, it is time for a massive global exchange of ideas...
 - a. Klotz/Ruplinger
 - i. It's a complete sentence now.
 - ii. Move into vote
 - 1. Amendment passes
 - 5. Call to question.
 - a. Move into vote.
 - i. Passed.
- c. National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) request for use of the Recreational Eagle Center (REC)
 - i. Hammen/Syaftri
 - 1. Happening next year, basic facilities request. Request REC in its entirety, but now only approving basketball court. Once we get more info we can approve more.
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. It's only the basketball courts for all day?
 - i. Yes all day. The tracks will be open at 5pm.
 - ii. That's pretty intense to shut off the basketball courts for the entire student body.
 - b. How many lectures?
 - i. Will be sessions going on from 10:30 until 1 or 2pm. But they don't want to take everything done at night.
 - c. Is there a way they can use only some of the basketball courts?
 - d. Like to say this is very important to have them on campus. If people are that into playing basketball everyday they can go to Mitchell.

- e. We made this commitment, it's a national research. Some thought that maybe classes will have to be canceled. Some students may go home. This is a very important research project. Expecting 3 to 4 speakers. May be difficult to keep courts in operation. This is important to the university and the students. Not too many institutions get to have this kind of event on campus. The speakers are pretty high profile speakers.
- f. It's at the end of April, lots of people outside. When we have high profile speakers, want to show off best part of campus.
- g. Asking for us to set up 1,200 people at least. Really huge undergrad research conference. Very good for the campus.
- h. Motion to close discussion
 - i. Hammen/Leibzeit
 - 1. Discussion closed
- d. Regional Basketball Tournament Facilities Request
 - i. Hammen/Schooley
 - 1. A basketball tournament that we hold at the REC every year. Utilizing all of the basketball courts.
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. What time would it be going on?
 - i. Friday evening until 1pm Sunday.
 - ii. Only need one court on Sunday.
 - b. Is the revenue going to back to REC?
 - i. Believe so.
 - c. Feel bad because students pay for the REC and wrong to kick them out for days at a time.
 - i. Conference free for all students.
 - d. Motion to close discussion
 - i. Hammen/Holzem
 - 1. Discussion closed.
- e. Amendment: AAU Basketball Tournament Facility Request
 - i. Fuhrmann/Cerwin
 - 1. this document already passed. Approved use of the REC from 25th to 27th April 2008. Now want to change the dates. Now what we have to do is change the dates that we approved the usage for. On plus side will be one day shorter. One court will still be open for student use.
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. Motion to close to discussion
 - i. Hammen/Leibziet
 - 1. Discussion closed.
- f. UW-L Student Association Resolution to Delay Action on the Proposed Segregated Fee Policy Review Committees Proposed Policy

- i. Motion to open discussion
 - 1. Leibziet/Cerwin
 - a. Regarding Seg Fee Policy, urging President Reilley to give us more time to look at it.
 - b. Motion to suspend the rules and move up to new business.
 - i. Wallace/Langhoff
 - 1. Discussion.
 - a. This is a very time sensitive issue, has to come up at regents meeting tomorrow.
 - b. Call to question.
 - i. Move into vote
 - ii. Passed.
 - iii. Document moved into new business.
 - ii. Motion to approve document.
 - 1. Hamenn/VanWinkle
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. As much as I hate suspending the rules, this is very important. Reilley has been shutting himself out lately, so anything we can send forth would be good.
 - b. Call to question.
 - i. Move into vote.
 - 1. Resolution approved.
- g. Board of Directors Restructuring (non-action)
 - i. Motion to open discussion
 - 1. Bayer/Hammen
 - 2. Point of info
 - a. Are the rules still suspended?
 - i. We just suspended one rule, so the rules are not suspended.
 - 3. We have introduced detailed and specific ideas for each position. We really want feedback and want to hear what you think. Want to know what you expect from us. If you have ideas that you don't see presented in here, please tell us. We felt there was a lot of inefficiency in the board so we wanted to do some restructuring and fix it. Feel free to interrupt at any point. Over J-term we will dig through these a little deeper.
- ii. Chair of the Board
 - 1. New position, take over position of Chief of Staff. Makes it hard to have something to do, we thought it would be good to have chair for board of directors meetings.
 - 2. Will get training guides going this year, then it will be chair of the board's responsibility, along with keeping by laws up to date.

3. Discussion
 - a. What if this chair of the board is also CFO? What if both become very demanding? Is the VP going to step in, advisors?
 - i. What we have set up is more like a team group atmosphere. We use each other as a crutch. The reason of having this go on to someone else's shoulders is because there is not enough for the Chief of Staff. Delegation will take place if duties become too much.
- iii. Chief Financial Officer
 1. Proposing CFO take on responsibility of Apportionment.
 2. Big thing is preparing the budget.
 3. Discussion
 - a. Don't know what the bylaws for apportionment say, but apportionment is a student committee. You would have to undo the bylaws of apportionment for this to happen. It should be whoever is best.
 - b. Uncomfortable with apportionment committee chair or vice chair. Feel conflict of interest. Important that they are a member of committee, but think it might give them too much power.
 - c. Have same concerns. Also seems like it is too much of a time commitment. Seems like trying to pile on all these professional job qualities, on top of our full time commitment as students.
 - d. What was rational behind this?
 - i. There was a lot of discussion and concern. Most likely, the person who is going to run for CFO is going to be a past apportionment member. We could also change to whoever gets elected for apportionment chair becomes CFO. In general they are not a voting member.
 1. Point of clarification
 - a. In case of a tie, chair is a voting member.
 - ii. Most of the time not a voting member.
 - iii. Talked to current chair of apportionment and did not think it was an issue.
 - iv. The way CFO is now, the bulk of their work is just preparing the budget. Beyond that there is really not much of a work load. And they are required to be a member of apportionment already, so they do vote. And if they were the chair, they would actually vote less. They are so interrelated; I don't see why they shouldn't be

one in the same. If they haven't been on apportionment before, they would be vice chair. Don't understand the biased thing, they actually vote less as chair.

- v. I think senate member should be chair because voted by students. CFO not voted in by students.
- vi. There are three at large members on apportionment as well. And they were not elected by students but can still be chair.
- vii. If there is no CFO in the fall, the vice chair is automatically voted in.
- viii. We have to remember that as student committees, not all committees have students as chairs. All committees I'm in, they all have faculty as chair.
- ix. Is this vote based? Would apportionment choose CFO or senate approve as CFO and as chair?
 - 1. Senate would be voting.
- x. A major issue is that the CFO has to be a member of apportionment. Only those individuals who have been on that committee could apply.
 - 1. Point of clarification
 - a. Not requirement that they be on apportionment.
- xi. Why limit or take away an opportunity for students to be active on campus?
- xii. If you trust them to be CFO, you should trust the same person to be apportionment chair. To me it seems there are 2 CFOs now. It doesn't make sense to me why we would have to have both. Maybe it should be through apportionment first, but either way the president or vp appoints people to be on those committees, will come through them and wouldn't appoint anyone who wouldn't do a good job at both.
- xiii. Don't see conflict of interest. Looking out for the benefit of students as a whole. The only thing is they need to be very responsible and have a good understanding.
- xiv. One thing I would say as far as conflict of interest, I was president of water ski team this year. Does that mean I was biased?
- xv. I don't feel like there is a lot else for CFO to be doing, this would be a good spot for them to be productive. Now that I hear people's thoughts,

we do need to figure out how they would be hired.

- iv. Public Relations
 - 1. Some of the wording had to be changed.
 - 2. Took out major requirement because will not have PR major anymore at UWL.
 - 3. Discussion
 - a. None.
- v. City Affairs.
 - 1. Working with alcohol task force is not part of duties.
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. None.
- vi. Environmental Sustainability Director.
 - 1. Gow is going to sign a sustainability declaration. This goes hand in hand with being more environmentally conscious in the future. Many schools already have this position.
 - 2. List is very long, but we just wanted to put on there everything this person could do in position.
 - 3. Will talk to RHAC and see if they want to have relationship with this person as well.
 - 4. Discussion.
 - a. Don't have a problem, but we have been doing environmental stuff all semester, but what about accessibility? How do you decide to create new positions?
 - i. We decided SAPA already has a senator position.
 - b. Meet with landscape and planner should be more defined than just once a semester. Also maybe have them relate to Pepsi contract committee. Duties need to be more defined.
 - c. There is a group of people who are interested in proposing a student referendum making student fees for environmental sustainability on campus. If we were to do that, there might be enough going on.
 - d. Another thing is "Recyclemania", I had to send it to environmental council because we don't have a person to deal with that.
 - e. How will this affect senate budget? Is it going to reduce other positions?
 - i. We are eliminating few positions.
 - ii. With restructuring there is a second step, which is the budget. We will propose increasing board of director salaries regardless.
 - f. I understand the importance, but to me it seems more like a world issue, not a student issue.

- g. We don't have a student senate committee on this. Now we are sitting here thinking about how we can outsource our responsibilities to board of directors.
- h. Don't we have an organization on campus that deals with this? I don't see why we should be paying a person to do this.
- i. Uncomfortable giving a salary to new a board of director without knowing what they would be working on.
- j. I don't agree with this position at all. We have an org that addresses this issue on campus.
- k. Can you not just add a seat in senate to inform us?
 - i. It would be a constitutional amendment.
- l. You said Stevens Point already has a position like this, why don't you talk to them?
 - i. Already have, they have signed declaration as well. Work actively to work on reducing green house emissions on campus. Constantly working on recycling, etc. I can talk to her again and her specific things.
- m. Why not just push this on environmental council?
 - Taking away from senators, slap in the face.
 - i. Council in favor of having it. Mostly because environmental change on campus has to do with student government. Don't have continued presence in senate.
 - 1. UW system making mandates to make changes on campus, UWL has no way to deal with those.
- n. Other director positions that overlap with organizations, not a big deal. Apparent that there is a lot of loose ends that we need to tie into senate. Maybe a senator position may be better.
- o. With student orgs, we don't have any control what they do or say. Don't think we should charge this to an org.
- p. Think it should be a senate position.
- q. With chancellor signing declaration, need someone held accountable. Can't ask that of a student org, but can in student government. Especially if we will have money coming through. Having someone who is elected by large student body, might not be able to choose an adequate person. With this you really need someone with knowledge and experience.
- r. You don't need a position to make sure someone is held accountable.

vii. Shared Governance Director

1. Discussion
 - a. What's the buddy regent?
 - i. Every campus has one.
- viii. Gender Issues
 1. Made it more gender neutral.
 2. Discussion
 - a. If we are shifting it to LGBT issues, we have a senator that does that. are we having 2 people do the same job?
 - b. How often has this position been filled?
 - i. In general filled as much as other positions.
- ix. Social Justice
 1. Discussion
 - a. Are we making sure that these are all committees and councils that we have authority to make sure people attend group meetings?
 - i. Have spoken to presidents. That is something that we will look into.
 - b. Can we make a requirement of attending at least two meetings? Would like some sort of follow up.
 - c. Is RHAC bi-weekly, where one week they introduce something and vote on it next week?
 - i. Can vote on it same week, sometimes postpone things.
- x. Get Out the Vote Coordinator.
 1. Like Grassroots position, only every other year in election years.
 2. Discussion
 - a. Would be it easier if it was a yearly position so that person could prepare? Would it be more effective to have this person work on campaigns?
 - i. Information would already be gathered.
 - b. Concerned about budget with every other year thing. Make sure other salaries aren't growing and shrinking every year.
 - c. Would be worried about individuals being biased. Don't see it as necessary as being every year.
- xi. Legislative Issues Director
 1. Combining United Council and USSA positions.
 2. Discussion
 - a. Wondering if this position has too much to do.
 - i. That is a concern, but I know it is feasible. The discussion was about the whole budgeting thing. Maybe compensation should be different because more responsibilities then wouldn't need outside job. There is enough overlap that is feasible.

1. No you have to take it here.
- vi. When you apply for grad school, they will recalculate your GPA. By not averaging the GPA, you hurt the student. This way students won't purposefully fail a course and have more seats.
- vii. Instead of averaging the grades, we could put a disclaimer on SNAP and let students know that grad schools will re-average GPA.
- viii. Shouldn't be averaged, if you know it's going to be recalculated, then the university doesn't need to do it for you.
- ix. Most people don't go to grad school, it is hurting them.
- x. Would like to limit retakes but against averaging. Students should be made aware of that.
- xi. Not everyone that graduates from here goes to grad school, and not every grad school re-averages. But maybe one retake may not be enough. Maybe two retakes would be better. Also it might say there is a problem with the class. If so many people have to retake a certain class, doesn't that say something about the class instead of the students?
- xii. If you average the grade for a gen ed requirement and get a D from the average, is that going to prevent you from going on?
 1. Will check on it.
- xiii. Agree with the cap, not with the averaging.
- xiv. Do grad schools only look at your major?
 1. Depends where you go, for med school it's strictly major.
- xv. Would it be possible to put the person who has taken the class several times, would it be possible to put them in the back of the line?
 1. Oshkosh used to do that.
- xvi. I spoke about this issue with DOC and OMSS and they are very opposed with putting a cap on how many times you can retake. Many people have issues with job, family, economic issues. You could talk to the dean, but it rests entirely upon the dean. Might discourage students from diverse backgrounds from coming here.
- xvii. A grade represents knowledge that a student has earned. We shouldn't be denying them and penalizing them for doing that. Not all grad schools average them. Also, if I get an F and the grades are averaged, the best I could ever get is a C. That may discourage many people.
- xviii. Shouldn't be how our university treats its students. Also advisors duties to let students know. Also if both grades are shown and not averaged, it leaves room for explanation at grad interview. It is the written proof that the student improved and did better.
- xix. Proactive approach with professors.
- xx. Maybe averaging it is too tough. But the fact that you did fail once should carry weight. And isn't the whole point of education is for students to try harder? I think by averaging them, people will start trying harder.
- xxi. Since 2005, there have 400 people who have retaken Chem 103.
- xxii. Motion to close discussion

1. Discussion closed.

XI. Announcements

- a. Motion to suspend the rules to add course retake policy into discussion.
 - i. Rome/VanWinkle
 - ii. Discussion
 1. It has to be done.
 - iii. Move into vote.
 1. Motion passed, rules suspended
- b. Thank you for feedback on restructuring. Please recognize what the board of directors have done this semester.
- c. Shoe drive at end of semester. Still taking donations. Going to distribute them to orphanage in Congo.
- d. Thanks for helping with call in day.
- e. Anyone who wants to go to board of regents meeting, meet after meeting.
- f. Expecting Carol has been postponed.
- g. Progressives is putting on an activism training this Friday, starts at 6 until 8:30 in basement of Cartwright.
- h. Need 5 people to help with team building.

XII. Adjournment

- a. Sackmann/Klien
- b. Meeting adjourned at 8:49pm

