



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN – LA CROSSE
STUDENT ASSOCIATION

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

Student Senate Agenda

Date: April 8th, 2009

Time and Location: 6:00 PM; **Port O' Call; Cartwright Center**

- I. Call to Order
 - a. 6:01 pm
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll Call
- IV. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Ruplinger/Nguyen
 - i. Move to add resolution for CAB into new business
 1. Thiel/Nguyen
 - a. Agenda amended
 - ii. Agenda approved
- V. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Klotz/Schoonover
 - i. Minutes approved
- VI. Guest Speakers
 - a. Eric O'Neill; Michael's Engineering (LEED Certification)
 - i. Leadership and Energy and Environmental Design is becoming the national standard for green buildings. It has taken off. There are 5 factors to a sustainable building. 1) Identification of a sustainable site. 2) Water management, minimizing the usage of water. 3) Energy is the big one, that is where we specialize. This encompasses using renewable energy. 4) Material use is just reusing materials as much as we can, try to use local materials. 5) Indoor environmental quality focuses on making a healthy environment for the occupants. There are 4 levels of LEED certification. Gallop polls say about 83% of people say they are concerned about the environment, only 16% do anything. The big benefit is energy, natural gas and electricity. On this campus the big one is coal. The direct result of reducing building energy is less costly for coal. Indirect measures are productivity and health. If your people are more focused on what they are doing they will work better, you don't want people getting sick because of the work environment. Increased awareness goes along with productivity. Having a LEED certified building may be enough to help competitiveness. Right now private schools are really using that as a marketing tool to attract new students. LEED looks at the building in terms of its life cycle. The whole life span of the building. The cost of going green: when people think LEED, there is a fairly sizeable upfront cost to it. This is because

of good building costs. Commissioning is the process of ensuring that what was designed is built correctly so that you aren't using excessive energy. Modeling is a design tool that helps identify measures to weigh one option over the other. USGBC fees are less than \$5,000. Template uploading and facilitation are things that can be done by students as a learning opportunity. Generally LEED adds about half a percent to two percent of the construction. Usually pays for itself within 5 years because they do get you a better building that is more cost effective. People ask why they can't just be LEED compliant. The big one is legitimacy, did you actually do it? Having the LEED stamp adds a level of credibility that you otherwise would not get. It is giving the outside world some verification. If you are really going to do the work, from a business standpoint, why not get the certification? You would miss out on student learning if you don't go through the LEED process. These are real life experiences; people actually use this in the real world. It is a resume building opportunity. USGBC does not like the phrase "LEED compliant". They will actively go after people that have not gone through the process because that sort of thing is damaging to LEED, so you won't be able to market it that way. Imagine you have a job opening for a business that you own and you have two candidates. One is a UWL student, the other is an MIT OpenCourseWare. That is a free process of going through the course work online, but not having to go through professors or get work graded. So the person that says they have gone through an MIT course has not actually gotten a degree. You have to ask yourself who should get the interview? In the same way, going through the LEED process, it is a very rigorous process for everyone that is involved. They are held to pretty high standards. You are accountable for doing everything you say you are going to do.

ii. Questions

1. What is the popularity level of this?
 - a. I am only familiar with WTC and Gunderson Lutheran. They might be doing something on French Island. I am sure there are more.
2. Is the USGBC a private company?
 - a. Yes, that's the US Green Building Council. It is funded by all the projects and examinations for LEED accredited professionals. It is pretty well run. They run off of a pretty tight budget. They outsource all of their verification. That is what the majority of the fee is.
3. How long does it take for a university building to pay for itself?
 - a. Generally commissioning is the big money saver. Generally there would have been design and building errors that would cost you more money. They give you a theoretical cost for it. If there is a mistake in the

drawings the contractor can charge whatever they want to fix it. The commission costs do tend to pay for themselves fairly quickly. It is the same for the energy model. It depends on the building type and the dynamics of the interior. Energy modeling helps you not make costly designs that may end up hurting you. Those are hidden costs that can be avoided.

4. Would we be entitled to upgrades?
 - a. The architect is the one that makes design decisions, so generally no. you get what you pay for. There is no real recourse to get back that money, which is part of the reason why the energy model is good.
5. If our contractors build a building and it is not up to standards, would we have to pay extra for them to repair the problem?
 - a. If your commissioning agent has done their job well, they will put language into the documents themselves that say that if there are any errors then it is the contractor's responsibility to correct those errors. If you didn't have that and you closed the contract it isn't covered.
6. Do you believe that contractors do cut corners in building sustainable buildings?
 - a. Yes. People that are supposed to come out and do their jobs don't do it, and we don't know the difference. That sort of thing is not as common as negligence, or mistakes. There are a lot of things that people have to remember. They do a pretty good job of staying on top of these things, but it is very rare, a virtual impossibility, to have someone build it all correctly. A lot of the times what architects will do to save time is take info from a previous project and put it into a new project. If they aren't thorough in that endeavor then things will be overlooked.

b. Jeff Allen

- i. I served a full term as the president of United Council. I wanted to talk to you about your resolution. I love the organization, but I don't think it is the best option for UWL. The first issue that I had when I heard about this is that UC decided to come last week asking for a referendum in potentially one week to allow students to vote. There are a couple of problems with that. UC has built into their budget money for their staff members to go out and talk non-member campuses throughout the year, not just right before a referendum. staff members are asked to build that into their schedule. I didn't hear anyone from UC come in here throughout the semester. My other problem is the executive president's family lives in La Crosse. She is here frequently. Where were they the entire previous year? they should

have come and given us these facts throughout the year. They say they have a website that we can go onto. I have been trying to keep up with some of the campaigns that they have been working on, and I will tell you that if you go on their website there is very little information. If you try to research their past campaigns, there is nothing more than a title of their past campaigns. We are very strong university and that is something that UWL has always been proud of. By UWL being a member of UC, will that add to what we have done as an individual campus, or will it be about the same? Is it worth allocating \$40,000 of student money? There is instability in the organization. Before I was in office, there was 50% turn over rate. When I was in office there was 100% turn over rate. Right now four of the positions have been refilled again and there is one vacant position. Not a lot of the staff members make a whole lot of money. One of the things we always required of them was to make an outgoing staff binder for the next person. A lot of them were like empty closets. The organization spends a lot of time reeducating their staff and remaking their connections. Another issue I want to bring up is the idea of voice as far as the campus is concerned. The GA is essentially the voting power. Two year institutions have a 60 vote majority, four year institutions are outvoted by 10. 2 yr institutions might bring up issues that sometimes aren't an issue on our campuses. UC works best when all of its members come together and work on the same issue. Most of them are on completely opposite ends of the spectrum. The GA will be diminished in its power substantially in the restructuring. If you want to have a strong voice and presence is to be on the board of directors. The way to do that is to get elected. If we had a referendum we would have to find someone and get them voted in by June 30th. If you do this you would have a substantial inclusion in the org, but I find it impossible for someone from this campus to be voted on the board of directors. There are a lot of grudges and high school politics in that organization. The board of directors job is to represent the best interested of UC. Hopefully that fits in with all of the campuses. One of the instances where that didn't work was Growth Quality and Access. UC was fighting for no tuition increases other than inflationary. So it was very interesting and difficult for me to balance that. UC told me I had to go back to UWL and tell them that GWA had to go. On the other hand at UWL I knew it was essential for our students. It is very hard both for UC and UWL to lobby when you have an entire organization of UW schools against you. You have to make sure you are both on par with what you will be working on, if not is going to cause problems. The students in UC are very passionate. But what happens is they spread themselves very thin, they start to have rivalries and disagreements and it is very hard to get things done. If you endorse this resolution, you HAVE to agree with becoming a member of UC. If not it is completely counter intuitive. It is not enough time. We don't have time to educate the students on

what UC is. Do you really have time to go educate the students of this campus? The wording of the referendum is very confusing. Then you need to get into what the organization is all about. The reality of the situation is it is unrealistic to do that. I have been in your position; I know how hard it is. We have to look at how UC has changed since we pulled out. how have they changed, what have they worked on, what have been their victories? How can you measure the change? Ideologically there promises of change sound great. if we do become a member you have to make a commitment to attend all UC events. That is your job. The truth is we have very low turnout of the events. A lot of students go there and they think it is a party. You need ot make sure members of this organization have time to go and represent members of this campus. So I encourage you to think long and hard. It would be irresponsible for you think you can just hand this off to the students. I hope that this gives you some food for thought. I believe in what UC is trying to achieve and what it was founded upon, but I don't think the organization is doing that.

ii. Questions

1. how come the changes didn't happen before?
 - a. My entire purpose of going into that organization was for change. Everyone at the GA when I was elected loved it. but when I was in the office I w as fought all along the way. When you try to deplete the 2 year vote, they wont want to give it up. It is a loosing battle. Also some of the current staff members like to be puppets. They bring their personal agendas that they are passionate about instead of being good leaders.
2. so what, it is a democratic process. UC didn't bring the resolution here, a senator did. Why aren't you here with a resolution in front of us saying we want to vote no?
 - a. Because by voting this down you are making that statement.
3. So you don't think students should have a choice?
 - a. I do think students should have a choice, but I think they should be informed. Otherwise what is the point?
4. how do you believe in the organization?
 - a. I believe in student empowerment, but I believe we have to do in a way that is focused and organized. GA's are chaotic and students look at things as students from a particular institution and it is hard to come together on an issue. 2 year schools don't want to work on things that affect 4 year issues.
5. Can they make UWL stronger?
 - a. No. I think UWL is very strong and I know this because of talks with UWL administration. They value our opinion over UC's.

6. Do you think we should be helping reform UC?
 - a. I would say yes if UC wanted us for that reason. When we made the stance of pulling out, they took the stance of they didn't want to lose the \$40,000, not because they didn't want to lose UWL.
7. Do you believe the regents listen to UC?
 - a. When it is convenient.
8. How so?
 - a. When it is not a controversial issue. Although they listen to UC they want other sources of information because they see the instability in UC. The regents like to listen to UC when it looks good for them.
 - b. I don't think that if we went back in we would have the opportunity to make them stronger. The board of directors really make the crucial decisions.
9. Do you think we should ever rejoin?
 - a. It depends on the restructuring. We need to have time to see what the change will be before we decide if we should go back in.
 - b. You don't have to be a member of an organization to support what it does. We don't need to jump the gun. We can still help them out in their initiatives without paying the \$40,000.
10. What specifically would you like to see?
 - a. I would like to see staff members that stay with the organization longer than four or five months. I would like to see staff stability and staff that bring less personal agendas to the table and are more about helping to guide students.
11. how familiar are you with the restructuring?
 - a. I have been involved with it a little bit. It is something that UC hasn't really posted so it is not info available to the general population.
12. do you feel that if all UW schools were members then the regents would take them more seriously?
 - a. I would say yes in general. If we could all unite and have this front then we would be a power to be reckoned with. I hope that can happen under the restructuring. But there are campuses that have resisted for years.
13. if you don't jump in while they are restructuring then it will be hard to have a voice.
 - a. I think that in order for you to regain a position there has to be friendship between us. They are very bitter. I do not see that happening.

14. It is more beneficial for us to watch right now than to be actively involved?
 - a. Yes. I don't think there is anything you could do right now to change what is happening. It is already in place.

VII. Officer Reports

a. Derek

- i. UC restructuring meeting on April 17th. We have one vote. If there is interest we would support those students. is there interest? The GA is at Parkside.
 1. We have to attend a committee meeting in order for us to have a vote. The committee meetings are on a Friday night and the GA is on a Saturday.
 2. Blazek, Turtenwald, Wallace
- ii. Chancellor Round table on April 21st at 5:30pm.
- iii. Mission Statement Report and Straw Poll
 1. The five select missions were voted on. There were 351 students voting on this, the student top pick won almost 31% of the support.
 2. Discussion
 - a. I would question whether the "no opinion" increased because people got tired of reading them.
 - i. That is a good point because they were fairly lengthy.
 - b. There is a lot of faculty that have no opinion, which was ironic to me. Maybe we could do anything that broke the 50% margin, or do the top 2 or 3. We aren't limited, but we have to have some sort of consensus on what we feel the student opinion is.
 - c. The idea is that we can pass these forward to the provost and the chancellor and they can go through it with a finer tooth comb and make their selections.
 - d. Put all four forward except for number 3 based on the results?
 - e. Put forward only the top 3 vote getters.
 - f. Option 5 has more people with no opinion. But it is arbitrary. Lets pick a percentage of yes. I think the further they got into the less they cared or didn't understand the differences. I have a feeling that if we reversed the order of the questions, except for 3, it would have been exactly the same.
 - g. When we picked our top pick, version 5 picked version 4 substantially. I like the idea of keeping any that passed 50%.
 - h. Decided to pass on the top 4.
 3. My goal was to procure money for a scholarship to send two students to Germany. I am excited to say that with the support

of the Office of International Education we are able to send two students to compare their student government to our student government. With that the provost have agreed to having it be specific to having one of those seats be filled by someone on senate or who has been on senate. We have to have someone with senate experience to be on that research group. That would be next Jterm for 3 weeks. You can get credit in both German and political science. If you are interested in that please let me know.

4. Leg Con photos are on the computer by the door.
5. good luck to all of the candidates.

b. Kyle

- i. Reminder of the campaigning shirts they don't belong in here or in the office.
- ii. Every year the UW System does an event called posters in the rotunda, it is basically a lobby day. That will be presented at the meeting as well. They put up a bunch of posters in the rotunda on grad and undergrad research projects. All legislators go to these. Plus it is on a Wednesday. We would like to send a group to that. I highly recommend it. We get a lot of opportunities to meet with them but nothing like this. I put 10 spots but it is not limited. It is April 22nd. It is an all day thing. They are highlighting UWL, we are the focus school.

c. Others

- i. CFO
 1. John and I will start working on a final document for SUFAC restructuring.
- ii. City Affairs
 1. Congrats to Mr. Schmidt.
- iii. Environmental
 1. Meeting with Ron Kind on Monday
 2. I will be speaking at the rotunda event.
 3. Green Fund resolution is on the table.
- iv. Leg Issues
 1. The hearings are over. We were thinking about putting forth a resolution tonight, it didn't happen. Faculty senate is thinking about putting forward a resolution opposing the auxiliary sweeps, so I think we will take a step back because I don't want to pummel Jennifer Shilling.
 2. Veggies with the Leggies! Friday April 24th at 1pm.
- v. PR
 1. My project is going forward. I sent an email to all of the student orgs outlining it.
- vi. Shared Gov
 1. if there is anything you would like me to take to faculty senate let me know because I report to them every two weeks.

VIII. RHAC Report

- a. Holding a blood drive on April 28th to the 30th.

IX. Advisor Reports

- a. Paula Knudson
 - i. I would like to ask for your direction in how we inform students about that student tech fee.

X. Committee Reports

- a. Election Commission
 - i. The debate was fun. It has been going really well. I researched bylaws from other schools.
- b. Student Tech Fee
 - i. We passed the 6 cents per image print for the student tech fee. We were under the impression that it had to be done last week because the budget had to go through, so it has been sent to the chancellor. Do you think it would be beneficial to have an informational session still?
 1. I think something is needed. Whether it is an open forum or a list of pros and cons, or a Racquet article. Something is needed so that the broader student population is informed.
 - a. I believe that the Racquet would be a great way to involve students with this. Instead of all of us going out and paying for all of our own printers and paper, it is cheaper to pay per page. It also benefits the university. Basically there is not enough money. They are going to use the money that we would be spending on this and using it on other things.
 - b. The minimum wage was a big issue.
 2. Was that the only option that the administration presented to you?
 - a. If you cut things somewhere everything else has to be cut also. We had to add something in order to keep things running.
 3. if we use that argument that this is cheaper than using our own printers then we need to prove that. What are the benefits that we can say about this?
 - a. If we wouldn't have passed this then there would be no help staff in ITS and the computer centers.
 - b. There was another thing that came up that caused some questions and that related to the additional salary added to the situation. That is the individual hired to provide assistance to students. The question that was asked was do we have to absorb that position or can we have it up for discussion. We were told that it wasn't up for discussion but I am hearing a different story.
 4. Was raising the fee ever discussed?
 - a. This was guided by a regent decision passed in 95. it's supposed to be only 2% increase.

5. Is there any way to turn this around?
 - a. This is a recommendation that goes to the chancellor. So do we want to wait until the chancellor makes a decision or do you want to let the chancellor know your stance on this?
6. When does the chancellor approve this?
 - a. Very soon.
7. Would this fee apply to every printer?
 - a. It won't be in the dorms.
8. We could maybe do a pop up on the computers, or put it in WINGS with registration coming up a lot of people will be on there.
9. I think students have a right to know and not be surprised.
 - a. We can talk to classes; we can work with the Racquet. If we inform the students about being locked up and having to grow in other areas, we can show the data produced in other schools. Part of it is changing our culture and printing habits.
10. I am not comfortable with this whole thing. I am not comfortable about us not taking a stance on it and the committee members had to vote on it without our stance. I am concerned with the salary positions. The salaries are only supposed to be used for help in computer labs.
11. I don't see the point in double dipping.
12. I know we had some issues about maybe being charged for things you didn't print, or if there are mishaps?
 - a. The cost wouldn't be there to refund people for sheets that don't print out. That is why we will get 10 print outs per semester.
 - b. It wasn't like that, the number that you are seeing is just the number of people in the lab printing, not how much you are being charged.
13. Printing doesn't fall under what you can spend. Has there been an audit?
 - a. Not that I am aware of.
 - b. Typically in the past senate has endorsed the budget. I think with the position when we asked whether that should be in there we were told we shouldn't be asking that. I think you should set a time to talk to Dr. Hetzel and explore that. Whether you need to do something tonight on that I am not sure. But it does need to be raised in some way.
 - c. So I think there are two things that need to be done. One is to go out and talk to students, the other is to take these questions to Dr. Hetzel.

14. We are paying \$229,000 in student wages for students to sit in the lab? I have a problem with that. They are paid to work on their homework.
 - a. I think this is an important conversation to have later.
15. Is this going to be paid in tower tender, cash, on a student bill?
 - a. I think it will be charges added monthly to your student bill.
16. So will your financial aid cover that?
 - a. Financial aid is based off of what the cost of college is. So it won't be a specific amount on there. Printing is not really a required student fee.
17. Will it be itemized to show where you printed?
 - a. I don't know the answer to that. I think when they put it in the bill it will all be tied together. I think you could go in and ask them where you printed and they should be able to answer that.
18. I think we use the PR director that you hired since that is his job.
19. Did JP&B talk about this and approve it?
 - a. We were asked by administration what we should be taking to the chancellor if we aren't comfortable with it. I think there is still room for voice.
- c. Campus Community Enrichment Fund
 - i. Dan Sweetman came in and answered many questions. We are going to hold off and have another meeting next week and hopefully we will be able to bring something back next Wednesday.
- d. Name the Eagle Committee
 - i. We can't get the NRA to use Eddie. The students started rethinking this and then other alternatives started surfacing. Over the past few days a Facebook group has started with 600 members to name it Colbert.
 - ii. I don't understand why we are still not doing something.
 - iii. How long would it take if we were to reopen this?
 1. I don't know what the new guidelines would be.

XI. New Business

- a. Spring 2009 Green Fund Requests
 - i. Ruplinger/Turtenwald
 - ii. Discussion
 1. Move to amend the green fund to include the \$10,000 for car share.
 - a. Schoonover/Klotz
 - i. This is because the Pepsi Fund is being asked to fund the solar hot water heater. If we did fund that it is limiting the proposals. We wanted to put forward a recommendation for other things.

- b. Does this money have to go to that company or can it go to any?
 - i. The city is in charge of finding the right company. There is a gamut of possibilities that they haven't determined and how much the cost is going to be.
- c. If the city decides not to do this do we get the money back?
 - i. Nothing goes to the city until a contract is signed. This would sit in an account in UWL until it is needed.
- d. Are we just letting the city decide the company?
 - i. I think we are giving them the power to do that.
 - ii. Keep in mind we are a major investment in this so I don't think the city would do that.
- e. Does anyone have the original verbiage for the resolution?
 - i. One of the suggestions was electric cars.
 - ii. It says not limited to.
- f. Gow has been here and asked us to do something big. By splitting this up between two funds we wont be able to say look what we did with the Pepsi money. Another concern of Apportionment was that if we earmarked this money it might be lost. I do oppose pulling this from the Green Fund because of the argument that we are spending too much on sustainability issues in the Pepsi fund.
- g. I disagree with you. We are just saying that we recommend that it be used for these issues in the future. We want to make sure that that money is there in the future.
- h. I agree with not splitting this money up. I am not saying this is not a good thing, but I don't think we need to put money into it five years down the road. I will not be supporting this amendment.
- i. We already spent a substantial portion on sustainability, it would take us most of two years of that money to pay that \$10,000. I have gotten numerous emails that aren't happy about funding only sustainability. We could acknowledge that we value diversity and accessibility. If we allocate it now it is set and funded, as opposed to trying to find it from somewhere. We need to put the funding up if we want to make the commitment.
- j. There aren't other pots of money for accessibility.
- k. With these different pots of money we are trying to have all the requests go towards one committee. We

- l. Is there money in the Pepsi fund that is going towards this as well?
 - i. Yes \$ 50,000
 - m. If we go with the money we have been talking about then yes we would need to fork up another ten. However we may go with another company and not have to pay any money. Also, we are being punished right now for saving money. This money instead of being spent, would be sitting in a pot for four years. Speaking on behalf of the Apportionment committee about wanting to make this a one group thing, we understand that every year we will have the possibility of spending money in the green fund.
 - n. We already have over 80% of the proposed funding for that so I don't see why we need it.
 - o. Call to question
 - i. Fails 8:17:3
2. motion to amend the document to remove note #2
 - a. Ruplinger/Haase
 - i. The original intention of this was to put steam meters on all buildings on campus, including the res halls. Using the current model it is incredibly inefficient and we are probably being over charged. I think that is the best thing to do with this money. It will be saving student's money in the long term.
 - b. Apportionment decided that since green funds are something all students pay for, all we are saying is that for all students paying this fee we want them to go to student buildings. We feel we could justify it better by saying it will go on buildings that all students are using. We are still allocating the same amount. I feel like it is responsible for us to say it is going to buildings that all students use.
 - c. I am in favor of this because everyone at some point lives in the res halls. And right now it seems like students living in the halls are already going to be charged so much more. I feel we should spread that cost out.
 - d. With everything that has been going on the res halls seem to be getting hit the most. So if this another one of those burdens on res life we really don't need to do it.

- i. We have a commitment to get meters on all of the buildings.
 - e. It's just where we are putting it, it is not how much we are paying.
 - i. Where we put them affects how much people pay for it.
 - f. The idea of the greater good is the idea behind this. it was put that any PR building could be affected. The res halls are the places where they can make the most impact. So if we are going to take this line of thought then we need to realize it is excluding most of the population. Keep in mind the continuity of this.
 - g. If we are just striking this note then is the \$30,000 equally distributed?
 - i. It would be split up equally among all 12 buildings.
 - h. Call to question
 - i. Passes.
- 3. Do we know how much electricity is going to be saved on a monetary level?
 - a. I don't know the exact amount. You could generate enough power to do something useful with it. This is just preliminary. With enough people you could do something useful.
 - b. This isn't necessarily a cost saving idea. This is more of a model just to see where it goes. Cost savings is not where we are at and it would take a much more significant investment. Also it might be wise to strike note number one based on the rationale I have heard from this body.
- 4. Technically we are just shifting apportionment's decision, so are notes included in that?
 - a. As far as I am concerned we are assuming taking Apportionment's notes.
 - b. So we will just make that assumption.
- 5. Motion to strike note one
 - a. Wolf/Schmidt
 - i. Call to question
 - 1. Passes
- 6. Call to question
 - a. Passes 26:1:3
- b. Spring 2009 One-Shot Requests
 - i. Wolf/Schmidt
 - 1. We feel comfortable in the decisions we made as a committee. If you have any questions about these we can answer those questions. The total amount is about \$17,153, which is more

than what we average spending, but that is not to say that we don't think these are worthy of being spent on.

ii. Discussion

1. With the men's and women's volleyball, we have approved one shots for travel in the past. At some point we have to stop using their precedence against them. We can't keep saying you keep coming back and we keep turning you down so we keep turning you down.
2. Call to question
 - a. Objection
3. move to question
 - a. Herro/Turner
 - i. Fails 15:11:4
4. It would blow my mind if we had zero seconds of discussion. I would like to think people look at this critically and question the decision of the committee, like you are here to do.
5. This is the time to change anything we want to. Speak up about what you want to change.
6. We are spending \$20,000 so I hope that you understand this is not just something on paper, this is real money.
7. Why aren't we giving gymnastics and wrestling any money?
 - a. Gymnastics has a very strong program. We can't base any decisions off of success of the program or number of students. There success can't have any factor in this. What does have a factor is what do they need to operate. This was in a grey area.
 - b. The proposal was for a new floor mat for their practice room. The issue was that it doesn't have enough spring and need to use a spotter every time and the only time they don't is at meets. It is a safety issue. It was a very large proposal. We were told they could sell their current mat to a high school. Realistically they could make the purchase if they did that. We were trying to be responsible with the money. Although it is very worthy we didn't want to throw another \$5,000 at it.
8. So with all of the athletics you want them to divvy the money? If the mat isn't safe for us to use why would they sell it to the high school?
 - a. They don't do the same things the collegiate level does, so it is not unsafe for the high schools.
 - b. One shots are outside of the normal budgets.
 - c. SUFAC will allocate funds for specific items rather than allowing groups a portion of their request.
9. More trust was added to the subcommittee and apportionment took it a step further and altered the funding amount of some of the other areas.

10. Gymnastics could have also received funding from another source. There is also additional means that they can get their funds from. They wanted to keep some of these athletic teams seasons in mind. There are groups that will have another opportunity to request funds and have them in time for their season.
11. It appears that there is a lot of money going into Cultural Affairs.
 - a. The jazz ensemble is purchasing a new drum set and it hasn't been updated for 25 years.
 - b. Jazz Ensemble has requested a lot of funds last year. New life has been brought into the program by a series of new directors. A lot of funds have been thrown here and they were not going to come back because there were such great amounts awarded earlier but since there were additional funds and additional needs they made the request.
12. Is this number where you wanted to be for total spending?
 - a. At the beginning of the year we said we wanted 10 to 15 thousand in the fall and in the spring. We kept that number in mind and made some adjustments. We do have a pretty healthy reserve.
13. I feel for gymnastics since it is a safety issue and it has a direct impact on their performance. Just think about it.
14. What are we using the PC's for?
 - a. The computer in the president's office is very old and very slow. Actually the screen now will go black and then come back all of a sudden.
15. Are the TV's for the PR thing?
 - a. It is three TVs and a scantron converter.
16. With the gymnastics team I think it is a safety concern, we should go with that first. I would be for amending this but I don't know a good amount for them. I am all for restructuring and giving the subcommittees having more power and authority.
17. The gymnastics mat has lasted around 17 years, so it is an investment that will be around for a long time.
18. When is the gymnastics season?
 - a. In October through February.
 - b. So there is a chance for them to bring it up as a one shot in the fall?
 - i. Yes.
19. The thing with gymnastics is that they do have alternate sources of funding, they could sell the mat. I think they should do that first and then come ask for a one shot.
 - a. They do a ton of fundraising.

20. Move to put \$4,000 towards gymnastics.
 - a. Klotz/Thiel
 - b. How much money total do we have for one shots?
 - i. The reserve is around \$120,000.
 - c. I think \$4,000 is completely reasonable.
 - d. They did get a new mat recently
 - i. They got a new meet mat because the old one wasn't safe enough for meets anymore. The mats are stored in Mitchell and they are only used for meets, there is no way to transfer the meets back and forth and they practice in a different building.
 - e. Does gymnastics have a reserve?
 - i. The way it was presented to us was that if we gave them \$4,000 they would be able to purchase it. if they didn't get that amount they wouldn't be able to do it.
 - f. Where else do they get money from?
 - i. One possible other avenue is through the carryovers that athletics is guaranteed. That is one direction they could go, although that wouldn't be until next February. Otherwise I am not sure.
 - g. Do we know how the other mat was funded?
 - i. That was a really long time ago. It was similar to the way we are talking about this. it was used so we got it for a little cheaper, and I think they fundraised.
 - h. Can they use the \$4,000 for anything?
 - i. There needs to be specific words used here to the effect of this money may be used for up to \$4,000 in reimbursement of the specific mat.
 - i. We are out of whack with the funding with the male sports and female sports, and this would put us much closer to where we need to be in Title 9.
 - j. Do we need to add that on there now?
 - i. It to be added afterwards.
 - k. Call to question
 - i. Passes
- iii. Move to question
 1. Kahl/Thiel
 - a. Passes 26:0:4
- iv. Approving document as a whole
 1. Passes 24:1:5
- c. SA 0809-056: Resolution on Room Reservation
 - i. Thiel/Wallace

1. This is to allow organizations to reserve a room for the entire year if it is done on April 22nd. It is to streamline the scheduling so that they don't have to keep reserving it every year. The exemptions are CAB, SA, and the Racquet.
 2. Now they can say it is set in stone that it went through senate. The form is a standard form asking the organizations and room number.
- ii. Discussion
1. I do like this reservation, although I am upset to see RHAC is not on the list of exempted. We do have a substantial budget, programming has been increased, and we are a governing body on campus. I move to add RHAC to the exempted organizations.
 - a. Urbas/Wallace
 - i. Call to question
 1. objection
 - b. Doesn't RHAC have a lot of dedicated space for meeting?
 - i. We meet once a week in this building, our size has increased. The rooms we had are not large enough. We have 40 or more people in the meeting
 - c. Call to question
 - i. Passes, one abstention
 2. call to question
 - a. objection
 3. Are there any other organizations that would fit into that?
 - a. The reason those three were listed on there is because of the nature of the organizations. They had already granted those groups exemptions and they already reserve groups prior to other groups.
 4. I think the reason those are on there is because they represent a substantial amount of students.
 5. You need to draw the line somewhere
 6. Are other organizations going to be kicked out?
 - a. This just means that these organizations can request before the others, they don't have the priority to kick other groups out.
 7. Call to question
 - a. Passes
- d. SA 0809-057: Resolution Adding Article VIII to the Student Senate By-laws
- i. Ruplinger/Schoonover
 1. we need to pass the bylaws first before the constitution
 - ii. Discussion
 1. The final words of the Pledge of Allegiance are liberty and justice for all, my constituents are concerned with the amount

of members of diversity org spots. The wording in this seems absolute. Move to amend it to say a minimum of eight.

- a. Palmer/Jimenez
 - i. I think we saw this at an open forum. Are there seats being cut?
 1. There are no cuts.
- b. My only concern is that when we put a minimum we will be required to fill the seats every time.
- c. This concerns me on a broader level. This process has not sat well with me at all. This doesn't address adding more seats to anything. There is only concern about that group, not the whole body. I don't think it means that there has to be a minimum to start the meeting. If we want to say there has to be a minimum that is something that needs to be put into the constitution. Even if this is something we want to do I think this is something that goes into the constitution.
- d. I am not in favor of adding a minimum of, but if we do then we need to do it in front of each spot.
- e. I think it is important that they atleast have their 8. we don't necessarily need to say which ones get it.
- f. I feel this is really open ended and there should be a cap somewhere.
- g. I am in agreement with the idea behind the amendment, however I am not in favor of it because this document is flexible and can be changed. If the circumstances arise that we need to change the number of diversity seats we can.
- h. Call to question
 - i. Objection
- i. I am glad that we had this conversation. I think if you can understand where we are coming from I hope you help in changing this. This is something that should be discussed a little more in here.
- j. I am not advocating for more seats, I just don't want there to be a cap. We are about to dissolve the constitution, I think my constituents don't want there to be a cap. I think if there were only 4 of you in here to represent you I think you would be upset about that too. I just wanted to get it out there. I took this to my constituents last night and they argued they didn't want the restraint of the seats on there. I am not saying we want more, I just want there to be an opportunity for other organizations to get the seats. I think the language is more absolute than it needs to be, it can be open ended.

- k. I want to clarify that the reason that this the bylaws are here is to clarify for the constitutions sake. I think the constitution will clarify it.
 - l. When you say a minimum of eight makes it open ended and doesn't allow us to cap it. it makes it no easier or more difficult to add or subtract diversity seats in any way. I think this makes the document weaker.
 - m. Call to question
 - i. Objection
 - n. Would this go against the constitution?
 - i. Yes, we would have to amend it also
 - o. Call to question
 - i. Fails
2. There has been a group of students working on the diversity seats. Because the document allows room for change, I am hesitant to let this pass with the 8 diversity seats listed on here. We are trying to develop a system where if the 8 seats are not filled it creates a process to fill them.
 3. I want to stress again is the reason this is like this is so that we don't contradict the constitution. That is the reason it is a brief as it is.
 4. move to amend this to add human in front of diversity and I want to strike all of the listed diversity organizations and I want it to say one senator selected from within the current list of recognized Human Diversity Organizations
 - a. Wolf/Hougen
 - i. I wanted to address the concerns that came up.
 - ii. It seems more open ended
 - b. I appreciate your concern, that is not what we were trying to say. By saying there is a minimum of eight you could turn to the other groups to fill it. this is saying that 8 out of those 12 can be chosen. We don't want to leave anyone out. we want it so that if anyone out of the 12 then they can be. you'd be leaving people out depending who applied and who got accepted. It doesn't really help. I would rather leave it the way it was.
 - c. To say to have 12 to represent the 8 is not fair. There is no process for these 12 organizations to elect 8 seats. I wish different individuals were in the conversations before making these rationales.
 - d. I think before we take action on this we have to have a process for it.
 - e. People have been looking for how to amend this for a long time. We need to have this to match the constitution. I think this is a wasted effort because we

will be hearing the other group with more concrete and thought out suggestions.

- f. I don't think we need to have a process at the moment. Why should we as a senate come out and say these are the organizations, we can't name these organizations while the others are not named. I don't think there is anything wrong with this.
 - g. I don't think we as a body should decide it, but I think there should be a process.
 - h. Putting something like this that is open ended helps fix the problem. I say this knowing there are people working on this so there is a solution coming.
 - i. As this stands now, who selects them then? Who says BSU or anyone gets a seat?
 - j. Move to split the question
 - i. Herro/Wallace
 - 1. passes
 - ii. Discussion of the first question
 - 1. Call to question
 - a. Objection
 - 2. Why does human have to be put in front of diversity?
 - a. In the proposal that is being put forward it includes human.
 - 3. call to question
 - a. Passes
 - iii. Discussion on the second question
 - 1. This is kind of pointless because we have a solution coming forward. They are pretty clear and they have a wonderful document they are working on and it is coming up right quick. Lets not waste anymore time, lets let this sit for another week.
 - 2. Call to question
 - a. Fails
- 5. Call to question
 - a. Objection
 - 6. move to question
 - a. Herro/Wolf
 - i. Passes
 - b. Move into a vote on the document as a whole
 - i. Passes 19:1:5
- e. SA 0809-058: Resolution on Holding a Special Referendum to Approve the Student Association Constitution
 - i. Wallace/Lauderdale

ii. Discussion

1. I don't disagree with any of it, I like the way it is written.
2. The idea of this is against procedure. To dissolve it is against procedure. It is a sticky situation.
 - a. The voter knows that immediately upon dissolving it there is another one enacted.
3. We can't do this during general elections because it is too late. If we didn't do two separate
4. Robert's Rules was something meant to help you do your business. The only time we need to use it is to help us do our business. It is a completely useless idea if it prohibits us. We don't have to bring it in, we don't even have to talk about it.
5. We have hindered ourselves from doing work in the past by sticking to rules we don't need to stick to. For two years this has kept us from doing real work on the constitution.
6. If we dissolve our current constitution then we would have no rules prohibiting us from restructuring it. I see no problem with this.
7. Why are we diving so deep into this? it is blowing my mind.
8. This is a mute point. There are really larger issues and I think we should be focusing on that.
9. Do we feel prepared right now to talk about the entire constitution as a whole?
10. In the executive board article 4 it mentions that the exec board is different than the board of directors?
 - a. The executive board is the governing body when senate is not in session, not the board of directors.
 - b. Overall approval needs to come at the first session of senate. The reason of this is because of summer. They are not formal decisions until they come to senate. The exec board is there because we simply cant convene in the summer.
 - c. I think we talked about even having it consist of CFO, shared gov, president and vice president, and two senate members. I don't want people voting on something that they are not comfortable with yet.
11. Can we say that the membership of the exec board is as stated in our bylaws?
 - a. Yes.
12. How can we add more flexibility in the exec board and board of directors and pass it on to the bylaws?
 - a. The bylaws can only govern senate. So the bylaws cant say what directors need to be in the meetings.
 - i. Could we put it in the board of director's bylaws?
 1. Yes.

13. What do you suggest given the concerns we have raised?
 - a. I suggest not voting on it this week.
14. Move to amend article 3, 4, and 5, all of section in 3 in each of those articles, I want it to say that members have to maintain a cumulative GPA of 2.0. Good academic standing is not clear because the university can see you as not in good academic standing because of something that happened last semester. I don't think you should be penalized for a bad semester.
 - a. Thiel/Schmidt
 - b. What about freshman?
 - i. I think you should have that solid GPA before you start to get involved.
 - c. In the catalog it says freshmen are technically in good academic standing with a 1.8.
 - d. When you apply to be on senate isn't the minimum a 2.5?
 - i. I think you just need to be academically eligible. It varies depending on what year you are in school. First semester it is 1.6, second semester it is 1.8, after that it is 2.0.
 - e. I don't agree with this, it limits freshmen.
 - f. First semester freshmen have a zero GPA.
 - i. I don't think you are given a GPA, you are in good standing instantly when you arrive.
 - ii. It is an arbitrary number, especially when the university has a scale for this. I won't vote in favor of this amendment.
 - g. I think the university set it, some people have a hard time adjusting the first year. I think we should leave it the way it is already defined. I think this would restrict first generation college students who have a harder time. And I think when you are involved in school things it gets you more involved in your school work.
 - h. I researched a lot of other universities that have this minimum cumulative GPA.
 - i. It is not an arbitrary number because that is the number that the university uses.
 - j. Call to question
 - i. Division
 1. Amendment passes 16:8:1
15. I think there is a lot that we need to talk about and at the hour we are at I don't think we can make a decision on this right now, I want to move to table it.
 - a. Wolf/Herro
 - i. Fails 10:12:3

16. Move to amend article 7 subsection 1D, I want to change it to a legislative position

- a. Thiel/Wallace
 - i. It makes it more specific
- b. Discussion
 - i. Move to amend the amendment to say legislative branch position
 - 1. Urbas/Ruplinger
 - a. Why are we only singling out the legislative branch? The election commission could be swayed
 - b. Call to question
 - i. Acclimation
 - ii. Passed
 - ii. Move to amend the amendment to add the legislative, executive, or judicial branch
 - 1. Point of order that is going against my motion.
 - a. I rescind my motion.
 - iii. Call to question
 - 1. Object
 - iv. The reason I am doing legislative branch is because that is the only area the election commission oversees. There is no point. It is limiting student's opportunities to say that they can't serve in the other areas.
 - v. I disagree, a candidate could be friends with the election commissioner and the election commissioner could be appointed to their cabinet.
 - vi. The election commission doesn't govern the branch, but this does. So if we want specifics in there, we can do it. We can outline it in this constitution.
 - vii. Call to question
 - 1. acclimation
 - a. Amendment passes

17. move to table this until 6:10pm on April 15th

- a. Schoonover/Turner
 - i. Passes, two abstentions
- f. SA 0809-059: Resolution Calling for a United Council Referendum
 - i. Ruplinger/Kahl
 - 1. We sat down last weekend and decided it was a good idea to bring this into discussion. Andi thought it was a good idea to bring this to the floor.

2. The main reason I seconded it was because Jeff is here so if we have questions we can ask.
- ii. Technically they haven't made any changes yet, so I don't agree with getting back in. I think we are strong enough just as UWL. I think that paying into an organization that hasn't supported us then I don't agree with it.
- iii. We are here to be representatives of students vote, not as trustees of their behalf. It is underhanded of us to undermine the student's vote that they decided just last year. They point that was made that if we join now then we have a chance to be in the decision making is void; we would be part of it whenever we join. I am confused why we are acting so quickly on this when the clear need hasn't been brought to us by the students. I don't think that it is right of us to try to overturn a student decision that was made so short ago. There was a point made that regents some times think students are unsure and easily swayed. We are thought to be easily manipulated, and I think that is the message we would send. I welcome anyone with descending opinions to speak their minds.
- iv. What attempt has UC made this year with communication?
 1. I have a weird connection having some vested interest in the restructuring process. Outside of that realm I have not been contacted. I have been contacted more by regent Thomas regarding this issue. Omer has made very good strides to contact me since he has been president.
 2. Nicole called me the day before she wanted to come and never called again. I have seen Omer and different events and it is something that we always talk about.
- v. Before tonight I was in favor of joining UC, but Jeff took me down memory lane. I do value the student voice and I know there is great potential. In June and the GA I made the suggestion to keep nonmember campuses involved in the restructuring process, but it doesn't seem like they have really done this. I wonder if they have a lack of communication there, how do we know they are communicating the facts now. I think it is best to stay a nonmember until the restructuring is done.
- vi. I don't think UC lobbying efforts will benefit us as much as our own student leaders lobbying for us. I would hate to see our lobbying efforts watered down or mixed up in the craziness of UC. Who better to lobby for us than ourselves? in the year that we have been out of UC we have seen them talk the talk but have we seen them walk the walk? Keep our reputation in mind when you vote.
- vii. UC is a really good organization and one we should be a part of, but I think it is best that we wait. There is no limit to when we can join.
- viii. If we were to have this referendum go through, I think it is important that they are informed voters and I don't think we have time to inform them.

- ix. I feel pretty passionately about this. There was a push for us to get out of it. What we say does go, we have to make a stand here. I can't see how we are putting so much negativity in UC. I think we are taking a lot of this stuff out of proportion.
- x. Speaking strictly on a budgetary issue... when I did the budget I kept the money that would have gone to UC and put it towards our own lobbying efforts. If we join UC it will slow down the amount of traveling we can do outside of UC.
- xi. I am interested to hear more about Kyle's thoughts on this.
 - 1. I think I have intentionally not informed you as much because I don't want to influence you. Just because I am on the committee doesn't mean they don't need to come up here and tell us why we should join. I can tell you we worked a lot. Regent Thomas has been a tremendous driving force behind this. Her purpose is for a unified student voice, and I do think that is important.
- xii. I am happy Jeff came in. I am concerned with the timing. When we are in UC we do a referendum every two years to stay in UC. I feel like that two year process is a valid point. I hope UC is going to be awesome; we can be a part of that next year.
- xiii. Call to question
 - 1. Fails 0:24:1
- g. SA 0809-025:
 - i. Motion to table until next meeting
 - 1. Thiel/Herro
 - a. This is going to take a long time
 - b. It is very important that we table it
 - 2. call to question
 - a. acclimation
 - i. moved into next weeks meeting

XII. Discussion

XIII. Announcements

- a. We talked about the USA Today Collegiate Leadership thing; we decided to send it to senate. Should we bring it to you, should we look at New York Times? We would have to approve something before we have to submit the budget to system.
- b. The building is locked so make sure when you leave the doors are locked
- c. Please look over the constitution if you have any questions contact me.
- d. Can people get together at 5pm?

XIV. Adjournment

- a. Wallace/Herro
 - i. Meeting adjourned at 12:16am



UW-La Crosse Student Association 2008-2009

SENATORS	ROLE CALL	ROLE CALL 2	ROLE CALL 3	ROLE CALL 4
Barquero				
Blazek	x	x	x	x
Brown	x	x	x	x
Decker				
DeVries	x	x		
Gietman	x	x	x	x
Haase	x	x	x	x
Hall	x	x	x	
Hastings	x	x	x	x
Hayes	x	x	x	x
Her				
Herro	x	x	x	x
Hougen	x	x	x	
Jimenez		x	x	x
Kahl	x	x	x	x
Klotz	x	x	x	x
Knutson		x	x	x
Lauderdale	x	x	x	x
LeFevre	x	x	x	x
Nguyen	x	x		
Palmer	x	x		
Ruplinger	x	x	x	x
Schmidt	x	x	x	x
Schoonover	x	x	x	x
Shervey	x	exused		
Sweeny				
Syafitri	x	x	excused	
Taylor	x	x	x	x
Thiel	x	x	x	x
Turner	x	x	x	x
Turtenwald	x	x		
Urbas	x	x	x	x
Vang	x			
VanWyk	x	x	x	x
Wallace	x	x	x	x
Wolf	x	x	x	x

Present	30	30	25	23
Total	37	37	37	37
Percent Present	81%	81%	68%	62%

Senate 2008-2009