



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 15th, 2009

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

- I. Call to Order
 - a. 6:00pm
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll Call
- IV. Approval of Agenda
 - a. Thiel/Turtenwald
 - i. Passed
- V. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Ruplinger/Schoonover
 - i. Passed, one abstention
- VI. Guest Speakers
 - a. Tyler Burkhart
 - i. Thank you for what you have done so far. Elections are over; I came because I wanted to make a public statement to congratulate Karly and Eric. I don't think over elections you form friendships with your opponents, but I did. Thank you for a great three weeks.
 1. I look forward to working with you. Thank you.
 - b. John Tillman, UWL-CIO
 - i. It has been a rough year for multiple reasons. The print cost recovery proposal is now one of them. I have been in favor of print cost recovery for 6 years. I think the student tech fee should be used for real technology, and for me printing is not real technology and doesn't put your money to good use. I think there are other things that could be funded and that money would help fund it. Each side of the page would be charged 6 cents. You would print something and you would be asked if you really want to print it, you say yes and it will send it to a print release station. After that it will ask again if you really want to print it. The charge would be administered to your account. Right now we are basically doing that, only right now we are just counting. As we discussed the print cost recovery with the committee, individuals were concerned that sometimes the printing just does not work, yet you get charged. In order to get around the problem of refunding, which would be a very labor intensive thing to do, we made the proposal that over a year's time we give 20 subsidized images. There is \$10,200 that would cover that cost. This would be in all the GCA labs, classrooms, the

Cartwright lab, Wing, Murphy Library. If this goes ahead Res Life said they would put some sort of print cost recovery in there as well.

ii. Questions

1. I used to work for the GCA labs, and there are times when the print count would be drastically wrong, so how are you going to regulate that?
 - a. I know we have a print counter, the people that run the lab tell me it is an accurate counter, so I don't know. That is something I will take back and ask the person that manages that. it is probably like any other software, things happen.
2. My question is there was some concern as to how this would be charged to student bills. Will it be added in batches, will it be one lump sum, or will it tell you when you printed each one?
 - a. It will be one lump sum. It will be added to monthly and each month we will transfer that monthly bill to financial services where they add it to your bill.
3. Is there going to be a way to appeal and look back in to the records?
 - a. The records will be there. That is something we could maintain.
4. Could you speak to where the money from the student tech fee is going?
 - a. Over the years we have gradually used student tech fee to fund things that benefit students directly, they are permanent things. a recent example is D2L. This is something that nearly every student uses. There is an administrative process that has to take place to make that work for the students. That sort of thing is what the tech fee. Over the years previous administration has said we don't have any money. The sad part of it is in order to provide these services we have to use the student tech fee. What we are really doing right now with the peoplesoft position, there is a position that does things directly for students. This person is the one that generates the sample for you when you do a student survey. So what we are really doing with those funds is providing the services that the students use directly. The person that works in the lab is not charged to student tech fee. But that is something that we could use it on. We also have a person that manages D2L; we have a person that backs up the health desk. We have a professional that works behind the help desk. They solve student related issues, but that person is not funded through the fee. Looking at those positions, we

decided to not divide up the money but to just fund one position.

5. How were students consulted?
 - a. Through the student tech fee committee, also through the joint planning and budget committee.
6. I am curious if we have a cost saving benefit, is there any real technology in this?
 - a. We are supporting the infrastructure that makes our system work. For example your email, security on the network that keeps the network functioning. In the past we have funded our IP provider. Hopefully this year we will be moving that out of there because costs keep going up.
7. What is going to be the incentive to print double sided now?
 - a. Our printers are set up to does it automatically, so you would have to choose not to. This saves paper.
8. Do you know if other schools in the UW system charge for printing?
 - a. Yes most other schools do. In Madison they have a print center. That is where the staff sends the documents. The other schools are Platteville, GB, Whitewater, Superior, Parkside. Some other schools are Marquette, Boston College, Burton College, UNC, Columbia, etc. it's not an uncommon phenomenon.
9. Is it typical for other schools to charge per side?
 - a. Yes. It is each side.
10. A lot of the print release stations have been down and it is going straight to printer. If they are down right now, how can we be assured that they are actually going to work?
 - a. We are going to have a lot more incentive to make sure they are working.
11. Is there anything being done to make sure the 6 cents doesn't go up any higher?
 - a. It is like your tuition. I would not raise that unless I was required. Most campuses that have gone to a print cost recovery have found a 50 to 60% reduction in printing. The median number of prints in 2008 was 190. in 2009 it was 266. That is a significant increase. That would have cost the student roughly \$16.
12. I am concerned about the campus wide implementation. Is it feasible to get more firm dates and implementation steps?
 - a. I think it would take us a full year to implement this. We would have to do a detailed investigation. We don't have good records of even the number of printers. We don't know how much is spent on ink jet cartridges. I would like to bring in large vendors to do a thorough

13. What steps are being implemented in regards to faculty and how much they require students to print off?
 - a. Right now, very little. But the provost has indicated that we would have to put together a very complete education process for the faculty. To a large extent some of them are just unaware.
14. We are still going to be paying the student tech fee, will that be used for technology such as D2L?
 - a. Yes. The pay per print will enhance that. Right now it costs us about \$70,000 per year to pay for printing. We would like to use that money to pay for other technology. We are going to do the same for faculty for accountability. It will be charged to the department.
15. A lot of the faculty that I have spoken to, their department is cutting down on printing and they pass it on to students. And as far as the lab staff, is it really necessary? There are two people in labs that just sit there and do their homework.
 - a. The reason it is increasing is because of the minimum wage increase. We are cutting down on positions. There is a big push to eliminate the labs. If down the road the labs start disappearing, we realize you will want the software, so there is going to be a shift in what you are paying for. The University of South Carolina has only one general access lab with about 100 computers. But they have a system set up to give students access to the technology that they need to get at.
16. If you have been trying to implement this program for 6 years, how come the faculty and staff weren't talked to?
 - a. That is a good question. One response is we have a very small staff and we have never really had support from the deans or the vice chancellor before for doing this. I think the deans are going to get a much clearer message that this has to be done. I haven't been able to get support.
17. So why is this time going to be any better?
 - a. As the student tech fee committee, which was a surprise to me. I told the provost that we needed to continue planning for this not to pass, and it did. Other CIOs that have accomplish this have said the first six months there is a lot of complaints, after that the students will start putting pressure on faculty. Right now they have no incentive.
18. Has installing the print release station lowered printing?

- a. I don't know. The numbers are going the wrong direction right now.
- 19. Were the students on the committee in support of this fee?
 - a. Yes.
- 20. A lot of students aren't too happy about this. What is the plan to get students on board?
 - a. This group right here. We are going to be doing marketing explaining what is going to happen. I don't know to what extent that is going to affect the way students think about this. I would hope that students wouldn't think that they will go out and buy their own printers. It would cost the median printer \$16 a year. Printing on your own is far more expensive.
- 21. You said you are looking at having a big vendor come in, do you think there is some sort of bias in that?
 - a. That is why big vendors will do this for nothing. Then they know what to bid.
- 22. But your RFP depends on their report.
 - a. We can do sampling and verify that, and we can use that information to generate requirements.
- 23. I would rather see it done internally.
 - a. I have outlined a way we can analyze it, but we don't have a print expert.
- 24. Is there a cost to Res Life?
 - a. They have a tool to keep track of the printing, so they have indicated they can put in a cost recovery plan. I suggested to them that they integrate that into what we are doing.

VII. Officer Reports

- a. Derek
 - i. Congrats to Kahl and Karly.
 - ii. Directors meeting tomorrow.
- b. Kyle
- c. Others
 - i. Legislative Issues
 - 1. People who signed up for posters in the rotunda next week, think about if you really want to go, I'll email you.
 - 2. Veggies with the Leggies next week.
 - ii. Environmental
 - 1. Next week is Earth Week.
 - 2. We went to visit Ron Kind last week. We shared student's views on the issues.
 - iii. Shared Gov
 - 1. My goal was to ensure that we had outsourced our email or figure out a different way to do it. It doesn't look like we are going to be able to do it. John Tillman did some research and

determined we should go from Outlook 2003 to Outlook 2007. We will still be one behind. I had advocated for something else completely. One of the issues is that we only have 40 megabytes of space. According to their statistics is that we weren't really using all of our space, but why would we use it when we only have 40 megabytes? We aren't going to get anything significantly different. That is frustrating.

2. With elections, for those that weren't successful in being elected, please don't take that as something that would deter you from being involved. Please stay involved, there are a ton of different ways to stay involved. We would all benefit from that.

iv. Social Justice

1. DOC is working on their constitution as well; I will try to be a part of that.
2. This past week I went to the White Privilege Conference, I will present that to this body next week.
3. I am interested in working on the Dream Act. This would allow undocumented students to pursue higher education. If you are interested please contact me or Turtenwald.

VIII. RHAC Report

IX. Advisor Reports

a. Jeremy

- i. Sign up for an office hour.
- ii. Matt Harter meet and greet on Saturday from 1 to 3pm. We need to let him know we are interested in working with him over the next four years. He is getting together a team of advisors; maybe we could weigh into that little group. It is at the public library.

X. Committee Reports

a. CCEF

- i. Made a decision coming to senate next week

b. Election commission

- i. Thanks for running a really clean and fun election. I will send out the election by-laws soon and I will bring a resolution next week. If anyone has any ideas I would love to hear them.

c. Leg Committee

- i. On Monday there will be a lot of legislators on campus, they will be here for the Joint Public Health legislative group on Monday 8:30 to 10am in CC.

XI. New Business

a. SA 0809-025: Resolution Requesting Shared Office Space for CAB-Student Association

i. Thiel/Turner

1. This is my favorite resolution. It outlines CAB member responsibilities. They are required to have office hours. Although we did change our board members. Other than that

this is a good way to keep the campus involvement ideas flowing.

2. I think we need to strike something with the membership.
- ii. Discussion
 1. Move to strike the whereas clause with all the membership and the 12 board members.
 - a. Thiel/Hayes
 - b. Discussion
 - i. Call to question
 1. Passes
 2. Call to question
 - a. Objection
 3. Is this for next year?
 - a. It says to be effective immediately.
 4. Are we mandating something out of the next senate? Are we making a decision that should be made next senate?
 - a. This is saying that it is going to be forever.
 - b. We do tons of stuff that attends future senate.
 5. Call to question
 - a. Passes
 - b. SA 0809-058: Resolution on Holding a Special Referendum to Approve the Student Association Constitution - 6:10 PM
 - i. Discussion
 1. Move to amend: Article III, Section 4, Subsection 4e to: "The Senate shall elect two (2) General Executives from within the Senate body to sit on the Board of Directors during J-term and summer months." Article I, Section 4, Subsection 4d: The Board of Directors will act as a Senate when Senate is not in session. Decisions shall be subject to Senate oversight and approval. Delete Section 9. Add to Section 10: Add subsection 10c: "During the J-term and summer months two (2) Senate General Executives will serve on the Board of Directors." Move to remove any mention of the "Executive Board" throughout the Constitution or replace with "Board of Directors" where appropriate.
 - a. Klotz/Wallace
 - i. We are changing it to have two members on the board of directors over the summer. We are not changing the membership, just adding the two members. We are removing any mention of the executive board or replacing it with the board of directors.
 - ii. The executive board is the acting group when senate is not in session. It is a legislative board.
 - b. Discussion on the amendment

- i. Does this change anything other than what the groups are called?
 - 1. Currently the executive board has met once. It is not really something we use.
 - 2. It has been used in the past. There was an issue with one shots last year and we voted on something. This year it was not utilized as much. Once you grant the power over the board of directors you loose control over what can be done with that group.
 - 3. Right now we have an executive board that is composed of two at large members. Then we have the board of directors. So this is combining them and saying there is not a need to have two. During the special time when it is needed then it will have the 2 senate members.
- ii. Are there any disadvantages?
 - 1. If you want a group to represent you then you are now loosing control. The executive branch would be acting as the legislative branch. There is a little bit of balance of power that could be argued.
- iii. So would the BOD be the summer execs?
 - 1. During that time you would have 2 senate members. But our executive board has less directors on it. So they are adding more members to the executive board from the BOD.
- iv. Is there anything in this to have the decisions go back to senate?
 - 1. Yes all the decisions go back to senate.
- v. On the one hand efficiency saves you time, but not the best government. We have the executive and legislative branch for a reason. If the city of La Crosse were to give the cabinet of our Mayor all the duties of the council that would seem strange. You could argue that no one is ever here over the summer, though that is not a problem with the system, that is a problem with the people who signed up. Just because the Executive Board isn't used all the time doesn't mean it doesn't need to be used. Our executive board is meant to be our proxy when we aren't

- vi. If something that we are really concerned about is separation of powers, I suggest there be an amendment to change the executive board because it is mostly composed of board of directors. If you are opposed to this then I suggest you change the membership entirely.
- vii. What happens over Jterm and summer that we are trying to address?
 - 1. There are different issues that come up. Over the summer the exec board had to meet to approve some board of directors and to work on the bus thing.
- viii. I have seen how these different boards have worked an operated. The board of directors are subject to senate approval in the first place. The number of times the exec board has had to meet, and considering most of it is board of directors, I don't see a need to vote this down.
- ix. I think part of the problem is the name of the executive board. Maybe we should consider renaming it a proxy for the committee. The name itself is very confusing. If we do vote it down we should consider renaming it
- x. I agree with that completely. I think we should vote this down and change the membership of the exec board so that it has just as many senate members as board of director members.
- xi. Call to question
 - 1. Division
 - a. Passes 18:11:1
 - 2. I noticed that one thing that was changing was that to impeach someone it has to go through legislative affairs. One side to it is that the committee is more efficient.
 - 3. Move to amend the document to say that the board of directors has an equal number of senators and directors.
 - a. Schmidt/
 - 4. This where we throw off the balance of power.

5. I feel we are putting too much power there and that is not the way it should be going. Right now we have people we trust in power, but it may not always be that way. I don't think we should put all that power into the BOD.
6. Senate would have to approve their decisions anyway. So adding this many senators to a board would make it very clumsy, especially over the summer. It was very hard to get 4 last summer.
7. I understand what you are saying; I wish we would have talked about this before the last vote.
8. If you would like to talk about things then I think you should propose amendments.
9. Move to amend: Article VII, Section 1, Subsection 1b: Members of the Election Commission are restricted from running for an elected office or from being appointed to a position in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch the following term. Article XI, Section 1, Sentence 2: change to "Legislative and Election Commission membership changes will take effect during the 2010-2011 session."
 - a. Klotz/Ruplinger
 - b. Discussion
 - i. I disagree with this because the election commission is approved through the BOD and the senate. If you think there is any foul play there are two things that would stop this from happening. I don't see why you are taking the opportunity away from them to be involved. If something is wrong you would be able to catch it.
 - ii. I don't see the point of this because it does have to go through to bodies where it is voted up or down.
 - iii. So if we approve this then everyone on the election commission can't be on the BOD.
 - iv. It would also be the judicial branch, so the student court.
 - v. I can see the need for it, but I feel like if you don't trust those people then why did you put them on the election commission? It doesn't bring enough benefits to enhance the quality of the BOD.
 - vi. The intent of the amendment was to prevent any chances of foul play.
 - vii. So it is something that is nice to have but not really necessary.
 - viii. It's not wrong not to have that.

- ix. I am always surprised with the argument that we shouldn't elect someone we don't trust. You don't game plan for the best possible scenario. Someone could turn their back on you later. We push a lot of trust into the election commission. We don't know what actually happens in elections, we just trust them. I totally support this.
 - x. I totally agree with that, I feel like something this group has a very short institutional memory. I think this just institutionalizes that we don't want corruption in our group and this puts this into the constitution instead of just trusting people.
 - xi. It also could be made aware to the election commission that before you say yes that you wouldn't be able to run.
 - xii. Sometimes for something like this it is difficult to find dedicated people to serve, so it would be harder to find educated people to serve.
 - xiii. Move to question
 - 1. Kahl/Herro
 - a. Division
 - i. Passes 23:5:2
 - xiv. Vote on amendment as a whole
 - 1. Passes, one abstention
10. Motion to amend to delete section 3 in article 11.
- a. Wallace/Decker
 - i. It was brought up to me that this could be interpreted to say that for example athletics is funded x amount of money, then every year we would have to fund them.
 - ii. I don't think that student funding should have anything to do with the constitution.
 - b. Discussion
 - i. I believe the intent of it was to make sure that money wasn't taken away, but it could put us into a bad situation
 - ii. Call to question
 - 1. Passes
11. In article 11, it doesn't have a provision for what is required to ratify it.
- a. In article 10 it says it has to be 2/3 of senate and majority of students to amend it.
12. Also in section 2, what is the scope of it? Can we never overrule a previous decision?

- a. It says we can take a stance; it is making sure that we keep those commitments.
13. Move to amend section 1 of article 11 to say it shall take effect immediately upon a 2/3 majority vote of the UWL SA. Strike the rest of the sentence. And replace the word replace with supersede.
- a. Decker/Schmidt
 - i. We don't need to micromanage the election commission.
 - b. Discussion
 - i. If this was ratified it would have to be ratified under the current rules. If the referendum passes then this is how it would be enacted. This section is about how it would be enacted.
 - ii. Does this line up with our current constitution?
 - iii. Our resolution that we have on the floor is to dissolve the old one. Do the effects of the previous one have an effect on ratifying this document?
 - 1. No.
 - iv. Right now because we haven't gotten rid of our current constitution, it might need to be reworded.
 - v. Shouldn't we be doing this to the resolution and not to the document itself?
 - 1. We can change whatever we want in this document. I don't know if this section is necessary.
 - vi. This constitution is not bound by the previous constitution; it no longer exists the moment this is voted on.
 - vii. The current wording stating 2/3 members should include voting members because otherwise it would count the people who aren't voting. Move to amend the amendment to add "of the voting members"
 - 1. Ruplinger/Turtenwald
 - a. We know that a lot of people don't vote and it would suck if it didn't pass because someone interpreted differently.
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. Call to question
 - i. Acclimation
 - ii. Amendment to the amendment approved

- viii. The intent of this amendment is for the document to state how it can be ratified. It is not bound by the previous constitution.
- ix. If this passes are we saying the new constitution takes affect after the vote?
 - 1. Yes.
- x. Are there any things in this constitution that we would want to add to be enacted later? Originally the new constitution wouldn't be the new constitution until the new session.
 - 1. We could have the vote on the day before the new session starts.
- xi. Technically if this is approved on April 23rd this would take effect immediately after. You might want to change the date to May 8th.
- xii. So then at large senators would be eliminated?
 - 1. It's in there that membership changes wouldn't take effect yet.
- xiii. I don't want to enact this while this session is still in session.
- xiv. I wouldn't spend as much time in the details of how this is going to transition because we can figure that out as a body. We might want to put in language about how we change this in the future. I don't want to see us waste to much time. I am confident we can make this transition without anarchy breaking out.
- xv. If you want to do a 2/3 majority you would have to amend the current constitution, so right now this means nothing. All that is saying is that we don't want to transition into a new constitution in this session. I interpret supersede over replace as all of the other constitutions still exist. It doesn't go along with the notion of ratifying it. I think this whole amendment is shenanigans.
- xvi. I couldn't agree more.
- xvii. I agree with the date thing. I question where to put that. I think it is appropriate to say it wouldn't pass without a 2/3 vote.
- xviii. I agree that there should be a date. The intent of this was to say how this would take effect. I think the date should be at the end of this session. The current constitution has no bearing on the new constitution. I think the 2/3 membership vote is a healthy thing to say. Move to amend the amendment to say "approval by

2/3 majority of the voting membership of UWL
SA shall be sufficient to ratify this constitution.
Provision of this constitution shall take
effect...”

1. Decker/Klotz

2. Discussion

a. We are planning to have this referendum on April 23, that would have to change. Under the current constitution a referendum has to take effect within 10 days after being voted on.

b. I don't understand how this clause could have any effect on this constitution if this constitution doesn't exist.

c. The way you could alleviate the tension between the two documents is say that it requires 2/3.

d. I understand the conversation that we are having, but I think we are missing the point. This is such a small issue and I think we need to spend time on other issues. Our current constitution is what rules until this comes in place. It doesn't have any power until it is voted on. Lets move on to bigger and better things.

e. Move to question

i. Ruplinger/Wallace

ii. Passes 28:1:1

f. Vote on amendment

i. Fails

xix. Call to question

1. Amendment fails.

14. Move to amend in Section 3 Enacting a New Constitution:
Approval of 2/3 majority of the voting members of the
UWLSA is necessary to enact a new constitution

a. Schmidt/Klotz

i. I think this solves some of the problems we were talking about.

b. Discussion

- i. I don't think it needs to say future. Move to amend the amendment to get rid of future in the title and in the second to last word.
 - 1. Wallace/Turtenwald
 - 2. Discussion
 - a. I future in there because we can't have two constitutions in there at the same time.
 - b. When we enact a new constitution we dissolve the existing constitution. We can put anything we want in there. The one millisecond of anarchy dissolves this.
 - c. It would have solved our problems tonight by putting in 2/3.
 - d. We shouldn't expect this constitution to change. That's the point of having a constitution.
 - e. Call to question
 - i. Objection
 - f. You can't bind the future constitution with this one.
 - g. Move to question
 - i. Ruplinger/Wallace
 - ii. Passes 28:0:2
 - 3. vote on the amendment to strike "future"
 - a. Passes
 - c. Call to question
 - i. Fails
15. Can there be small grammatical edits without voting on it as long as it doesn't change the intent?
- a. Yes
16. Call to question
- a. Objection
17. I want to strike from Article 3, Section 2, Sub-section 2b, strike the second and third sentence.
- a. Kahl/Decker
 - i. I want to be able to keep it loose but recognize that it is under the realm of the organizations. just because organizations covers a lot of things, this makes it a little more fluid for the by-laws to regulate them
 - ii. The composition of the senate should be covered by the by-laws.

- b. Discussion
 - i. Then I think we should strike the 17 of the college representatives. The break down should be in the by-laws.
 - ii. Call to question
 - 1. Objection, can you explain this a little more?
 - iii. It won't affect the diversity seats, if we talk about the representation it is all under the idea of organizations. The point of the constitution is it is very difficult to change it on a regular basis; the by-laws can be changed.
 - iv. We aren't specifying any seats, if the by-laws didn't get done until next year, and then there is no way of specifying anything.
 - v. Point of clarification: technically the membership changes don't take effect until another year. so there would be a lot of time to change the bylaws.
 - vi. Call to question
 - 1. Objection
 - vii. I understand the concern, but suppose in the future another organization comes up then it makes it more flexible, but in both ways.
 - viii. So by putting it in the bylaws then it is easier to change it, but then it is easier to take it out.
 - ix. If we get rid of this then we could have 9 or 10 diversity seats, with having this in the constitution it keeps it there.
 - x. Call to question
 - 1. Division
 - a. Fails 12:17:1

18. call to question

- a. objection

19. move to amend the date on the resolution to April 30th

- a. Thiel/Herro
- b. Discussion

- i. Call to question
 - 1. Acclimation

- a. Approved

20. Move to amend subsection 2b to put human in front of diversity, and any where else it belongs.

- a. Taylor/Ruplinger
 - i. We did this in the by-laws.
- b. Call to question
 - i. Amendment approved.

21. Article 6, Section 2, Sub-section 2a is kind of strange.
 - a. Actually it is not.
22. Well if the president doesn't sign it then it is called a pocket veto. What is the rationale behind having the president and vice president sign it?
 - a. My signature is approval of the senate. I sign it and then give it to Derek to sign it.
23. If the vice president were not to sign it then it would be vetoed. Is the vice president purely a representative of the senate, or can they veto?
 - a. Subsection 2b says the vice president can veto.
24. Move to strike "both" and "vice president" in 2a and in 2b to strike "vice president".
 - a. Decker/Schmidt
 - i. The meaning of vice president is they are the substitute, they aren't the president. If we are going to give them the equal power as the president then they should be called co-president.
 - b. Discussion
 - i. My interpretation is that the vice president is a stamp to say that this is the intent of what the senate did. The president can veto it or not.
 - ii. Student Association is different than senate, so I think it is important that we have both of them sign it. I think it is important that both sides are represented.
 - iii. If that is what our intent then that would belong in the responsibilities of the vice president. It is purely a symbolic thing, it doesn't belong in the veto section.
 - iv. Call to question
 1. objection
 - v. The way it is written now is that both have the power to veto, but I think that they both should be signing off on it. Move to split the question, the first question will be the first sentence; the second is the other part.
 1. Ruplinger/Thiel
 - a. Passes
 - c. Discussion on the first question
 - i. I understand the reasoning on it, but essentially you are still giving the vice president veto power. While the intent is good it still doesn't make sense. I will be voting no on this portion.

- ii. If you look at Article 4 Section 6, if we want the vice president to sign it should be part of his responsibilities, but I don't think there should be mention of it in the veto section.
 - iii. Call to question
 - 1. Fails
 - d. Discussion on second half of the question
 - i. This is giving the president veto power and that both have to sign off.
 - ii. If we vote yes on the current question then subsection 2a will not make sense.
 - iii. I agree with that. Move to reconsider.
 - 1. Schmidt/Decker
 - a. Passes
 - e. Move back into vote on first have of the amendment
 - i. Passes, they will be stricken
 - f. Move back into second half of the question
 - i. We are losing site of the section that is just before it. That is where we should make the distinction that the vice president needs to sign. If the intent is that we want the vice president to sign, but the president is the only one that can veto then I recommend you bring it back in and go to the section up above.
 - ii. Call to question
 - 1. Passes, one abstention
25. call to question
 - a. objection
26. Move to add under Subsection 1c to have both their signatures.
 - a. Haase/Herro
 - i. It clarifies what we are arguing now.
 - b. This takes steps towards where we were intending to go. The question is are we being redundant and is there a better way? What if the vice president doesn't sign it? The only reason you have this is what if the document passed on to the vp isn't right?
 - c. I would like to amend the amendment that the vice president shall certify the decision of the senate to the president. I think that signing is implied there. It reiterates that it has to go to the president.
 - i. Decker/Herro
 - ii. Call to question
 - 1. Passes
 - d. Call to question
 - i. Objection

- e. Can we put this into section 6? If we were to make it a numerated duty of the vp then we wouldn't have to worry about the what if situation. I want to add it to article 4 subsection 6c.
 - i. If you would like that to happen then vote this down.
 - f. Call to question
 - i. Motion fails.
27. Move to add what was just typed as a duty of the vp, number 11 of section C.
- a. Herro/Decker
 - b. Call to question
 - i. Motion passes.
28. Call to question
- a. Passes.

UW-La Crosse Student Association 2008-2009

SENATORS		College/Org.	ROLL CALL VOTE 1 Resolution 0809-058		
			YES	NO	ABSTENTIONS
Barquero	Ulisses	CBA			
Blazek	Kelliann	CLS	X		
Brown	Micha	BSU	X		
Decker	Rourke	RASO	X		
DeVries	Jon	RHAC	X		
Gietman	Jake	SAH	X		
Haase	Chelsea	CBA	X		
Hall	Palmer	NASA			
Hastings	JennieLynn	Rainbow Unity			
Hayes	Laura	Off - Campus	X		
Her	Dorothy	ASO	X		
Herro	Nick	CBA	X		
Hougen	Carly	SAH	X		
Jimenez	Sergio	LASO			
Kahl	Erik	Greek Senator	X		
Klotz	Melissa	Athletics Council	X		
Knutson	Megan	SAH			
Lauderdale	Laura	SOE	X		
LeFevre	Kevin	At-Large	X		
Nguyen	Anh	ISO			
Palmer	Andrea	SAH	X		
Ruplinger	Missy	At-Large	X		
Schmidt	Eric	Freshman	X		
Schoonover	Sara	SAPA	X		
Shervey	Ryan	CLS	X		

Sweeny	Bonnie	GSO			
Syafitri	Sonia	CBA	X		
Taylor	DeAndre	Arts & Comm	X		
Thiel	Chuck	Off - Campus	X		
Turner	Sarah	SOE	X		
Turtenwald	Andrea	Arts & Comm	X		
Urbas	Cate	RHAC	X		
Vang	Baobai	HOPE	X		
VanWyk	Katie	Freshman	X		
Wallace	Karly	SAH			
Wolf	Britten	At-Large	X		
Present			28	0	0
Total			37		

- c. SA 0809-061: Resolution Welcoming the NCUR 2009 Conference
- i. Kahl/Shervey
 - ii. Discussion
 1. Is this going to be displayed somewhere? Otherwise it is useless.
 - a. It will probably be mentioned at some opening ceremony.
 2. I think this is great. Call to question
 - a. Objection.
 3. Would like to amend it to spell out NCUR.
 - a. Taylor/Decker
 - b. Call to question
 - i. Acclimation
 1. Passes.
- d. SA 0809-062: Resolution Opposing the Print Cost Recovery Program
- i. Ruplinger/Schoonover
 1. After our conversation with the chancellor and vice chancellor I don't feel that they did the necessary work this year to advertise it for next year. When we first thought we were paying people were really concerned. Nothing has changed on the interface, and maybe some students wouldn't know that this had changed and not know that they were being charged. I am also not comfortable with the amount of student help that they have. Tillman recommended scaling back the amount of hours instead of scaling back on the amount of students workers. I don't see why we need two student workers at the labs. It is a waste of money.
 2. My major concern is with the implementation. I am not against the print cost recovery, but I am against the steps being taken.

Senate isn't a body that can develop something in time for when the chancellor needs to approve it. I am not comfortable with where this has gone.

ii. Discussion

1. I view this much the same way as our involvement in UC, there are too many what ifs. Mr. Tillman, when pressed on some really important issues with this plan, couldn't really answer some of the questions. He has been trying to push this through for 6 years and couldn't answer some questions. It is my fear that without the proposed education this burden will be passed on to the faculty who will pass it onto the students. It is unfair to pass this responsibility of talking to the faculty onto the students. They don't even have a timeline of implementation of this.
2. As a whole I approve of the idea. I would like to clarify the title of this resolution. Move to have it say "proposed" print cost recovery plan, because we may not oppose the idea, just the proposed plan.
 - a. Herro/Turner
 - b. Discussion
 - i. Call to question
 1. Acclimation
 - a. Passes.
3. Why isn't the faculty the first group to hit? I agree with this.
4. I agree with this in principle. Why are we putting this in new business?
 - a. The budget is due Friday.
5. Everyone that I have talked to has been against this. in their quest to make our boundaries wider with technology they seem to be taking a lot of stuff away.
6. call to question
 - a. Passes 26:0:2

UW-La Crosse Student Association 2008-2009			ROLL CALL VOTE 2 Resolution 0809-062		
SENATORS		College/Org.	YES	NO	ABSTENTIONS
Barquero	Ulisses	CBA			
Blazek	Kelliann	CLS	X		
Brown	Micha	BSU	X		
Decker	Rourke	RASO	X		
DeVries	Jon	RHAC	X		
Gietman	Jake	SAH	X		
Haase	Chelsea	CBA	X		
Hall	Palmer	NASA			
Hastings	JennieLynn	Rainbow Unity			

Hayes	Laura	Off - Campus	X		
Her	Dorothy	ASO	X		
Herro	Nick	CBA	X		
Hougen	Carly	SAH	X		
Jimenez	Sergio	LASO			
Kahl	Erik	Greek Senator	X		
Klotz	Melissa	Athletics Council	X		
Knutson	Megan	SAH			
Lauderdale	Laura	SOE	X		
LeFevre	Kevin	At-Large			X
Nguyen	Anh	ISO			
Palmer	Andrea	SAH	X		
Ruplinger	Missy	At-Large	X		
Schmidt	Eric	Freshman	X		
Schoonover	Sara	SAPA	X		
Shervey	Ryan	CLS	X		
Sweeny	Bonnie	GSO			
Syafitri	Sonia	CBA	X		
Taylor	DeAndre	Arts & Comm	X		
Thiel	Chuck	Off - Campus	X		
Turner	Sarah	SOE	X		
Turtenwald	Andrea	Arts & Comm	X		
Urbas	Cate	RHAC	X		
Vang	Baobai	HOPE	X		
VanWyk	Katie	Freshman			X
Wallace	Karly	SAH			
Wolf	Britten	At-Large	X		
Present			26	0	2
Total					

XII. Discussion

a. SA 0809-060 Resolution in Support of Chartwells Going Trayless

i. Brown/Taylor

1. After meetings with folks from Whitney and dining services they expressed they were very interested in this and they were looking for support. It is about the immense waste of food and water that takes place because of having trays in the cafeteria. It doesn't limit how much they eat. I have heard that one to three gallons of water is used to wash each tray. The amount of food that is wasted excluding weekends and breakfast amounts to 40,000 pounds each year. I have heard from people that they want more local and organic food options, so savings from this

could go towards that in Whitney center. Larry also said it is essentially his call, so wherever it says Whitney Center it should say University Dining Services.

ii. Discussion

1. UW Whitewater did this for breakfast because at lunch there is more traffic and another concern is that with the new dishwasher you need a tray.
 - a. This is just in Whitney, not in Cartwright where you need a tray.
2. There are a few of my constituents that need a tray.
 - a. There is a stipulation for that.
3. Someone mentioned going back to high school trays. I like the idea.
4. I agree with this resolution. I think RHAC was really split. The only thing I would like to see changed is I'd like to see the money go to the betterment to the Whitney Center.
5. Have you considered having a poll of people at Whitney to see how many people there are for this?
 - a. I haven't, it is up to you to talk to constituents, this is a poll in itself.
6. It might cause more congestion because people will constantly be getting up and sitting down.
7. I think this is a good idea to have here in Cartwright because it is not all you can eat. It defeats the purpose of all you can eat buffet style atmosphere.
8. I would argue the exact opposite. So you said you think people would get more food, but if you sit down and eat what is in front of you then you might realize that you are full before getting up and getting more food. With the drinks for example, there was much more left in the cups when they used trays because people take all that is in front of them with a tray.
9. Tom Dockham is for it in the sense that it is doing the right thing. He was frustrated with the oversight of the dishwasher in CC because right now they can't do anything about going tray less with the way it is set up.
10. You have to be careful about the law of unintended consequences. I don't see how this would save dishes, but I could see how more dishes could be broken. I am all about choice, and we are talking about individual responsibility. Maybe this would discourage food wasting a little bit, but I don't think it will make that big of a difference. Maybe it should just be discouraged.
11. I disagree; I think it will reduce the amount of food that we waste. I think that will also have a direct effect on congestion. With the amount of extra food on the floor and tables, they said

that with fewer trays there would be fewer dishes and so the workers could go and clean the floor.

12. I worked for Chartwells and Whitney and I cleaned the goddamn trays. I agree with this. The amount of waste that dumped from the trays is unbelievable. I think without the trays people will be more efficient. With the CC there is not a lot we can do because the new dishwasher it is not possible. It also a personal responsibility thing but this plants the seed.
13. I still feel like more people would go up and get food multiple times. Are they going to take multiple trips to take their plates and cups? I think that during a trial period there should be signs that prompt people to take less food.
14. Are they going to redo the conveyer belt?
 - a. They will just put trays up there and keep the trays up there. They already did a trial called tray less Tuesdays and students didn't like it. I think this was because most days they could have trays and that one day they didn't. I think this should be implemented next semester so that the freshmen coming in don't get used to using the trays and don't feel like they are missing something.
15. Do you recognize any more congestion on tray less Tuesdays?
 - a. I don't see more congestion but I do see more spills.
16. I think the end result of food cut down is a happen chance result of people not wanting to get up and get more food. It is like the pay for print. I feel this limits you freedom of choice and what you can get.
17. I have been going tray less for a week; it is not as terrible as everyone makes it out to be. I think you are making too big of a deal out of it. It is not limiting your choice, there is still the same food there, it is just whether or not you have the drive to get up and go get the food. It is just walking a little bit more. I don't think it is as big of a deal as everyone is making.
18. I hated tray less Tuesdays. But I also hate paying taxes, but it is the right thing to do. Move to exhaust the speakers list.
 - a. Herro/Thiel
 - i. passed
19. I think congestion would be less without trays. Motion to close discussion
 - a. Herro/Taylor
 - i. Discussion closed.
- b. Approval of 2009 Student Association Election Process and Results
 - i. Thiel/Kahl
 1. As of right now these are the unofficial election results. The people with the most votes won.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. Where there any complaints or issues that came up?

- a. One of the violations was about a Facebook group started before they could start campaigning, so there campaigning on campus was delayed a week. The others were turning in the election papers late. The GPA requirement was an issue; the individual wasn't in good academic standing according to the university.
2. Traditionally these results are kept within this room until they are certified.
3. The numbers should not leave this room ever.
4. What are the RHAC results?
 - a. They have there own process.
5. There were 2,651 something votes, just a little above last year's. That's unfortunate.
6. What is the rational for waiting a week to certify the results when it is all done electronically any way.
 - a. In case there are any appeals or complaints, you have to have a time period.
7. motion to close discussion
 - a. Brown/Syafitri

XIII. Announcements

- a. The Rob Wagner Benefit show is this Saturday and Sunday. The football team and dance team come together and it is hilarious. It is worth the \$5
- b. Augustans is a week and half away from today. \$15 for students and \$20 for general public.
- c. UW Stevens Point students passed a vote of no confidence for their chancellor.
- d. College reporters are asking the attorney general what groups have to abide by open records law.
- e. If this body feels that we should move forward with the USA Today the executive board could vote on it. If we want to add a segregated fee then we need to approve it by Friday. (straw poll)
 - i. Whatever we come up with tomorrow it will be sent to senate.
- f. Talk to Keng and I about the Dream Act.
- g. Fundraiser at Cold Stone. The organization gets a dollar back when you buy ice cream tomorrow.
- h. HOPE culture night on Thursday night in Valhalla.
- i. With NCUR being here there are a lot of volunteer opportunities. Get a hold of Dr. Nick.
- j. The main reason we had such a clean campaign was because we had such a tough election commissioner named Chuck Thiel.
- k. Stop and ask NCUR participants if they need help.
- l. Tomorrow morning I will be selling tickets to some of the excursions. Friday night Shoeless Revolution is playing.
- m. Triathlon at the REC this weekend.

XIV. Adjournment

- a. Taylor/Herro



i. Meeting adjourned at 11:10pm.

UW-La Crosse Student Association 2008-2009

SENATORS		College/Org.	ROLE CALL	ROLE CALL 2	ROLE CALL 3	ROLE CALL 4
Barquero	Ulisses	CBA				
Blazek	Kelliann	CLS	x	x	x	
Brown	Micha	BSU	x	x	x	
Decker	Rourke	RASO		x	x	
DeVries	Jon	RHAC	x	x	x	
Gietman	Jake	SAH	x	x	x	
Haase	Chelsea	CBA	x	x	x	
Hall	Palmer	NASA				
Hastings	JennieLynn	Rainbow Unity				
Hayes	Laura	Off - Campus	x	x	x	
Her	Dorothy	ASO	x	x	x	
Herro	Nick	CBA	x	x	x	
Hougen	Carly	SAH		x	x	
Jimenez	Sergio	LASO		x		
Kahl	Erik	Greek Senator	x	x	x	
Klotz	Melissa	Athletics Council	x	x	x	
Knutson	Megan	SAH				
Lauderdale	Laura	SOE	x	x	x	
LeFevre	Kevin	At-Large	x	x	x	
Nguyen	Anh	ISO				
Palmer	Andrea	SAH	x	x	x	
Ruplinger	Missy	At-Large	x	x	x	
Schmidt	Eric	Freshman	x	x	x	
Schoonover	Sara	SAPA	x	x	x	
Shervey	Ryan	CLS	x	x	x	
Sweeny	Bonnie	GSO				
Syafitri	Sonia	CBA	x	x	x	
Taylor	DeAndre	Arts & Comm	x	x	x	
Thiel	Chuck	Off - Campus	x	x	x	
Turner	Sarah	SOE	x	x	x	
Turtenwald	Andrea	Arts & Comm	x	x	x	
Urbas	Cate	RHAC	x	x	x	
Vang	Baobai	HOPE		x	x	
VanWyk	Katie	Freshman	x	x	x	
Wallace	Karly	SAH	x	x		
Wolf	Britten	At-Large	x	x	x	

Present	26	30	28	0
Total	37	37	37	37
Percent Present	70%	81%	76%	0%