



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–LA CROSSE STUDENT ASSOCIATION

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

Student Senate Minutes

Date: **December 9th, 2015**

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

- I. Call to Order (6:06 pm)
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll Call
- IV. Consent Agenda
 - a. Garcia/ Bhatoya
 - b. Approval of agenda
 - c. Approval of minutes
- V. Guest Speakers
- VI. General Student Body Open Forum
 - a. Elaine Anderson: Special Registration Deputy training available. Certification lasts until next general election. At 5pm, 15th in Tuesday in City Hall. Students needed!
- VII. Officer Reports
 - a. President: Kaylee Otterbacher
 - i. Board decided to go to board with only 4% tuition increase for out of state and graduate students.
 - b. Vice President: Molly Davies
 - c. Chief of Staff: John Becker
 - d. Chief of Staff to the Vice President: Kate Laird
 - e. State Affairs Coordinator: Jacob Schimmel
 - i. All neighborhood association met on Sunday (ATLNA).
 - f. Local Affairs Coordinator: Brady Gross
 - g. Inclusivity Coordinator: Ayush Shrestha
- VIII. RHAC Reports
 - a. Winter formal was last Friday; it went really well. Dr. Nick is coming tomorrow to talk about gender inclusive housing, especially in Wentz & Eagle Halls.
- IX. Advisor Reports
 - a. Yesterday we had a bit of a campus scare. To give you a concept of what happened, I personally found out around 2pm about the suspicious package and we were working to evacuate the area and working to get dinner served. It ended up being a couple of individuals who wanted to catch a Greyhound bus and they found out too late that they were only allowed x amount of packages, so they needed to consolidate their bags. I was really happy to see how all students dug in efficiently and calmly and reacted in a very respectable manner.
- X. Committee Reports
 - a. Schimmel: ADAC budget finally approved by Gow!
 - b. Garcia: Not much completed in our meeting...
 - c. Ames: SUFAC: Worked to clear differences in rates between presentation and written document. The reason for the difference had to do with the initial rate and current rates of enrollment. Also worked to decrease confusion on the disbursement of Green Fund monies. It should be capped at \$120,000 but in previous years \$139,000 has been distributed.

XI. Organizational Reports

XII. Unfinished Business

- a. SA1516-030: Resolution Approving the Student Organizations Committee Adviser Limit Policy
 - i. Mans/Tashner
 - ii. Purath: *Looking at limiting the number of committees advisors may oversee for the previous year.*
 - iii. 8:16:1; resolution doesn't pass.
- b. SA1516-031: Resolution Supporting the Indigenous Land Recognition Policy
 - i. Garcia/Sparks
 - ii. Razidlo: *NASA & JMAC are asking to read a small slogan before large UW-L sponsored events. Last week discussion was discouraged by what events are considered "large" so we worked to figure that out.*
 - iii. Steck: Amend the document
 1. Insert: "to honor indigenous people"... Add another whereas clause: "every group, organization, and team is required to recite this statement at least once a semester before one of their events, and group, organization, or team is free to recite this statement as many times or at multiple events as they see fit."/Razidlo
 2. Floerke: What is defined as group?
 - a. Steck: Predominantly, I mean student groups, however the question is at large.
 3. Floerke: Also, how would you enforce this? That's why I think it might go well with events that say the national anthem.
 4. Brever: I like this, and I think it would be good to add in the idea of national anthem and ticket sales, and then make it optional for groups who don't require either one.
 5. Schimmel: POI: addressing the issue regarding if it's Ho-Chunk or other tribes. It is solely Ho-Chunk in the La Crosse County.
 6. Steck: Motion to amend amendment
 - a. Insert "student, faculty, and staff" remove "before" and replace with "at" and include "ticketed" before events
 - b. Voted on: passed, 1 abstention
 7. Faust: How would this be enforced?
 - a. Steck: We don't have an official enforcement method, however that doesn't mean we aren't going to take a stance against something. There will be members and conscious students who go to meetings and events that will recognize if it is or isn't being said.
 8. Voted on: amendment passes; 2 abstentions
 - iv. Garcia: Does it need to have the national anthem AND a ticketed event?
 1. Razidlo: We can discuss this further, however I think this is when the second part of this amendment would take this on. We don't want this to be redundant, however we want it to be heard.
 - v. Garcia: I didn't know this until this resolution. Is there a way to have this on the UWL resolution.
 1. Razidlo: The problem it is that this isn't federally recognized, but we still are. NASA & JMAC would have to work on this as an organization.
 - vi. McLoughlin: Was the amendment decided that it would only be stated at events ONLY where the anthem was stated?

1. Razidlo: Do we want to say “and/or”?
- vii. Mason: I feel like you should be much more encompassing but limited to specific types of events so you can avoid being redundant, however not focusing on just one group of attendees, such as sporting events.
- viii. McLoughlin: I see this as problematic, because we don’t see the same speakers come to campus every time, we don’t always play the same team, and we don’t always see the same fans at each event.
- ix. Brever: I support what was said by senator Mason.
- x. Floerke: Authors: Was the original slogan made by a student of Ho-Chunk origin, or from another student addressing the issue?
 1. Razidlo: Yes
- xi. Purath: I think that going back to the repetition of this, we aren’t addressing the issue of celebrating the group and I think we can come up with something better.
- xii. Mans: Authors, do you think this is going to open up a floodgate of other nationalities? I think this is a great idea, however I think that other nationalities are going to be thinking that they should be honored as well for various reasons.
 1. Razidlo: I think it would start some discussion regarding recognition, however I don’t think it would open up a floodgate necessarily because of the land we are on, and there isn’t other nationalities originated on this land. It’s original intent is to claim something overlooked and unknown, and to peak people’s interest enough to make them think about who was here before and the history behind the land. I don’t see others being able to make that same argument.
- xiii. Quaschnick: The land of La Crosse County, is it only Ho-Chunk or is it Menomonie and Dakota as well?
 1. Razidlo: we have spoken to the student in the org and another student who spoke during the indigenous people’s day event, and as far as our research went, yes this is solely Ho-Chunk’s land. If need be we need to do more research.
 2. Quashnick: I was under the impression it was all three tribes because of the Blackhawk war, and then after was forcibly removed by US Army.
 3. Steck: This resolution is solely for the land that campus is on, and the city of La Crosse, and not the whole county.
 4. Quashnick: I am in agreement, and just wanted to clarify the language.
- xiv. Quaschnick: I would like to see this go back to the committee or authors and comfortably fix the wording that can be read and agreed with. Motion to send to JMAC. /Johnson.
 1. Steck: I’m on JMAC and I’m not sure when we’re meeting next and I’m not sure when we’re going to bring this back, or that they will have much to change and/or add.
 2. Mason: I think we have a lot more concerns to say than the committees and thkn we should finish it here.
 3. McLoughlin: I do want to see this pass, however in the right way and I want to see it come back to us in polished format with much more clear wording.

4. Floerke: I think we would generally like to see this passed, however I agree with pushing it back to committee, and however long it may take, I'm sure it will be done eventually and then it can be much more clear.
 5. Mason: If this goes back to committee, I would like them to think of other ways this land can be recognized. For instance some groups bring indigineous people's at graduation or freshman orientation. Smoething like this would be a much better way to show the culure and hstory behind us, moreso than the statement that eventually will be forgotten about. I don't think this will be mistaken.
 6. Steck: I see why senators would want this to go back to committee, and I hope that when it comes back that they will not be afraid to take a stance on it.
 7. Razidlo: I'm ok with it being tabled, for making sure that everyone is ok with it, however I do want this body to vote on it. There is a reason why we brought it to this body and why we wanted a stance made.
 8. Brever: I would like to know what "better wording" entails, that is being suggested
 9. Saprks: It doesn't make sense to me to refer this back to a committee that didn't originate it, and that the authors are perfectly capable of doing it themselves. They can work on it, bust it out, and make it more approvable from the eyes of the senators. I think we should either vote it down and have them bring back something completely new or table it.
 10. Quaschnick: retract motion to send to JMAC
- xv. Quashnick: Motion to table. /Bennett
1. Voted: passed
- c. SA1516-032: Resolution Approving FY16 Allocated Budget Amount and Segregated Fee Rate
- i. Ames: **Amend: adjust value to \$96.50 per student.** *We dicussed this and found all areas appropriate, and if we didn't previously we had the student group come in and talk and explain why it might be.*
 - ii. Spencer: Why didn't orchestra get the full amount they requested?
 1. Ames:
 - iii. McLoughlin: Why did the Raquet get less than what the subcommittee approved?
 1. Ames: We've had problems with the revenue they were reporting from advertising, and how they were presenting them versus what was actually there at later times. We hope that the Raquet chooses to evolve in a way that will create their own revenue, and discontinue asking for money from us. We don't feel like students should have to bail out the Raquet each year when they are continuously coming in the red year after year.
 - iv. Voted On: Passed, no abstentions
- d. SA1516-033: Resolution Recognizing the Confederate Flag as a Symbol of Hate
- i. Tashner/Mans
 - ii. Gunaratnam: This resolution brings up the confederate flag as a symbol of hate. It is offensive and intimidating towards multiple groups on campus.

1. Johnson: After referring to my constituents, we really can't support this. The symbolism represented and interpreted can be varied entirely. Also, there was no education done when this event took place. Does anyone actually no way the man chose to display the flag? There are multiple meanings for the confederate flag, which will eventually hurt the student because when they graduate and leave campus, they won't have the cage that we have just created for them.
2. Faust: I don't think the SA should take action after multiple hate crimes happened, I don't think that the SA should be behind. I understand that this was going to come up, however I don't see that why we should take a stance.
3. Bhatoya: His purpose there was not to push the meaning of the confederate flag, but to do construction work. It feels like we're casting the employee in a bad light, when in reality we have no idea what he's really look, other than some of us don't agree with his beliefs. I don't like the way that this resolution is going.
4. Gunaratnam: I do believe we can change the wording of the resolution to not accuse the employee. I would also like to say that we were educating when we held a session regarding the confederate flag and a lot was learned and taught regarding its history and meaning.
5. Almazrou: Coming from a minority student, and I fully understand how students feel about hate on their campus. When I came to America, I realize that there are some people that are more sensitive than others, and I also recognize that there are policies in place. Why are we talking about this here? Why not allow this to be dealt with by the administration, whose policies do prevent this from happening? Why do we have to politically correct, and why not working on more so on educating people and appreciating our education?
6. McLoughlin: I'm not sure what freshman orientation covers, and I don't know what power we have, but I do think that we could possibly cover something on symbols of hate in that time.
7. Steck: Paula, are state employees allowed to show confederate flags on campus?
 - a. He's being ultimately by student fees, but employed by somebody else. If an employee came into my office with a confederate flag on their shirt, I could not say that she has to take it off, but I could have a conversation with her about why it might be offensive and obtrusive.
8. Steck: So at the federal level, it is isn't allowed. This doesn't restrict any one's ability to bring a confederate flag onto free-speech areas onto this campus. Even if he didn't intentionally bring that confederate flag onto campus, he unintentionally affected those of us on this campus. This body was not made to be a passive body. If there is anything brought up that might needed to have a stance we should take a stance.
9. Quaschnick: I don't think any symbol should be banned. We are a teaching institution, and I think we should teach why those symbols have been showed, and what they mean. I think that

would make a much larger impact than just banning the symbol. I don't believe in banning any symbol. I do understand where this is coming from, however I don't believe I can stand behind banning this completely from campus.

10. Sparks: I think we should look past the flag and its intents on our campus. I think if we have students feeling badly about it on our campus, we should take about it. If there's anyone to make a statement about it, it's us. If students aren't feeling safe, then we aren't getting enough out of education; but they won't get enough out of our education if students don't feel safe enough to leave.
11. Ames: Regarding the "subject to state law" it isn't entirely against that law. I move to removed "laws" from the of the WHEREAS clauses. /Steck
 - a. Voted on; passed
12. Purath: a symbol that can be interpreted as hateful can have different meanings for another student as their history. I do believe this is saying you are saying banning the flag from campus, which is a slippery slope.
13. Mason: There has been some discussion on this saying that it isn't our place, however I do believe it is. This is a university, and also a home to students for 4 years. When we are in a place to be comfortable learning and growing, I think we should promote that.
14. Rudolph: I move to strike second to last whereas clause and the one before that. /Quaschnick
 - a. There were concerns regarding the specific language here, and it streamlines the intent of this resolution in saying that this is a symbol of hate and it only does that and doesn't go outside the boundaries of what this resolution is supposed to do.
 - b. Voted on: passed, no abstentions
15. Brever: We are paying to be here, and some students aren't comfortable going to classes with the symbols around.
16. Ames: Amend to change the line that says "prohibiting" to "discouraging"
17. Razidlo: These are the issues we need to be addressing, and not to be apathetic. We need to take a stance because our students are. Stepping back will not do anything, and in that case we shouldn't even be here.
18. Johnson: With our last whereas clause: if we are creating this out of a perceived act, then this should actually serve to act on middle eastern flags that inflect painful memories on my veteran constituents. If we start here with this one flag, where do we draw the line in the future for other groups, when we want to be an inclusive campus.
19. Gunaratnam: As a minority, I will never escape the inflictions of the confederate flag on me and other groups. I want to recognize that we are not trying to ban the flag, however when its appearance hinders the education of students that it shouldn't be present.

20. Voted on: passed, no abstentions.
- e. SA1516-034: Resolution to Amend the UW-L Student Association Constitution with Gender Inclusive Language
 - i. Tashner/Garcia
 - ii. Brever: *inclusivity that should be addressed*
 - iii. Voted on; passed
 - f. SA1516-035: Resolution Approving Fall 2015 Green Fund Request, Veterans Memorial Stadium transition from 32W to 25W halogen lamps
 - i. Gustafson; Bhatoya
 - ii. Ames: SUFAC didn't feel like it's a good idea.
 - iii. Voted on; passed
- XIII. New Business
- a. SA1516-036: Resolution Opposing H.R. 3403, the Safe Campus Act of 2015
 - i. Gustafson/eidenschinck
 - ii. Schimmel: *This isn't a state issue specifically, this is a national issue; something in congress. It's the safe campus act of 2015. Initially, there were a lot of sexual violence groups were interested in it and what it had to say. This amends the original act of 1965. This takes away the institutions right to have their own investigation on a sexual violence case, and to a case for police force investigation. They would not be able to go through the confidential route of the institution, but victim can choose to go through law enforcement investigate. This has lost a lot of support in congress, and we want to go to Washington and see that this does not go any further. A lot of sexual violence groups oppose, as well as many members of congress, and this resolution would oppose that as well.*
 - iii. Quaschnick: Playing devil's advocate: at Penn state, where the institution didn't do anything, when does this become a bad thing?
 - 1. The original takes away the institution's right to do anything whatsoever. That would be the own institution's problem.
 - iv. Schimmel: Another severe problem with this proposal: what would likely happen would be a decrease in reports because now the aspect of confidentiality is gone, and the role of violence prevention is gone. It allows victims to feel safer. I'm not certain if it makes victims feel safe to go to law enforcement and have their confidentiality removed right off the bat.
 - v. Almazrou: This is to rebuttal exactly what happened in Harvard, Yale, and Penn state. The problem with this is that those schools don't want to talk about it because it's their reputation that is at risk.
 - vi. Brever: I move to suspend the two-week rule.
 - 1. This is the last meeting of the semester, and Schimmel & Otterbacher want to take it with them to discuss while we're not in session

2. Rudolph: I don't believe we should suspend the two week rule simply because we haven't had time to look at his fully. And in the past, institutions have a tendency to do a bad job at reporting and investigating these incidents. It's not as one-sided as it is being presented to us here. We should leave this to the experts, the police for the investigation. We should definitely have more time to learn more about it before rushing to a vote.
 3. Ames: I have reservations on reporting the two-week rule. There have been cases where institutions have prevented some cases from going forward, and I also have not had time to look over the bill
 4. Brever: To combat that, there were cases where the police didn't respond in fair ways either.
 5. Steck: I don't necessarily agree with suspending the two-week rule ever, because it doesn't allow us to think about this.
 6. Voted on: 6:14:2, motion fails
 - vii. Garcia: As it currently stands, could someone go to directly to the police without going to the violence prevention?
 1. Yes.
 - viii. Johnson: What was the initial intent of the original proposal?
 1. Schimmel: I think that they had the intent to make campus safer. I think the attempt was to help in terms of sexual violence. Going directly to law enforcement isn't as effective. The authors of the proposal probably thought that going past them would be more efficient and effective.
 - ix. Johnson: I can understand that they wouldn't want the university to investigate, but doesn't that specifically eliminate that student an go to the task force, like the one we created. Could the institution help the student in any way?
 1. Schimmel: they could have a safe zone potentially, but violence prevention would have no action to take in that case. It would essentially pass at the safe zone for the victim; they couldn't go further within the university.
 - x. Davies: move to close discussion;
 - b. SA1516-037: Resolution Requesting Use of REC for Women's Club Volleyball Tournament
 - i. Eidenscink/Gustafson
 - ii. Garcia: *this resolution is allowing the cub v-ball team to hold a tournament at the REC for all four courts, and throughout the day open up more courts, and to be done by 8p.*
 - iii. Suspend 2 week rule
 1. Garcia/Bhatoya
 2. Voted on: passed. No abstentions
 - iv. Voted on: voted on; passed
- XIV. Announcements/Adjournment

STUDENT SENATE ATTENDANCE 12/09/15

Last	First	Roll Call
Almazrou	Yousef	
Ames	Jeremy	
Anderson	Allison	x
Banker	Blaine	x
Bennett	James	
Bentdahl	Madison	
Bhatoya	Aaron	
Brever	Patrick	
Eidenschink	Matthew	
Faust	Alexander	
Floerke	Weston	
Garcia	Spenser	
Gunaratnam	Alfonso	
Gustafson (gustifsin)	Allison	
Hackett	Kayley	
Hayward	Paige	x
Hungness	Dana	/
Johnson	Zackariah	
Mason	Lauren	
Mans	Emily	
McAdory	Serina	x
McLoughlin	William	
Nicholson	Matthew	
Purath	Anicka	
Quaschnick	Andrew	
Razidlo	Anna	
Rudolph	Chris	
Schultz	Thomas	x
Sparks	Jacob	
Steck	Rebecca	
Tashner	Brittany	
Tatum	Jasmin	x
Yakes	Alissa	x
Yang	Gaozie Vang	x