



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–LA CROSSE STUDENT ASSOCIATION

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

Student Senate Agenda

Date: **November 4th, 2015**

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

- I. Call to Order
 - a. 6:03pm
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll Call
- IV. Consent Agenda
 - a. Approval of agenda
 - i. Tashner/Steck
 - b. Approval of minutes
- V. Guest Speakers
- VI. General Student Body Open Forum
 - a. Matt: I'm concerned with the language that these documents contain. Please keep language open and concise and make sure that they represent what is being said. Please keep in mind that the student body's thoughts are separate from the Senate, which are also separate from the officers.
 - b. Wanted to come and represent ourselves for the NASA since we didn't agree with the resolution and amendment that passed. We hope to see a change with that soon, as a multicultural organization.
- VII. Officer Reports
 - a. President: Kaylee Otterbacher
 - i. I want to give the opportunity for you to address me with any question you might have, whether it be personal or whatever. I know there are personal disagreements, as well as disagreements with our executive branch decisions. I am now going to open the floor for you to ask any question that may be on your mind.
 1. Mason: My question is regarding the lobbying process.
 - a. There whereas clauses say here's there problem, and in the end there's a resolution. We're supposed to pass resolutions in order to act and them. The resolution that was passed last week, both Molly and I stand behind fully. That is fully lobby-able.
 2. Molly: What are your career aspirations?
 - a. Kaylee: If I were doing this for personal reasons, I would have quit long ago. This job is not easy. If I were focused on my personal sanity, I would not be in this position. If I were truly concerned about my career, I would be focused on internships or more so on my academics. If I were here for my career, I would not be here any more.
 3. Steck: I know that you and Molly are going to the Student Reps and that the resolution is already in the books. I am concerned with the language, and those changes. Will you stand by the language?
 - a. We will stand by what you pass as a Senate. This is why it's so important right now, because this is what we will stand by, as the role in our job, which is why we think this is so important to get

right the first time around.

4. Razidlo: Can you tell us the most basic principle of your job?
 - a. To advocate in students' best interests. For example, JPNB brought up tuitions increase came up. My job is to represent all students. I said, graduate and nonresident students already got a hit last spring, and now they're about to get another hit? I recommended that we should wait until the tuition freeze is over so that we can spread a tuition increase impact among all students, instead of centralizing it on a select few. Was that representing the majority of students on campus? No, because most students on campus are undergraduate residents. However, that was thinking in the best interest of all students and for the good of the campus.
5. Razidlo: With the backlash that we have seen, how does that sit with the interests of the students, since so many students are unhappy and upset?
 - a. So many of you are thinking that the only way to pass this is to completely oppose it, and last year I would have agreed with you. However this year, now, I do not want to make the same mistake twice under my leadership, and I want to see that we were able to do something with what we have in Madison. Had I not experienced slammed doors, legislators walking all over us, etc, that I experienced last year, I would 100% agree with you. But I would not be okay with making the same mistake twice, and allowing concealed carry everywhere on campus, especially where students sleep at night.
6. Razidlo: Last week and now you have been comparing last years' budget cuts to this current resolution. However there is some dissonance, as far as who and what this affects. Tis time around, we're not talking about money and resources, we're talking about guns and peoples' lives. I understand the strategy of give & take and flexibility, however in my experience, and what I've heard from advisors and people who are good at negotiating, we should be asking for more than we want. And if they completely stomp on us, then we can go back and ask for more. When it comes to students' lives and learning and living in a safe environment, why you think its ok to go and ask for a little when it's still so early.
 - a. You're right; we keep saying we can't keep comparing this to the budget, but yet we keeping comparing the two. That being said, power is power, and legislators are going to believe what they want to believe. Though they are completely different issues, I believe legislators are going to vote the same, because it comes down to party issues and political strategy. Like Schimmel said last week, we tried that approach, and it didn't work in the slightest. I believe if we started with that approach last year, we would have a lot more now than what we were given.
 - b. Schimmel: When you have a super majority and complete opposition from the get-go, we can't not change our strategy.
7. Quaschnick: I just want to mention, that we may be going about this in our own way, however other organizations have already taken that approach. Chancellors have already stated they don't want guns anywhere, and that didn't work . There's been no response in any

newspaper in Madison. I think this is our only approach to change anything in this bill. If we were the first ones down there, we would be saying no guns anywhere, but we're not the first. And we should learn from their mistakes.

8. Rudolph: It seems to me that we have a public relations problem. A group of students came in and talked to us and told us they disagreed. If there were a group that went and lobbied with us in Madison, it would be those students. Is there a change that we can make to better encompass those students and represent them?
 - a. I was told last night what people wanted to hear me say, and I realized that that was what I was thinking, but it's not being portrayed that. That is the intent of Molly and I, and if we can make it clear in the resolution, that's exactly what we want. The language doesn't change the impact of any of this, so that's completely doable so that we can include more students' opinions.
9. Rudolph: Does that stop us from lobbying and acting out the plan if we get rid of the last THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED clause?
 - a. Schimmel: I think we could try, but I think the student body wouldn't be happy because it would seem we're not being transparent. That would probably be a disingenuous move with the student body.
 - b. Otterbacher: I believe it would solve the public relations issue, however it won't solve the bigger issue. I am willing to face every challenge thrown at me, that's how passionately I feel.
10. Ames: Do you think its any bit realistic to say that by getting our foot in the door with this compromise, that we're going to achieve larger things later?
 - a. I don't think that it is super realistic, however it gives us the leeway to do try. I like the resolution because it is not sticking us to solely one opposition with no wriggle room to negotiate. I believe it is more realistic to do it this way versus the alternative.
11. Ames: from a negotiating standpoint, it sounds weird to ask for one thing and to ask for more, then just being upfront with exactly what we want in the first place.
 - a. Although we may not be seeing it as realistic, we do see students' opposition, which is why we compromised for residence halls so that students' get do something to work with instead of nothing.
 - b. After we pass a resolution, we send it to Madison, with a statement on top. From last year, we learned that they look at the statement, and rarely refer to the resolution.
12. Rudolph: I think tis important that the UW system send a consistent message, and what you said makes it seem smart to have 2 resolutions. If we have 1 resolution that makes us stand against it along with the other schools, and then a separate one to say, so this is what we're going to do with it.
 - a. The problem with that is that one will be acted upon and one won't. There's not a huge problem, it's just that it won't be very productive. Also, Platteville is not in agreement with us; they are for the concealed carry. So our unity is already interrupted.

13. Gunaratnam: You said last night there's a way to shut down the bill before it even hits the floor, what is that process? Is it possible?
 - a. Schimmel: It is now in the committee process; the judiciary committee. It's in the process of being evaluated by the committee; it's not yet on the floor. The republicans have the majority vote, so they will most likely approve it and then let it go without much trouble. It already hit the committee, so there is not opportunity to shut it down.
 14. Brever: When do you see it being approved and passed?
 - a. Schimmel: It depends on the speed that the committees work on it, it could vary depending on the opposition it faces.
 15. Steck: I heard that because Democrats are engulfed in a separate matter, they said they won't even discuss it until January.
 - a. Otterbacher: I have no idea, and it's really hard to say. It's more of a play by ear issue.
 - ii. Otterbacher: If there are any more issues, I would love to hear about them. I would like to be an effective leader and do more, but I can't do anything without you telling me what you want done.
 - b. Vice President: Molly Davies
 - i. Committees: please write down and make sure this document is correct and that you are on 2 committees. There is a separate document listing openings on committees. Please make sure we are meeting quorum and having real meetings. Also, please make sure we are directing all questions and comments at the chair, and not at each other. This is a respectful organization and this goes for the audience as well; we do not snap or clap so as to not create biases in this room. Please just be respectful for what everyone has to say.
 - c. Chief of Staff: John Becker
 - d. Chief of Staff to the Vice President: Kate Laird
 - i. Please come and support flag football next Friday for It's on Us week. Just please say if you are or not attending on FB. We can do a senate team if you'd like! Slices with the senators is next Wednesday.
 - e. State Affairs Coordinator: Jacob Schimmel
 - i. Concealed carry introduced to judiciary committee as SB363, and I will be keeping tabs as it moves through committees and what we can do with its progress.
 - f. Local Affairs Coordinator: Brady Gross
 - i. GENA got back to me with the rankings of the projects they'll be working on. Would you be interested in having him come in and elaborate more on this so we fully understand? Yes? Ok I will have him and talk to us.
 - g. Inclusivity Coordinator: Ayush Shrestha
- VIII. RHAC Reports
- a. There is a resolution that they will vote on tomorrow, which is basically the same resolution from Senate.
- IX. Advisor Reports
- a. Paula: One, This is really hard on so many levels. Second, I'm proud of you; for joining us, for finding your voices, for grappling with this from the past few weeks. This is hard to deal with heart and head and how they often conflict. I respect the idea that you are approaching this civilly, and I know it's not easy. I share your journey on this one, because I said this is an emotional topic, and that you are a leadership role here. Leaders have to make choices, and sometimes they have to take a stand on what they don't think should be negotiated. I'm not here to tell you when that time is. You've all really tried to

listen, and now it's time to decide where you personally stand on this. I have to decide when I'm going to reach out to my counterparts and make a stand or not on this issue as well, so I am sharing in this journey with you as well. Some good ideas were heard last night, such as calling a public hearing so that they can hear our concerns, or is there chance for appealing the bill. Where are you willing to stand, are you willing to listen to others and understand where others are coming from? Are you willing to change the direction of this bill to stand for this? As you're making your decisions, think of all this when considering your options available to you.

X. Committee Reports

- a. SUFAC looked over budgets submitted. We voiced our concerns and sent those to our subcommittee chairs. We approved 2% increase in segregated fees, so we ask you keep your budgets within that increase, otherwise they're going to be cut anyways. If you have anything more than 2%, make a wish list, so that if we have room to work with it we will, although most likely not.
- b. Student Services & Buildings met and talked about the budget, and we didn't ask for too much more money. And we will have a resolution for rec usage for next week.
- c. Athletics committee met and we worked to whittle our budget down as much as possible. If the students on that committee could actually come, that would be great. We are currently not even meeting quorum and don't have a chair.

XI. Organizational Reports

- a. ASO met yesterday and their main concern was with the resolution and they just wanted to voice their concerns; they weren't very happy with it.
- b. ASU met and they discussed the compromise, and they were not happy because they don't feel like their lives aren't being recognized and shouldn't be compared to a budget. I agree with that their lives are being compromised, and that they have voiced their opinions in here
- c. NASA feels like they aren't feeling represented and hopes that this can be brought up again and discussed, and hopefully changed for the better.
- d. Yang: HOPE met also did not feel comfortable with this resolution, so we came up with ideas in ways that we can reach out to our legislator as well, even if it's a letter to our fellow representatives. Concealed carry is a huge issue, and with that I hope everyone is represented by this resolution.

XII. Unfinished Business

- a. Motion to rescind **Resolution** (by Razidlo)
 - i. *My intent to rescind is because of the complete backlash and anger regarding the passing of this resolution. This is not what the majority of our students want, and they feel silenced and underrepresented. IN addition, I wanted to rescind this on a personal level because I, as well as many others, don't feel comfortable with how we voted. I think we can agree that this is not done yet.*
 - ii. Gunaratnam: I felt a lot of backlash as well, and I agree with previous senator. I don't feel like I voted the way I should have. I think a lot of students think we rushed through this.
 - iii. Brever: I think it's a good idea to reopen the issue and continue discussion. There have been emotions made clear and I think we should listen to that body.
 - iv. Sparks: The idea of the resolutions was not a compromise, and rather a foot in the door strategy.
 - v. Voted on; motion to rescind passed by 2/3 majority.
 1. Razidlo has amendment:/ Mason
 2. **WHEREAS; The Student Association recognizes that there was a strong concern within all groups regarding concealed carry in all**

residence halls and academic buildings on campus and the potential impact it will have on the daily lives of all students, professional staff, and faculty, and;

3. THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED; The Student Association of the University of Wisconsin- La Crosse determines that the best course of action for the students of this university would be to advocate against concealed carry within all buildings on campus with special attention to residence halls.
 - a. I don't think this changes too much, I just think it makes a better representation for the students who are in complete opposition. It puts an emphasis on starting with academic buildings and also emphasizing residence halls, so that we have leeway. This also shows the impact this will have on students' daily lives.
 - b. Quaschnick: I don't agree with the statement of using "all" groups, because we do have 33% of students who are not against concealed carry.
 - c. Brever: I would like to address whether or not this makes it easier to lobby or strengthens our statement, Otterbacher & Schimmel?
 - i. Otterbacher: It's not as strong, however it will make a case against, and it is better than the alternative.
 - ii. Schimmel: It's open for flexibility of the angle we want to take. There's a lot of room for interpretation.
 - d. Brever: Does this ensue a slammed door in our face?
 - i. Otterbacher: It makes our intent less easy to be heard, rather it's going to say listen to us. I would view it as a legislator that they're going to trick us to talk and then directly oppose. It is going to give us some wriggle room, however it leaves more room for interpretation, which can go either way.
 - e. Brever: Do we have less of a chance of getting concealed carry not allowed in every building with this language?
 - i. Otterbacher: I think this is a step forward from the original, but a step back from last week.
 - f. Purath: We all spent 2 weeks discussing this issue, and I think the course of action we took last week was appropriate. I think it showed the opinion of the student body and also represented the best approach.
 - g. Bhatoya: I don't like how there is more speculation, which we worked so hard to work against last week. I also think this is softer than previous, and I don't support this.
 - h. Steck: I am in support of this amendment to the resolution. I have heard a lot of interest with "open to interpretation", which is better in reality because it is open to a lot less negative interpretation. I think this clarifies that we are not open to it being allowed in academic buildings, but rather emphasizes not allowing it in residence halls. I think this additionally represents more students. I also don't think that speculation is apparent in the document, because it fully represents the opinions expressed to us from our constituents.

- i. Mason moves to amend amendment.
 - i. In first whereas clause, Strike “potential”, so that it reads, ...”daily lives of students”, strike all.
 - ii. *I don’t think we just caught up in quantifying who thinks what.*
 - 1. Voted on; passed, 2 abstentions
- j. Razdilo: I would like to address a previous senator and their [inaudible]. I think our job is to listen to the majority and represent them. [inaudible] I think this amendment better represents the majority of what our students want. We are not here to make decisions on what we as individuals think, and that we should listen to the students who have told us this is not what we were asked to pass.
- k. Mans: Amendments were made to the document last week in regards to specificity, and it was shot down. And now we’re introducing amendments regarding specificities once again. I think we should really focus on what we really want instead of going in circles.
- l. Rudolph: We have heard from students loud and clear that they were underrepresented by this resolution. There’s a way to better represent the student body. This fixes the public relations problem that the student senate has, and better represents how the student body feels.
- m. Johnson: I would like to echo and build upon what a previous senator said. We think it will have a negative impact on our campus, but the legislators won’t care. What concerns with me about the discussion within this senate is that we can’t represent majority and minority at the same; we can’t represent both. That’s the problem with democracy; somebody always has to be discluded. I’m not sure if we can find that ground right now, but I don’t see how this amendment would help us right now.
- n. Gunaratnam: I think this is more inclusive of how the student’s feel on campus. I also don’t think this needs to be voted on right now. If we table this, we can come up with some better wording within the week to come.
- o. Yakes: I believe this language is vague, which puts us at a disadvantage with lobbying and I also think this is in response to emotional responses of the student body seeing this past week. I don’t see that this represents the original language that we voted upon, and I think we should come up with better language.
- p. Sparks: A previous senator said we had time to discuss this however, in the beginning we were told we needed to get our statement out there right away. There’s a lot of confusion on where we stand and how fast we need to be working with that.
- q. Bhatoya: I think how we’re debating has changed, and that we are now defending ourselves against public opinion instead of deciding how we’re going to stop concealed carry. Also, our speculation is not the same as legislations speculation. The Republican party is going to think very differently on our opinions on ensuing safety. I would also like to say that I hate guns and would wholeheartedly oppose them, however I’m

- looking at the best strategy.
- r. Voted, Roll call: 10:19 :1 motion fails
1. Steck: I would like to make an amendment:
- s. Add “first and then expand to other buildings on campus”.
 - t. *Steck: I think this is the best of both worlds; it is our best option because it represents more of the students who have showed us that they feel underrepresented.*
 - u. Floerke: I think this allows us to lobby more efficiently. It encompasses more student’s feelings and opinions.
 - v. Brever: in the last few weeks we’ve discussed multiple times saying we don’t want to go to Madison showing all our cards. We don’t want our legislature to think that we have motives to move on past the res halls. Stating res halls is important because it is intriguing and from there we can sway them. Stating it this way shows our cards and shows that may have ulterior motives. I am in favor of including the word “first”, but not the rest.
 - w. Steck: One of the issues I’ve brought up is that we don’t to show up showing all of our cards. This is showing all our cards. This is something that the senate wanted last week, and I feel this is a bit redundant because we already are with this last clause. This will help us build a bridge between Student Association and the student body and to show we are not turning a blind eye.
 - x. Johnson: I like the ideology that we want this bit that says we want to include more than just res halls. This whole document was rescinding because the majority advocated for it. If we keep catering to the majority, then that opens the door for more, and eventually it will go too far. This is not in the correct language to pass right now.
 - y. Ames: I think that this resolves a few problems. One of which is the public relations problem as well as the feelings toward our students and their emotions. If we go down to negotiate and debate, they’re going to think we’re lobbying for just res halls. If we get that, and then ask for more, we’re going to looking like “sneaky students.” I think it would make it worse if we didn’t include this because it will make us sneaky and they won’t want to work with us in the future.
 - z. Banker: I think when legislators look at this, they are going to clearly see our intentions are for adding this, and it will make them less likely to listen us. I think we are doing this to avoid angry students rather than looking at the end results. We can’t call the angry students a majority, because they are not the majority of students who came in and talked about this. For the reason I am going to oppose this amendment.
 - aa. Purath: I move to amend amendment, by striking everything after “first”
 - i. Rudolph: I object. The part that we are crossing out would have sent a message to the students saying we are on your message we swear, and wouldn’t have offended the legislators. If we cross it out, the students won’t think we are listening.
 - ii. Gunaratnam: I believe we will be facing the same

backlash by crossing out the rest. We tried being more inclusive in another amendment, and senators still weren't satisfied. Crossing this out will still make some students unhappy and left out.

- iii. Steck: I oppose this amendment to the amendment, because this crossed out part would get us in the door after (if) we are successful within the residence halls. The green shows students we are standing by them, and gives Kaylee and other lobbyists the flexibility to work with the legislators.
 - iv. Bhatoya: Otterbacher & Schimmel, eventually the legislators are going to look at the resolution, correct?
 1. Otterbacher: It's up to them if they look at it or not, but in my experience they usually look at just the summary.
 - v. Ames: Grammatically, the next thing a senator is going to ask is then what... so this eliminates the unasked question.
 - vi. Motion fails; 16:10:1
2. Rudolph: We need to elaborate more on what "first" means and that affects our intentions so that no one is left out.
 3. Johnson: I move to amend the amendment:
 - bb. Strike out "first and then expand to" and add "with consideration of" before other, and after campus insert "as the need arises".
 - cc. Johnson: *I like the fact that we're trying to keep our options open. I just think saying first and nothing else could be interpreted as hostile language. The campus will never stop evolving, and we will have more buildings, hopefully, so this will keep options open to things we haven't even brought to the table yet.*
 - dd. Rudolph: Author, when do you think the need will arise?
 - i. Johnson: something will arise, that we probably haven't even thought of yet, however I just want to have that option.
 - ee. Rudolph: Do you think this addresses the concerns of the students in the original resolution?
 - i. Johnson: Yes and no, we will never be able to please them all. We can work with them as far as the Wisconsin senate allows us. There is a limit to what we can and can't ban without their approval.
 - ff. Steck: Just reading this, I would see that it implies there are buildings that concealed carry wouldn't be necessary, and that doesn't represent what the majority of students want or are saying. As the need arises is kind of vague. We have been given a path by students to advocate. Are we going to take a stance via what's easy or what the students have told us overwhelmingly what they want?
 - gg. Tatum: I don't agree with this amendment. At the end of the day, this doesn't represent my constituents. In a sense it says their voices are invalid, and that's not right.
 - hh. Ravidlo: I do not agree with this amendment. I think this is

wishy washy, since it says we will fight against it in residence halls, but then maybe in other buildings. This is not representative of what students have been telling us. It says we might as well not even have a stance.

- ii. Vote for amendment to the amendment: fails, 1 abstention
4. Vote on amendment to the document: 12:15, motion fails.
- b. SA1516-015: Resolution Requesting REC Use During Family Weekend
 - i. Garcia/Mans
 - ii. This would give faculty more freedom, with no revenue building.
 - iii. Voted on to pass resolution. Passed
- c. SA1516-016: Resolution Requesting Use of REC for AAU Tournament
 - i. Garcia: *They do this every year and it makes money for the rec.*
 - ii. Voted on; passes
- d. SA1516-017: Resolution Approving Student Court Nominations
 - i. Introductions from Robert, Morgan, and Miles.
 - ii. Voted on approving nominations; unanimously passed.
- e. SA1516-018: Resolution Amending Executive Cabinet Bylaws to include the Diversity Organization Coalition in the Inclusivity Coordinator Selection Process
 - i. Sparks/Gunaratnam
 - ii. Gunaratnam: So the DOC would have to be included in the executive decision, whereas before it was more so a privilege. I am in full support of this.
 - iii. Steck: I am in full support; my question is when the election n] will take place so that there is a DOC when the selections are held.
 1. Passed on; passed, 1 abstention

XIII. New Business

- a. SA1516-019: Resolution Supporting AB 430 and Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence Advocates
 - i. Garcia/Eidenschink
 - ii. Brever: *A council that would follow a victim throughout the process. This would entitle victims to allow an advocate with them in more proceedings than allowed currently. This has a lot of bipartisan support; this is more of a gesture that we are in full support of this.*
 - iii. Mason: I am excited to see this front of us right now. It's an important issue in terms of sexual assault, and its good for us once again to show our students that we support them in all aspects of their lives.
 - iv. Eidenschink: I think this aligns very well with what we're doing on campus, and I'm excited to vote yes on this next week.
- b. SA1516-020: Resolution to Limit Faculty Involvement in Organizations
 - i. Tashner/Gustafson
 - ii. Purath: *this would limit the amount of organizations a advisor can overlook. Problems with shutting down orgs due to advisor lacking would be eliminated by limiting the amount of problems aroused by lack of involvement from advisors.*
 - iii. Brever: Is there concern amongst advisors that they are overextended?
 1. Purath: Yes, we have spoken with numerous faculty members and they feel they aren't allocating enough of their time to these organizations.
 - iv. Johsnon: My only concern comes with issues that I've had with my own organization. It's hard to find faculty interested in advising over an organization, and I'm worried that this will pull faculty from orgs they do wish to oversee.
 - v. Steck: I am conflicted by this resolution. One of the main concerns I have is that students have more autonomy by choosing what they want to do for themselves. I've been on committees that are student-led that fail to meet quorum or fail to

turn things in, so it s sometimes to have an advisor who can be a person of reference for the responsibilities that can occasionally skip with the opposition of being a student.

- XIV. Discussion
- XV. Announcements
- XVI. Adjournment

STUDENT SENATE ATTENDANCE 11/04/15

						Vote #3 Final
Last	First	Roll Call	Vote #1 Rescinding	Vote #2 amendment	Roll Call #2	Rescinded Resolution
Almazrou	Yousef		Y	A		Y
Ames	Jeremy		Y	y		Y
Anderson	Allison		Y		x	
Banker	Blaine		Y	N		Y
Bennett	James		Y	N		Y
Bentdahl	Madison		Y	N		Y
Bhatoya	Aaron		Y	N		Y
Brever	Patrick		Y	N		Y
Eidenschink	Matthew		N	N		Y
Faust	Alexander		N	N		Y
Floerke	Weston		Y	N		Y
Garcia	Spenser		Y	N		Y
Gunaratnam	Alfonso		Y	Y		N
Gustafson	Allison		N	N		Y
Hackett	Kayley	x				
Hayward	Paige	x				
Hungness	Dana		Y	N		Y
Johnson	Zackariah		N	N		Y
Mason	Lauren		Y	Y		Y
Mans	Emily		N	N		Y
McAdory	Serina		Y	Y		
Nicholson	Matthew		Y	Y		Y
Purath	Anicka		N	N		Y
Quaschnick	Andrew		N	N		Y
Razidlo	Anna		Y	Y		N
Rudolph	Chris		Y	Y		Y
Schultz	Thomas		Y	N		
Sparks	Jacob		Y	N		Y
Steck	Rebecca		Y	Y		N
Tashner	Brittany		Y	N		Y
Tatum	Jasmin		Y	Y		N
Yakes	Alissa		N	N		
Yang	Gaozie Vang		Y	Y		N