



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–LA CROSSE STUDENT ASSOCIATION

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

Student Senate Agenda

Date: **October 7th, 2015**

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

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Razidlo/Tashner
- II. Pledge of Allegiance
- III. Roll Call
- IV. Consent Agenda
 - a. Approval of agenda
 - i. Strike line A of new business
 1. Brever/Hartwig
 - b. Approval of minutes
- V. Guest Speakers
 - a. WiSys Tech Foundation
 - i. Marcus Lowe & Rachel Neve, ambassadors from WiSys Tech Foundation introduce new Ambassador Program, with goals to spread the word of the program and increase intellectual property utilization.
- VI. General Student Body Open Forum
- VII. Officer Reports
 - a. President: Kaylee Otterbacher
 - i. Presenting the current budget for the Student Association: payroll, previous year's budget. Reduced from \$26,300 to \$25,700 for this year.
 1. Brever: Is there a rule that your payroll can't be more than \$6,999.99?
 - a. No, just the way it worked it.
 - ii. A reporter from UW-Oshkosh is doing a report on the payroll of schools around the state, and in comparison we make somewhat less. Considering more allocation to directors for the following year. \$7000 rolled over from the last fiscal year. Almost came under budget with almost category from last year. Left over money will hopefully go toward electronic voting system.
 1. Hartwig: Could the chair send the documents out because it is not visible?
 - a. Yes
 2. Garcia: Why are the supplies category \$400 over?
 - a. Probably because a new desk was purchased for the Vice President.
 3. Yates: What is the awards/medals category used for?
 - a. Medals and plaques purchased for seats.
 4. Yates: For advertising & notices, what kind of things are used in that budget, for example banners events that SA is involved with?
 - a. Yes, most likely, we just have to make sure it is going toward the right category & being accounted for.

5. Almazrou: Do we get audited?
 - a. No, however we do have an review process in the CFAC bylaws every 2-3 years.
- iii. The USA Today app: really cool app; be sure to download. “Brand ambassador” option to work with managers of app to work with marketing of app on campus, as well as with other campuses. “It’s on Us” planning meeting that went well. Director for Int’l Education & Engagement Office: Fred Pierce, previously coming from Provost Office.
- b. Vice President: Molly Davies
 - i. Parking structure: Victor is on our schedule to come in next week with Bob, is that still necessary? (Thumbs up/down vote: voted to not have him come) Updated committee membership: please cross your name off committee so that we can meet quorum so that we can elect chair. If you are chair, please post minutes and meetings outside office so that we are in compliance with Open-Meeting Law. Interviews this week for 3 open senate positions.
 1. Eidenschink: How many open applicant positions?
 - a. Davies: 3
 - ii. Parliamentary Procedure: we use it to the most formal extent, however last week we got stuck within the logistics. Can be much more efficient without the extreme formalities of our usage. Opinions
 1. Hartwig: I’d still like to see a Speakers’ List. Without it, members of the group were not able to get their thoughts in.
 - a. How do you feel about being able to rebuttal those thoughts, however they are so far down that they lose their thought process?
 - i. Perhaps come up with a new solution for rebuttals.
 2. Gross: Go more lax on Parli Procedure
 3. Yakes: Encourages improvement on Speakers’ List, but more relaxed on the formalities of Parliamentary procedure.
 - iii. Think about how bringing conversation back about the tabled discussion last week, that we weren’t necessarily done talking about.
 1. Tatum: I like speakers’ list, but I don’t like that it consumes so much time. If we could get it done in a timely fashion, but a lot of things can be repetitive and makes meetings much longer.
 2. Steck: I would like a general speakers’ list, however I’d like to reiterate that using this procedure is to discuss ideas and not directly attack, so I’d like that to uphold
 3. Brever: Regarding last week’s discussion, I would’ve like to talk about that. Regarding procedure, RHAC is definitely more relaxed, and the focus on attacking ideas and not people.
 4. Mason: I would like more relaxed version, but if we decide that isn’t what we want, but as a body we should decide to discuss these things without pushing them off the table. What does RHAC do that we don’t that makes it more relaxed.
 - a. Davies: Instead of going by the next speaker, rebuttal is allowed so that multiple different topics aren’t discussed as well.
 - iv. I do want to maintain that we discuss solely ideas, however Parliamentary Procedure did not allow us to discuss/attack our idea, so

that is the reason I want to readjust how we use it.

1. Almazrou: I didn't like how it was used last week. I was blocked from speaking on the idea because it was blocked and voted to move forward. I don't think it was a good idea to use ParliPro in such a negative manner.
2. Quaschnick: Objectives were able to be called, as well as objections to the rules. In Roberts' Rules it allows for immediate rebuttals if someone is specifically pinpointed.
3. Sparks: So when it comes to more relaxed policies, do they not have a speakers' list?
 - a. Davies: It depends on how many people are speaking and how confusing it becomes.
4. Sparks: I like the idea of going more relaxed, but it does hinder us. I think we should be able to decide when we want to be more relaxed and when it is necessary for the discussion.
5. Ames: More relaxed procedure: I support. I also support limitations on the number of times you are allowed to speak because conversation can become dominated by a specific few senators.
6. Quaschnick: For example, I can only do that twice
7. Garcia: Hinders new senators because they are not up on these rules. Also, if we do switch to more relaxed state, it can also always go back.
8. Bennett: A perspective from Senate that sat in this room 3 years ago: A much different atmosphere than now. There was still a Speakers' list, however much more a free-flowing discussion. People were more willing to throw in their voices for discussion, and yet we were still able to get out in a respectable amount of time. No one here should be too afraid from switching from a more relaxed Senate.
9. Johnson: If we do switch, it would be more advantageous to keep some sort of list so that we don't get off track with topics, and that officers step up with control so that we are in line with discussion.
10. Yakes: With allowing rebuttals, the nature of the body and the topics we face are heating and controversial. There could be a lot of conflict with such openness. Bennett: Were rebuttals allowed a few years ago?
 - a. Bennett: Were rebuttals allowed Kaylee?
 - i. Kaylee: It definitely became more formal last year, and more work was done 2 years ago.
 - b. Bennett: Direct rebuttals to certain comments still kept in a professional manner, however some sort of speakers' list was still allowed. Discussions did get heated over certain topics, however it all worked out
11. Yakes: In a perfect world, rebuttals wouldn't attack other people and just ideas, and perhaps tighter control would help. If discussions do go in circles due to this change, could we refocus the group?
 - a. Davies: Yes, that could work.
- v. Davies: On the 21st, we are doing a new training night because at that

point we will have 7 new senators. How about next week I bring in a proposal to change the way we do Parliamentary Procedure?

1. Eidenschink: Could we test the waters with that tonight?
 - a. Davies: Yes
 2. Bennett: Just want to put out the point that it does put more responsibility onto the Chair to keep the group on track and avoid going in circles with discussion.
 3. Quaschnick: I sat on the Senate for UWSP last year, we used a Point of Order to reinstate the rules at any point of time if anyone was going incredibly off track
 4. Steck: A senator will have an amazing idea, and then so many people get onto the list to simply agree. We should have an universal way to show that we agree.
 - a. Davies: "I agree with the previous Senator, I yield."
- c. Chief of Staff: John Becker
 - i. absent
 - d. Chief of Staff to the Vice President: Kate Laird
 - i. Nothing to report
 - e. State Affairs Coordinator: Jacob Schimmel
 - i. Perkin Loan, which provides more than \$1 billion to students, has been expired in Congress. Could possibly come back next year and be renewed in the next budget.
 - f. Local Affairs Coordinator: Brady Gross
 - i. Oktoberfest went well. Assettfest will be the Oct. 10th. Email coming soon regarding Goosetown funding.
 - g. Inclusivity Coordinator: Ayush Shrestha
- VIII. RHAC Reports
- a. Next week is Reslife Games! The week is all Harry Potter themed. Download the Buzz app. Also, Paula will also be coming to our meeting tomorrow.
- IX. Advisor Reports
- a. Paula: Want a chance to react regarding the email forwarded to students from the Drake Hall Director. He fully admits at this time that he regrets his decision to send it, and wishes he could redo his actions. Sent out an apology to his residents this weekend. Also, we've been trying to communicate to the community how we're responding as a university. I recognize that some here are more comfortable than others; I hope that we learn to take something out of this regarding professionalism. We can also learn that social media can come back in multiple ways. The media can take topics completely out of context and can harm a lot professionally. I want to give you the opportunity to voice your thoughts.
- X. Committee Reports
- a. Hartwig: SUFAC met this past Monday. We looked at cashback funds to Student Org committee.
 - b. Schimmel: ADAC met yesterday. We reviewed what budget presentations will look like when next week we present to students.
 - c. Quaschnick: 2 new bio classes passed. Allowed for teachers
 - d. Garcia: Student Services meeting yesterday but we couldn't actually meet because we didn't meet quorum. U-line asked for permission to have tournament inside Rec. We're looking at how it will affect student usage
 - e. Brever: Parking will meet tomorrow to review tickets on campus.
- XI. Organizational Reports
- a. Hartwig: I <3 Female Orgasm was last week. 250 turned up to the show and had

a very positive feedback and will be back in 2 years. From the Pride Center, we have confirmed 2 ally trainings. More locations and dates when they come about.

- b. Schimmel: The Sexual Assault Task Force met on Sunday. We bought wristbands for 2 different slogans: “The mission is permission” & “We represent consent” for \$1. Looking at “The companion app” allows you to track your movement from Point A & Point B, and notifies your friend if you weren’t able to respond for some reason. Working with the founders to get this app on campus to work with the campus police as well.
 - i. Brever: There are ways to track statistics as well, “I feel nervous”, to gather stats and areas that aren’t safe so that police can monitor it better.
 - 1. Laird: Point of clarification: Does to see if you start running?
 - a. Yes
- c. Razidlo: NASA is sponsoring an event on Monday Oct 12 at 5:30. FIERCE is having their first meeting on the 11th at 6pm in the Pride Center.
- d. Hartwig: National Coming Out Day is on a Sunday. With a picture frame to take photos to be shared however you want.
- e. Yang: Facilitating a discussion “Like, Comment, Share” looking at the intersection of social media and social justice every Tuesday 2-4:30.
- f. Gunaratnum: ASO is having an event Oct. 29th with people from Ferguson, Missouri to talk about consequences.

XII. Unfinished Business

- a. SA1516-005: Resolution Recommending use of Student Initiative Money
 - i. Hartwig/Sparks
 - ii. Almazrou: I want to know the point of view from the President and Vice President.
 - 1. Davies: I think these are all appropriate, and we haven’t heard discussion on it since. We have about 20 ideas that are not in the view from GPR funding, so this is a good summary within the GPR funding.
 - 2. Otterbacher: I want to hear more ideas before I answer.
 - iii. Gunaratnum: What will the money be used for in Murphy?
 - 1. Mason: Murphy is never guaranteed a certain amount of money every year, so they have to re-ask for more funding yearly.
 - 2. Schimmel: They’re focused on hiring new tutors for the amount of students that are coming in there, especially in Math & Chem, so the money will most likely go author.
 - 3. Garcia: Mason, how much it will cost to hire new tutors?
 - a. Not sure
 - 4. Brever: In the RHAC, there is a lot of support for this money to go to Murphy. Students have noticed that there are not enough tutors for the number of students going in for help.
 - 5. Schimmel: It averages \$941 per student, and they say they have over 110 tutors. And we are not sure if there is a specific amount allocated per department.
 - iv. Gunaratnum: Could money go toward the White Privilege Conference funding?
 - 1. Razidlo: I have received a possibly “maybe” as answer to that, however I am not sure if that falls under the guidelines.
 - 2. Davies: OMSS is funded through something that GPR funds, however we are adding it to our list to check.
 - 3. Yang: I agree with the previous senator.

4. Eidenshink: As a point of clarification, you cannot one-time fund a conference through this, correct?
 - a. Davies: It has to be continuous funding, it cannot be one-time funding for one specific event.
5. Garcia: I went and it was moving, but a lot of it is funded through ResLife as well.
6. Steck: POC: The money we are allocating, it is to be used for fees for these conferences, or is can it actually be used?
 - a. Davies: We are not sure, something we are asking Bob.
- v. Yang: For HOPE we need Keynote speakers, and it is hard to find money to bring in people to talk about social issues.
- vi. Hartwig: Motion to move to ADAC. Seconded by Bennett.
 1. Razidlo: ADAC has better chance to further research where this money could go and where it is needed. ADAC would not be as restricted by ParliPro and would be able to look through this much faster than we can. If we refer this to ADAC, we can ask them to look at specific areas.
 2. Schimmel: Chairing ADAC, we can look into it and where it could go. We can't make a decision. The money could go into a reserve, but I'd have to ask Paula.
 - a. Davies: ADAC cannot make a final decision. They will be doing the research, and it will come back to us to make a final decision.
 3. Hartwig: POC: I would like to see an informal recommendation to come back in a timely manner.
 4. Eidenschink: I'm opposed to sending it to a committee, because we have so many voices here now. I feel it would restrict the quality & quantity of ideas that we could generate idea.
 5. Steck: We have had this for a while now. We could do that, however ADAC has a busy schedule, and if we don't know when it will come back to us, we should decide here by ourselves.
 6. Yakes: Is ADAC fully filled of students or faculty as well?
 - a. Schimmel: More students than faculty, however fairly close. (6 students, 3 faculty members)
 7. Yakes: I think that we have the privilege to come up with a solution here instead of passing it off to a committee.
 8. Hartwig: Call to question.
 - a. Objected by Mason.
 9. Bennett: If we're going to table it, we should refer it to a committee. If not, we should finish it.
 10. Brever: ADAC may not have the time to review this in a week. Also, we should table this now if we want to, so that we can hear other ideas as well. I hope that we can get to a point where we can discuss ideas instead of bringing up more.
 11. Razidlo: I support a referral, in my perfect world, since ADAC has more resources, however we are looking at a longer time. I would be in favor of tabling it another week, if we have senators who take the initiative to DO it.
 12. Schimmel: ADAC will not be able to make a clear decision for another month, because they are presenting other work.
 13. Vote to move into ADAC: denied.

- vii. Mason: I believe there are many capable senators in this room with their own resources. I think if Senators want it to go somewhere, they do the research and do something about it.
 - 1. POC: Gross: How time sensitive is this?
 - a. Otterbacher: Until the last JPNB, which is end of Nov, where that could affect other budgets that late. Tabling this one more week could be ok, so that everyone could look at the ideas. If not, I urge you to consider voting instead of continuously voting
- viii. Tatum: Is it possible to write those suggestions in?
 - 1. Davies: We could vote this down and write a new resolution, or we could write the new ideas and vote, which is more timely.
- ix. Motion to table next week: Hartwig/ Steck Voted, approved.
- b. SA1516-006: Resolution Approving Student Court Nominations
 - i. Written statement by Madison Wescott: My name is Madison Wescott and I am a sophomore working towards a Political Science degree with a minor in Public Administration. My final goal is law school at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I grew up in Waunakee, WI and love the Madison area. I have a strong passion for politics and an even stronger love for the judicial process. If approved into this position, I would bring great enthusiasm and professionalism into the position, as well as many new great ideas on how this system can work at its best.
 - 1. Passed by Majority Vote.
- c. SA1516-07: Resolution Recommending the Inclusion of Shared Governance Bodies
 - i. Hartwig/Sparks
 - ii. Brever: No student voice was consulted regarding Parking because it was done in private. Student voice isn't necessarily important to writing this, however in the future should be validated that they want a voice. RHAC is sponsoring this solution, and has been accepted as a friendly amendment. There was more talk last week about making last line more specific, so please let us know; we are open to doing that.
 - 1. Resolution passes with Majority Vote approved

XIII. New Business

- a. ~~SA1516-008: Resolution to Legitimize the Sexual Violence Action Committee~~
- b. SA1516-009: Resolution Approving Fall 2015 Election Results
 - i. Garcia/Eidenschink
 - ii. One grad senator elected. Election ran in fair manor and elected with equal opportunity to vote.
 - 1. Hartwig: Do all electors meet qualifications to be Senate?
 - 2. Brever: I move to suspend 2 week rule. Seconded by Sparks.
 - a. So that those elected can immediately do their job.
 - b. Hartwig: I don't want to suspend, because they don't need to vote after they haven't already for the majority of the meeting.

- c. Gross: With the Student Initiative decision coming up, it would be important for these 3 new voices to be a part of this process.
- d. Yakes: I agree with this, and that we agreed that Roberts' Rules hindered our decision making process, and that applies now.
- e. Hartwig: Agendas are moved, we could move this to a different line.
- f. Eidenschinck: Call to question. Moved to vote, approved.

iii. Move to vote, passing initiative: Majority, Approved.

- XIV. Discussion
- XV. Announcements
- XVI. Adjournment
 - a. Gustafson/Mason

STUDENT SENATE ATTENDANCE 10/7/15

Last	First	Roll Call	Quorum #1
Almazrou	Yousef		
Ames	Jeremy		
Anderson	Allison		
Bennett	James		
Bentdahl	Madison		
Brever	Patrick		
Cruz	Stefani		
Eidenschink	Matthew		
Faust	Alexander		
Garcia	Spenser		
Gunaratnam	Alfonso		
Gustafson (gustifsin)	Allison		
Hackett	Kayley		
Hartwig	Timothy		
Hayward	Paige	x	x
Johnson	Zackariah		
Jurecki	Haley		
Mason	Lauren		
Mans	Emily		
Nicholson	Matthew	x	x
Purath	Anicka		
Razidlo	Anna		
Sparks	Jacob		
Steck	Rebecca		
Tashner	Brittany		
Tatum	Jasmin	x	
Yakes	Alissa		
Yang	Gaozie Vang		
Banker	Blaine		
Bhatoya	Aaron		
Quaschink	Andrew		