Student Senate Agenda
Date: April 28th, 2010
Time and Location: 6:00 PM; Port O’ Call; Cartwright Center

I. Call to Order
   a. 6:00 PM

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Roll Call

IV. Approval of Agenda
   a. Cloud/Heying
      i. Approved.

V. Approval of Minutes
   a. Kedrowski/Verhoeven
      i. Approved.

VI. Guest Speakers
   a. Rourke Decker and Katie Fanning, Germany Research Project
      i. A Tale of Two Campuses, are students at Goethe University more passionate than students at UWL? Is education a human right that everyone is entitled to? Or is it a commodity to be sold on the market. We have become accustomed to yearly raises in tuition and fees. In Germany is viewed as a human right, something everyone is entitled to. If you have to pay for it that means you are denying people who can’t afford it a human right. In 2006 Germany authorized to charge tuition and fees. There was an uproar. They don’t have the same financial aid system so students had to work. The protests numbered in thousands of students. Some states rescinded the fees. Hessen and Wisconsin have a close relationship. We were very familiar with how they do business and we wanted to have a closer working relationship. Fred and Bjorn forged an agreement with the student association at Goethe. Nothing actually happened in terms of working together. Derek Kockler had the idea of sending a delegation over there to try to strengthen the relationship. Obtained funding through OIE to send two students to Germany on a research project and hopefully bring back information. We don’t have that united collected voice that we thought they have in Germany. We tend to work more behind the scenes in small groups. We were hoping to study their methodologies and help UWLSA improve student mobilization and engagement.
      ii. Methodology: passed out surveys in high traffic areas on all four GU campuses. Performed personal interviews in German.
iii. Survey Responses: most students said that they would protest fees, but that their student government doesn’t represent students will.

iv. Personal Observations: one thing that we thought was very different was that they had absolutely no formal structure. They didn’t take role or have any formal motions. There was no voting. A lot of dispute and arguing. Literally 5 people smoking and drinking in a circle. AStA viewed as a fringe group, appealing primarily to leftist and non-career oriented students. A lot of students don’t believe that the protests are getting anywhere. Not a vehicle for mobilizing student interests. The strikes became a nucleus for every disgruntled group out there. As a result there was a lot of graffiti and unrest. Some students thought the vandals were setting them back. AStA did not control the protests to run them peacefully.

v. Conclusions: AStA’s approval was about 10%. Over all most of the students are not all that passionate about protesting. The business and political students are afraid of getting kicked out of their programs. AStA does not play a key role in motivating students. Most of them have never heard of what the aims of the organization. They think they are harming student interests in the long run. There is not much for UWLSA to learn from them at this time. Mass protests were inflated from the nationwide involvement.

vi. Recommendations: we went during our J-term which was not convenient for them. We recommend doing this in May before they get panicked about their final exams. We need to involve administration at both universities in logistical arrangements. We had to no logging. We need to be able to take a more random and representative sample. We have a non representative sample. I think the best way to do this project would be to allow students to stay there for the entire semester. It would allow students to see how the university works and to observe AStA’s process over the course of entire semester. I think we should embed students who can speak German so that they can learn the ins and outs of the process.

vii. Further Plans: repeat experiment on GU campuses with improved methodologies. Expand project to other German universities. The biggest flaw is that we don’t have a comparative experiment on UWL campus. We need to create more ongoing lines of communication.

viii. Questions:
   1. Did you share these findings with them?
      a. Not yet. We are trying to find a tactful way to do it.
   2. Were you disappointed at all? Do you feel the trip was a success?
      a. Our hypothesis was wrong. We didn’t know what to expect. It was an awesome experience.
      b. It was humbling for me. My main disillusion was finding out that there was a lack of vision with the students there. Overall it was an amazing experience.
3. Do you think we have a lot to learn from them?
   a. Until we have the comparison from a UWL experiment, we don’t know.
   b. At this time they are a very disorganized group, so I don’t know how productive it would be. It is possible that other universities would be willing to work with us.

b. Tyler Burkart, Biographies on Online Ballots
   i. We had 4 different questions that we thought were appropriate:
      1. What are your past experiences?
      2. What inspired you to run?
      3. What are your future goals?
      4. How will you represent your constituents?
   ii. Each question allows a 40 word response. The nice thing is we keep the questionnaire separate from the names. There is no way you can go back and forth in between them. We keep the information and “campaigning” separate from the actual vote.
   iii. Questions
      1. Will it say on the page how many people they can vote for? So that the voter can write down who they want?
         a. That is a minor change so we can do that.
      2. We will have these bios available with the sample ballot a week before.

VII. Officer Reports
   a. President
      i. Received an email from System they are looking for student’s interested serving on committees. Talk to Karly or I by next weeks meeting if interested.
      ii. BOD met last night and talked about a presentation for next week. Karly and I are headed to Superior to meet with all the System reps.
   b. Vice-President
      i. If you want to apply remember the applications for next year are due on Friday by 9:00 PM
   c. Chief Financial Officer
   d. Legislative Issues Director
      i. We had our legislative event today. Kapanke cancelled yesterday afternoon. We only had a single Leggie, Mike Huepsch. We talked about a wide array of things. He said if he could have killed the green jobs any harder he would have.
   e. Others
      i. City Affairs
         1. 5:30 volleyball. Meet in the SA office.
         2. Last MTU board meeting this Monday. Change to bus route 4.
         3. WTC is still on the fence with the campus circulator. They will contact us over the summer. If you are a returning senator keep your ears open for that.
      ii. Gender Issues
1. The Drag Show was awesome. Earned up to $1,200 in tips.
2. MUASA campaign.
3. Aging and Health Sexuality Sexpo.
4. This is my last meeting. Remember gender issues are important and one director can’t make a difference alone. It takes all of us to make a change in our personal lives.

iii. Social Justice
1. There was a proposal sent to RHAC and a lot of people are misinformed. I encourage you to talk to the author of that proposal. It deals with the diversity orgs and res life.
2. The Multicultural Student Services is hiring a director. Tomorrow in the diversity center at 3:15 you can meet one of the individuals who is going for this position. May 15th another candidate will be there.

iv. Environmental Sustainability
1. Have a good discussion on the Green Fund tonight. A lot of people put a lot of time into it
2. Open forum tomorrow at noon on the parking ramp.

v. PR
1. Look at the website and fan page this week. This one question is going to be worth $15.
2. We are at 999 people. I think it is unfair, so you can expect something next week.
3. Thanks to everyone who came to art show this weekend.

VIII. RHAC Report
a. If you want to help with the proposal get involved with it. The proposal is to get each res hall paired with a diversity org.
b. Groundbreaking.

IX. Advisor Reports
a. Fill out the assessment.

X. Committee Reports
a. Student Court
   i. Hearings on Friday.
b. CAPS
   i. Met for the last time and suggested faculty senate amend the course repeat policy so that anyone who is repeating a course be placed at a later date so that others that are not repeating the course can get into it.

XI. Consent Agenda

XII. Unfinished Business

XIII. New Business
a. SA0910-068: UW-L Student Senate Bylaws
   i. Knutson/Boll
   ii. Discussion
      1. In article 5 it doesn’t say anything about the consent agenda.
         a. It was added, this is just a different version of the document, I will add it right now.

Senate 2009-2010
2. Call to question
   a. Approved by majority.
   b. SA0910-073: Resolution Changing the Bylaws of the UW-L Student
      Association Elections to Establish Biographies on Online Ballots for Student
      Association Candidates
      i. Brown/Kedrowski
         1. We included Section 4.43 Biographies. If there is any
            recommendation let us know.
      ii. Discussion
         1. Does it say how or when to submit the biographies?
            a. It says they will be on the application.
         2. I like this idea. I just think that “what inspired you to run for
            this position” and “what are your future goals” the answers will
            be too similar.
         3. Move to amend to include “will be placed on a separate
            webpage linked to…”
            a. Cloud/Verhoeven
               i. I like the idea of having it on the ballot. I am not
                  in favor of changing it.
               ii. A part of why we wrote this is because we
                   wanted to have the resource to educate the
                   voters. By completely removing it from the
                   ballot, it would be less likely for people to
                   educate themselves and defeats the purpose of
                   what we were trying to go for.
               iii. I think the way it was set up before is the best
                   way to go about it. Once someone is at the
                   website they aren’t going to leave it. If we have
                   a separate website people aren’t going to go to
                   it.
               iv. As a political science major, I feel like this is
                   campaigning. At a state level if this was
                   provided I think it would be considered
                   campaigning. The education should be outside
                   of the process and not in it.
               v. Having a link to another website, I don’t think
                  that would help.
               vi. I have expressed in the past my frustrations with
                   this process and I do believe the way they had it
                   set up is probably a lot better. I think if we gave
                   this a separate webpage, that seems more shady.
               vii. I think the way it is set up is the best way to
                   educate voters.
               viii. The way this was reminds me of the way the
                   referendum was set up and I think that was the
                   best system
ix. Call to question
   1. Failed.

4. Move to amend the first question to “what are your past experiences in leadership roles?”
   a. Lauderdale/Talhouarne
   b. I don’t think it should be too specific. I like it the way it was.
   c. I think that is too specific.
   d. Motion to amend it to say “what are your past experiences relevant to the position you are running for?”
      i. Grabanski/Urbas
         1. I think this way more specific than it was. I don’t really like this. I would suggest voting this down.
         2. I don’t like this either. This would limit people who are not experienced in SA.
         3. I personally feel that if someone is running for any leadership position, they will answer the question seriously. I think keeping it specific is good but we are looking at it too much.
         4. We are getting too into detail. We only have 40 words that we can write, so if you are trying to say how something is relevant to this position, good luck trying to fit it in.
      5. Call to question
         a. Failed

ii. Call to question
   1. Failed.

5. I think it should be sent in as an email instead of sending it in with the nomination papers.

6. Motion to strike to fourth question
   a. Verhoeven/Kedrowski
      i. I think if there is too much information students won’t read it.
      ii. I like the question. I think it challenges them. People don’t have to read everything. If it is important to them they will read that column. It is not obligatory to read everything.
      iii. I think this is the number one priority as a senator. If people are concerned about too much reading, they can skip over it.
      iv. I don’t mean it is too much reading, it’s just that I think more people will read it if it is shorter.
v. I agree that I don’t want this to be too long. I would be interested in merging questions two and three. I do see the value in this question.

vi. Call to question

1. Division

   a. Fails 15:16:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>Motion to strike 4th question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>RU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boll</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>SAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>BSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaway</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>NASA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>LASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>At-Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabanski</td>
<td>Kaitie</td>
<td>SAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haase</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>CBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmer</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>SAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her</td>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>ASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heying</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>RHAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedrowski</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koplin</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>SOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieder</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>At-Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodahl</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>CLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattson</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>SAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>RHAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nell</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>SAPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>CBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popp</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>RASO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radke</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>A/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schauer</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>A/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>CBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talhouarne</td>
<td>Gaelle</td>
<td>ISO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbas</td>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>CLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhoeven</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>SAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wermedal</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Move to amend question three to say “what are your plans for the position?”
   a. Bennett/no second
      i. Failed
8. Motion to strike question 3
   a. Talhouarne/Her
      i. It was previously said that two and three were similar.
      ii. I think this question is extremely important. You could be inspired from anything. I think they are completely different questions.
      iii. I think it is important to know what those future goals are.
      iv. Call to question
         1. Failed
9. Call to question
   a. Objection
10. I would like to know the author’s opinion if we should have these submitted online so that it doesn’t have to be retyped?
   a. I don’t see any problem with submitting it.
   b. It sounds you will need to make other deadlines then too.
11. Call to question
   a. Approved, one nay.
   c. SA0910-075: Resolution Approving Spring 2010 Green Fund Requests
      i. Zwieg/Cruz
         1. As far as the feedback on the survey, 70 out of 92 liked the showers and wanted them to be replaced. The average shower length is 10 minutes. The costs savings would be $147,000 in an academic year.
      ii. Discussion
         1. Where was the composting going to take place?
            a. The new facilities would be at Hillview Greenhouse.
         2. When would they be implemented?
            a. Over the summer
         3. Does this mean tuition will go down?
            a. We are hoping the program directors would put the cost savings towards other programs.
4. I think this is all great. The kids from the day care can go on a field trip to the composting. Call to question
   a. Objection
5. Explain the REC lights
   a. Savings of $19,000 a year so over 4 years they would pay for themselves. Sue White says she will convert the rest of the lights with those savings.
6. All of these proposals really embody the objectives of the green fund. It is pretty exciting.
7. Call to question
   a. Approved by majority.

XIV. Discussion
   a. SA0910-076: Resolution Amending Campaign Period
      i. Zwieg/Cruz
      ii. Discussion
         1. I don’t feel comfortable discussing this when I don’t know the author’s motive.
         2. What does this actually change?
            a. The current campaign period is three weeks, this changes it to two.
         3. There is no actual explanation or justification. I would like to have the author present for discussion. I don’t agree with shortening the campaign period. If you are going to run a successful and ambitious campaign you want that amount of time.
         4. I don’t see the differences between 3 weeks and two weeks.
         5. Motion to close discussion
            a. Cloud/Talhouarne
               i. Failed.
         6. I think it is self explanatory. I think shortening is because he feels it unnecessary to have a three week period. The reason the three weeks is utilized is because we feel we have to utilize it.
         7. Schmidt and I both got sick during the campaign period from being so stressed. I think that is why he wants to shorten it.
         8. I think three weeks is too long. I think your grades suffer, you get sick, you aren’t healthy. It is very tough on the candidates. I think you can still educate the campus in two weeks.
        10. I think shortening the campaign period might affect voter turn out.
        11. Motion to exhaust the speakers list
            a. Bradley/Knutson
               i. Speakers list exhausted.
        12. Why is the time for campaigning for VP and Presidential three weeks instead of two in the first place? That would help me make a decision.
13. We were just looking at the bios in the election commission
b. SA0910-078: Resolution Reforming the Use of Slates
   i. Knutson/Cruz
   ii. Discussion
      1. I think slates help people run a successful campaign. I don’t like this resolution at all.
      2. I also disagree with this resolution. With the slate system I think it encourages people to get involved that might not get involved otherwise. When I was a freshman Kyle Obrien asked me to run on his slate and that is how I got involved. I think slates are great and it gives the opportunity for team work. Even if there were no slates, you could still have a group of people who support you.
      3. I think there are going to be a lot of conversations outside of senate about this. I have never been on a slate but I can say the confusion it would cause someone. I think that president or VP could unknowingly or knowingly put a less qualified candidate on their slate.
      4. Slates discourage people form running if they are not on a slate because they are immediately at a disadvantage.
      5. I think this is out of our power to say that senate disapproves slates. It is not an unfair advantage. It is a lot of help to the candidates.
      6. I feel that slates are limiting and prevent people from running. Less people are willing to run if they are not on the slate. There is no reason why as senate as a whole we cant go shoulder tap good people out there and encourage them to run. Slates limit the diversity in senate.
      7. I hate to see things become name games. That is what sometimes happens with this.
      8. There may be good ideas behind this but there are problems with it as well. What does the word association mean? Does that mean we can’t wear the shirts? How will the election commission monitor that? I disapprove of this; it causes more problems than fixes things.
      9. As someone who didn’t run on a slate, it seemed like a disadvantage to be on a slate. I don’t see a problem with slates and associating with people. Even if this were to pass, name games would still be out there. People can still support certain individuals. I think the biographies for the ballot will prevent an entire slate with identical views from getting on senate. I definitely saw advantages and disadvantages and I feel that should be an option for people. I feel joining people with similar views is ok.
     10. I think the advantage comes from collaboration and motivated from one another. A number of people that weren’t on a slate
this year got elected. I feel the word associate is absurd. It makes it sound like candidates running cannot speak.

11. I feel there are advantages and disadvantages. I would like to see us talk about whether or not the senate body should have the power to tell candidates what to do.

12. If candidates want to work together as a team, that is awesome.

13. When we are voting, people don’t see who is on a slate or not. I don’t think most students pay attention to the slate; it is the individual names that they recognize.

14. motion to close discussion
   a. Haase/Her

b. SA0910-079: Resolution Modifying the Requirements for the Academic Initiative/Global Link Scholarship for International Students
   i. Cloud/Her
      1. The money for the scholarship comes from Academic Initiatives. There are rules to get the scholarship. I never found the official rules. The paper that is attached is what Sasake heard is the way it is supposed to be. I made changes to increase the GPA and increase the number of Global Link points from 2 to 4 so that we can increase awareness of different cultures. The money is not increasing as much as the students so by making it a little harder to get the scholarship we can have more to give to the students.
   ii. Discussion
      1. Internationalization is important. The idea of requiring more outreach is a great idea.
      2. Have you talked to many international students about this? Unfortunately, this document is very specific and complicated. I did talk to some students, most agreed with the ideas in this document. I talked to the members present at ISO. Is it just one scholarship? The AI money is split among many international students. This will make it more competitive. Since the GPA requirements are changed, what qualifies people besides GPA? ESL students do not qualify for this scholarship. People have to have passed the English requirements.
      3. Maybe we could find another way to have another scholarship.
      4. We don’t want the students to be there just for one hour for one point. Maybe if I changed it to four Global Link points, would that make sense?
         a. Yes and a list of activities. Maybe one more guideline.
      5. There are some issues in the wording, we will be going over those and clarifying it more. I think the intent of the points of having it at 4, it won’t be just one event, they would have to be involved in more events.
6. Are there any other scholarships for ESL or international students?
   a. They can apply for regular scholarships, but if they do then they can`t receive this scholarship.
      i. I don`t like to see the GPA go up.
   b. Motion to close
      i. Bennett/Kedrowski\  
         1. Closed.

XV. Closed Session
XVI. Announcements
XVII. Adjournment
We will move into closed session to consider compensation of any public employee, as permitted by s. 19.85(1)(c), Wis. Stats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>ROLE CALL</th>
<th>ROLE CALL 2</th>
<th>ROLE CALL 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boll</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaway</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>LASO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>At-Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabanski</td>
<td>Kaitie</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haase</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmer</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her</td>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>ASO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heying</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>RHAC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedrowski</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koplin</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieder</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>At-Large</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodahl</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattson</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>RHAC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nell</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>SAPA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popp</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>RASO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radke</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nickname</th>
<th>A/C</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schauer</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talhouarne</td>
<td>Gaelle</td>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbas</td>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhoeven</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wermedal</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahn</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwieg</td>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Present:** 28, 31, 30
- **Total Members:** 36, 36, 36
- **Percent:** 77.78%, 86.11%, 83.33%