Student Senate Agenda
Date: May 5th, 2010
Time and Location: 6:00 PM; Port O’ Call; Cartwright Center

I. Call to Order
II. Pledge of Allegiance
III. Roll Call
IV. Approval of Agenda
   a. Zweig/Zahn
      i. I thought it was supposed to be closed session?
         1. The state statute doesn’t say it has to be.
      ii. Motion to move 076, 077, and 078 to the end of new business just
          because the author would like to be here
         1. Schauer
            a. Approved.
      iii. Agenda approved.
V. Approval of Minutes
   a. Cloud/Urbas
      i. Schauer was not present during the first roll call.
         1. Passed
VI. Guest Speakers
   a. Bob Hetzel and Scott Rohde, Parking Ramp
      i. All of you have done a great job this year. I want to commend all of
         you for your great work and leadership. I do a better job when you
         hold me accountable. Chief Rohde and I are going to run through a
         quick presentation.
      ii. Parking spaces just over 2,230. We issued 2,975 permits. Visitor
          permits issued was 7,545. We did have a parking study in 2000
          completed in 2001. The study indicated a deficit of 411 spaces.
      iii. The data is telling us we are short about 400. Then we grow our
           enrollment by 560 people. Most of you have seen the master plan.
           Since we developed it in 2005 the first thing that happened was the
           new sports complex. The next thing, Baird and Trowbridge. The new
           academic building. Then the new res hall. Those are the capital
           projects occurring right now. The master plan said we would need a
           parking plan. It also tells us that Cowley will need to be replaced. It
           was built in 1965. We need to do something about it. When that
           happens we are going to loose almost 200 spaces. If we ever do
           something with the student union, it will land in the Wimberly lot.
iv. The gravel lots are considered temporary lots. The lot has a biofiltration basin. We have moped and bicycle parking. The police building would be in there. This is the most safe, efficient flow pattern. We are looking at 3 levels. Elevator access would be put in. there is green space. We think it would be as efficiently built as possible.

v. We have done a lot of work on the financial modeling. We think we can take advantage of the current competitive market. We think the rates would go up to $288 for commuters and $388 for res halls. That ramp is only going to provide 600 parking spots. The ramp fills one void. We are counting on alternative transportation as part of the solution to our parking problem at UWL.

vi. Questions

1. Was there anticipation for this ramp in the last few years?
   a. We started gradually increasing rates a few years ago.

2. Is there anything to address the bike parking deficit on campus? There is a lack of bike parking outside of Wimberly.
   a. Centennial will have a lot of parking for bikes. We really need to see what is going to happen with that. Anything we put on campus today is going to be impacted by Centennial and the new res halls. We are going to have our landscape people do surveys to see where our crowded areas are.

3. Could you expand your thoughts on the circulator?
   a. It is conceptually good but has a price tag that is difficult to manage. If the collaboration works out I think that is great.

4. Would you say right idea but wrong timing?
   a. It is the right idea; we have to look at the timing.

5. Will the streets surrounding the parking ramp, will they still have on street parking?
   a. Right now those are not UWL streets. We have been in discussion with the city because we want them to give us those streets. We are going to ask them to vacate those streets so that we can park some cars out there and maybe get some green space.

6. What are your next steps with these plans and what student involvement are you asking for?
   a. We are in the process of submitting our 6 year plan. We will be submitting the ramp as our capital project priority. We could move into design process in spring 2011. When we go into the design process we will have a steering committee that will include students, probably 2.

7. How are the meter spots going to be covered in the parking ramp?
a. Some people use meters exclusively. We would probably move into a pay station type mode. You would be able to use your credit card. Some of the parking in the ramp will be dedicated to the transitional parkers.

8. Will this be comparable to how they are right now?
   a. Right now we are not looking at a rate increase.

9. Do you know the square footage for the police building?
   a. 6,700 square feet at $2mil
      i. That seems high for a building that size.
         1. Its $200 a square foot plus the soft cost.
      ii. Would there be room to expand in the future?
         1. It would take alternative parking spaces away primarily for 2 wheel transportation. We want to do things right the first time. Too many times these types of buildings are obsolete in 2 years in terms of space. We want to make sure we can use this for a long time.

10. When do you see ground breaking taking place?
    a. Ideally fall 2011.

11. Are there any plans to make up for the parking spots lost during the construction?
    a. If we can get those streets that we talked about we can get those spots there. We are looking at greater use of some of the remote parking. That year we are going to ask people to put up with some inconvenience but it would be worth it.

12. Are these prices similar to Oshkosh?
    a. Yes, they are just under $300. It is reasonable and affordable. Some people might not want to get a permit, but there are not a lot of options. If we can bring the rate down, we are going to.

13. I understand the need to charge on those streets, but once that year of transition is done I think they should be free parking.
    a. That is to be determined. I would be lying to say we can make that kind of promise. We have to keep in mind the need for flow control. By parking vehicles there it might impact the safety factor. That would be to be determined.

14. Will this have an effect on parking in commuter lots at night?
    Right now you can park on commuter lots after 7pm.
    a. That has gone fairly well, so I don’t anticipate that is going to change.

b. Brad Konkel, Student Court

Senate 2009-2010
i. We deemed section 4.8 as unconstitutional. What was in question was relating to some CLS candidates for senate next year. The election commission admitted that they found them in violation of res hall campaign policy. We agreed there was not a fair and just election. Our proposal is to seat Madison and Brock as CLS senators for next year and hold an appointment process for those CLS seats. We want the appeals process to be clarified. We are expecting an appeal to Chancellor Gow.

ii. Questions

1. If senate would like to they could divide the question to seat Brock and Madison because their seats are not in question.
   a. Can we do that?
      i. You should be able. We were waiting to find out the results. The election commission and student court did not have issue with the election of Brock and Madison.

2. For the appointment process, will it be open to the entire school of CLS?
   a. Yes, anyone within CLS can apply. We are not having restrictions based on people who ran before.
      i. Why doesn’t it go to the people that received the next highest amount of votes?
         1. We determined the conduct of the two senator elects in question affected the election. So we don’t know if it affected votes for other people. We didn’t feel it would be fair for the people who didn’t get it. We did rule that the senator elects in question could reapply.

3. The student court didn’t feel it was out of order that the complaint wasn’t filed until after elections took place?
   a. You have 7 days to appeal. The dilemma we had was that the plaintiff was never notified by the commission.

4. If you found those sections unconstitutional why did you use them?
   a. 4.8 and 4.9 did not come into effect for our ruling.

5. Did you set any sort of timeline?
   a. No we did not.

6. I don’t see how you can say that some votes are valid and others won’t. If they affected voters with their actions then they affected those that made it into office and those that didn’t.
   a. We were along the lines of where would the 300 votes that were accumulated go? They could go to the bottom two or the others. Enough votes were accumulated for the top two people. We felt this was the best way to approach it. Throwing out the entire election didn’t
seem like the ethical thing to do. It was our hope that the senate would take care of the appointments on a more timely basis.

7. Why did the justices feel the process followed was not fair?
   a. The appeal was going directly to the election commission and the appeal process should not go back to the same body. It should have gone up to the student court.

8. Is there a timeline for the Chancellor’s decision?
   a. There is not timeline in the bylaws. The chancellor might delegate that to Paula for an investigation. I would expect it to be back before the end of next week.

9. Was the complaint filed against student court?
   a. The complaint was filed against the election commission.

10. The election commission thought it was above us since there were no witnesses but we thought the election should go on since there was no evidence that anything went on.
    a. The testimony we received was that the commission found them to be in violation of the res hall policy. Being so close to the election, many people felt that the commission should have taken stronger action instead of written warning. The election commission did not insure a fair election. While this may seem like a more harsh reprimand, by the time it came to us we had limited options in terms of what we can do.

11. What were they in violation of?
    a. Campaigning out of the appropriate hours.

12. What is the difference between campaigning and free speech?
    a. We weren’t evaluating whether or not they were slandering people.
    b. We felt that they violated campaign policy. We also felt their conduct was unbecoming of a student elect senator. That is stated in the bylaws.
       i. In the senate by laws the behavior refers to senators.

13. To be clear, behavior after the elections ruling was not our case. It was primarily whether not it was a fair election. We felt it was not. The reason for that was that there was clear admission through election commission that they were in violation.

14. Don’t you think they should have had an opportunity to talk?
    a. Absolutely I think they should have been called as witnesses by the election commission.
15. I feel with this situation that there is a lot of contradictory thoughts. I worry that it will get biased. I think we should reopen these seats.

16. I think in the future the student court should be a lot clearer. This left Klima and Brenzel without a voice.

17. I think everyone on court agreed that we didn’t want to be up there, but that was how the by laws were set forth. It was a trickle down effect. That is why we had to go through that process.

18. During the elections the election commission received a lot of things that were against what were in the bylaws. We thought it was not important so we let it go. And those were ok. But yet this is the same situation, but now we are punishing them. This is no different that the other things that we let go. We are teetering on this hazy line on what’s fair and what’s not fair. This is not going the way that I think that it should.

19. I feel like the court justices are like the supreme court. You are just on the fence saying that you don’t have an opinion. There is not a clear cut.
   a. Our sole goal was that we thought that their conduct merited harsher punishment. We didn’t feel that they shouldn’t just be given their positions, but we didn’t feel that they should completely be dismissed. We didn’t feel a re-election would be fair either. We felt senate could make a decision on the last two seats.
      i. If that’s the route that you are going, then you should have just let them have their seats from the beginning.
         1. That’s we went with the appointment process. To speak to behavior after election commission results, that is something that you can all determine. But the clear cut answer is that we found that in our opinion it was not the most fair election that it could have been. We don’t think election commission did everything in its power to ensure a fair election.

20. We are not mandating that you go through an appointment process, that is our opinion.

   c. Kat Klina
      i. We went to the election commission and received the decision via email. We had no idea the investigation was going on. We didn’t find out about this until last Wednesday. We had the case this past Sunday. Our voice was not heard in any of this. The student court disqualified us from our seats without hearing from us. I felt an acceptable ruling
was for the court to say they would rehear the election commission’s case. I am unsure how they came to the conclusion with only one side of the story. We are asking to be seated tonight due to the inconsistencies in the student court processes. The process is flawed. We are here right now and we are ready to work.

ii. Questions

1. Where you present at the election commission decision?
   a. They sent us a warning via email.

2. I believe the whole case was not transparent and we were blind side. We were not included in this decision.

3. Have you filed an appeal with the chancellor?
   a. We are in discussion as to the exact process.

4. Do you think the appeal process is just?
   a. I don’t feel it is just. There are some apparent contradictions. Both sides don’t present their case to the student court. If that were the case I feel that it would have been a different ruling. Yes, there were inconsistencies, there were things that happened later that were brought into the hearing. They didn’t comment on the original act, they commented on things that happened after. I was assured that those things would not be heard, but the court chose to keep that information in the case. It was wrong for them to guarantee that that information would be thrown out if that wasn’t the case.

5. Do you feel that you did anything wrong? Do you feel the letter was just?
   a. I feel the letter was just. We were sitting in the lobby discussing among our friends things that were going on.

6. If you are seated do you see it affecting you in a negative way?
   a. Yes I do. I am worried that we are going to look bad in front of the entire senate. The reason I ran for senate was because I want to make a difference on campus. I feel like this is painting me as a bad person. I want to make changes and I want to have a say for the students who voted for me.
   b. It’s really a sad situation. I really hope that we do get seated so you get a chance to know us and not just see us as a people who got convicted.

7. Do you feel that you will be able to serve to your full potential?
   a. Yes, and I would like to be given the chance to.

8. Did you both attend the meeting before you started campaigning as candidates for senate in which all the policies are gone over?
   a. No I had to work so I met with Matt Landi the next day where he discussed this with me on a personal basis.
9. Did you go over the residence hall solicitation guidelines?
   a. Yes we did. I was aware that there were res hall guidelines. It was difficult for the election commission to draw the line between what is campaigning and what discussing things at home.

10. When you were in the lobby, I am interested in what was happening and what was being said?
    a. This took place in a discussion we were having with him about the election.

11. Do you feel you were in violation?
    a. It is very tricky. I don’t feel that we were in violation because what was going on was a conversation with a resident at home. In order to be campaigning you have to have a specific intent. We didn’t have the intent to campaign or sway anyone.

12. If you had heard someone say the same things about you, would you feel that it would sway the opinions of other people. Any time you talk about someone it does influence how someone might vote. Would you consider that a violation.
    a. I think it is appropriate because there were a number of things that I called Matt Landi about that were done by other candidates.
    b. I think the strongly worded letter would have been fine. There were other violations that deserved a letter. But I don’t think we deserve to be removed.

   d. Representative Shilling, Jenn O’Neill, President Kahl, Vice President Wallace
      i. Last year we started a tradition to award an individual with the Higher Education Advocate of the Year. This year we would like to present Shilling with the award. The reason we did this is because of the wonderful things she has done for our campus. She has been a constant advocate, active on the campus, constantly on this campus coming to open forums and classes.
      ii. The commission you served on helped us get the new academic building. Jen was a huge advocate for us during the budget sweep.
      iii. This is a complete shock and honor. I am literally off the road from Madison. I am completely blown away by the things that come from this campus. It is real life applications that will have profound impact on research and science. The view from the bluff is global. I think about how this campus has changed. The landscape has changed a lot. There is a synergy to be part of UWL. I cant say enough about the great students that contribute so much to our community. The faculty and staff really put a value on education here. I love to serve this community and I am honored to represent La Crosse in the state assembly. Thank you very much for this honor!

VII. Officer Reports
    a. President
i. Exec committee met last night.
b. Vice-President
c. Chief Financial Officer
d. Legislative Issues Director
e. Others
   i. Social Justice
      1. Knutson, Radke, and Hemmer are all going to the Pearl. Let me
         know when you want to do that.
      2. This summer they are doing a lot of hires and search and
         screen. Students need to be proactive and make the university
         listen to us.
      3. It has been nice being your social justice director. Thank you
         all
   ii. Environmental
      1. Working on bringing farmers market to campus.
      2. Thank you all for a great year.
   iii. Public Relations
      1. Thank you for a great year.
      2. Facebook fan page treats are full size candy bars.
   iv. Leg Issues
      1. It has been a pleasure working with you all.
   v. Local Affairs
      1. Thanks for a great year.

VIII. RHAC Report
   a. Exec positions open for next year. Applications due by the 14th at noon.
      Thanks for putting up with our reports.
   
IX. Advisor Reports
   a. It has been a pleasure working with you this year. We have had challenges.
      What you do here really represents you as individuals. I hope you learned
      something. You are student representatives but you are also students.
   b. Thank you for a good year.

X. Committee Reports
   a. SAH Senators
      i. Sign by the Clocktower on opinions on Cowley Hall
   b. We have had a couple of student services coordinator search and screens.

XI. Consent Agenda
   Urbas/Her
   i. I would like to remove 080.
      1. Agenda approved.
   a. SA0910-079: Resolution Modifying the Requirements for the Academic
      Initiative/Global Link Scholarship for International Students
   b. SA0910-081: Resolution Acknowledging and Recognizing Paul Moran
   c. SA0910-083: Resolution Requesting Student Presence on Capital Projects
   d. SA0910-084: Resolution Expressing Gratitude for Student Regent Kevin
      Opgenorth Term of Service
   e. Approval of Academic Initiative Stipend Committee By-Laws

Senate 2009-2010
f. Approval of Student Organizations Committee By-Laws

g. Approval of Cultural Affairs Committee By-laws

XII. Unfinished Business

XIII. New Business

a. SA0910-080: Resolution Approving REC Expansion of Outdoor Connections
i. Kedrowski/Brown
ii. Discussion
1. if anyone is concerned about the large benches, they will try to reuse them as much as possible.
2. Have they ever though about expanding the weight room?
   a. We didn’t discuss that.
3. Call to question
   a. Approved, one abstention

b. SA0910-082: Resolution Amending President and Vice-President Salary Section in UWLSA Board of Director By-Laws
i. Brown/Kedrowski
   1. I put this in there as a safe guard and not put any more president’s and vice president elects in that position.
ii. Discussion
   1. What does the remaining board of directors mean?
      a. The president and vice president is part of the board of directors.
         i. In this situation Missy is part of the board and is the vice president elect.
            1. I tried to keep everything to the same standard.
   2. This is taking the opportunity from senate to decide this on their own. Senate now can’t discuss it. The checks and balances doesn’t work. There is a conflict now between this and the bylaws. I think this needs to be defined more.
      a. It is ok that they are conflicting; this would need to be amended.
         i. I would like it to remain up to the senate body.
   3. move to make an amendment to alter the therefore be it resolved to strike “board of directors”
      a. Schauer/Dill
      b. Since this is budgetary is it implied that it is a closed session?
         i. According to state statute it is up to the discretion of the chair.
            1. I suggest that a closed meeting be included.
               a. The open meeting law exists so that there is a clear and open meeting with people.
b. If you look at the closed
document, it doesn’t have to be
in the bylaws to close it. You can
close it yourself.
c. Isn’t this why we have the abstention law? This is why
people are supposed to abstain to avoid conflict of
interest.
   i. We can’t require someone to abstain.
d. We would be doing this in the fall so there wouldn’t be
conflict of interest with the future president and vice
president
e. I think the senate body should be able to decide these.
We could never bring any of these ideas to the table.
f. I would not approve this because I think it is important
to have the BOD to be a part of the decision making. It
is still going to come to senate too.
g. With the way it is written now the BOD could still
bring a resolution forth, it would just have to go
through senate.
h. Call to question
   i. Motion passed.
4. In adjusting the pay could you change “current” to “future”
a. The future salary can already be done. This is about the
current salary.
5. I like that you are always going to have the senate deciding the
future salary. But I don’t like the senate adjusting the salaries
during their term.
a. I was just putting that in there for clarification because
in the past the salaries of the BOD were adjusted during
the year. If they can be subject to that process then there
is no reason the president and vp cant.
6. The intention is that it would be set before the budget is
finalized.
7. If we are opening it up for the compensation to change during
the year, I don’t like trying to limit it to before the approval of
the budget. I think we should try to reword that.
a. The only reason we adjusted the BOD is because they
weren’t working hard enough or because we felt they
deserved extra pay.
8. If you are forcing to change it before, the learning curve is
relatively high and I have trouble with having to do that before
they are comfortable with the positions.
a. We changed it in our board meeting. That was an
option.
9. Move to strike the last line in therefore be it resolved.
a. Dill/Heying
b. If we remove this sentence, does this resolution have a purpose?
   i. No

c. Wasn’t the purpose to equal out the opportunities to adjust the salaries throughout the year?
   i. The intent was not for that. It wasn’t budgetary. It was just to get the point across that we should set the salary before we know who will fill the seats.
      1. I still don’t think we should ever limit something of this matter.

d. I don’t think we can have both of those sentences together. We have to get rid of the first or second sentence.

e. Where would the money go?
   i. It would stay within the budget and the pr

f. Motion to add “due date of election papers through final approval of the student senate”
   i. Radke/Urbas
      ii. I like this, it elevates the time period people are worried about.
      iii. I still don’t understand the point of the document. Once fall comes around we are still able to adjust it.
      iv. This doesn’t prevent anything.
      v. Call to question
         1. I am confused about the addition added. That’s the only addition that was made?
            a. Yes it is stating the obvious.
      vi. Call to question
         1. Motion passes.

10. Call to question
    a. I think it is too confusing the way it is. There should be two clauses.
       i. These would be going into bylaws so you would have to create a new letter.

11. Motion to create a new section 1.B(2) reads: “salaries for the president and vice president…”
    a. Heying/Hemmer
       i. I feel this is necessary. I was getting really confused reading it all together. If it ever needed to be changed it could be changed

b. Call to question
   i. Motion passes.

12. The reason the first part was put in is because the BOD is treated that way so that is what is fair. It wouldn’t happen very
often. The next part talks about subsequent years. Call to question
a. Approved unanimously

c. SA0910-072-2: 2010-2011 Student Association Election Results
   i. Allen/Zahn
      1. You can separate the question and confirm candidates one and three.
   ii. Discussion
      1. Move to divide the question so that this resolution only applies to Bennett and Heinze
         a. Schauer/Kedrowski
            i. Approved, two abstentions.
      2. Call to question
         a. Part one approved
   iii. Discussion of part two
      1. Is it possible to take two of those names and appoint them now?
         a. No, not until all the appeals are exhausted.
      2. I think this isn’t our place to be voting on the student courts findings. Motion to table this indefinitely to allow the proceedings to take place
         a. Callaway/Bradley
            i. It would make more sense to postpone until a specific time.
         b. Amend to postpone until the appeals process is concluded
            i. Call to question
               1. Postponed.

d. SA0910-076: Resolution Amending Campaign Period
   i. Lauderdale/Cruz
      1. The only change is from three weeks to two weeks. This isn’t only for this body but it also goes out to say that one of the first things we are here are students.
   ii. Discussion
      1. Call to question
         a. Objection
      2. I think we need to consider that the three weeks are utilized. It is hard to educate a campus. It is really tough, but three weeks might be necessary to do all the organizational meetings and class raps. Individuals don’t have to use the three weeks.
      3. The three weeks are utilized but the only reason is because the other team is utilizing it too.
      4. The majority of the campaigning is concentrated in the last two weekends.
      5. I think one of the problems we have discussed is educating the voters even more. Some student orgs don’t meet in a two week
time span. They would miss the opportunity to have a presidential campaign. What happens if you get sick in that two week time? Then you loose out on a week.

6. I understand everyone’s concerns but you know you are doing this ahead of time. If it is two weeks you plan it ahead of time. If you are a smart candidate you know when the orgs meet and you find a way to contact them anyway. I don’t think we will run into a factor of less voter turn out. Before it was said that you don’t have to utilize the three weeks, but when you are competing against someone you have to, you just have to. I don’t think this will hinder voter turn out.

7. What does the author have to say about the date of the debate?
   a. I think the debate would be best suited the day before the campaign; people would have that fresh in their minds.

8. Stripping this down to two weeks would affect the non partisan campaign. There are benefits but also some concerns.

9. Candidates would squeeze three weeks worth of work into two weeks.

10. I think there are pros and cons. Call to question
    a. Objection

11. Don’t you think that moving the debate would be bias because it would be right before the elections?

12. The opinion was expressed that really the only major campaigning was done the final two weekends. I have seen that it is the entire three weeks that are utilized. The most important objective is to educate students. And this inhibits that. This would not improve things.

13. I don’t think two weeks is an adequate time to reach all the students you need to reach. It would be nice to for orgs to know with a three weeks notice.

14. Even with two months of planning, candidates still aren’t going to reach every single voter that they want to. Since this is a university and it takes an academic toll, emotional toll, and physical toll, I think this shorter period is much better.

15. Motion to exhaust speakers list
    a. Bradley
       i. Passed

16. Students know that they will be running for this earlier than the three week period. You can have the debate a week out. As far as educating the students, it is everyone’s job in this room to educate students. That is part of the duties of this body. We could still have your papers due at three weeks. This gives us a week to adjust with election commission so this non partisan campaign can get prepared. Also during that week we could be
saying that elections are in three weeks and not announce who is running.

17. There are a lot of people in here that have run and they all said they were in favor of cutting this down to two weeks.
   a. Not me.
   b. I am in favor of the three weeks because you have meetings that meet once a month.

18. If we shorten this time is this going to screw up the election commission when issues come up?
   a. No it would not.

19. Move to question
   a. Zahn/Kedrowski
      i. Approved.

20. Roll call
    a. Fails 11:22:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>SA 0910-076</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>
</tbody>
</table>

Senate 2009-2010
e. SA0910-077: Resolution Amending the President and Vice President’s Salaries
   i. Her/Popp
      1. I passed around a table sheet that compares other school’s salaries. The position of VP and president would be filled whether there was a stipend or not. There have been $1,200 fees assessed to students. The student salaries have stayed the same. The cost of living has also gone down. The BOD aids in the work load of the president and vice president.
   
   ii. Discussion
      1. I have a perspective having served as a RHAC rep. two years ago the salaries of RHAC were lower. So we are trying to even out the playing field. Should we raise the salaries of RHAC members?
      2. I find it irrelevant to compare the salaries to other universities. We are known for having a strong student association. I feel that salaries should not be used to make things equivalent. They should be working up to the salaries that they get.
      3. I am not in agreeance with this resolution. They already make less than minimum wage.
      4. I think it is ridiculous to ask people to decrease their salaries and leave the work the same. The money is there to benefit the students. Is that benefiting students in a pot of money or is it benefiting students more in the pay of two students who are working for students sometimes 24/7
      5. I think it is very important that we separate people from the positions. Is it worth the money? Does it benefit students in salaries or is it better going towards something else? La Crosse does pay more than other schools. If you are comparing it to a part time job, you are overpaying a little bit.
6. Last week it was brought up that president Kahl’s hours come out to less than minimum wage.

7. It comes to $5.70 an hour. I would consider Oshkosh a similar school for the fact that they are the only school that attends the board of regents like we do. They have a similar chancellor. They are asked for many different facets campus wide. There are schools where the pres and vp receive tuition waivers.

8. Comparing RAs to president is comparing apples to oranges. It is absurd to put that out there. The roles are completely different. The expectations they are held to... it is irrelevant. The $2,000 we are saving is 20 cents per student. $2,000 doesn’t do anything. It can only stay within our budget. It can be allocated to a director.
   a. It could go back to a general fund that could be used in any seg fee program.

9. I have been in that office at one in the morning. It is admirable what they do.

10. Move to question
   a. Bradley/Kedorwksi
      i. Fails 17:14:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>Move to question SA 0910-077</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>RU X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Freshman X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boll</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>At Large X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>SAH X</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 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>LASO X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>At-Large X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabanski</td>
<td>Kaitie</td>
<td>SAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haase</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>CBA X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmer</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>SAH X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her</td>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>ASO X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heying</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>RHAC X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedrowski</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Greek X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Athletics X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koplin</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>SOE X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>SOE X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieder</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>At-Large X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodahl</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>CLS X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattson</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>SAH X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>RHAC X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Samantha</td>
<td>Off-Campus X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11. I struggle with the purpose of this resolution. Is it just to make us even with the other schools? Do we want to be like UW Platteville? I think that we know that is not true. Our student governance has an excellent reputation for a reason. It is because they do a phenomenal job. To expect that same level of excellence and commitment and decrease the salary seems pretty counter intuitive. I think that to decrease salaries by this amount… it would have a disproportionate impact on students that are working their way through college and they would not be able to have these positions.

12. motion to change the salary to the next fiscal year to 2011/2012
   a. Schmidt/Dill
   b. There are 57 signatures on this document. $2,000 for them is going to build up for them. It is important to them.
      i. Where did you tell them the $2,000 is going?
         1. I did not specify.
   c. Did you let them know what the position entails?
      i. I justified the position.
      ii. Is there a reason why you went to Coate Hall?
         1. Because there is a majority of freshman.
      iii. Do you think it would have been more representative to ask people who have been here longer who know what the pres and vp do?
         1. There are a number of signatures here that are from Wentz Hall that are upper class men.
   d. Call to question
i. Objection

e. Changing the date doesn’t change my opinion on the resolution. The money is there for there to be excellent students in these positions.

f. Call to question
   i. Passes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>Schmidt motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Cody</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boll</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callaway</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dill</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>X</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>
</tbody>
</table>
13. This is not something to get back at Missy and Karly. You need to think about what we are doing with this money. The praise should be reward enough. You should not be in this position for money. I think that the fact that students are paying for two other student’s tuition, that should never happen. At the most we should pay for the room and board. There are proposals that compare those differences. The current system we have right now is drifting them too far from the average student. If a $200 fee comes up it won’t matter to them as much because they don’t have to pay for it. The faculty have received cuts and mandatory furlough days. I think the benefits of decreasing the salaries could be used in other programs.

14. What are plans for the student association fund for the next few years? I feel like we are trying to buy those funds down. Am I correct?
   a. SUFAC decides.
   b. Yes with the reserve fund we are trying to lower the reserve.

15. Senate is bigger than two people. I am definitely in favor of saving money. The majority of us are all here because of our dedication to a public service. Not for money. The majority don’t get paid to be part of that. To directly link the quality of our leadership to that salary is not accurate.
16. I have a problem with the second whereas point. That should be stricken. I don’t feel that Ben Franklin advocating for this is relevant to UWL
   a. Boll/Bradley
      i. Call to question
         1. Passed.

17. I think it is absurd to ask people to do the same amount of work and get paid less. Call to question
   a. Objection.

18. You have to look at opportunity costs here also. People need enough to live. Would the part time job take away from the effectiveness of the leaders? It could be used to pay for heat in this room. With the $2,000 in the hands of the vp and pres affects a lot of students.

19. Putting this in the 2011/12 senate body is overstepping our bounds. It should be sent to the next senate body.

20. I will be voting this down because I have spoken with students who are aware of what goes on in these positions and they are against this. Move to question
   a. Haase/Bradley
      i. Passed 27:4:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>Move to question SA 0910-077</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>
</tbody>
</table>
Moore  Riley  RHAC  X
Morris  Samantha  Off-Campus  X
Nell  Ryan  SAPA
Nelson  Derek  CBA  X
Popp  Brian  RASO  X
Radke  Olivia  A/C  X
Schauer  Andy  A/C  X
Schmidt  Eric  CBA  X
Talhouserne  Gaelle  ISO
Urbas  Cate  CLS  X
Verhoeven  Andy  SAH  X
Yang  Bee  HOPE  X
Wermedal  David  Freshman  X
Zahn  Matt  CBA  X
Zwieg  Kara  SAH  X

TOTALS  27  4  0
Members Present  31
PERCENT YES  87.10%

21. Roll call
   a. Fails 11:20:0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>SA 0910-077</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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f. SA0910-078: Resolution Reforming the Use of Slates
i. Lauderdale/Knutson
   1. Without slates we promote people voting for individuals. I think people looking at slates at an early time in the year so that they can get with a group so that they can get elected. I think people looking at individuals they vote for the most qualified. You stop working when you are on a slate. If you happen to not get on a slate it is really hard to get elected. I think this would be a motion towards people looking at individuals when they are voting. I think we would have better candidates.
ii. Discussion
   1. I see the advantages of a slate as a beneficial relationship. Having that mutual relationship allows for a better and smoother campaign. There are people who haven’t run on a slate who have gotten elected. I recommend we vote this down.
   2. As a person of color on this campus, it is harder for people to want to get to know who you are. Some people are not
comfortable talking to people on their own. Think outside the box. Not everyone has the same experience.

3. I don’t feel we as a body should be able to tell how we as individuals act.

4. I respect where the authors are coming from but I really do believe that choosing a slate helps alleviate some of that stress that we wanted to alleviate in the other resolution.

5. What constitutes a slate?
   a. I would like to limit the intermingling. If you don’t know those people it would be easier for someone you don’t know get in. I don’t want people
   i. I am sorry to interrupt you but you are not answering my question
      1. if you are associated with another person with the purpose of becoming elected is a slate
         a. That would include the president and vice president. They are team that works together. The wording is so vague and unclear it is completely unmonitorable. Would joining someone’s facebook group constitute associating with them?

6. I understand the intentions, but I feel there are more strong things about slates in general. I feel that it is very intimidating for someone to run as an independent. It is a much more comfortable and inviting environment.

7. There are a lot of negatives to slates. However I do see them as a necessary evil. I think there are a lot of great senators here who if they were not asked to be on a slate they would not have run. I think policing slates is a very difficult thing to do. I don’t think it is something we can control

8. Call to question
   a. Fails 5:26:0

XIV. Discussion

XV. Announcements
   a. Congrats on the new tables

XVI. Adjournment
   a. Heying/Hemmer
      i. Meeting adjourned at 11:29 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENATORS</th>
<th>College/Org.</th>
<th>ROLE CALL</th>
<th>ROLE CALL 2</th>
<th>ROLE CALL 3</th>
<th>ROLE CALL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>RU</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>BSU</td>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud</td>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>LASO</td>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabanski</td>
<td>Kaitie</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haase</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemmer</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her</td>
<td>Dorothy</td>
<td>ASO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heying</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>RHAC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kedrowski</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutson</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koplin</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodzi</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattson</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>RHAC</td>
<td>x</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>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nell</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>SAPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popp</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>RASO</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radke</td>
<td>Olivia</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schauer</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talhouarne</td>
<td>Gaelle</td>
<td>ISO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhoeven</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>Bee</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wermedal</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahn</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwieg</td>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>SAH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present: 32 33 33 31

Senate 2009-2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Members</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>