SENATE MEETING
24 February 2019, CTO 5:01 pm
UWM Union Fireside Lounge, 2200 E Kenwood Blvd
Milwaukee, WI 53211

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

1) Alyssa Molinski - present
2) Zen Johnston - present
3) John McCune - present
4) Emma Horjus - present
5) Alexis McAdams - present
6) Mary Greuel - present
7) Josh Rivers - present
8) Luis Filho - present
9) Liz Papandria - present
10) Adyson Leonard - excused
11) William Paltz - present
12) Emire Sewell - excused
13) Gabe Rosenthal - present
14) Brielle Shortreed - excused
15) Amaya Varela - present
16) Zak Zielkowski - present
17) Katie Malek - present
18) MaryJo Kanelos - present

19) Connor Mathias - present
20) Daniel Schindler - present
21) Mohiminul Islam - present
22) Robert Bavisotto - present
23) Courtney Raatz - unexcused
24) Charlie Turchan - excused
25) Santiago Moreno-Islas - excused
26) Tedi Ocken - present
27) Yugg Kolhe - unexcused
28) Jonathan Melcher - unexcused
29) Josh Graybow - present
30) Rebecca Eaton – present
31) Conal McNamara - present
32) Clarence Kinnard - present
33) Morgan Johnsen - present
34) Amanda Grzebien - present
35) Maisey Michelz - present
36) Madeleine Dorcy – excused

18 present – QUORUM ACHIEVED

III. Reports
Zen: Reminds folks who would like to attend Reps to email Zen and Sarah (SAPS)
John McCune: SLIC is working on smoke-free implementation plan at next meeting, next Farmer’s Market on March 13th from 10-3pm.
James: OAC met on Friday.
Mohiminul: SFC met the week before last, will be speaking on that today.
Mary: Reminder that the deadline for Fall 2019 SAC grants are March 4th at 11:59pm. Engage may be replaced by a system called Presence the year after next.
Alyssa: Will be meeting with the Chancellor this week along with Zen and John.

IV. Open Forum

a. Stephanie Bloomingdale, President of Wisconsin AFL-CIO
Connor introduces Stephanie Bloomingdale to the podium, and shares that she used to be involved in student government at UW-Milwaukee as President in 1990-1991. Stephanie thanks the members of Student Association for the work that they do to improve the life of students here on campus.
Stephanie shares her experiences when she was involved in SA, including implementing recycling at UWM, the SafeWalk program, and providing the MCTS bus pass for students through segregated fees.

Stephanie emphasizes the importance of the Shared Governance statue enshrined in the State of Wisconsin, calling it the strongest in the country. Stephanie also shared stories of working with Student Regent Robin Vos on a push for a tuition freeze for UW students.

Connor asks Stephanie to expand on how to lobby for student issues at the state level. Stephanie urges each SA member to work with alderman, state representatives, and national representatives who work on issues that are important to them and their constituents, financial aid in particular at the federal level.

V. Approval of Agenda
   a. Motion to approve by Daniel. Second by Connor.
   Josh Graybow moves to add new business item L: “Discussion on Editing the Sponsorship and Interest Form Proposal”. Second by Will. Motion passes unanimously.
   Daniel moves to amend the agenda to move time-sensitive items C, D, E, H, J and L to the front of new business. seconded by MaryJo. Motion passes unanimously.

   Motion to approve the agenda as amended passes unanimously.

VI. Special Orders
   a. Senator Appointments
      i. Matisen Ardis
         1. School of Education Senator
      Matisen introduces herself as a student in the School of Education and the degree program that she’s interested in. She notes problems and discrepancies with class schedules set for different levels of students (bachelor’s students and post-bachelor’s students) that are difficult to balance with other needs such as holding a part-time job.

      Will moves to approve Matisen Ardis as the school of education senator, seconded by Daniel. Motion passes unanimously.

      b. Shared Governance Appointments
         i. Alyssa Pleiffer
            1. Graduate Scholastic Appeals Committee
         ii. Robert Bavisotto
            1. Student Association Safety Committee (SASC)
         iii. Sam Watters
            1. Independent Election Committee (IEC)
         iv. Ilian Iliev
            1. Independent Election Committee (IEC)
         v. Aparna Deshmukh
            1. At-Large Commissioner, Oversight and Appeals Committee (OAC)

      Daniel moves to package and approve items VI.b.i through VI.b.v. Seconded by Connor.
      James takes a moment to explain that Aparna is moving from Deputy to At-Large within OAC in order to accommodate a different on-campus job that she has.
      Motion passes unanimously.

   VII. Old Business
      a. Approval of the Senate minutes from February 10th, 2019
      Daniel moves to approve the minutes, second by Amanda.
      Motion passes unanimously.
b. **SB1819-023 Veto Discussion**
Alyssa introduces this item and the background of her decision to veto this legislation. She met with the OAC to examine what this legislation would mean, and the OAC determined that the legislation goes against the Constitution.

James chimed in that yes, Alyssa met with OAC and they went over the text of the bill and came to that conclusion.

Josh Graybow points out that there is an option for the president to temporarily appoint someone to serve as the voice of the student association.

Daniel moves to end discussion, seconded by Conal.

VIII. **New Business**

a. **February 26th Eating Disorder Awareness Event Legislation**
Liz introduces the legislation that she wrote and shares that she is interested in eating disorders and plans to work with eating disorders after graduation. The legislation is a card-making event to send to folks at a local clinic who are suffering from eating disorders.

Zak asks why there are two events. Liz explains that the first event is a charitable card-making event, and the second event is an informational event. Since the first event is in the concourse, Liz expects there to be a higher attendance than the information event, which is held in the Wisconsin Room of the Union.

Will moves to package and approve A and B. Discussion proceeds about if the Senate can package and approve money votes. Will rescinds his motion.

Will moves to approve the February 26th Eating Disorder Awareness Event Legislation at a value of $81.65, seconded by Josh

1. Liz Papandria - yay
2. William Paltz - yay
3. Gabe Rosenthal – yay
4. Amaya Varela - yay
5. Zak Ziolkowski – yay
6. Katie Malek – yay
7. MaryJo Kanelos - yay
8. Connor Mathias - yay
9. Daniel Schindler - yay
10. Mohimun Islam - yay
11. Robert Bavisotto - yay
12. Tedi Ocken - yay
13. Josh Graybow - yay
14. Rebecca Eaton – yay
15. Conal McNamara - yay
16. Clarence Kinnard - yay
17. Morgan Johnsen - yay
18. Amanda Grzebien - yay
19. Maisey Michelz – yay
20. Matisen Ardis – yay

Ayes: 20
Nays: 0
Abstentions: 0

Legislation passes.
Discussion proceeds as to the question of if Matisen can participate in money votes if she has not received viewpoint neutrality training. SAPS and OAC weigh in, and it is determined that the viewpoint neutrality training itself is highly recommended but not required, that Matisen can do money votes. What is important is all Senators vote in a viewpoint neutral manner, not that they have received the training.

b. **February 28th Eating Disorder Awareness Event Legislation**

Will moves to approve, seconded by Gabe

1. Liz Papandria - yes
2. William Paltz - aye
3. Gabe Rosenthal – aye
4. Amaya Varela - aye
5. Zak Ziołkowski – aye
6. Katie Malek – yes
7. Maryjo Kanelos - yes
8. Connor Mathias - yay
9. Daniel Schindler - yay
10. Mohiminul Islam - yay
11. Robert Bavisotto - yay
12. Tedi Ocken - yay
13. Rebecca Eaton – yay
14. Conal McNamara - yay
15. Clarence Kinnard - yay
16. Morgan Johnsen - yay
17. Amanda Grzebien - yay
18. Maisey Michelz – yay
19. Matisen Ardis – yay

Yes: 19
No: 0
Abstain: 0

Legislation passes.

c. **Student Union Endorsement Resolution**

Will introduces this legislation as a product of the workgroup that met to address the administration’s concerns that the legislation passed at the last session did not adequately signal support for the Union.

Zak moves to approve, second by Gabe.

Yes: 17
No: 0
Abstain: 0

Legislation passes.

d. **Response to Chancellor Mark Mone**

Daniel introduces this legislation and accompanying letter, and he explains how it came about and what it is for.

Zak moves to approve the Response to Chancellor Mark Mone Legislation, seconded by Connor.
Josh Rivers asks if the letter will be sent to the office or brought to the meeting that the SA President and Vice Presidents will be attending. Daniel says that if it communicated via email to the Chancellor’s office, that would be fine.

Yes: 19  
No: 0  
Abstain: 1

Legislation passes.

e. **Gathering First Year Feedback legislation**
Amanda and Maisey introduce their legislation, which is looking to collect information from first year students about their experience so far at UWM. This would be an event held in the Sandburg Lobby.

Will asks about the late fee on the catering quote. Alyssa shared that the late fee was assessed because the order was recently (within 6 days before the event) changed to halve the ice cream order from 2 orders to 1 order, which was done to save costs.

Gabe asks about freshmen that don’t stay at Sandburg, and how to reach out to them. Amanda and Maisey will have a link to the survey shared via email and flyers.

Zak asks what questions will be asked on the survey, and Maisey reads them off.

A member of the public who is an RA shares that all of those questions are on the “Pride Survey” and is available to everyone. Zen shares their experience with living in Sandburg and of students not filling out the Pride Survey.

Conal points out that we are voting on the legislation, not the content of the survey.

Conversation proceeds about if use of another vendor besides Catering 20/20 is possible on UWM property outside of the Union. Since Sandburg is under the purview of UWM Housing, it would likely not be possible to bring in another vendor.

Conversation also proceeds about survey methodology and survey response habits of students.

Josh moves to approve the Gathering First Year Feedback Legislation in the amount of $468.30, second by Daniel.

1. Liz Papandria - yes  
2. William Paltz - yes  
3. Gabe Rosenthal - yes  
4. Amaya Varela - yes  
5. Zak Ziolkowski - yes  
6. Katie Malek – yes  
7. Mary Jo Kanelos - yes  
8. Connor Mathias - yes  
9. Daniel Schindler - yes  
10. Mohiminul Islam - yes  
11. Robert Bavisotto - yes  
12. Tedi Ocken - yes  
13. Josh Graybow – yes  
14. Rebecca Eaton – yes  
15. Conal McNamara - yes  
16. Clarence Kinnard - yes  
17. Morgan Johnsen - yes  
18. Amanda Grzebien - yes
19. Maisey Michelz – yes
20. Matisen Ardis – yes

Yes: 20
No: 0
Abstain: 0

Legislation passes.

f. **Editing Sponsorship and Interest Form Proposal**

Josh Graybow introduces this item and outlines a timeline of events of communication and feedback given about the form, the legislation, and the initiative itself. The people he interacted with were chiefly John McCune, Alyssa Molinski, and Sarah from SAPS.

Josh goes over the points brought up in the veto letter.

Josh goes over some other concerns with the legislation shared by Senators at the last Senate meeting, including the language over a “contract”.

Josh wraps up with asking why Alyssa will not meet with him, and also expresses a desire to resolve this issue and pass the legislation properly at this meeting today so it can be available during the SAC Grant hearings, which begin next week. Alyssa responds that she is open to meeting to discuss this issue.

Zen asks who will enforce the “contract” should one be drawn up. Conversation proceeds between Zen, John McCune, and Josh Rivers about contracts and enforcement powers.

Mary points out her perspective as the SAC Chair that an initiative like this does not need to be done by the start of SAC Grant hearings, so there should not be a rush to get this done.

Katie shares her opinion that the fact that the Senate unanimously passed a piece of unconstitutional legislation is the biggest problem here. Josh Graybow refocuses discussion to the issue of the President temporarily appointing a Senator as a voice for the Student Association.

Conal expresses that it is not a big problem that unconstitutional legislation was passed, as that is what OAC is supposed to catch, and notes that this happens in other government bodies. Katie disagrees.

Sarah (SAPS) brings up that the proposal was brought up to different people while the idea was still fluid and changing, so when the idea was presented to her the meat of the issue was about the SA logo on top of the form. Josh Graybow disagrees with Sarah’s statement and says that the letter shared with her was the same document. Alyssa expresses confusion, as her veto letter addresses problems in the language of the legislation, not the form/letter.

Josh Graybow expresses confusion as well and discusses the timeline again, including that the legislation was written in conjunction with John McCune and therefore he assumed that the language of the bill was good to go. Josh also expresses frustration that the constitutionality problems with the legislation were not caught at or before the last Senate meeting.

Tedi summarizes the issue (emphasizing that the bill was supported by the SA Senate unanimously) and asks what the student body can do right now, in this item of business, to remediate the situation.

John recenters the conversation on what to do next. Josh Graybow brings up the idea of the Senate conducting a straw poll urging Alyssa to appoint/deputize someone to act as the voice of the students. Daniel and Quincy (SAPS) reemphasize that only Alyssa has the power to appoint/deputize, at her discretion as the President according to the SA Constitution, therefore the Senate can’t force Alyssa to appoint someone.
Josh reenters the conversation and repeats that he is not working to force Alyssa to do anything, but is just trying to understand why this can’t move forward, what concerns the Senate has, and how to make this happen for RSOs.

Alyssa repeats that her problems with the legislation are outlined in the veto letter.

Daniel moves to end discussion. Motion rescinded.

Josh Rivers weighs in that he supports this legislation, particularly since RSOs already do this (reaching out to external organizations) on their own. Josh Rivers also supports this especially when considering the problem of the SAC grant process the previous semester. Josh Rivers expresses confusion as to why Alyssa wouldn’t go ahead and appoint Josh.

Discussion continues about whether this is a conversation better had in one-on-one meetings and not during New Business, considering that there are a limited number of people involved in the discussion and there is nothing concrete for the Senate to vote on at this time.

Josh Graybow reiterates that he is trying to respond to a need expressed by the students and supported by the Senate and some members of the Exec board.

Connor makes a motion to end discussion, seconded by Zak. Motion passes unanimously.

g. Approval of Textbook Letter

John introduces this letter and expresses why he would like to send it.

Will asks who is receiving this. John responds that it would go to the Provost, who could send it out to the listserv that has all faculty members on it.

Alexis asks if this was a project that came out of the Textbook Affordability working group. John replies that yes, it was sent around to the workgroup for edits before it was brought here today.

Josh Rivers notes that there are numerous grammatical errors. Josh declines to list them at this time.

Connor makes a motion to send this out with minor grammar edits to the Provost and associated entities, seconded by Liz.

Connor states his support for this legislation and his experience on the textbook affordability working group.

Robert asks if this letter is referring to (calling for action from) the individual faculty members or the departments. John responds that it more for the individual faculty members. Josh Rivers chimes in that instructors have the option to receive a desk copy from the publishers which could then be donated to the Media and Reserve Library.

Motion passes unanimously.

h. SFC Recommendation Reports and Presentation

Emma introduces this item and the background of the decision to split the non-allocable round 1 and 2 documents into separate reports for clear communication with the funded entities, citing a miscommunication that occurred last year.

Emma reviews the fee rate requests, justifications, and SFC recommendations for each of the entities in each of the reports. Emma also provides background on the unique situation with the Office of Student Life’s fee request and the split of the fee across different departments. Emma also outlines the situation
regarding the justification for the Athletics fee increase. Emma moves on to the discussions of the capital fees for Athletics and the Union, and her desire to establish a more transparent process for the review of the capital fees.

Will chimes in to clarify that each of the numbers were the amount paid per student, per semester. Will also provides context as to how this document ties into the Union Capital Fee discussion, and how the process needs to become more transparent and have student approval in the process.

Will notes that the practice of transferring a capital fee from one entity to another (once the debt was paid off) is an issue that will be addressed (for the Capital Fee only) in legislation that will be brought to the next meeting.

John asks a question about the capital fee in the report, and Emma points out that it was her decision to not include it because it was not put through the same SFC process and in order to prevent that it would be construed as a recommendation by SFC.

i. **Proposal for Health Sciences Event Legislation**

Katie introduces this legislation as an event for her constituency, the students of the Helen Bader School.

Will asks if there is a quote attached with this event. Katie responds that there is a quote, but she forgot to attach it to the legislation when she sent it to the Secretary. She reads off the numbers: ~$680.00 for catering, plus funding for marketing and a service fee for the Union ballroom. The total fee would be in the ballpark of $956.00, rounded up to $1,000 in the legislation.

Will moves to approve the Proposal for Health Sciences Event Legislation, seconded by Connor.

Josh Graybow asks what the programming budget looks like, Emma responds that she does not have the exact numbers, but gives a ballpark estimate: approximately $3,000 of the $18,000 (marketing and programming combined) budgets has been allocated prior to today’s Senate meeting, so this event could definitely be accommodated.

1. William Paltz - yes
2. Gabe Rosenthal – yes
3. Amaya Varela - yes
4. Zak Ziolkowski – yes
5. Katie Malek – yes
6. MaryJo Kanelos - yes
7. Connor Mathias - yes
8. Daniel Schindler - yes
9. Mohiminul Islam - yes
10. Robert Bavisotto - yes
11. Tedi Ocken - yes
12. Josh Graybow – yes
13. Rebecca Eaton – yes
14. Conal McNamara - yes
15. Clarence Kinnard - abstain
16. Morgan Johnsen - yes
17. Amanda Grzebien - yes
18. Maisey Michelz – yes
19. Matisen Ardis – yes

Yes: 18
No: 0
Abstain: 1
Legislation passes.

j. **Milwaukee Police Department Resolution of Solidarity**
Will introduces this legislation and explains the rationale behind it.

Daniel moves to approve, seconded by Gabe.

John points out a typo on line 11. Will treats it as a friendly amendment so that line 11 reads “...we pay tribute to the quiet courage of Officer...”

Zen suggests changing the language to make the language on lines 10 and 11 “...to the brave individuals serving at the Milwaukee Police department...” on lines 10 and 11. Will agrees to treat it as a friendly amendment.

Yes: 19
No: 0
Abstain: 0

Legislation passes

k. **Student Voting Rights Committee Tabling Funding**
Daniel introduces this piece of legislation and explains that it will be used to print a poster of the voting ward around UWM and non-partisan profiles of the folks running.

Zak expresses his appreciation in keeping the cost down.

Conal moves to approve the legislation in the amount of up to 10.00, seconded by MaryJo

1. William Paltz - yes
2. Gabe Rosenthal – yes
3. Amaya Varela - yes
4. Zak Ziolkowski – yes
5. Katie Malek – yes
6. MaryJo Kanelos - yes
7. Connor Mathias - yes
8. Daniel Schindler - yes
9. Mohiminul Islam - yes
10. Robert Bavisotto - yes
11. Tedi Ocken - yes
12. Josh Graybow – yes
13. Rebecca Eaton – yes
14. Conal McNamara - yes
15. Clarence Kinnard - yes
16. Morgan Johnsen - yes
17. Amanda Grzebien - yes
18. Maisey Michelz – yes
19. Matisen Ardis – yes

Yes: 19
No: 0
Abstain: 0

Legislation Passes.
1. **Inclusivity Omnibus Legislation**

Zen brings up the idea of tabling this legislation in order to have more time to receive input from SAPS, as they have experience with some of the entities named in the legislation. Zen and Becky also want it to be attached to the email that is sent out with the SA elections email by SAPS.

Daniel moves to table this item, seconded by Connor.

Discussion proceeds about the best way to give feedback about this legislation to the authors. Will expresses that he would like to discuss it now. Zen shares their opinion that since the legislation would be tweaked later anyway, that maybe an email Zen and Becky would be the best way.

Daniel rescinds the motion to table.

Discussion continues about if topics can be discussed. James (OAC) says that without a motion on the table, no amendments could be made, but discussion could be had.

Will shares that he does not support the idea in the legislation that the 2.5 GPA requirement for service in SA is discriminatory. Zen responds that removing the 2.5 GPA requirement would still leave in place the “good academic standing” requirement, which is set by the University. Zen also shares that most student governments don’t have a GPA requirement. Will requests that this element be removed from the rest of the legislation so it could be up for a separate vote.

Robert asks how this applies to graduate students, Josh Rivers responds that it is a cumulative GPA requirement. Robert asks if other student orgs use GPA requirements. The consensus is that yes, other organizations (such as the Athletics teams) have GPA requirements that are different than the “academic standing” requirement.

Tedi expresses their thoughts against this point and thinks that quantitative rules are just as valid as qualitative rules (such as leadership, experience etc). Zen responds that performance in classes doesn’t reflect on their ability as a leader in SA.

Josh Rivers expresses concern with how removing the GPA requirement could hurt SA credibility to faculty and staff.

Conal replies that UWM SA is supposed to represent all students equally, and that includes students that have a GPA below 2.5.

Connor points out that Senators are elected (or appointed after consideration by the Senate) and we decide then and there if they are fit to serve.

Amanda and Gabe express opposition to removing the GPA requirement. Gabe forcefully states that discriminating based on GPA is nothing like racism, sexism, or other forms of discrimination.

Quincy (SAPS) adds that UWM’s policies put students under probation and threatens to remove them from the school when GPA drops below 2.0, and provides several reasons why a higher GPA requirement would be desirable to judge future SA members.

Katie expresses her opposition to the GPA requirement and also supports breaking up this omnibus into multiple piece of legislation.

Zen notes that it appears that everyone is on the same page and (as the author of this particular piece of the legislation) would support removing it and looking at it harder. Therefore, Zen urges discussion to move on to another issues.
Josh points out a contradiction between lines 26 and 46 in the legislation. Zen responds that the word “disabled” is the legally recognized term at this point in time in the United States.

Mohimun expresses opposition to removing the GPA requirement.

Will brings up the issue of changing the word “disability” and shares the experiences and words of his relatives, one of whom worked for many years as the head of Wisconsin Special Olympics and another whom has two children with down syndrome. They share their opinions that the word disability is merely a descriptor and not inherently discriminatory.

James (OAC) provides a suggestion to clarifying the citation passages. Zen and Becky agree to take that into consideration when the bill is reintroduced.

Josh moves to table this to the next meeting, second by Zak. Motion passes unanimously.

IX. Questions and Concerns
Mary shares that SAC’s next meeting is on Tuesday in EG80 from 12-1pm, discussion will be on bylaws changes and cap adjustments.

Will announces that the next Senate meeting will have legislation addressing the union capital project, and Will urges everyone to come prepared to the next meeting. Daniel echoes that and points out that everyone should be coming prepared and reading the material before the meeting.

Josh asks any Senators interested in discussing the sponsorship interest issue to talk to and meet with him.

X. Adjournment
Motion to adjourn by Zak. Second by Daniel. Motion passes unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm