# Senate Meeting
March 10th, 2019, CTO 5:01pm
UWM Union Fireside Lounge, 2200 E Kenwood Blvd
Milwaukee, WI 53211

## I. Call to Order

## II. Roll Call

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alyssa Molinski - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zen Johnston - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>John McCune - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emma Horjus - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alexis McAdams - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mary Greuel - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Josh Rivers - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Luis Filho - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Liz Papandria - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adyson Leonard - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>William Palz - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Emire Sewell - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gabe Rosenthal - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brielle Shortreed - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amaya Varela - Unexcused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Zak Zialkowski – Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Katie Malek - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MaryJo Kanelos - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Connor Mathias - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Daniel Schindler - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mohimaniul Islam - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Robert Bavisotto - Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Charlie Turchan - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Santiago Moreno-Islas - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tedi Ocken - Unexcused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yugg Kolhe - Unexcused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jonathan Melcher - Unexcused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Josh Graybow - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rebecca Eaton – Excused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Conal McNamara - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Clarence Kinnard - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Morgan Johnsen - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Amanda Grzebien - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Maisey Michelz – Unexcused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Madeleine Dorcy – Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Matisen Ardis - Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## III. Reports

**Luis:** Been working on designing a few event flyers for senators. Also has prepared a social media guide for senators to use to determine MPD’s needs for making social media posts.

**OAC:** Met Wednesday. Alexis came and discussed record keeping procedures.

**Charlie:** Had event on Friday that went well. Event was for PSOA to put on school collaborative showcase and encourage interdisciplinary communication.

**Katie:** Finalizing College of Health Sciences event to make sure that there are no last minute hiccups. Went to UWSSR this weekend.

**Morgan:** Went to UWSSR.

**Adyson:** Nominated as vice-chair of EAAC.

**Santiago:** Attended SVRC meeting.

**Clarence:** Attended SVRC meeting.
Josh G.: At last SLC meeting, had a union administrator in charge of Union Marketing to help create document for event planning. Tom Dake became ex-officio member of SLC. In the works: helping put on two events, one is a debate with Pi Sigma Alpha and Josh Rivers reached out to do a continuation of Yugg’s cultural expo event. Will be presenting more information at next senate meeting.

Amanda: First-year feedback event went well.

Madeline D: Helped with first-year feedback event.

Liz: Had two events for eating disorder awareness. Made over 70 cards in two hours.

Mary: SAC is continuing, hearings continue to next week. Something new that came from today’s meeting, SAC decided to no longer fund orgs for travel that includes presenting their academic course-related research. Senate will likely be seeing affected organizations attending to make appeals.

Emma: SFC met to discuss PUR (Panther Union Reinvestment) Project.

Zen: Went to UWSSR. Working on creating materials for next VPAA.

Alyssa: Met with Luis and Josh to talk about CCED (Campus and Community Engagement) and MPD (Marketing and Programming Director) job descriptions, which will be posted at end of the month. Also been doing general SA president stuff including communicating with Will and administration about PUR.

John: Met with two state representatives about affordable textbooks initiative and will be incorporating their feedback. Farmer’s Market is coming up and looking for volunteers. Volunteering is 9-10 before market or 3-3:30 after market. Taking up challenge of trying to send out a post every day about things happening on campus. Hoping to revisit idea of making panther cards voter-ID compliant.

SAPS: Tomorrow is formal debate for SA elections. Food will be available. 5-8PM in union ballroom east. RSVP and share it. Head commissioner of IEC will be moderating.

IV. Open Forum

a. Adam Jussel, Dean of Students

   i. Adam Jussel: Going into week 3 of job. Formerly worked at Washington State University. Spoke about wanting to connect directly with students and wanting the Dean of Students to be open and receptive to feedback.

    1. John: Some offices on campus have struggled with soliciting feedback. Are there ways you’re thinking of implementing a robust feedback system? Response: Would ask us where he should be getting that feedback. What are new avenues that haven’t been explored?

    2. Santiago: Was an orientation leader last summer. How does the dean of students envision continuing the connection with the campus? Response: Being visible. If the first time a student meets the dean of students is when something’s wrong, there’s a bigger issue. Wants to be more involved in orientation.

    3. Josh: Suggestion that Adam attends SA senate meetings regularly.


    5. Katie: Generally hears issues from students in one-on-one meetings. How should students communicate issues to the Dean of Students? Response: Would prefer to hear from people the issue has been communicated to directly.
b. Alec Smith, Chair of UWSSR
   i. Alec: Here to give senate an update regarding yesterday’s meeting at UW-River Falls. UWSSR is the systemwide student governance group meeting approximately 8 times a year. UWSSR consists of 26 student government bodies from all campuses in the UW System, each campus has one vote. Focusing a lot on mental health this year. Yesterday, met at UW-River Falls and discussed voter IDs. Passed a letter in support of student refugees. Last thing discussed was about student loan refinancing, added to the UWSSR legislative priorities.

   1. Conal: Had attendance issues as a UWSSR-wide issue. Where is the situation with that, and what’s the relationship with the board of regents? Response: Sept. and Oct. meetings didn’t have quorum, likely due to a lack of communication with new campus leadership. Relationship with board of regents is good. They don’t meet often with UWSSR face-to-face personally, but there is a lot of professional communication.

V. Approval of Agenda
   a. Motion by Daniel to approve the Agenda. Seconded by Gabe. Motion to approve agenda passes (unanimously).

      i. Move to include “New business item e. ‘Farmer’s market CBD vendor discussion’ Second by Conal.

         1. Motion passes unanimously.

      ii. Move to amend item 8a to read “Open floor for nominations to all open committee seats” by Clarence. Second by Daniel.

         1. Motion passes unanimously.

      iii. Motion by Conal to strike item 8b. Second by Daniel

         1. Motion passes unanimously.

VI. Special Orders
   a. Senator Appointments

      i. Silbi Isein

         1. Junior at UWM anything and everything that belongs to SA, [pronoun] is interested in. Recently an email was sent out recently by Alyssa and Provost Britz RE: metamajors. Becoming a senator is the first step to getting involved with SA.

            a. Katie: You seem interested in a lot of our projects, is there any in particular that you’d like to take on? Response: There is something in the works, but not currently at liberty to speak about it.


         2. Motion to approve by Will. Second by Gabe.

            a. Motion passes unanimously.

   b. Shared Governance Appointments

      i. Morgan Johnsen

         1. EAAC

      ii. Connor Mathias

         1. SVRC

      iii. Courtney Raatz

         1. SAC

         2. Alyssa: Courtney is no longer on senate, this appointment is for an RSO seat on SAC.

Daniel moves to package and approve items VI.b.i through VI.b.iii. Seconded by Connor. Motion to package and approve passes (unanimously).
VII. **Old Business**  
a. Approval of the senate minutes from February 24th, 2019  
Motion to approve by Daniel. Second by Adyson. Motion passes unanimously.

b. Inclusivity Omnibus  
i. Zen is speaking on behalf of this legislation. GPA requirement is no longer included in this document and will be presented as separate legislation at a later time once more research is done. All feedback was incorporated from our last Senate Meeting to take out the statements that did not give leeway for the word “disability” to be reclaimed

ii. Daniel moves to approve, second by Adyson

iii. Discussion  
1. Will – Lines 45-47 clarifying on relaying this legislation to other student governments after passage. This was due to continuing reports to Reps that we would relay this out  
2. Josh yields time to Alec about his thoughts on this legislation:  
   a. Alec – UW-System Reps has this verbiage in their constitution since April of 2017

3. Gabe- Lines 30-34: what changes were made?  
   a. Zen- only adding identities, not changing or taking away what is currently there in the constitution

4. Zak: lines 3-4: What does this line refer to? What legal protection are they missing  
   a. Zen: There’s not necessarily legal protections currently in every instance that deems protection

5. Conal- just because examples of this cannot be thought about at this time, that doesn’t mean they don’t exist.

6. Josh – motion to amendment for lines 3-4 change it to “that may face discrimination and oppression and may have no legal protection on the basis of said identities”  
   a. Second by Amanda

   b. Discussion:
      
   i. Liz asks is this legal protection or is this protection through SA. Would like to keep it to “do face discrimination” rather than “may”.

   ii. Santiago: adding the word “may” will weaken the language and would not do well being changed.

   iii. Connor: people do face discrimination regardless of whether or not we are seeing it happen currently or not or whether we believe it is a problem or not.

   iv. General discussion that we are not offering legal protections through this document necessarily, but rather a standard to hold ourselves up to.

   v. Josh rescinds his motion to amend legislation.

7. Gabe – academic history discrepancy? This seems to conflict with GPA policy for SA.  
   a. Zen: The intention is enrollment history

   b. James – agrees with Gabe

   c. Zen Friendly Amends line 40 to read “Or conviction record, enrollment history, academic concentration, Wisconsin Residency Status, housing”

   d. Second by Gabe

   e. Sarah – process for being a union employee

   f. All in favor (current quorum – 1)
VIII. New Business
a. Open Floor for Nominations to Student Appropriations Committee
   i. Motion to open by Daniel, second by Zak.
      1. Motion to end discussion by Conal, second by Gabe
         a. Motion passes unanimously
      2. Motion passes unanimously
   ii. SAC - one spot
         a. Motion passes unanimously.
   iii. SFC - advocacy seat open, but most work is completed at this point
   iv. Safety committee has two open seats
   v. Transportation has one senator seat.
   vi. Student Leaders has one senator opening.
         a. Motion passes unanimously.
   vii. GSAC has two seats.
   viii. WAC has two seats.
   ix. ROAC has three.
         a. Motion passes unanimously.
   x. GSRC has three.
   xi. Motion to close nominations Santiago. Second by Daniel.
      1. Motion passes unanimously.

b. SAC March 2019 Kick Start Grant Legislation

  i. Will: Simply, a piece of legislation to reaffirm our commitment to a new fee to
     replace union capital, but with added requirements. Creates fee at $75 for
     FY20, so there would be no lapse in fee. Fee shall never exceed $75. Required
     that this fee only pay for 94% of the project. Currently admin has one million
     dollars raised. SFC did not feel that fees should be cut, but Will found that the
     union segregated fee ($159.05) could be reduced.
  ii. Alyssa: I noticed last time when we talked about the union, we had quite a few
      people abstain. More people should participate. If you don’t feel comfortable
      voting, ask more questions so you understand what you’re voting on. Alyssa
      also will start a speaker’s list immediately.
  iii. Motion to approve legislation by Zak, seconded.
  iv. Katie: When I cosponsored the legislation, I was under impression that “SFC
      and administration advising” meant that they approved as well. It’s come to
      my attention as well that that’s not necessarily the case. Was this legislation
      presented to SFC and what was their feedback?
v. Morgan has issue with 52-55 where the legislation talks about the cut on the union segregated fee. Why was there a need to cut, and why union fee versus capital?

vi. Daniel: I was also under the impression that SFC had reviewed it, and it’s come to my attention that the $10 was arbitrary and not researched. It’s not the union’s fault that students have loan issues. If looking at addressing that issue, it should look at seg fees as a whole, not punishing the union.

vii. Silbi: For line 49-51, should the PUR, be adopted, would all seg fees across all departments be reduced?

viii. Emma: 52-58, Ultimately, something that should be kept in mind is that the SFC of these respective fiscal years can’t be held accountable for changing fees by this body. Emma also feels that lowering the fee to compensate for the fee being reinstated is comparing apples and oranges. It’s comparing a building to departmental services. I get the impression that the $10 is arbitrary. If this legislation would go through, it would over three years decrease union’s money by 1.5 million. There is also a concern about setting a limit for the future when we don’t know the possible state of the union.

ix. Will: SFC has struggled to meet quorum, and met Wednesday, but the legislation had not been sent out in accordance with open meetings law, so it couldn’t be formally approved. 42-44 is in there because we can’t increase some operating revenue because restaurant ops has been operating at a deficit. Students are subsidizing that fee because restaurant ops can’t operate at a cost neutral. It would not reduce all seg fees, only the one laid out in legislation. Will is open to eliminating other capital fees, but the only other capital fee is being used for Norris health services. Will is open to other ways to cut, but he has worked extensively on it, but we can’t make cuts wherever we want because of viewpoint neutrality. Originally when legislation was passed for this, other fees were cut as it was increased.

x. Sarah: On Will’s point for SAPS and SAs budgets being cut: some say it was to offset fee increases, others say it was to spend down reserves.

xi. Connor: To address overarching cost of school, I have paid for college through loans or money I’ve worked for. Segregated fees are important, and to cut them blindly is dangerous, particularly when the fee is apparently unrelated to the capital fee. This could also have repercussions on event services.

1. Connor makes the motion to strike lines 52-58. Seconded by Morgan.
   a. Josh: Agrees that decreasing union fee should be separate legislation.
   b. Daniel: Appreciates the motion to strike, but doesn’t know that it fixes the legislation. SFC makes the decisions on a yearly basis, so it can’t be enforced.
   c. Zak: Important to keep cut in the legislation so that the student body understands that it’s important to have a new union, but we must understand how much money we’re spending on seg fees. Introducing fee without cutting something else is fiscally irresponsible. Union will ask for fee increases when enrollment increases, and enrollment being low is the time to cut.
   d. Emma: SFC exists to make these decisions and discuss these types of changes. Reorganizing seg fees would have to be an SFC discussion. Looking for an equitable solution would be a better alternative to an avenue that happens to exist.
   e. Will: This fee got to $75 without approval. When the fee went from $25 to 75, SA would have asked about cuts had they been involved. A fifty dollar increase is more than
students pay for transportation, nearly anything but athletics and union.

f. Daniel: To respond to Zak’s point about lower enrollment. Lower enrollment is not the time to cut.

g. Katie: Agreed with Emma about future SFCs should be responsible for what happens next. Part of why I originally cosponsored is that I was strongly opposed to the original legislation. I feel the original legislation was from a place of transparency, but this legislation doesn’t feel transparent, and I wouldn’t like to support legislation that doesn’t

h. Zen: If it was cut every time it increased, hasn’t the $75 increase already been accounted for?

i. Alyssa: I know people don’t like when I state my opinions, but I do have that right. I know you all know that it took me a while to sign the first piece of legislation because I was on the fence. I ultimately signed it that the next piece of legislation would reinstate the fee, the process would be cleaned up, and we’d be good to go. It’s concerning to me that I don’t agree with 52-58 because I don’t think there’s a reason to punish the union for a process that was done incorrectly. This piece of legislation has things that are separate.

j. Josh: If I present something from a committee, it still has to go through the senate. Senators should be part of the discussion about the segregated fees.

k. Sarah: SFC meetings are open to the public and majority senators. It would be, truthfully, unreasonable to expect entire senate to be involved in SFC process. This is why a committee exists. There are two rounds on nonallocable fees, nonallocable fees are under the purview of the chancellor, and SFC can only recommend.

l. Mary: If this were implemented, my process question is, if it were passed by the senate, what would that effectively do?

m. Conal: Thinks that the issue of SFC not having quorum is being overstated, if anyone else would like to confirm that. SFC has passed, in a timely fashion, all legislation and given all recommendations that we were supposed to. Further, I’d like to bring everyone’s recollection back to the original legislation and question whether the process from then until now has been honest. Thought the fee would be reinstated as it existed already. Move to end discussion on amendment, seconded by Daniel.

   i. 13 in favor, three opposed. Discussion is ended.

n. Original motion by Connor: Strike 52-58

   i. 14 in favor, 3 opposed.

   ii. Motion passes

xii. Emma: Quorum has not been difficult for SFC, we may have had to wait for ten minutes before the meeting starts, but the only time quorum hasn’t been met was when someone requested a meeting two days before. Enrollment can’t be used as a reason to ask for an increase. With 52-58 being stricken, 76 and 77 have the same effect, and the timeline lines up with the decline “of the other fee,” it may be something to consider taking out.
xiii. Will: 52-58, two people from senate were at SFC. Will has been to every SFC meeting. The last meeting, while the legislation couldn’t be voted on, people did prioritize the union fee. Moves to amend line 76-77 to read “Any increases to the Union segregated fee following fiscal year 20 for a period of five years shall be for reasons of only pay plan increases or fringe benefit increases.”
   1. Seconded by Santiago
      a. Daniel: These changes don’t strongly affect the legislation, even if we pass something concerning the seg fee, it needs to go through SFC, I would like to revoke my cosponsorship of the legislation, and I will not be supporting this legislation in its current form.
      b. Will: Rescinds his motion, and moves to table until the following meeting. Seconded.
         i. Josh: They want support for the union, and tabling the legislation could be as bad voting no.
         ii. Kelly Haag: The legislation passed two meetings ago supporting the fee helps give support for the building commission, while this is urgent due to its nature, tabling would not be devastating.
         iii. Daniel: move to end discussion, second by Conal.
             Motion passes unanimously.
         iv. Motion to table passes.

xiv. Kelly and Rick will not be able to attend the next meeting. They have materials present to help the SA in their decisions. Rick says that the document to pick up is a packet of financials. If the cut went through, it would have been a 1.2 million dollar cut. The cuts would have had to have been absorbed somewhere, but there are things that simply cannot be cut.

d. Quorum lost at 7:20PM. All items discussed after this point were at a meeting without quorum.

e. Senate Finance Committee Letter of Justification
   i. Emma: per SFC bylaws, Emma is required to give a written letter stating why increases weren’t approved at their full amount.

f. Farmer’s Market CBD vendor discussion.
   i. Daniel has concerns about a vendor selling CBD products, because although there is no campus policy against CBD oil, he is concerned about the image it may project of SA.
   ii. John: Farmer’s market vendor will be selling CBD oil. Reached out to administration to ask for regulations. He responded with old information that it was outlawed and not be allowed on campus. A senator in Wisconsin who helped legalize CBD oil will be having a meeting with university stakeholders.
   iii. Connor: It’s important to think about how administration views us, but more importantly how do students feel about the CBD oil? People overwhelmingly support CBD and THC.
   iv. Santiago: yield time to Kelly Haag.
      1. Kelly Haag: To clarify, this is not a view, but advice from university legal and chief of police. Essentially this isn’t about image, but about legality. According to chief of police and attorney general, there will be a report coming out, so university legal shouldn’t be interpreting something that the attorney general is working on.
   v. John: Wisconsin Department of Justice has released a report that CBD oil may be sold to anyone.
   vi. Kelly: According to her information, the only people who may legally possess CBD have the medical and physician justification.
vii. Dean Adam Jussel would like more information on the legality before talking about any views on image.
viii. Conal: sees no issue as CBD is non-psychoactive.

IX. Questions and Concerns

a. Josh reminds committee chairs that people can be removed if they are not meeting quorum.
b. Will: Question for Rick, has there been an audit conducted to see how many students use a service versus the cost of them?
   i. Rick: We do track user levels of various operations. Event services, if we were to quantify usage, they set up the room for the senate meeting tonight. The numbers wouldn’t look that significant on paper.
   ii. Will: So there’s no number or audit that has been done?
   iii. Rick: would have to look at details to give specific numbers.
   iv. Will: Looking for an assessment on prioritization of services based on how students use them
   v. Rick: This has not been done.
c. Conal: May not have spoken out about it enough, but considers the student org sponsorship to be a good policy, and thinks the body should reconsider.
   i. Mary: in an RSO, there have been issues without having a contract and thinks that a contract would be valuable.
   ii. Josh: Right now the issue is one of delegation. Talked to John about this extensively and agreed that it should be done outside of senate.
   iii. Alyssa: Chose not to delegate because she does not want the student org advocacy senator to represent SA.
   iv. James: Why doesn’t SOAS help orgs connect with legal clinic to write a contract? It seems like Josh is only willing to move forward if he is the
   v. Daniel: This could be an agenda item for the next meeting.
   vi. Zen: This is no longer worth discussing.
   vii. Josh: This continues to be discussed because the senate is in favor of it.

X. Adjournment

Quorum was lost at 7:20PM. Meeting was informally adjourned following discussion in Questions and Concerns.