



ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF MADISON

Student Council, 16th Session

6:30 PM; 2 September, 2009

Hearing Room, Student Activity Center, 333 E. Campus Mall

- I. Roll Call
- II. Swearing in of New Representatives
- III. Open Forum: Any member of ASM shall have the right to speak at the Open Forum, subject to the time limits specified here. Members of the ASM who are not officers of the ASM shall take precedence over officers and appointees. Non-members of the ASM may be granted the opportunity to speak by a majority vote of the Student Council. Each speaker may speak once for up to three minutes. The Open Forum is limited to 45 minutes, unless the Student Council shall by two-thirds vote to extend it.
- IV. Removal or Impeachment of Representatives, Filling of Vacancies in the Student Council and Swearing In of New Representatives
- V. Adoption of the Agenda
- VI. Reading and Approval of the Minutes
- VII. Special Orders
- VIII. Old Business
 - A. Reapproval of 16-0822-07 Choice in Voting Bylaws
 - B. Reapproval of 16-0822- 08 a2 Include All Students in Fall Election
 - C. Ratification of ASMCC 16-0824-01 Appointments to the Press Office
- IX. New Business
 - A. Report on RA Union Education Efforts
- X. Reports of Special Committees
 - A. Safety Campaign
 - B. SAC Governing Board

C. Bus Pass Advisory Board

XI. Reports of Standing Committees and Boards

A. Academic Affairs Committee

B. Diversity Committee

C. Finance Committee

D. Foundation Hiring Committee

E. Legislative Affairs Committee

F. Nominations Board

G. Shared Governance Committee

H. StudentPrint Board

I. External Affairs Committee

J. SAC Governing Board

XII. General Reports

A. Chair

B. Vice-Chair

C. Student Judiciary

D. Student Services Finance Committee

XIII. Reports of Liaisons

XIV. Viewpoint Neutrality Appeals

XV. Announcements

XVI. Roll Call

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF MADISON
Student Council, 16th Session
16-0822-07

Title: Choice in Voting Bylaws
Sponsored by: Representative Paulson
Co-Sponsored by: Secretary Gosselin

In 2006, I voted for the Union Initiative, but only because I wanted to invest in Memorial Union. To me, the Union South rebuild was an obnoxious example of the First Rule of Government Spending (why buy one when you can have two at twice the price?) I know that I am not the only person who voted “Yes” for the initiative because they wanted to modernize Memorial Union, despite Union South. I am also sure that many people voted “No” to stop Union South, despite wanting to improve Memorial Union.

The questions should never have been tied together as an all or nothing proposition. Borrowing language from the state constitution, ASM should amend its bylaws to require anything put to referendum to ask each question separately. Had this been a requirement in 2006, there would not be a big hole where Union South was, and students who won’t even be born for another 12 years wouldn’t be stuck paying to fill it.

You may ask, why does this matter now, after the Union question has been settled? The most obvious concern is the upcoming Natatorium rebuild. Some versions of the plan have included a SERF renovation. These are separate questions, and the case should be made individually for each of them. This is actually not critical to finish in the fall semester. I haven’t heard of anyone trying to put a referendum on the fall ballot. If this were delayed until a council meeting later in the fall, it’d be fine.

For the interested reader, here’s the language that I’m proposing:

Create section 6.08(1)(a) of the bylaws to read:

All non-constitutional questions placed on an initiative, referendum, or recall measure shall be submitted in such a way that members of the ASM may vote for or against each question separately.

Create 6.08(1)(b) to read

All challenges to initiatives, referenda, or recall measure arising under 6.08(1)(a) must be filed within five days of the ballot being published under section 6.05(6). Initiatives, Referenda, and recall measures may remain on the ballot while the SEC and the Student Judiciary review the challenge.

6.08(1)(b) is to try and prevent post-election SJ battles over whether or not a ballot question is really separate as a strategy a losing side could employ. It may be appropriate for the council move to strike 6.08(1)(b) and just let the SJ figure it out some day in the future.

Whereas, members of the ASM should have the opportunity to vote as they please; and,

Whereas, referenda and initiatives that ask multiple questions simultaneously prevent students from doing so;

Therefore, the Associated Students of Madison acting in Student Council do ordain that:

Section 6.08(1)(a) of the ASM bylaws shall be created to read as follows:

All non-constitutional questions placed on an initiative, referendum, or recall measure shall be submitted in such a way that members of the ASM may vote for or against each question separately.

And, Section 6.08(1)(b) of the ASM bylaws shall be created to read as follows:

All challenges to initiatives, referenda, or recall measure arising under 6.08(1)(a) must be filed within five days of the ballot being published under section 6.05(6). Initiatives, Referenda, and recall measures may remain on the ballot while the SEC and the Student Judiciary review the challenge.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF MADISON
Student Council, 16th Session
16-0822-07

Title: Choice in Voting Bylaws
Sponsored by: Representative Paulson
Co-Sponsored by: Secretary Gosselin

In 2006, I voted for the Union Initiative, but only because I wanted to invest in Memorial Union. To me, the Union South rebuild was an obnoxious example of the First Rule of Government Spending (why buy one when you can have two at twice the price?) I know that I am not the only person who voted “Yes” for the initiative because they wanted to modernize Memorial Union, despite Union South. I am also sure that many people voted “No” to stop Union South, despite wanting to improve Memorial Union.

The questions should never have been tied together as an all or nothing proposition. Borrowing language from the state constitution, ASM should amend its bylaws to require anything put to referendum to ask each question separately. Had this been a requirement in 2006, there would not be a big hole where Union South was, and students who won’t even be born for another 12 years wouldn’t be stuck paying to fill it.

You may ask, why does this matter now, after the Union question has been settled? The most obvious concern is the upcoming Natatorium rebuild. Some versions of the plan have included a SERF renovation. These are separate questions, and the case should be made individually for each of them. This is actually not critical to finish in the fall semester. I haven’t heard of anyone trying to put a referendum on the fall ballot. If this were delayed until a council meeting later in the fall, it’d be fine.

For the interested reader, here’s the language that I’m proposing:

Create section 6.08(1)(a) of the bylaws to read:

All non-constitutional questions placed on an initiative, referendum, or recall measure shall be submitted in such a way that members of the ASM may vote for or against each question separately.

Create 6.08(1)(b) to read

All challenges to initiatives, referenda, or recall measure arising under 6.08(1)(a) must be filed within five days of the ballot being published under section 6.05(6). Initiatives, Referenda, and recall measures may remain on the ballot while the SEC and the Student Judiciary review the challenge.

6.08(1)(b) is to try and prevent post-election SJ battles over whether or not a ballot question is really separate as a strategy a losing side could employ. It may be appropriate for the council move to strike 6.08(1)(b) and just let the SJ figure it out some day in the future.

Whereas, members of the ASM should have the opportunity to vote as they please; and,

Whereas, referenda and initiatives that ask multiple questions simultaneously prevent students from doing so;

Therefore, the Associated Students of Madison acting in Student Council do ordain that:

Section 6.08(1)(a) of the ASM bylaws shall be created to read as follows:

All non-constitutional questions placed on an initiative, referendum, or recall measure shall be submitted in such a way that members of the ASM may vote for or against each question separately.

And, Section 6.08(1)(b) of the ASM bylaws shall be created to read as follows:

All challenges to initiatives, referenda, or recall measure arising under 6.08(1)(a) must be filed within five days of the ballot being published under section 6.05(6). Initiatives, Referenda, and recall measures may remain on the ballot while the SEC and the Student Judiciary review the challenge.

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF MADISON
Student Council, 16th Session
16-0822-08

Title: Include All Students in Fall Elections

Sponsored by: Representative Paulson

Summary:

Over the next few days, thousands of students, most fresh out of high school, will start to arrive on campus. However, many of these students won't actually be Freshmen, at least according to the UW's classification.

Colloquially, freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior match up with the four years of an undergraduate degree. The UW's precise definition is based on the number of credits a student has, with a freshman being any student with fewer than 24 credits. This classification is useful for academics. For example, it can say that a certain class requires that a student have some experience with college-level work before attempting it, or that a class is designed for new college students and upperclassmen should not take it.

With the proliferation of AP courses and other opportunities to earn college credit before arriving at UW-Madison, starting college as a sophomore (or higher) is not at all uncommon. 15 years ago, when ASM was founded, it was likely that only a handful of students fell into this category. In the fall of 2008, ~~about 500~~ 694 students did.

In 2001, future ASM Chair Austin Evans tried to run in the ASM Fall election for a "Freshman" seat. The Student Election Commission denied him eligibility, because he had more than 24 credits of AP work. The Student Judiciary ultimately confirmed that he was not eligible to run, unwilling to accept Austin's argument that common sense should prevail, and that he obviously was a freshman by society's definition. In 2008, current SSFC Chair Brandon Williams was also unable to run as a freshman.

In 2001, the SJ ordered itself to evaluate the election process and issue rules to define who is eligible to run as a freshman. It does not appear that it ever did so. The SJ also left open the possibility of "an alternative conception of the freshmen district beside the one used now." **As a matter of common-sense fairness, ASM should more carefully define the term "freshman" in the ASM bylaws and fully engage all of the newest students.**

The ASM Constitution allows for the bylaws to create districts based on "reasonable academic units." The SJ has interpreted this to mean some characteristic that the University tracks that can be used to tranche students, school or college being the most obvious way. Academic standing is another.

The Registrar already tracks students in a variety of ways, and can give us ready access to a list of students meeting any of these classifications:

First Year Students: an undergraduate student that has never previously attended a post-secondary institution (regardless of academic level i.e. freshman, sophomore, etc.)

Transfer students: an undergraduate student that is transferring from another post-secondary institution, but has never previously attended UW Madison.

Re-Entry student: a student that has previously attended UW Madison, but has been inactive for at least two consecutive semesters.

Re-entry/Transfer: a student that has previously attended UW Madison, but has been inactive for at least two consecutive semesters and also attended another institution and is now transferring that work back to UW Madison.

New Student: applies only to graduate students and professional students.

The UW is getting good at using 'First Year Student' for many of its programs, but there are places where it gets a bit sloppy and identifies a group of students as "Freshmen". The Data Digest, UW's official publication that has just about every fact and figure you could want to know about the UW, uses "Freshmen" in many places where it really means 'First Year Student'. (In other places, it uses "Freshmen" and really means students with under 24 credits.)

It is my contention that at a minimum, the ASM bylaws should define a freshman as a "First Year Student". That will restore voting rights, and the right to be a candidate, to ~~500~~ 694 students. It is hard to imagine disenfranchising these students was anything but an oversight 15 years ago, and regardless of original motivation, restoring it now is the right thing to do. This is what I call 'Option One'. Here's the language:

[Renumber section 6.02\(1\) to section 6.02\(1\)\(a\). Create section 6.02\(1\)\(b\) to read:](#)

[For the purposes of participating in the fall election, 'Freshman' shall mean any undergraduate ASM member classified as a 'First Year Student' by the Registrar.](#)

Now, let's consider a bigger picture. ASM seats are divided up into districts – Letters and Science Undergrads, the Law School, CALS, etc. Every single student – including the new 'First Year Students', are a member of one of those districts. (Freshmen who will ultimately be in Business or Ed start out in L&S) Are they dually represented, if they have both Freshmen Representatives and the reps from their school? Yes, but we've been OK with that. **The idea is that students who weren't on campus in the spring should have some chance to participate, by voting and/or by running, and so some seats are set aside for a fall election, as the "Freshman" seats.**

So, what about transfer students? That's another 1200 undergraduate students who weren't on campus last spring and who didn't get to vote or run in the election. We haven't worried about them, because they had representation from the reps already elected from their school. But, using that logic, there's no reason to have an election for Freshmen representatives, because they're also already represented by the reps from their school. **Any argument that you can make for allowing Freshmen to participate in a fall election also applies to a transfer student** – including that we need their perspective on the council. Therefore, in the interest of fairness and enfranchising as many students as possible, here is 'Option Two.' Here's the language:

Renumber section 6.02(1) to section 6.02(1)(a). Create section 6.02(1)(b) to read:

For the purposes of participating in the fall election, 'Freshman' shall mean any undergraduate ASM member classified as a 'First Year Student' or 'Transfer Student' by the Registrar.

You should be able to see where this is going. New Graduate and Professional students are also represented by people they didn't vote for nor did they have an opportunity to run for a seat. This is perhaps even a bigger problem for some graduate students, because there are masters programs that can be finished in two semesters. That means, for some students, they enter the University in September, get their first chance to vote in April, and graduate in May. We can do better by them.

That brings us to 'Option Three', which I will be moving to the floor on the August 22nd 2009 meeting. The language is:

Renumber section 6.02(1) to section 6.02(1)(a). Create section 6.02(1)(b) to read:

For the purposes of participating in the fall election, 'Freshman' shall mean any ASM member classified as a 'First Year Student', 'Transfer Student', or 'New Student' by the Registrar.

This effectively enfranchises every student, and guarantees that everyone will have the opportunity, in his or her first semester on campus, to fully participate in ASM. Reentry students had an opportunity to vote before they left, but we could create an option four to address them:

Renumber section 6.02(1) to section 6.02(1)(a). Create section 6.02(1)(b) to read:

For the purposes of participating in the fall election, 'Freshman' shall mean any ASM member who was not an ASM member the previous spring.

I won't be moving this to the floor, because I'm most interested in engaging students who have never participated in an ASM election, but I wanted to provide option four in case anyone wanted to go there.

Now for the really wonkish part: the Constitutional question involved. There are two lines from the ASM Constitution to consider here:

VII.1 Freshman Representatives shall be ASM members who are freshmen, elected at the Fall elections. Seats shall be apportioned among reasonable academic units by law every four years.

And VII.2

Shall serve for one year. No person may serve more than two full terms as SC Representative. Terms for all Representatives except the Freshman Representatives shall begin May 1st. Terms for the Freshman Representatives shall begin immediately after the Fall elections.

Let's start with the easiest thing first: It is completely within the Council's power to create a new "district" for "First Year, Transfer, and New Students" and allocate it five seats, and say that there are zero Freshman seats on the council. The problem is that the terms don't line up, and only the Freshman seats run October-October. If we created a new district, the term would still expire on April 30th.

Is the plan to redefine 'Freshman' Constitutional? Yes. The SJ has already ruled that the definition of the 'Freshman' district could be redefined. Could it be redefined so far that it included new graduate students? That's the rub. The constitution just says 'ASM members who are freshmen.' I think it's pretty clear this is completely compatible with Option One. It's more of a stretch for Option Two and Three, but I think it's within the Council's power to define the term. The SJ may have to decide. That actually gets very complicated, because in order for the SJ to get involved, an ASM member has to be "harmed." In this case, it would have to be a "freshman" who was harmed. Given that the most likely outcome is only "freshmen" will win seats, it's most likely the case that no "freshman" will be harmed.

If we want to be completely safe, a simple constitutional amendment could be added, which would change VII.1 and VII.2 to change "Freshman" to "New Student". If it were to pass, we'd be completely set: no challenge to the redefinition of 'Freshman' could be filed until after the election, but as soon as election is over and the amendment passes, there's no longer any basis to file

a challenge. We'll call that the 'Constitutional Amendment Option', and it will be a separate resolution, but they should be discussed together. It would read something like:

Shall the ASM Constitution, sections VII.1, VII.2, and VII.3 be amended to change 'Freshman' to 'New Student', which would allow for more students to run and vote in the Fall election?

(The SEC/SJ would also place the two versions of the text on the ballot)

OK, if you've gotten this far, congratulations. The hope is that by laying out four different versions, covering nearly every possibility, it will be easy for other council members to easily offer substitute motions, and keep the debate moving quickly. We'll see if it just makes things more complicated or if actually helps.

Whereas, the current ASM bylaws and procedures disenfranchise new students; and

Whereas, ASM has permitted this to continue for far too long;

Therefore, the Associated Students of Madison acting in Student Council do ordain:

Section 6.02(1) is renumbered to section 6.02(1)(a). section 6.02(1)(b) is created to read as follows:

For the purposes of participating in the fall election, 'Freshman' shall mean any undergraduate ASM member classified as a 'First Year Student' by the Registrar.

**Associated Students of Madison
Coordinating Council, 16th Session
16-0824-01**

Title: Appointments to Press Office

Sponsored by: Chair Junger

Cover Letter:

The ASM Student Council wasn't able to appoint the following students during the Student Council meeting on August 22nd due to requirements of giving proper notice. Because of this, we should act in the Coordinating Council to approve these appointments to allow our press office to get the ball rolling into the year.

The Press Office Media Specialist and Associate Director are paid the same wages and have the same per-week hour allotment. The determination of their titles will be based on the skills each person possesses, and therefore their titles should be decided at a later date.

The Associated Students of Madison acting in Student Council do enact as follows:

Be it resolved, Ken Harris be appointed as the Director of the Press Office and Callie Otto and Hetrick be appointed as Press Office hourly officers, whose job titles are to be determined in the future by the ASM Chair, ASM Vice Chair, and Press Office Director. Their decision shall be subject to repeal by the ASM Student Council at a Student Council meeting in September 2009.

Report on RA Union Education Efforts

The message below has been sent to most graduate students. In early August, it was sent out to about 5200 of the 8700 graduate students, because the Registrar gave us an incomplete list of graduate students. (The registrar can only give us a list of students who have registered for classes, and it is not uncommon for grad students to not register for classes until just a few days before the semester, or even well after the semester has started.)

Lisa A had several back-and-forths with them, and in the end we simply took the list of graduate students from the end of the spring semester and sent all of them the email, filtering out students who had already recieved the message. We know that this missed new graduate students, and we'll find a way to reach them after the semester has started.

The resolution the council passed in July asked that the council be kept informed of what the grad caucus is doing. Don't worry, that doesn't mean we're going to forward you every single email we send, but the first one seemed like a good one to send to the entire council.

----- Forwarded message from ASM <asm@rso.wisc.edu> -----

Date: Fri, 07 Aug 2009 15:01:42 -0500

To: epaulson@cs.wisc.edu

From: ASM <asm@rso.wisc.edu>

Subject: Introductions and an update from ASM on Research Assistant Collective Bargaining

Dear fellow graduate students,

We are your representatives to the Associated Students of Madison (ASM) Student Council. ASM serves both as the body that ensures students fulfill their obligation to participate in the governance of the University, and as a vehicle for the student body to pursue ventures that will improve student life, independent from the University administration. This email is the first of several that you will receive from us over the next year.

The primary purpose of this message is to provide you with more information on Research Assistant Collective Bargaining. You received an email last month from the Chancellor, which shared the news that the state budget contained provisions that allowed RAs to bargain collectively, if they so desired. Her message also included a brief description of the process, and urged the campus to study the issues involved.

The Chancellor's email kicked off many conversations among graduate students across campus. Be it with your labmates at lunch, or on departmental email lists, or with friends at the Terrace at the end of the day, many of you have started to learn more about the potential for RA unionization. Often, these conversations have raised more questions than they have answered. To help inform these discussions, ASM has collected a list of 25 questions students may have, and has placed them online here:

<http://www.asm.wisc.edu/ra-collective-bargaining-home.html>

ASM, the University administration, the TAA, and staff from the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission reviewed these answers. The document is long, but we hope you will take the time to read through it.

For now, ASM is not taking a position on RA Collective Bargaining, either in the abstract or recommending for or against any specific labor organizations. Instead, we are pledging to remain a neutral source of information. We will continue to collect questions and information for our web site, as well as keeping graduate students informed of any news that may develop. ASM will likely send occasional email messages to all graduate students. ASM may also sponsor town-hall style meetings and forums when the academic year begins, if it appears such meetings would be useful.

RA Collective Bargaining is something that all graduate students should continue to stay informed about and discuss, because it does affect all of us. Ultimately, the decision belongs to the RAs. At the moment, the situation remains the same as it has been for many years: TAs and PAs are represented by the TAA, and other graduate students are not. RAs, along with any labor organization that wishes to represent RAs, will decide when and if to take the next step in the process. ASM cannot predict if that will be tomorrow or next year. ASM is committed to keeping you informed of any and all developments.

We hope you enjoy the rest of your summer, and look forward to continuing this discussion!

Katrina Flores
Curriculum and Instruction
kbflores@wisc.edu

Colin Ingram
Chemistry
cjingham@wisc.edu

Erik Paulson
Computer Sciences
epaulson@cs.wisc.edu

Matthew Tobelmann
Chemical and Biological Engineering
tobelmann@wisc.edu

Elizabeth Wrigley-Field
Sociology
wrigleyfield@wisc.edu

TO: ASM Student Council, ASM Coordinating Council
FROM: Lauren Vollrath, Chair, Student Activity Center Governing Board
SUBJECT: SACGB Update
DATE: August 31, 2009

Office Space:

Applications are still available on the website (under the SAC Governing Board tab), and they are due by 5pm November 20. If you know of any organizations that may want / need space, please let them know where they can find an application. We will be conducting space allocations during the Spring semester. Any organizations that receive space in this round of allocations will be able to move in on July 1st 2010. 5 office suites, 3 large offices, 4 medium offices, and 20 small offices are available in this round.

Café:

The board is moving forward on plans for the café space. We decided that, although it may not be the most popular option, we would like to have conversations with the Union. Based on the amount of work that would need to be done to the space, the Union has the most resources. They would also be the most reliable and already have all the needed certifications. We are also required by University policy to offer the space to them first. At the next SACGB meeting, we will be brainstorming ideas as to what we want the café to look like. So far, what we hear from students is that they want healthy food at a reasonable price. The offer to the Union will not be made until the board has a firm idea in its head and we have specifics that we can give to them. This will NOT be the typical Union café.

General:

We will be updating and signing new MOUs with the other tenants for use of our conference and meeting spaces. We are also working to write an MOU with StudentPrint as they would like to pay rent for use of their space. As soon as we have the details worked out, I will give you more information.

SAC Hours:

We are now back to regular SAC hours. In case you are new or have forgotten, the hours are listed below.

Monday-Thursday: 8am-Midnight\
Friday: 8am-9pm
Saturday: 10am-9pm
Sunday: 10am-Midnight

That's all I have. If you have any questions about anything in the SAC, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Lauren Vollrath

Shared Governance Chair Report
September 2, 2009

- Student Advisory Board to the Office of the Registrar
 - Met with Michelle Kelley, Office of Enrollment Services, to discuss the creation of this committee
 - Similarly structured to the ODOS Advisory Board
 - 12-15 students giving feedback on services provided by the Registrar
 - Will act more like a sounding board to the Registrar
 - Hoping to have the plans finalized in time for Fall Application period
- Director of Admissions Search and Screen
 - Still have not appointed a student, was waiting to hear back from administration on the committee in order to give applicants a better timeline before committing
 - First meeting is September 29
 - First semester will be spent accepting applications, second semester will be focused on the interviewing process
- Shared Gov meeting last Friday
 - Discussed the Office of the Registrar Advisory Board
 - Went over new Shared Gov attendance form
 - Discussed the idea of standardizing the process of choosing students for Search and Screen committees that occur within specific departments on campus

- Shared Gov will now meet every Thursday at 5:00pm in the Caucus Room