ROMANO, J. This case presents us with the question of whether the Student Services Finance Committee (SSFC) violated the rights of the Multicultural Student Center (MCSC) and other Registered Student Organizations (RSOs) either in its adoption of Policy Paper 2 or in the application of such policy. We hold that it has not and thus find for the Defendant.

I. Background and Facts
This complaint arises out of the adoption of SSFC Policy Paper 2 at the beginning of the GSSF budget process for the fall semester of 2003. The following facts are uncontested. Budgets for the GSSF funded RSOs were due on September 19, 2003. MSCS timely submitted their application on that day. They would eventually be granted funding this semester, though not at the requested levels.

At its meeting of September 22, 2003, SSFC adopted Policy Paper 2 pursuant to its authority under the Associated Students of Madison (ASM) By-laws, see By-Laws Part 3, Art. IV §3. Policy Paper 2 set standard wage for students working for RSOs during the Tenth Session at a rate of $8.52, with certain exceptions. These exceptions allowed for various increases for students with more than one previous year’s work, for executive positions and for student positions that require “educational discipline.” This final prong is also the only prong that specifically required a vote of the SSFC before it could be considered; this prong also was the only one that did not set a specific standard of pay increase.

The MCSC budget was deliberated and approved over a course of several meetings of the SSFC and a final amended budget was approved on or about November 13, 2003. MCSC

II. Discussion
We must confront several questions in our analysis of the claims of MCSC. First, we must ask whether Policy Paper 2 is inherently invalid, either as a violation of University policy or of ASM documents. Next, we must ask whether it was invalid as applied in this specific instance. If either is answered in the affirmative, then there is no choice but to remand the issue to SSFC for reconsideration.
The question of validly turns on two separate, but related points. First, is Policy Paper 2 void as being contrary to the established policies of the University of Wisconsin. Second, is it void as being contrary to the governing documents of ASM.

The University of Wisconsin has set a policy regarding the use of student help. MCSC alleges that SSFC violates this policy. We cannot agree with this argument.

University policy regarding student employees sets standards not for students who are working generally, but only for a specifically defined sub-group of student employees who are “student help” as defined by the policy. The germane provisions of this policy state that student help means those students who “provide part-time and/or temporary administrative, clerical, laborer, technical, or other general support to the faculty and staff of the institution.” University of Wisconsin System Financial and Administrative Policies – Employment of Student Help (G18), http://www.uwsa.edu/fadmin/gapp/gapp18.htm §II(B) (July 1, 1991) (emphasis added).

A plain reading of these provisions indicate that the University intends for this to apply to those students who help faculty and staff. Its policies do not apply to students employed in the workforce at large, including workers of RSOs. RSOs are neither faculty nor staff. However important that they may be to the student community, they are not included under the terms of the G18 policy. The University sees them the same way as it would see other local community employers. Thus, SSFC is not bound by this policy, though it may adopt it at its discretion; there is no evidence that it has done so here.

Indeed, the University itself considers that SSFC has not violated this policy, nor is there evidence that the University even been concerned about the relation of this policy to its general employment policy. The drafter of this policy, Representative Benjamin Hawke, was assured by administrators that the policy was legal. Indeed, he was told that they “felt [Policy Paper 2] was a huge step in keeping consistent with GSSF Groups.” Affidavit of Benjamin Hawke, November 25, 2003. When we look at University policy, we give vast deference to the views of the appropriate University administration. If the University sees no problem, neither should we.

MSCS might think that this is unfair and may even disagree with the reading of the policy that the University gives it. That is their right. However, in our deference to the University, we cannot evaluate this policy for any substantive matter. We simply look to see if it applies to ASM and how. If the policy should be changed or if its application is incorrect, that is a matter that must be dealt with by the Office of the Chancellor. No body in ASM, nor any RSO or group of RSOs has any authority to alter or abolish university policy.

Again, we must stress that our holding in this regard is extremely limited. We hold solely that RSO employees do not fit into the definition of “student help” currently used by the University. We say nothing about the policy itself. We are simply determining the status of ASM members under the policy. Any substantive, or even trivial matter of the policy is wholly at the discretion of the Chancellor and his designee.
Next we turn to the issue of whether the policy is inherently void as against the governing documents of ASM. We can only invalidate this policy if it runs afoul of some explicit prohibition of the Constitution or By-Laws. It violates neither.

First, Policy Paper 2 was adopted in full compliance with the procedural requirements of the By-Laws. SSFC is required to adopt a wage policy by October 1 of the fall semester. By-Laws Part 2, Art. IV §3. Due Process would require them thus to adopt such a resolution before that time.

Policy Paper 2 is SSFC’s wage policy. Its sets the basic wage and such rules and regulations to allow for deviations from that policy. Further, it was adopted on September 22, over a week before the deadline. SSFC met the requirements of the By-laws and thus due process is satisfied.

Second, the policy does not violate any substantive rule of the ASM governing documents. The authority to set the wage policy is clearly within the province of SSFC. The actual wage is above the campus minimum wage. Finally, Policy Paper 2 requires SSFC to make all funding decisions, especially its discretionary decisions (i.e. wages above the standard), in a wholly neutral manner.

Policy Paper 2 requires all student salaries receive $8.52; this is a broad rule and is non-discretionary. The few allowances over are made for non-discriminatory reasons. The ASM Constitution prohibits discrimination for certain characteristics: race, color, creed, religion, sex, national origin, disability, ancestry, age, sexual orientation, pregnancy, marital status, prenatal status, arrest or conviction record, amount or source of income, political ideology, command of the English language, or relation to any who is in one of those categories. ASM Constitution Art. IV. §1. The By-laws require a viewpoint neutral stance. By-laws Part 1, Art.X. The policy violates neither of these.

None of the three listed exceptions violates these rules. Returning students, executive positions and students who meet educational requirements are all categories of student workers that are determined non-discriminatorily and without reference to viewpoints.

They is a look at objective qualifications – does the student have certain degrees, diplomas, or other forms of educational certification that merit an increase in pay? Has the student worked in this position before? Is the student in a position of senior leadership with added responsibilities? No one could reasonably conclude that these questions concern an Article IV protected category. There is no discriminatory or viewpoint based choices made, thus there is no substantive violation.

Knowing that the policy is valid per se, we ask was the policy void as applied in this case? MCSC argues that SSFC diverted from this policy by not looking at educational requirements for its employees and that the definition of “educational discipline” is not viewpoint neutral in its application.

The latter point is easily disproved. We have already shown how the substance of the policy is valid. Giving students raises based on their educational achievements in no way implicates
viewpoint neutrality. It simply looks at credentials. There is no evidence that SSFC in any way used this as a cover for viewpoint discrimination.

The former point is equally shaky. Evidence shows that MCSC did not ask for an exemption under subsection (3) of Policy Paper 2. Nor is there any evidence that they actually have positions requiring certain educational qualifications. They may link up students in various fields into service sections that will make use of their skills and knowledge, but this is not within the fair meaning of the term “educational discipline.” This is simply good use of employee resources. SSFC representatives testified that they have never considered mere use of “majors” in employment decisions as a basis for this exemption, only requirements of some level of education actually received. Again, the only exemption even requested for the Legal Information Center, which requires its Executive Directors to be law students, thus having received some level of educational accomplishment, not merely studying in a certain field.

We can find no evidence that SSFC either departed from its established policy or that it used that policy as a cover for illicit discrimination.

III. Orders

Accordingly, we find in favor of defendant SSFC Chair Aaron Werner and DISMISS the complaint.

By the Court, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Nathaniel Romano, SJ Yin-Chin Wang, SJ

---

1 Policy Paper 2 defined “executive position” as positions of “highest leadership;” we interpret that to mean the senior officers of each RSO.

2 While the term “educational discipline” was not explicitly defined in Policy Paper 2, SSFC representatives presented to the panel that it was intended to refer to positions that had some form of degree or certification requirement directly related to the work of the position. The only time this exception was utilized was in granting extra funding to the Executive Directors of the Legal Information Center, who are required to be law students. Apparently, no other RSO sought an exception under this provision.

3 Law students are required by the University of Wisconsin Law School to have earned at least one baccalaureate degree; this is in contrast to majors, where a student is merely studying a particular field but does not need any degree or certification beyond acceptance to the University prior to beginning study.