**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**October 19, 2015**

Co-President Rasmussen calls the meeting to order at 7:00

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: What’s your favorite thing about Fall?

1. **Approval of the Minutes 10/12/15**

No objection

1. **Community Comment**

None

1. **Committee Updates**
   1. **Technology**

Mueller: I e-mailed GTS and I will meet them to talk about wi-fi issues in the library.

* 1. **Student & Academic Affairs**

Ostberg: We are discussing about the TJ Morisson memorial; contacting Lofaro about any plans; Fair Trade Resolution; Meeting with Reverend Konkol.

Other concerns: we are working on them (J-term; D-Center).

* 1. **Ethics**

Svendsen: We are going to start looking through the Constitutional Amendment.

1. **Unfinished Business**
   1. **Hydration Station Survey**

Rasmussen: Last week we talked about hydration system. I worked with Physical Plant when I was Chair the past two years. I talked to them to ask about it and they told me they are going to put a hydration system in Sohre. Last week, Cabinet discussed about the pros and cons of the survey. We are still trying to see if it’s something we should do now.

**Discussion**:

Hinnenkamp: I don’t see the need of a survey because the College is already in charge of this.

Dix: It would be interesting to send the survey to specific dorms that lack the hydration stations and see if they are really interested in that.

Luing: We would be helping the administration to prioritize residence halls if we did the survey.

Singh: There is a way Physical Plant prioritizes where to put hydration stations. Even if information may be helpful, it might not influence their decisions.

Schmitz: It might be helpful to have the survey

Gladitsch: I move to reconsider the motion

**Seconded** by Hinnenkamp

**Discussion:**

Gladitsch: It is obvious that we want to move to something else

Antes: I would like to ask: are we trying to dismiss the survey or change it?

Gladitsch: I’m not suggesting anything specific but we can discuss it

Martinez: I think that sending a survey to all the the students would be a great thing to do

Cella:I think that focusing on the specific dorms is a good idea.

**Vote (Reconsidering the motion)**

**The motion passes**

**Discussion:**

Sweet: A question to the previous Chair. Can you repeat what you discussed with Physical Plant?

Rasmussen: I was told that the Sohre’s was going to be put next week and discussions would be held about how they decide.

Sweet: I would urge a carefulness in the wording of a motion. Keep it general and open to facilitate the work of committees.

Muganga: It was approved by the Hall Council that a hydration station be installed. I’m glad to hear that one is gonna be installed in Sohre. I support that other dorms get them too.

Hinnenkamp: I move to amend the motion: Health and Housing will look into the issue and come back with a recommendation within a month.

**Seconded** by Sweet

Hinnenkamp: This is for looking deeper in the issue.

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Motion passes**

**Vote (Motion)**

**Motion passes**

1. **New Business**
   1. **Ethics Committee: disciplinary action**

Svendsen: This is an issue that rose before forming the actual Senate team. A member student at large resigned from the election committee to run for the Class of 2016. It was charged to Ethics to see if there was any violation within the by-laws, a student at large resigning from a an election committee position and running for a Senate position within the same election period: Speaker Sweet. Ethics decided that the issue needed to be brought up on the floor. We decided a censure of the current speaker and see if whether or not a student at large is a member of the Senate. The censure we are bringing on Speaker Sweet is for not formally resigning from her election committee position before she was seeking to run for a Senator position. The action wasn’t premeditated by the individual but we are yielding the floor to you and have a discussion.

Rasmussen: Co-President Panzer will present our (as Co-Presidents) statement as asked by the Ethics Committee.

Panzer: I want to question the need for a formal censure and why Speaker Sweet is the target of that censure.

No harm was done in this, there is a gray area in the By-Laws concerning whether or not a student at large is member of the Senate. No formal application was given, no formal invitation was offered, therefore formal resignation was needed then

1.From the definition article 1 the definitions are clear and we don’t have a student at large here.

She is one of the most experienced senators and we invited her to be a student at large and she decided to run later.

2.I strongly disagree with the Ethics Committee to target Speaker Sweet. It would be our fault instead. You could target us: Co-Presidents and the Ombudsperson.

Sweet: I wasn’t at the Ethics Committee meeting when they talked about this, I have no input on the matter. I had a discussion with Panzer, turned around for an hour. I made the choice by myself to run.

**Questions:**

Gladitsch: I have a few questions.

Elections’ Committee (EC): Did she have access to other candidates’ applications.

EC:No

Gladitsch: In the Constitution, where did she have to submit a formal resignation ?

Svendsen: Article 4.2.

Dix: Speaker Sweet, did you accept the position at large?

Sweet: Yes

Dix: Did you receive an informal resignation from her?

Panzer: She told me she wouldn’t be on the Elections committee because she had decided to run.

Luing: Did you gain anything by this informal position?

Sweet: No

Antes: How did you know that this happened?

Rasmussen: One of the senators asked the question about who was the student at large on the election committee and the student brought their concern to Ethics Committee.

Rasmussen: Constitution Article 3 about the Composition of the Student Senate, where is the committee considered part of the Senate?

Svendsen: Nothing about the committee being part of the Senate

VanHecke: In five years of advising the Senate, I don’t know anyone who resigned before from an open Senate committee position. Maybe it’s a problem that needs to be fixed but be careful how you handle it.

Dix: With all due respect, this a time for questioning.

Sweet: My resignation was “formal”; there was no Administrative Director.

Andersen: If there was an application process, could the Ethics Committee have stopped her because she was already on the committee?

Sweet: I resigned by the time I had turned in my application.

AbuEid: There is a flaw in the By-Laws and the Constitution that needs to be fixed.

Sweet: Ethics Committee, if you’re trying to change a by-law, why are you putting me on Censure?

Svendsen: The issue was an issue of a formal resignation. You’re not being targeted, that’s not our goal. Our objective is just to point out anything not working.

**Discussion:**

Rasmussen: The motion is to censure Speaker Sweet and the cote will be a simple majority.

Hinnenkamp: This doesn’t need to be censured. I call into questions some definitions about the student at large. There was no Administrative Director at that time, there isn’t any background for this decision.

Panzer: Article 4.2. (a member of the Senate).

From my perception, a student at large is the one who is not seeking a Senate position. And a member is a student who is holding a Senate position.

Cella: The senior Class chose her and I don’t think it’s reasonable to do this.

Gladitsch: The Constitution talks about resignation. Article 3.3; 4.2.; 1.1; Reemphasizing Panzer. There was no Administrative Director, she couldn’t have resigned to anybody.

Luing: This is a shortcoming of the By-Laws (formal resignation issue). She did it from her own heart to accept the position and help the student body. The censure would be an unfair action.

Dix: -If there is an Informal method of appointing, is there something as an informal position?

-If a student at large is not a Senate member, we have a serious issue because they wouldn’t be subject to any Senate laws.

The point was never to target Speaker Sweet. To run and have a committee that you were part of evaluate the elections committee is a disaster. I don’t think you did anything wrong about if we don’t denounce this is to accept that this is normal. And I wouldn’t support that.

Sweet: Student at Large and Committees are not a part of the Senate, my goal was how I could serve the student body at my best. I never went to a committee’s meeting. I don’t think this needs a formal censure.

Rasmussen: No rules can be changed or manipulated by the Elections Committee. I urge you not to repeat what others already said.

Singh: Confusion about if a student at large is not part of the Senate, constitution doesn’t apply to them.

Hinnenkamp: Our speaker is being shown as an example. I will be voting down. I call to question.

**Vote**

**Question called**

**Vote (Motion)**

**Censure fails**

* 1. **By-law Proposal**

Svendsen: I’m impressed in how simple the discussion remained.

This is a by-law we are bringing to avoid the issue to take place again, it would be **Article III 6)**

**“Any member who has served on the election committee cannot run for an office during the same semester in which the member served on the Committee”**

Rasmussen: This will be voted to consider for the next Senate meeting.

**Questions:**

Luing: Would you include a wording about a formal process for accepting the resignation of committee members?

Svendsen: That would go under a constitutional amendment concerning the election committee.

AbuEid: The main point was to remove the option of running at all at the same time. If you resign or not, it doesn’t matter.

Luing: Would that be more formal then or just simply asking someone to join the committee?

Svendsen: After Fall Election, the election committee comprises the Ethics committee.

Hinnenkamp: The wording of “any member”?

Svendsen: Member is anyone serving on the committee.

Jones: If the Ombudsperson for instance decides to run for a class position, they can’t run. Right?

Svendsen: Correct! This is to avoid any other similar issues later.

Jones: What’s your concern?

Svendsen: That a person would be given a privilege because they were part of the committee.

Jones: Most of the elections happen with the Fall Election Committee…

Svendsen: Now with the new mid-vacancies law, more positions become more available.

Sweet: The ombudsperson can never run for Co-President, right?

Svendsen: Correct. There wouldn’t be anyone running the Election committee then.

Sweet: Those who resigned in the Fall?

Svendsen: They wouldn’t be able to run.

Sweet: Those who resigned in the summer?

Svendsen: Cabinet voting members would deal with the issue. There would be also an Administrative Director to which the resignation would be submitted.

Dix: We should debate on a few points in two weeks on this issue.

Gladitsch: In the summer, we would need a full meeting of the Senate…

Svendsen: It was hypothetical

Panzer: Point of order- Could you recommend how you want Senators to come back next time?

Svendsen: If this gets voted to consider and you are proposing an amendment, please bring the a written-out to the Technology Director to help things go smoothly during the amendment discussion.

**Dicussion:**

Hinnenkamp: I recommend that this goes through

Andersen: We should start with something fresh

Dix: We need to clear all the gray area

**Vote**

**Approved to reconsider**

**c. Dickey**: We are working on “Take your Professor to Lunch”. We need feedback from Senators.

**d. Antes**: Suggestions for the Caf.

I move to charge Health Housing to look into the way the Caf disposes the food.

Seconded by Cella

**Discussion:**

Gladitsch: Didn’t we have a similar question last year?

Panzer: As previous Health and Housing Chair, I don’t recall this item.

Hinnenkamp: Two years ago we ran into this discussion

Jones: It was connected to the complexities of how a food shelf can or cannot accept food because it’s already made.

Luing: It’s used toward Compost. It’s already being used and it’s pretty efficient.

**Vote**

**Charge fails**

**e. Dix**: I charge Health and Housing to look into getting peace tea on the campus.

**Discussion:**

Luing: Sure!

Hinnenkamp: This is a good charge.

**Vote**

**Charged**

**f. Martinez**: Can the extra money left on the Caf account be given to charities.

Hinnenkamp: We do do that already.

1. **Announcements**

Panzer: -Tabling is going well (lots of suggestions).

-A good number of charges: let’s work on balancing focus and flexibility to allow the right actions to be taken.

-On Thursday, Bobby and I met with Becky. Always feel free to bring concerns. Some of the things happening: there is more international student attention and more work on new facilities renovations being achieved.

-Please bring your amendments ahead of time concerning the by-law.

Have a nice Fall Break!

Gladitsch: Chipotle Mayo Pump, I support it. Good discussion in the censure issue.

Haberman: October 31, Men and Women Cross Country race

Singh: You can always snap when you like something; Try not to use “the” previous speaker , you can just say instead “a” previous speaker to avoid calling anyone out.

Schmitz: Welcome to our New Senator from Arbor View.

Svendsen: Thank you for an awesome conversation. I will send the language for By-Laws.

When we are abstaining for votes: don’t do it because you don’t want to vote. It’s your job to represent. Try to refrain from abstaining as much as possible.

Rasmussen: Welcome again to our Arbor View Representative. We are working on how to keep President Bergman updated about the students’ concerns.

Finally thanks for an awesome conversation about the censure and the By-Law.

Swenson: I will send an e-mail about a PR project. Fill the blanks and please send me also your picture.

Gunnigle: Let’s avoid a liberal use of language. Let’s keep it civil.

Hinnenkamp: October 31 SNL/ PA’s hangout on Mondays.

Jones: Thanks for a quality time engaging with each other.

**\*Meeting adjourned**