**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**November 2, 2015**

Co-President Panzer calls the meeting to order at 7:02

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: If you could be a celebrity for 24 hours, who would you be?

1. **Approval of the Minutes 10/19/15**

Approved

1. **Community Comment**

None

1. **Budgets**
   1. **Student Senate: Take Your Professor to Lunch**

Schmitz: It started last year. It’s a meeting between a student and a professor to spend a quality time together in an unusual environment. Student Senate is planning on doing it again. A vote of 2/3 is needed to break the by-law.

Svendsen: reads Section 2.6

**Discussion:**

Sweet: It was very successful last year. And many of my constituents appreciated it. I support it.

Svendsen: There were concerns that it went against our governing document but the impact it had was positive.

Sauvé: We don’t fund food unless for ourselves. We’re discussing breaking the by-laws, it’s not ethical.

Hinnenkamp: We are in full support of this program. Even if there are disagreements, me and my constituents love the program and we want to see it fully supported.

Dix: Last year there was some time crunch. How about this time?

Panzer: The 15 day by-law. This time opens an Advising window as it’s time for course registration, so we thought this would be a perfect time to launch this project.

Dix: That makes sense as long as Health Program function.

Rasmussen: This by-law is being broken because we want to see it happening this semester.

Dix: Why wasn’t it introduced earlier?

Rasmussen: It was a long process because we tried partner with CAB but it didn’t work.

Singh: It’s a finance guideline (funding food). Culturally, this is not a diversity related event. The event is essential. Based on the success of last year, it is valid to support the guideline

Sauvé: I don’t understand why we can’t follow rules we set. We keep breaking them. The by-laws were supposed to be followed.

Rasmussen: A correction on previous speaker. I’m not suggesting that the body moves this back

Sweet: Isn’t this built out?

Dickey: We have an account number that Dining Services take from.

Sweet: Does this break the by-law? I move to change November3 to November 9.

Sauvé: Appeal to Chair

Panzer: Miscommunication on the date

**Vote (Appeal)**

**Appeal fails**

Sweet: It’s our job as the body to support the students on campus and this is a good way to do it.

Dix: Question on Guideline? General public: the student body or Saint Peter folks?

Svendsen: Gusties.

Dix: This only makes sense, why 100?

Dickey: According to the number of last year?

Dix: Isn’t it built in? We pay only what we use…increase the tickets.

Dickey: We didn’t want to be unrealistic

Dix: There is no harm as long as the money comes back to us. Housing and Health, can I appeal to change the number?

Dickey: It will depend upon Dining services

Luing: My constituents don’t care whether a by-law is broken or not, they’re in full support of this. I move to end the discussion.

Seconded by Lamberty

**Vote**

**Discussion Ended**

**Vote (budget)**

**So passed**

1. **Unfinished Business**

**a.Contingency Update: Controller Johnson**

Johnson: Our contingency is $88,336

**b.Committee Updates**

**i.Public Relations: Chair Swenson**

Swenson: Advetising Take your Professor; Monthly Updates about senate’s meeting; P.O. Box: senators profiles.

**ii.Health & Housing: Chair Dickey**

Dickey: Take your professor to lunch from Nov. 9;Survey about hydration system: discussions still going on with Physical Plant; visitation hours. Biggest accomplishment: Mayo Caf.

**Questions:**

AbuEid: Break Housing updates?

Dickey: Discussions still going on.

Antes: An e-mail was sent that it won’t happen this semester.

**iii.Diversity: Chair Singh**

Singh: We’ve been working on 2nd Monday of October. Tabling for informing students about the titling of the second Monday of October. We did research on all positions.

A survey will be sent out on how they want the day to be titled.

(IRB: We must have our survey formally approved by the Institutional Review Board). The survey will be open for a number of days to gather enough information about it.

**Discussion:**

Sauvé: Don’t we have to vote before tabling for Senate?

Singh: The Committee will do the work. We are not asking anyone else.

Sauvé: Doing things without Senate’s approval?

VanHecke: Senator Sauvé, your question is interesting but I don’t know there is any guidance in our governing documents.

Svendsen: There was a charge about this…

Sauvé: This goes beyond my original charge. I’m also worried about Senate printing money.

VanHecke: Committee never asked for printing budget in my history of advising.

Panzer: Perhaps this might be discussed in new business.

Gladitsch: Chair Singh, can you send the proposal to us?

Singh: Yes.

**iv.Cabinet Update**

**Archiving Charge: Technologies Director Mueller**

Mueller: The whole archiving charge is not necessarily feasible and put everything online. Our solution was to have resolutions online for as many years as possible.

**v.Bylaw Amendment: Ombudsperson Svendsen**

Svendsen: The by-law was voted to reconsider. Article III 6. This was proposed by Ethics to solve a problem in the by-laws.

**Discussion:**

Dix: This is a flaw in the by-laws that should be fixed.

Sauvé: Is there any way to add any language in the by-law?

Svendsen: That would be an amendment in our constitution

Sauvé: I support the by-law

**Vote: Roll Call Vote (Full Vote: Luing, Sweet, Hinnenkamp, Roose, Andersen, Gladitsch, Cella, Toeben, Sauvé, AbuEid, Martinez, Lamberty, Miller, Antes, Stolt, Haberman, Muganga, Dix, Jagler,Huerta)**

**Approved**

1. **New Business**

**a.Fair Trade Resolution**

**Presentation on Fair Trade: G.A.C. Fair Trade leadership along with Chair Ostberg:**

Ostberg: The concerned individuals will be here at 8pm

Sauvé: I move to temporarily recess until 8pm

**Vote**

**Recess**

**10 minutes later**

Brian Konkol and Abby Nistler have arrived.

Ostberg: Some Context and History. Abby is the president of the club and Brian is the advisor.

Konkol: You are all consumers. What we consume are made in different parts of the world. The Fair Trade Movement wants to shape these stories. Which is why I’m here today. We’ve been working hard to achieve this and be a Fair Trade College.

Nistler: There is an actual campaign about it and different criteria to get the title. Gustavus has been working hard to achieve these goals.

Ostberg: The Committee’s members were in favor of this. It affirms the values of Gustavus. This would make Gustavus the first Fair Trade College in MN and 29th in the nation. Saint Olaf is close to where we are. Senate is the last step before it becomes official. It’s already approved by the kitchen cabinet.

**Questions:**

Sauvé: What is the consideration on meal plan costs?

Ostberg: Products have been already incorporated in the caf. No huge change.

Another thing to take in consideration is that there are other products that are not Fair Trade.

Dix: What entity implemented the change?

Nistler: Dining Services and the Bookmark.

Dix: If we adopt it, what is the intent of this resolution. We can’t empower these things.

Ostberg: The intent is to confirm that the student body is behind the Fair Trade.

Jones: What’s our requirement to check the box?

Nistler: We need your approval.

VanHecke: Can we include a language that states that “Senate urges” the College to be a Fair Trade College.

Konkol: Yes. What we have presented to this body is concrete.

Hinnenkamp: In the resolution: 5. Education? What kind of education?

Ostberg: Where it would be valid and make sense; not a specific class.

Nistler: We have different events (movies; fashion show; educational events)

Sweet: Did you work with the Kitchen Cabinet on making this resolution?

Nistler: We drafted and we shared it with them.

Toeben: When you say that the College will oversee it…who do you mean specifically?

Ostberg: Margo Druschel (Current organization’s advisor)

Konkol: The kitchen Cabinet is also a major part of it

Sauvé: Any formal survey?

Ostberg: Senate represents the body.

**Discussion:**

Sweet: I’m in full support of this. Fair Trade affirms the human nature. The costs

are pretty comparable. We’re moving to make Gustavus a better community.

Sauvé: I move to extend the meeting until the end of announcements.

Seconded by Sweet

**Vote**

**Approved**

Sauvé: We should talk to all the student body first. This directly impacts students, we should be careful about it. I can’t support this motion.

AbuEid: We see a more global implication. I totally support this.

Luing: My constituencies are excited about it. I’m in full support of it.

Hinnenkamp: This quite in line with our values. This would be the first college in the state to do this. It touches the lives of more people in the world. We’re in full support of this motion.

Toeben: The people I talked about it among my constituencies are in full support of this.

Dix: I propose an amendment to the text. Add that “the student senate urges” this to the College.

Seconded by Luing

Luing: I agree with previous speaker. I feel an urgency.

**Vote**

**Amended**

Singh: I would like to add that this is a formality. This is making it official from Cabinet discussion.

Svendsen: Does Senate vote on resolutions that come forth from outside the body?

VanHecke: This is appropriate to the governing documents

Haberman: I move to end discussion

**Vote**

**Passed**

Sauvé: Point of privilege. I ask to the resolution to be read out.

Advisor VanHecke reads it loudly

Sauvé: Secret Ballot

Haberman: I object

**Vote (Secret Ballot Vote)**

**Rejected**

**Vote(Passing the Resolution)**

**The Resolution Passes**

**b. Sauvé**: Committees do things very independently. I move to bring the Diversity Committee tabling to put a proposal on the floor for a vote.

Seconded by Cella

**Discussion:**

Sauvé: This comes from Indigenous Day issue.

VanHecke: The Administration didn’t dismiss your concerns. It was a question of timing.

Singh: Clarification between Marketing and Administration. There are levels of decision making: it had to be dealt with the Marketing office first. We’re having a tri-fold because we want informed students, a good work was done to find enough information.

Sweet: We’re being very intentional in our language (inform vs educate). This is still a part of our charge. We need to resolve it and come back to the student body with a solid decision. We’re trying to get the input from the student body.

Hinnenkamp: Ombudsperson, could you read the by-law about Diversity Committee?

Svendsen: No by-law about it.

Hinnenkamp: We’re not trying to get our agenda ahead but we want to be informed as well as inform.

Svendsen: reads Duties of Chair of Diversity.

Toeben: We’re being intentional into what we have. We are tabling to inform.

Gladitsch: It concerns me that it has the Senate name.

Dix: The urge to inform is very good. It is important to be mindful.

The Committee should have brought it to the floor.

Sauvé: I came up with the charge last year, that’s all. Nothing involving information or survey. What we say should be respected by the administration.

VanHecke: The smoking policy for instance. The Cabinet kept going to the Senate

to ask their opinions and they said they didn’t want the smoking

banned. We do respect your opinions.

Sauvé: The visitation hours policy for 5 years. It wasn’t accepted .

VanHecke: My suggestion was to bring the concern to the President’s cabinet.

Sorry if I made it too complicated.

Singh: Diversity Chair attends DLC. Everybody is welcome to send suggestions or comments about the proposal.

Johnson: We support tabling.

Rasmussen: A motion was made this year about this. Diversity Chair talked to Marketing but because of timing issues we talked to Jones and she suggested a survey to show more evidence from the student body support. The tabling is informative and not pushing our agenda ahead.

Singh: We can have a vote. Our committee will still be going on with what’s supposed to happen. Tuesday 4:30 Gustie Den. If you think Senate should vote, go for it.

Sweet: I call to question

Seconded by Lamberty

**Vote**

**Called to question**

**Vote (Motion)**

**Tied**

Rasmussen: I think that committees shouldn’t get “yes” from the Senate body every time but let’s hold a discussion on it as we see there still is some tension around this.

**Discussion:**

Sauvé: I’m in full support of it. All I wanted was to have a vote.

Sweet: This point of action was necessary because we can’t speak for everyone.

Dix: We need to review the document. I move to table this discussion until next week.

Seconded by Sauvé

**Discussion:**

Dix: The aim is an informed of discussion.

Hinnenkamp: I’m not in favorite of tabling anymore because this has been put in doubt.

Andersen: Does tabling punch your work (Chair)?

Singh: It is fine if you think tabling is necessary. This wasn’t designed as a proposal. We will look it over and on Wednesday we will send the official document.

Sauvé: I think that it’s in the best interest of the Senate (50-50) to table this.

Gladitsch: I don’t think we should vote on something we haven’t read.

Cella: The document is not informal one. I propose to let us (the committee) run into through it again and we will send an official document after revising what we have.

Muganga: I move to end the discussion

Seconded by Sauvé

**Vote**

**So ended**

**Vote (Postponing proposal)**

**Proposal tabled**

**c.Sauvé**: I move to have Senate send us the agenda 72 hours before the Senate meeting

Seconded by Dix

Sauvé: I think that we should be informed ahead of time to prepare ourselves better.

Rasmussen: This is wonderful. Sometimes we have unexpected things, that’s why we wait until Sunday.

Sauvé: First draft of agenda on Friday then?

Solveig: Ethics meeting on Fridays, so that complicates issues.

**Charge amended ( first draft on Friday)**

Rasmussen: I appreciate the concern.

Svendsen: As I said, Ethics meeting would cause an issue in terms of timeline.

Sauvé: What would be the best way to amend it?

Solveig: I’m just giving information.

Sauvé: I change the motion to Saturday instead of Friday?

Seconded by Cella.

Toeben: Is this an actual charge or a friendly request?

Panzer: A friendly request in the form of a charge.

**Vote**

**So amended**

**Vote (On sending the agenda on Saturday)**

**Approved**

**d.Luing:** I would like to charge Health and Housing with investigating in the possibility of opening the gate between Chapel View and the campus.

VanHecke: It’s a zoning problem. It can’t be an open to the public.

Ostberg: Potential changement of zoning. I discussed it with Campus Safety.

**e.Roose:** I move to charge Student and Academic Affairs to look into the possibility of having and contacting administration about mirrors in the weight room.

Seconded by AbuEid

Sauvé: That’s a valid motion, I support it. I move to change to Health and Housing.

Seconded by Luing

**Vote**

**So amended**

Luing: I’m in favorite of this.

Sweet: Jones, is the weight room being redone?

VanHecke: Cabinet has not been made aware of any specific changes.

Ostberg: We can take the charge, we are not so busy.

**Vote**

**So charged**

**f.Dix**: Student Concern Report from tabling: Club sports don’t have access to trainers and this is a danger.

Johnson: Academic training is not open to non-athletes because of insurance issues.

Dix: I move for Health and Housing to analyze and bring back information about the possibility of having trainers for club sports.

Seconded by Cella.

**Discussion:**

Dix: This a major health concern.

Sweet: About the insurance, you’re covered by Health Services in some ways.

Hinnenkamp: I like the compassion in this motion. This might implicate expensive issues though.

Toeben: Going with what previous speaker just said, I don’t support this.

AbuEid: There is an intramural soccer tournament going on and there is no intervention if someone is injured.

Roose: Being a Rugby player and having had a lot of injuries, I can’t emphasize enough the importance of having athletic trainers. I’m in full support of this and especially the investigation part of it.

Lamberty: This is not feasible, it’s already tough with varsity sports. Also, Health and Housing has a lot going on.

Dix: This is an investigation that will come back with an analysis. I don’t see the difference between varsity athletes and club sports athletes in terms of safety. Both groups should be served.

Andersen: I would like to amend the charge: make athletic trainers an option and encouraging students to explore other options as well.

Dix: The nurses can’t train as well as athletic trainers from experience.

Seconded by Stolt

**Discussion:**

Andersen: We should be able to make athletic trainers an option because there is a lot going on already.

Dix: I think that if we come back with an analysis, it’s better.

Toeben: Can you give the exact wording again?

Andersen: Explore options for improving access to health treatment options for club athletes. Just for Health and Housing to look into other options and come back with a broader investigation.

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Amendment fails**

Haberman: Since there is no revenue coming from club sports, I don’t support this.

Schmitz: It is our duty to look into this.

Sauvé: I amend for it to go to an ad-hoc committee.

Seconded by Andersen

**Discussion**:

Sauvé: This would include more rules and procedures that would be appropriate to be dealt with by an ad-hoc committee.

Sweet: This should be delegated to the people who are concerned directly.

**Vote**

**Amended**

Sauvé: Talking about club sports, I support this entirely because all the “healths” are important.

Toeben: I move to amend the motion to include bringing back information about avenues in which one can take when injured whether they are athletes or not.

Seconded by AbuEid

**Discussion:**

Dix: This brings away the interest in varsity sports.

Svendsen: I support what previous speaker just said.

Toeben: What’s the difference between intramurals and club sports?

Johnson: Intramurals stay here while club sports compete against other institutions.

Toeben: Intramurals students wouldn’t then get athletic trainers when injured…some intramurals are more serious, access should be included for them as well and not just club sports.

AbuEid: We are serious in soccer, we should get insurance too. We play events sponsorized by the College.

Rasmussen: Let’s make a decision.

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Approved**

**Vote (Charge)**

**Approved**

**g. Sauvé:** I charge Health and housing to ask the Dining Services and the Ad-hoc committee to change theirs hours slightly during Ramadhan when it coincides with the academic year.

Seconded by AbuEid

**Discussion:**

Luing: We were founded as a Lutheran College and we are expanding.

Hinnekamp: We should pass it.

**Vote**

**Approved**

**VII.Announcements**

Svendsen: We should be engaged even when the meeting takes longer. Talk charges in committees. Rugby for Nationals!

Rasmussen: Thanks for a good conversation about Take your Professor to lunch. I would like to urge senators to restrain from using it and avoid being seen as a group of individuals who allocate money for their own benefits.

Ngabirano: I will be sending a reminder around Friday about sending an e-mail to your constituents concerning tabling since I’ve seen that sometimes senators forget to do it.

Johnson: As an athetic trainer representative, I want to make clear that we want to help people but sometimes it’s complicated.

Hinnnkamp: I’m on a committee which is revising the student curriculum, if you have any ideas or suggestions feel free to come and talk to me.

Swenson: PR Committee, meet me at the end of this meeting.

**\*Meeting adjourned**