**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**March 14, 2016**

**6:00 PM**

Co-President Panzer calls the meeting to order at 6:04

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: What’s your favorite fast food restaurant?

1. **Approval of the Minutes 3/7/16**

Approved

1. **Community Comment**

None

1. **Cabinet Nominations**
	1. **Diversity Chair**

Rasmussen: This is Gabe Grossuetsch. He is a junior and he has Senate experience from previous years. We think he has the drive and the motivation for this.

Grossuetsch (G): I have served as a Senator freshman year and last year as Diversity Chair. I’m involved with PASO, Queers and Allies, Building Bridges,….

Last fall, I was abroad and I became familiar with new areas of diversity. I think that my perspectives expanded and I look forward to contributing to Senate’s work.

**Questions:**

Cella: What do you want to get done before the end of the year?

G: Implicit Bias program, policy on rape culture

Dix: How has your sense of Diversity changed?

G: I used to think that Diversity means all. I’m a member of the LGBTQ. When I was in India, I learned how patriarchy oppresses the community. I learned that I can be part of an oppressive community even as a member of a marginalized community. I also learned to think critically more.

Dix: We didn’t endorse the WAC petition. How will you work with the mixed support?

G: I was shocked by the decision. I think the body should revisit the decision again or Cabinet. We need to have better relations with WAC.

Dix:

G: WAC would prefer a partial endorsement than no endorsement.

**Discussion:**

Hinnenkamp: We both served on Senate. He is a phenomenal voice. I’m fully endorsing Gabe to be brought back in.

Sweet: He is a rockstar. He gets things done.

Dix: We were both members of 2A. I met him first semester and he is very interested in people and I believe that’s an integral part of understanding diversity.

Panzer: It’s an awesome position. He is bringing in great perspectives.

Singh: It seems like we keep flipping roles ☺. We will work closely.

Shaikoski: He is an activator. He is willing to challenge the status quo and he is grounded as someone who can hear many different perspectives.

**Vote**

**Approved**

1. **Finance**
	1. **Gustie Buddies**

Meg Crosby and Anna St Dennis are representing the Club

Schmitz: Simple budget. They came in to get a trip to the Children’s Museum with the little children.

Crosby: It’s mentorship program that works with the Saint Peter Community.

**Questions:**

Dix: How many people are going?

Crosby: About70. Our org won’t transport the children but just the students.

**Discussion:**

Gladitsch: We thought that this is a great educational program. They came prepared. I recommend that we fund it in full.

**Vote**

**Approved**

* 1. **French Club**

Kelsey Berryman and Owen are representing the Club

Schmitz: They are organizing a book club. We recommended the full amount.

Berryman: We focus on francophone culture and language. It was brought up by one of our faculty members. This book was originally written in French and won a lot of awards. It’s open to the whole campus. We are hoping to meet 3 or 4 times.

Schmitz: The budget looks good. They are asking for additional budget.

**Questions:**

Dix: Since the French Club and the Greens are partnering, have they reached their budgetary maximum? I appeal to the Chair.

Seconded by Gladitsch

**Vote**

**Appealed**

Schmitz: As far as the by-laws go, we viewed this as a singular path.

Andersen: Is the French Club keeping the books?

Berryman: They will remain within both clubs

Stolt: Do you already have a budget?

Berryman: Yes. We are asking for the remaining amount.

**Discussion:**

Gladitsch: This is not a takeaway item.

Dix: This a great way orgs can partner.

**Vote**

**Approved**

* 1. **Connecting Clouds**

Allison Birnschein and Jordan Gette are representing the Club

Schmitz: A program to help people know each other.

Birnschein: We talked about this when we were back in Ireland. It’s a great way of connecting with people.

Gette: We are just spreading positivity throughout the campus. We have long terms goals as an org and we want to get people interested.

Schmitz: If you have any questions, feel free to ask.

**Questions:**

Hinnenkamp: What’s the theme?

Gette: Surprise party for strangers in one of the banquet rooms.

Lamberty: What would you do with balloons?

Birnschein: We would have balloons’ events during the day. We would encourage students to keep them on their backpacks as well.

Sweet: How will you spread the word?

Birnschein: We were inspired by where it started in California.

**Discussion:**

Hinnenkamp: This touches a great part of the campus. I’m in favor of funding this.

Lamberty: This is a great idea. Would the balloon in the banquet room be a take-away item?

Schmitz: No

Gladitsch: We saw the difference as if the balloons would stay with individuals.

Dix: I’m excited for this as an opportunity of meeting new people. We should fund the décor as well.

Schmitz: In the past years, it’s been used as a one-time deal.

Dix: I think that the décor is part of the surprise party. I move to fund line item 39.

Seconded by Hinnenkamp

**Discussion:**

Sweet: This is a real good idea and a reminder that we are approaching the Spring budgeting.

Gladitsch: It’s frivolous

Hinnenkamp: The amount is not that much for not being given. I’m in full support of this.

Gette: We see this as something we will keep using.

Andersen: Who else would fund streamers?

Rasmussen: To ask JoNes

Dix: I see this as a request for funds that seem in line with its goal which was approved and that doesn’t break our by-laws. I think we should pass this.

Singh: I want to reiterate that I like the intent and the org. If we pass this now, this should stay the same for other orgs as well.

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Fails**

**Discussion:**

Dix: That was the only disagreement I had.

Hinnenkamp: I’m looking forward to this.

**Vote**

**Approved**

1. **Committee Updates**
	1. **Technology: Director Mueller**

None

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

None

1. **Unfinished Business**

Rasmussen: We were thinking on how to move forward from Monday’s decision. We feel like that the Administration has heard our concerns. We sent an e-mail that you saw a few hours ago. If you want to do more, feel free to do so.

1. **New Business**
2. **Cella:** Last week this body decided in the end not to give the WAC’s petition the support of Student Senate, because the Student Senate endorsement entails the support of the entire student body, and a majority of senators could not in good faith reconcile the demanding language and strict terms that the petition called for with the best wishes of their entire constituency. Despite not passing support for the petition, there was very productive discussion about what we should do as senators to address the issue of sexual misconduct that has again risen up here on campus. Because of that discussion and the massive outcry on the issue from the student body these last few weeks I believe that we must not stay silent on the issue. Vice President Joe Biden wrote in an opinion article published on the White House website late last year that said “You know that survivors are not statistics. They’re our sisters; they’re our classmates; they’re our friends. They’re at every university, every college, in every community—large and small. For all of them, everywhere, we can and we must end sexual and dating violence on campus.” In the preamble to the senate constitution we are called to “to uphold the values of Excellence, Community, Justice, Service, and Faith; to safeguard the rights of students; to foster an atmosphere in which students may freely pursue their academic endeavors.” We must not choose inaction as a body. Think back to this senate’s dedication to justice. We’ve made Gustavus a free trade school. We’ve talked about handicap building accessibility and worked hard to make sure Gustavus is a safe place for everyone. Now it’s time to tackle sexual misconduct. We can be the senate that finally speaks out on the right side of justice, or we could do nothing, but as VP Joe Biden has also said “that’s a bunch of mallarky.” With that, I move to charge the entire cabinet to draft a statement to be presented for voting on no later than three weeks from today that 1.) Emphasizes survivor's well being and ensure that survivors are sufficiently informed of their options, both within and outside of the conduct process here at Gustavus. 2.) Reexamine the sanctioning board process, emphasizing more training and a more comprehensive selection process as well as possibly reexamining the way that appropriate sanctions for sexually related crimes are disseminated. 3.) Work to increase transparency of the misconduct process on campus, emphasizing statistics and both survivor and perpetrator rights and obligations going through the process. And 4.) Explores the viability of changing Gribly to an affirmative consent system for displaying student’s personal information. Let’s be the ones to continue the conversation and start actual change, for the good of the entire Gustavus student body.

Seconded by Martinez

**Discussion:**

Cella: We didn’t have the power to amend it.

Martinez: I agree with previous speaker.

Sweet: It’s a great and thoughtful charge.

Roose: I support this

Hinnenkamp: An e-mail should be sent for us to stay in touch

Antes: So this is a charge Cabinet will draft?

Cella: Yes. More appropriate for Senate to approve.

Stolt: It’s a great level-headed way to go into.

**Vote**

**Charged**

2. **Rasmussen**: Every year we (as Co-Presidents) are asked to appoint students to different committees. We need two new students to appoint to the Academic Operations Committee. E-mail us before tomorrow. The committee meets once a month and reviews everything about academics on campus.

Andersen: Just this year?

Rasmussen: Yes

Dix: When do they meet?

Rasmussen: I’ll look into that more and get back to you.

3. Hinnenkamp: People are confused about the elections’ results. I’m duty-bound to bring it to the floor.

4. Andersen: I had many constituents asking me about it. I would charge Ombudsperson (Ethics Committee) to separate e-mails in the future.

Seconded by Sweet

**Discussion:**

Sweet: Two separate e-mails would decrease confusion.

Dix: I don’t think the e-mails are a problem. The real issue was the lack of information about the infraction. I would like to amend this charge and provide more info on how the conclusion was reached

Panzer reads the e-mail.

Dix: What was the impact of the infraction then? I charge Elections committee to clarify the outcome of the infraction

Seconded by Miller

**Discussion:**

Dix: My understanding is that a by-law will be made related to this.

**Vote**

**Amended**

**Vote (Amended charge)**

**Approved**

1. **Announcements**

Sweet: Lineus show Alumni Hall 9pm

Cella: Welcome Gabe Grossuetsch

Guniggle: Saint Patrick’s Day on Thursday+parade

Johnson: National Athletic meeting soon

Hinnenkamp: We’re introducing a new program related to mental health (PAs) soon through online modules.

**\*Meeting Adjourned**