**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**March 7, 2016**

Co-President Rasmussen calls the meeting to order at 7:34

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: What’s your favorite topping on ice cream?

1. **Approval of the Minutes 2/29/16**

Approved

1. **Community Comment**
   1. **Soule**: I’m the Co-President of WAC. I would like to explain our petition and encourage you to endorse it. What we’re proposing complies with the law. We’ve consulted research on Title IX, we’ve talked to people who have been in this the experience. This is coming therefore from a considerable number survivors and these demands are based on experiences. We based this on the Ohio policy, which has been referred to by others as well. Some of the things we address are: how the sanctioning board gets 3 hours of training, it’s not enough. We want an increase of training. The room assignments, that’s easy to change. We’re also asking clarity in the policy. So, I’m here to explain more what’s going on and encourage you to endorse our petition for a safer Gustavus.

**Questions:**

Dix: What kind of biases do you mean in the petition?

Soule: Attitudes of homophobia, racism,…those need to be addressed before anyone is approved as part of the Conduct Board.

Dix: How to identify that?

Soule: Sociological research can help

Dix: Students on the Board?

Soule: That came from survivors. We feel like there might be a conflict of interest.

Toeben: Are there faculty members on the Sanctioning board?

VanHecke: There is an appeal board and a hearing board. Yes there are faculty members on these committees.

Panzer: Should we vote?

Soule: I would encourage you to endorse it. But if you disagree with some elements, feel free to discuss them. I would rather get partial endorsement rather than no endorsement at all.

* 1. **Sauvé:** An ethics violation. Why was the punishment chosen? The punishment didn’t fit the violation.

Svendsen: It was a dispute within an election. One of the things said in the by-laws is that there can’t be any change in the vote process. We didn’t know the exact word said in the moment, so we couldn’t push the decision further. A formal apology was decided as the most appropriate action.

Sauvé: What WAC brought should be endorsed.

1. **Finance**
   1. **Student Senate Executive Fund**

Schmitz: Audi brought enough documentation.

Dickey: It’s a program Co-President Panzer brought to my attention. It consists in exchanging bracelets among students and have them talk about how was their day. Tell Me About Your Day is a program started in response to the mental health climate at colleges and universities. Originally it was started at MIT by Izzy Lloyd. The bracelets will be passed around as students talk about their days. The program is intended to build community, show support for those affected by mental illness, and invite students to talk about deeper issues. This program will be paired with social norming media, most likely in poster form. We want to order around 500 bracelets (proportionately to the number of students that may be affected by mental illness). The budget is just for the bracelets.

Schmitz: We funded this because we feel that this will be used as intended.

**Discussion:**

Miller: These bracelets are a great part of the program.

Hinnenkamp: I’m fully in support of this budget. Still, we have to keep checking our laws on take-away items.

Martinez: I support this because we haven’t done much on mental illness.

**Vote**

**Approved**

1. **Committee Updates**

Rasmussen: I appreciate that Chair Svendsen intervened for community comment. Next time let’s wait for the Co-Presidents to yield the floor to any speaker.

* 1. **Technology**

Mueller: I talked to GTS. Two modem items added to Arbor View. Phone IDs are gonna be looked into but it’s not feasible as of now. Virtual lab is gonna be worked on as well. Finally, they are trying to migrate everyone to Gusmail.

* 1. **Health and Housing**

Dickey: The finished summary is done to be sent to Charlie Potts. Summary of the Policy. The plurality of the students were for the policy to change. That will be our recommendation to Charlie.

**Questions:**

VanHecke: Different policies?

Dickey: Having roommates to choose which policy they want to abide by

AbuEid: Update on Break Housing

Dickey:It won’t happen either this Spring. Discussions are still going on.

* 1. **Ethics/Finance**

Svendsen: The take-away items’ charge. Ethics changed some elements in what the Finance Committee gave us and will vote on the language of the proposal. A by-law will be brought up next week.

1. **Unfinished Business**

None

1. **New Business**

Sweet: I sent out an e-mail about the petition last night. I want Senate to endorse it. I think this is important because it’s an equity issue.

Rasmussen: I suggest that if you want an endorsement, you make a motion and we’ll go forward with amendments.

I move that Senate endorse the petition.

Seconded by Cella

**Discussion:**

Sweet: I suggest that we be very specific about any elements we might not like.

Rasmussen: I suggest that senators make an amendment if they want anything to be changed.

Sweet: Also what happens here will determine what will follow

Haberman: I fully support this.

Gladitsch: Not everyone I’ve heard has the same opinion. I think it’s good to support the common interest of the forum.

Dix:”Mandatory minimums” wording can have unwanted effects. The removal of students on the Board is a hasty demand. I’m confident that we can find students on campus who don’t have conflict of interest.

VanHecke: When the complainant suggests to remove the student on the Board, they are out.

Dix: A general concern about both students and faculty forming the Board. My final concern is to remove contact information of the students. I would like to amend and not endorse 1,4 and 6.

Seconded by Gladitsch

**Discussion:**

Dix: These demands are not well thought of.

Toeben: I think that format that Ohio has clears a great gray area. We’re making this our own and I don’t support the amendment. For 4, there needs to be an amendment. To what level do we determine biases?…demand 6 is a right that everyone must have.

Cella: Is it possible for us to strike any points of the petition?

Sweet: No. We’re supporting it or not. This not our work.

Cella: We should keepthis in mind as we vote. I want to echo previous speaker on the language of demand 1. I’m in favor of not amending any part of the petition.

Sweet: Demand 1 should be thought of in picturing what’s ahead. 4, a jury is selected through implicit bias. 6, the only people who should have access to the housing information are CFs, Greeter Campus Safety and ResLife.

Dix: My issue was with students and not implicit bias.

Sweet: If we strike number 4, we strike all of it.

Andersen: Demand 1, Ohio doesn’t have lower rates of sexual misconduct. Adopting Ohio is odd. Demand 4, I don’t feel comfortable eliminating students. 6, I think that I support it. I amend the amendment to not include 6.

Seconded by AbuEid

**Discussion:**

Andersen: Gribley is odd.

Hinnenkamp: I agree with previous speaker. My question is on how serious these exact wordings will be promoted.

Sweet: Some elements are hard to change. The petition is composed of demands and not suggestions. It’s up to the College to interpret the demands.

VanHecke: 388 signatures are great. But Student Senate endorsement means a lot too. The idea of Senate endorsing this is heavy.

Singh: WAC stated strongly that these policies will be considered carefully.

Hinnenkamp: It’s hard to adopt part of it and not all of it.

Dix: I was highlighting the fact that in this case students will have to consent to Campus Safety. A demand carries a great commitment.

Schmitz: FERPA, student’s information can be released without their permission but their parents can suggest differently.

Singh: Students can take off their information freely.

**Vote**

**Passes**

**Discussion (Amendment: striking 1 and 4):**

AbuEid: What kind of formal investigation is carried on in case of sexual misconduct?

VanHecke: A third party investigator is used and they will write a report. Responses will be suggested to students.

AbuEid: What is the college obligated to state?

VanHecke: The college currently honors the survivors’ wishes about release. The school encourages them to go to the police, but does not oblige it.

AbuEid: Do they have the right to go to the police after their entire appeal process is over, or not?

VanHecke: Yes.

Dix: Demand 1 is not needed, because it’s already similar to our policy except mandatory minimums. I think that mandatory minimums make it harder for justice to come about because it is restricting.

Shmidtz: I have an issue with Senate endorsing something that we are not 100% in agreement with. I think it’s important for us to strike certain demands if we do not agree with it. There is direct democracy, people can sign the petition.

Stolt: Some of the language “expect…” suggests that these are more guidelines rather than “mandatory minimums” in terms of judicial language.

Haberman: With regards to Damand 1, paragraph 5. Current policy has no words of education intervention, thus this demand is valid because it is an improvement. Move to strike demand 1 from being striked.

Seconded by Sweet

**Discussion:**

Haberman: Like I said, educating language is not in our current policy. One could argue that being suspended and coming back is a form of education, but it is not .

Dix: Do we have online tools as a sanction to help educate offenders, and mentors?

Van Hecke: Yes.

Dix: It seems to me that we do have educational options, so that should not be a concern when it comes to this demand.

Andersen: I agree, we have educationals, but I think that demand 8 is effective in emphasizing this.

Sweet: If you have an alcohol violation, some have to go to ACES, this is a preventative step. I think a similar thing needs to occur for sexual misconduct. Is there one?

VanHecke: There is an assessment, where certain aspects of sanctions need to be complete. There sometimes need to have an intake with me- which is kind of like a re-assimilation process.

Sweet: If you are coming back after suspension with a checklist of things to do to “fix” their record. Some sort of training could be helpful in assisting them . Justice for the survivor is what we are looking at in demand 1. We might think this is harsh, but it is serious. Rape is a felony. This petition is focused on giving agency to the survivor and justice for them.

For Demand 8, the language is aiming for a committee. Additional programing is efficient and not forced or mandatory. Programming that is more targeting towards people who have violated policy may be more effective.

Cella: Last paragraph of demand 1. Concern, for a survivor, having to come into contact with their perpetrator could be one of the worst things possible. It immediately makes people feel unsafe. I strongly support keeping demand 1 for the sake of the survivors and their education.

VanHecke: There is a lot in this petition that is good and helpful that the college will think about. For demand 1 I want to think about what the goal is? Mandatory minimal sanctioning guidelines? If the senate endorses, I would read it as the entire student body wants mandatory sanctioning guidelines, and I would worry about the minimum being 1 semester of suspension, which is not applicable to all the situations. Sometimes the survivors don’t want that for the perpetrator. If Senate says this is what the student body wants, it’s hard to say that the school will be looking into the way that all students want. Student streaking in the arb could be considered a violation, but this punishment seems extreme for that situation.

Cella: Questions for JoNes- what do you mean when you say that the demand will be looked at as asking for mandatory minimums?

VanHecke: I can only assume these are not recommendations, because we already have those recommendations in our policy. So I must look at it as a request for mandatory minimums.

Cella: Before we vote on this amendment, I want Senators to realize that the work “expect” is there not requiring a mandate.

Sweet: One person coming forth with their story is not going to be an immediate punishment, there is still a whole process of adjudication before punishment is delivered. The people that constructed this petition did a lot of research, these were not taken lightly, and survivor input was taken and they said that these changes would be helpful.

Andersen: Although they were crafted by survivors, our current process allows for each survivor have a say in how the justice is brought forward for the perpetrator is good. And I think people need look at each of the cases on an individual case rather than generalize it.

Panzer: We need to weigh how the writers wrote the petition, but also what a high level administrator said that the administration would interpret our endorsement.

Martinez: I don’t feel comfortable changing what survivors helped write because I have not been where they have, so I don’t have that experience to back this change. There are additional factors that can be considered in the making decisions on sanctions.

Miller: we are not changing the words of these demands, we are simply not indorsing them. I call to question

Seconded byAbuEid

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote (the amendment to strike demand 1 from the list of demands being striked).**

**Amendment Fails**

**Vote (remove demands 1 and 4 from the endorsement).**

**Passes**

**Discussion (Petition Endorsement):**

Cella: Reiterate how important it is to vote for our constituency, rather than themselves, with the force of the Gustavus community behind them.

Toeben: I believe that we need to support it in its entirety not just partiality.

Demand 2 my constituents would really appreciate it, we haven’t seen it and need it. Demand 3.

Demand 4. The main point is on implicit bias training, I feel like people would feel better if the sanctioning board had more training.

Demands 5. People don’t know what their rights are, this is a problem and needs to be clarified. Restricting what people can share is a problem.

VanHecke: we don’t restrict survivors from saying anything about their case

Demand 6. Room assignments- people should know they can take it down.

Demand 7. Should not be discrepancy.

Demand 8. Research should be supported in an ever changing world.

Demand 1. Intent is to increase the severity of the current punishment system. Should categorize sexual misconduct in more than 388. 388 is not a full representation of our campus. Maybe we should try to revisit this petition after emailing our constituents to reflect on what their wishes.

Hinnenkamp: I move to extend the meeting to the end of announcements.

**Vote**

**Passes**

Hinnenkamp: I have been talking to my constituents; there are a lot of opinions. My constituency is mixed and I do not know where the majority lays. How we interpret this message and how the school interprets this is very different. The severity of these demands are thus brought into question. I am more comfortable supporting this version of this document, but I cannot support the whole thing because I don’t know where our constituents lie on it. There is nothing stopping us from telling people to look into the petition.

Singh: Our WAC representative said they would prefer some support to none.

Sweet: Echo a previous speaker. The email that would be sent out to the student body would be very intentional, and not rushed. People advocating for this petition, want us to support parts of it. We should talk to as many constituents as we can, but things can get swept away in the bureaucratic nature of things- this is happening now and student senate’s actions need to happen now. The WAC needs to know now so that they can figure out what they can do next.

Svendsen: Regarding the discussion about going to your constituents. For demand 6, we would pass deadline. In our constitution a petition bearing at least 10% will be considered – 388 is more than 10% of our student body.

Roose: I don’t know what my consituents are thinking, these are demands.

Panzer: Think about whether our charge to represent the majority, or is there more to look into that is more equitable.

Andersen: I would like to speak on my non-support of demand 3. My biggest issue is that info should be public, but the publication through campus email. We do have suvivors, and they would get the email multiple times. It could be triggering. I think it would create a campus climate of fear, which may not be productive.

I move to strike demand 3.

Seconded by Roose.

**Discussion:**

Sweet: Was it because of FERPA?

VanHecke: There has never been a question about general statistics, so this hasn’t been questioned.

Sweet: I think this is about being more aware of your community. It is statistics, its publicizing what goes on at the college. These demands are set forth by survivors, so if they were in support of this, the fact that this could be deterring might not carry that much weight.

Dix: Do you know what information here is not in the daily crime log?

VanHecke: How many survivors were denied accommodation, how long cases were open, sanctions, or any of the outcomes.

Dix: We don’t post any of this information online either?

VanHecke: Currently no.

Toeben: Thank you to JoNes for still being here. I want to reiterate that the survivors were with them while writing this, and if they are okay with this, we should be too. This is data that we should not be afraid of. If it makes you scared, it’s not something you should hide from, but learn about, and know more about. It helps perpetuate the culture that we want to end.

Andersen: I think that it will create fear. My bigger concern was the survivors. There are survivors that are still too afraid to speak, and they may be affected.

Stolt: Not everything is covered in the two sentences of this demand. Respect that the people who send out these emails will be more tactful and not blunt in presenting the information.

**Vote to amend the motion to remove demand.**

**Fails**.

Gladitch: Call to question.

Seconded by Sweet

**Vote**

**Question called.**

**Vote on Endorsing the WAC’s Petition without Demands 1 and 4.**

Gladitsch: Request for Role Call Vote

AbuEid: Request for Secret Ballot

**Discussion:**

Cella: Role call Vote is important because I think the record should be clear as to how they voted.

Gladitsch: I think if people can vote with a better conscious with secret ballot, that should be granted.

Hinnenkamp: I think secret ballot should be granted.

Dix: When people support things, they should do it wholeheartedly. We are representatives, take a stance.

AbuEid: It would make me feel safer, rather than being judged. At the end of the day, we are just humans. It might not change the vote, but it adds security to the voters.

Haberman: If we are committed to transparency, secret ballot does not support that.

**Vote on secret ballot.**

**Split vote – Panzer: Transparency argument wins,**

**Motion fails.**

**Vote on endorsing the petition without 1 and 4.**

**Role Call: 6 support, 1 abstention, 10 against.**

**Motion fails**

1. **Announcements**

Gladitsch: Good discussion

Cella: Good discussion

Rassmussen: Good discussion; congrats to Co-Presidents Elect.

Singh: Look forward to your cabinet applications. They will be sent out soon. Africa Night is on Friday, so make sure you come.

Rasmussen: We will be bringing forth an appointment for our diversity chair next week.

**\*Meeting Adjourned**