**Student Senate Meeting Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**October 14, 2013**

1. Call to Order
   1. 7pm
2. Attendance
   1. No absences tonight!
3. Minutes
   1. Approved
4. Community Comment
5. Old Business
   1. Timmons- Entertains a motion to move the approval of Hudah Ibrahim to point ‘a’ under new business.
      1. Burggraf- So moved
         1. Seconded
         2. Vote
            1. Passes
   2. Ethics- Henrickson- Hudah Ibrahim nominee for student at large for ethics committee
      1. Ibrahim- Junior Political Science major. Served as rep on senate two years ago.
         1. Discussion/Questions
            1. Hoppe- Last Monday you had a conflict with senate…is that typically a problem?

Ibrahim - Not usually a problem. Was not contacted last week/didn’t know she needed to be present.

Hare- Why do you want to be on the ethics committee?

Ibrahim - Wants to be involved with senate, give back to Gustavus community. Felt that the position was the best fit for her/way to contribute to the body.

\* Ibrahim asked to leave the room\*

Discussion

Hare- Concerned as to why she wasn’t able to give a specific reason for wanting to join.

Eiler- She was censured on the floor two years ago in regards to attendance. The candidate’s intent was that she feels that she would be best able to serve the senate not by being a senator, but by acting as a student at large. Already serves on a faculty committee. Seemed apparent through conversations that this was something she was willing to take up.

Vogel- Concerned about her attendance.

Henrickson- This was two years ago. She is entitled to another chance, and has made it apparent that she won’t let that happen again.

Hoppe- Thinks it says something that she approached the ombudsperson regarding this position.

Thayer- Was initially apprehensive, but seeing as she has been recommended/nominated by the ombudsperson trusts it.

Kemp- A lot of growing happens over two years. She would be a good voice to have on this committee. Attendance should not be a concern.

Thrash- Is there any information regarding her attendance on the committee she currently serves upon?

This info isn’t available. It’s a faculty committee.

Henrickson- Has taken time to consider this. Appreciates the thoughtful discussion and concerns.

Vote

Passes

Ibrahim appointed as student at large to the Ethics Committee.

* 1. The Dive Renovation
     1. Timmons- At the board of trustees meeting we discussed this topic. A board member approached saying that it could potentially be his class’ gift to pay for a “facelift” for the dive. A meeting with President Ohle was held. Another meeting with all of these individuals and JoNes is scheduled. Updates to come.
     2. Discussion
        1. Burggraf- Restoration over renovation at this point?
           1. Timmons- This board member felt that restoration was the best point. There remains to be discussion regarding this.
  2. Hate Crime Resolution
     1. A hate crime occurred on campus the weekend of Oct 4th.
     2. Felt it appropriate to pass a resolution as senate/cabinet.
     3. Timmons-Resolutions are a statement made by the senate that go out to the community as a whole outline our feelings/opinions on a given subject.
     4. Discussion
        1. Henrickson- All in all, likes this document. Outlines the feeling on this subject— this hate crime was a horrible, reprehensible event that has no place in this community. Recommends that senators look at line beginning with “Encourages”. Feels that this isn’t appropriate for a resolution. Encourages consultation outside of this meeting, rather than making changes on the floor.
        2. Hare-Was the date the 4th of October or the 27th of September?
           1. May make a friendly amendment.
           2. Hare- Amend that it should read September 28th in place of October 4th.

Birkey seconds

* + - * 1. Burggraf- What do you mean by consultation rather than changing the document on the floor?

Henrickson- Would recommend that it be done outside of this meeting and then be presented next Mon for approval.

Burggraf- So you would entertain that this be tabled until next week?

Henrickson- Yes

Burggraf- So moved.

Vogel seconds

Vogel- Also felt uncomfortable with this wording, felt that it was accusatory.

Thayer- Next Mon is reading days, we won’t be in session. Friendly to state that it be tabled until the next meeting?

That is how it reads.

VanHecke- Encourages us to not table and just slug through this. We are already so far away from this event.

Afreh echoes these sentiments.

Vote to table

Vote fails

* + - * 1. Thayer- Would like to friendly “Gustavus Student Senate” to “Gustavus Adolphus College Student Senate”

Rasmussen seconds.

* + - * 1. Thrash- Move to change “survivor” to “victim”

Siatta seconds

Discussion

Burggraf- Takes this issue to heart. Important language. When you say victim, you are putting the power in the person committed the crime. That makes the person “less than”. Implies that something happened to them rather than them getting through something.

Siatta- Doesn’t think that Survivor is a strong enough word. Thinks that victim should stay.

Schwichtenberg How can we change the words if we don’t know what happened?

Timmons- We are working to address hatred and bias as a whole, esp. here at Gustavus.

Schwitenberg- We shouldn’t change the wording since we don’t know the details.

Hinnenkamp- Echoes a previous speaker’s thoughts on the word victim. The person deserves the respect of the wording “survivor”.

Nigro- Thinks that either word would be appropriate.

Rasmussen- Is this a resolution that we technically made as a senate? Or was it made outside of this body?

Came technically from committee, but yes, it is senate’s.

Vote to change *survivor* to *victim*.

Fails

Hoppe- Would like to move to change line (after encourages the Gustavus Community) to “stand up against acts of hate and bias. Striking “to stop being bystanders during”.

Nigro seconds.

Discussion

NA

Vote

Passes

Nigro-Has difficulty with the words “Gustavus Community” Finds term vague.

Vogel- Where did this list of offices come from?

Cabrera- They came from the forum held by these offices addressing the incident.

Vogel- Also supports the Gustavus community.

Afreh- Would like to friendly to change “Community” (after Encourages) to “Campus”.

Patton seconds

Discussion

Thayer- Likes Gustavus community, because this refers to faculty, staff, and students. Campus refers to just those on campus. There are people we represent who aren’t on campus (like those abroad). Urges this to be voted down.

Richardson- Campus refers to a place. Community refers to people.

Vote

Motion fails

Hare- Really likes this resolution. Question about the last line using “disable” Curious as to this rational for this word.

Cabrera- Wants to send the message to disable this in others. Implies that we can work towards bettering the community.

Hare- Would like something more positive like “encouraging”.

Richardson- Feels that those are two different things. It might be valuable to address “encouraging diversity”, but this is important as well.

Thrash- Would like to friendly to lowercase all of the “communities” in this document.

Hare seconds.

Vogel- Why isn’t community capitalized?

Not a proper noun.

Cabrera- We modeled this after previous resolutions that did this.

Vogel- Friendly to lowercase community in to the “submitted to” line.

Best- Entertains a motion to change “disable” to “impede” or “cease”.

Vote to approve the hate crime resolution.

Resolution passes.

Note about resolution[[1]](#footnote--1)

* 1. Finance Committee Confirmations
     1. Montes- Osorio- Now have the four senator nominees. They are: Vogel, Burggraf, Hoppe, and Selness.
        1. Nominees
           1. Vogel- Served on finance last spring. Loved the process, excited about finance and loves getting other people excited about it. It’s not easy to make the tough choices, but it’s easier if you’re excited.
           2. Burggraf- Was Rundstrom rep last spring. Has a lot of opinions on this subject. Interested in the process.
           3. Hoppe- SW rep. Wants to be part of the conversation earlier on. Wants to make the conversation the best it can for the campus.
           4. Selness- New to finance. Understands the process a bit from coming in to request money for groups. Looks forward to learning more.
        2. Discussion/Questions
           1. Thayer- Directed to all nominees. How strictly do you think the committee should follow the finance guidelines?

Vogel- guidelines are there for a reason, to stay consistent. Also recognizes that sometimes things happen- things aren’t updated, or groups need money and must break bylaws. But, overall feels that they are there for a reason. Consistency is important.

Selness- Agrees. Should stay true to bylaws, but that there are some circumstances that must be taken into consideration.

Burggraf- Sometimes circumstances happen that must be considered. Fairness.

Hoppe- There are some situations where we must operate under a system of justice/fairness. Sometimes things happened.

* + - * 1. Thayer- Thoughts on food allocations?

Vogel- This will be a big discussion to be held in the committee.

Hoppe- Echoes.

Burggraf- Notes the cultural events held. But, there are situations where food shouldn’t be funded. Shouldn’t impede learning about cultures and events through food.

Selness- Echoes. Shouldn’t generalize.

* + - * 1. Thayer-Thoughts on funding Club Sport coaches?

Burggraf- Feels strongly about this (Rugby player). Needs to be discussed.

Hoppe- More than willing to have that discussion in finance.

Vogel- Since GAC rules change, we need to adapt.

Selness- Agrees. (Rugby player as well, understands this situation.)

* + - * 1. Hare- (To Vogel) Any specific instances of breaking bylaws?

Vogel- It did happen a couple of times last year, can’t think of specifics. Something that isn’t taken lightly.

* + - * 1. (Nominees asked to leave the room)
      1. Discussion
         1. Montes- The four nominees have different perspectives/ levels of experience. Ranging from more experienced to brand new. Want to have a wide range. –Two management majors, poli sci, bio chem., philosophy, art history. Good to have multiple perspectives.
      2. Vote to approve all four nominees.
      3. Thayer- Asks to approve them individually.
      4. Vote to approve
         1. Selness- Approved
         2. Vogel- Approved
         3. Burggraf- Approved
         4. Hoppe- Approved
  1. Timmons- Just received correspondence from the US Today Rep. Would like a date in order to move forward. Senate should look into this. Just wants to put that before senate. (Looking at late Oct for the next time to bring this up)
     1. Nigro- Co-President, do you have a preferred day of the week for the paper distribution?
        1. Timmons- A Monday
     2. Nigro- What week/time frame are you looking at?
        1. Timmons- How about November 4th.
     3. Nigro- Moves to deliver the issues of USA Today to all residence halls on Nov 4th, 2013. (In the year of our Lord)
        1. Seconded
     4. Discussion
        1. Burggraf- Do we have reps for all halls?
           1. Yes
        2. Wilkes- Is this required?
           1. Nigro- Cannot make it mandatory, but the more who help the better.
        3. Thayer- Encourages this to be struck down. And then charge PR chair to create a doodle to find a better time.
        4. Hare- Consider off campus reps as subs for hall reps.
        5. Rasmussen- There are so many people here, it will be impossible to find a date that works for all.
        6. Richardson- Echoes Hare- would be willing to sub.
        7. Best- This happens at 6am. Shouldn’t be a big conflict time.
        8. Hoppe- Encourages a doodle.
        9. Kemp- Doesn’t think that a doodle is necessary. There are other reps in dorms who aren’t hall reps that could help. Think about the senators that live in your building. Calls to question.
           1. Afreh seconds.
           2. Vote to Call to question

Passes/Question has been called

* + - 1. Vote on motion
         1. Passes

1. New Business
   1. Meal Plan Requirement
      1. Robby Bragg- Here to talk about this issue of the meal plan and how it is required for all students who live on campus. Will be showing a presentation.
         1. First year on campus. –Interested in comp sci and soc/anthro. Interested in how institutions function and the politics of finances in institutions.
         2. Over the summer was thinking about how to pay for college over the summer/ help out parents. Considered just providing food for self and opt out of the meal plan (save $2500.) Emailed many individuals over the summer.
         3. 3 plans available. Even if people can afford these, why are they required to pay?
            1. Steve Kjellgren says that this is a budgeting thing/ to plan for the year.
         4. Robby has showed that it wasn’t necessary to use the meal plan. Hasn’t used a single dime in account. Asked Steve about it. Asked if he could use it towards tuition. Steve said that he could donate it to Gustavus.
         5. Eats off of the trays. Brings back to dorm (microwave). Uses free/excess food from the co-op that would otherwise be sent to the garbage. (Generally that would be tossed for aesthetic reasons, but still perfectly edible).
         6. Working to start a partnership w/ the St Peter food shelf. Sees a problem in the community. Wants this food that is edible to go towards people who could eat it.
         7. Why are the prices in the caf higher than those in a grocery store?
            1. Steve said- 60% of the money we pay is towards the labor. These prices are in the food. (Other 40% is purely for food)
         8. Not adequate space for cooking (Other reason listed for having to pay for plan). There are microwaves in res hall kitchens, courtyard, etc.
         9. Why not share the break down of this budget with others?
         10. Every night the caf throws away a lot of food. We do have a composter, but not all of the food goes there.
         11. Each day, 2 or 3 400/500lbs bins are filled 3 to 4 times a day.
         12. Wants to stop this waste and to do something proactive.
         13. Steve Kjellgren (put Robby on the Kitchen Cabinet.) Sent him to Ken Westphal. Had an abrasive conversation. Sent him to president Ohle. Ohle says that “these are the rules of the community and you knew them coming in. If you don’t like them you can leave” He then sends him to the board of trustees.
         14. Asks for your support in striking the requirement of a meal plan. Has been doing this by himself since this summer. Really questions the integrity of Gustavus. Asks for help in this issue.
         15. Email [rbragg@gac.edu](mailto:rbragg@gac.edu)
         16. Questions
             1. Siatta- Agrees with most of what you’re saying. Works in Pizzeria…noticed the pizza being thrown away. Has tried/started leaving pizzas for janitors. Or, student workers may take it. Could have more talks with students. (Siatta) would be willing to talk to other student leaders who work in the pizzeria.
             2. Hare- Appreciates the work you’ve put into this. Thinks that senate should take this on. Hare had similar experiences (w/meal plan) freshman year. Charges to Health and Housing Committee.

Seconded

Hoppe- Should this be on Student and Academic Affairs (SAA)?

Two years ago this committee sat in the kitchen cabinet.

Hare serves on kitchen cabinet.

Barr- Hare serves on KC and the committee interacts with dining services.

Thayer- Encourages voting this down and moving it to SAA as it deals more with finance.

Nigro- Both committees would be able to handle this well.

Hare- There are more than financial concerns that drive the movement of a meal plan, such as ethical food purchases. Would be best on health on housing.

Vote to charge to Health and Housing

Passes.

Patton- (To Bragg) Applauds your ambitious climb up the ladder of bureaucracy.

Henrickson- Echoes. Your drive is inspirational, especially as a first year. You’ve done a fantastic thing. Thanks!

Thayer- Doesn’t support belt grazing. Feels that it is a health risk.

* 1. Senate Mentors
     1. Nigro- There are a lot of new senators in this room. You’re doing a great job, but there have been a lot of questions/ concerns expressed. If you have any questions, feel free to approach me to talk!
     2. Cabrera- There are also a lot of veterans in the room who could help. Talking to veteran senators is a helpful way to learn!

1. Announcements
   1. Henrickson- Thanks the senate speaker for his words. They are most appreciated in this chamber. –Ethics complaints should be submitted to him. –Pay attention to what’s going on. –Does everyone have a copy of the constitution/ bylaws? If not, talk to him. – Happy midterms!
   2. Rasmussen- In the future, if senate is looking at a wordy document look at it well in advance.
   3. No meeting next week!
   4. Contact chairs about your committees so you can get started meeting.
   5. May- Senators, SEND ME THE COMMITTEEES YOU’RE SERVING ON ASAP. ☺
2. **Meeting adjourned at 8:33pm.**

**FINAL VERSION OF HATE CRIME RESOLUTION:**

Submitted to: The Gustavus community  
  
Subject: Regarding the Hate Crime during the weekend of September 28th  
  
GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE STUDENT SENATE,  
  
CONSIDERING the unacceptable acts of hate and bias that took place on this campus over the weekend of September 28th;  
  
ACKNOWLEDGING the on-going state of the investigation;  
  
EXPRESSES COMPASSION to the survivor;  
  
UNDERSTANDING that these acts of hate are not the only bias incidents that have occurred on campus;  
  
SUPPORTS the Dean of Students Office, the Office of Multicultural Student Programs and Services, Campus Safety, Saint Peter Police Department, the Chaplains Office, the Provost Office, and student organizations in their efforts to provide space for the Gustavus community to grieve these hateful acts;  
  
ENCOURAGES the Gustavus community to stand up against acts of hate and bias;  
  
URGES faculty, student, and staff to assist in the on-going investigation however they are able;  
  
PLEDGES to work with interested members of the Gustavus community to disable hate and bias on our campus.

1. The final passed resolution is included in full at the end of these minute. [↑](#footnote-ref--1)