**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**Student Senate**

**Minutes**

**February 24, 2014**

1. **Call to Order at 7pm**
2. **Attendance**

**A.**

1. **Approval of the Minutes 2/17/2014**

 **A.** Approved

1. **Community Comment**
	1. Darcy Coulter for Mosaic Interfaith
		* 1. Co-President of Mosaic.
			2. A survey will be coming out likely sometime next week from the IFYC (The Interfaith Youth Corps). The Chaplain’s office is organizing it. It’s for students, and will ask about the campus’ climate (will measure attitudes, demographics, etc) in regards to faith and interfaith. Interfaith work is still relatively new on campus. This will be a good way to gage where we’re at, and then be able to reevaluate in five years. If you take the survey you will be registered to win a $25 gift card to El Agave or Patty’s. Talk to your friends and constituents!
			3. If you have questions, email Darcy at dcoulter@gac.edu
2. **Senator Confirmations**
	1. Complex
		1. Delaney Sweet.
			* 1. Lives in Sorenson
				2. Involved with Greek life
				3. Experience with parli pro and student gov’t in high school.
		2. Sam Leske (sp)
			* 1. Gibbs
				2. Soccer, Greek Life.
				3. Thinks senate would be a good way to reach out to the student body and improve quality of life for students.
		3. Questions
			1. Birkey- How much of a time commitment are you wiling to put forth?
				1. Sweet- As much as is necessary! A poli sci major, wants to be a senator (career goal). Able to grasp a wider audience at GAC.
				2. Leske- Open all week. This would be his main focus.
		4. Burggraf-Anything you’re especially passionate about?
		5. Leske- Improving quality of life. (EX) Increasing Gustie ware.
		6. Sweet- Improving the greater community, especially in complex.
		7. Thrash-What qualifies you for this position?
			1. Leske- Interested and cares about the community.
		8. Schwichtenberg- Why didn’t you run the first time?
			1. Sweet- Did, but not elected.
			2. Leske- Did not have time first semester.
		9. (Candidates leave room) Discussion
			1. Burggraf- How do we decide?
				1. Cabrera- Ballot and simple majority.
			2. Thayer- Supports Sweet. She ran last semester. Leske may have soccer obligations later.
			3. Olsen- Sweet running an active write in campaign for president with Thayer. We would have to do this again if she is elected. Just putting that out there.
			4. Burggraf- Spring semester is a lower commitment for soccer team.
			5. Hare- Issue of continuity is an interesting point to bring up. Developing a relationship with constituents may be more difficult if we have to replace.
			6. Schwichtenberg- Concerned with the time commitment Sweet may have with running a campaign.
			7. Thrash- Leske did decline to run in the fall because he was worried about time commitment. That shows responsibility.
			8. Harbeck- Knows both people and thinks highly of both. Delaney does balance her time very well.
			9. Thayer- Sweet and Thayer are running as a write in campaign. Most people don’t pay attention to write ins, already underdogs. Not really putting much effort in the campaign, she would be able to put a lot into the complex position.
			10. Rasmussen- Not concerned with others in the body who are running for co-pres (as far as being committed to senate), so not concerned about this with Sweet.
			11. Nigro- Speaking on behalf of Sam Leske. He’s a great individual. It’s one thing to worry about the time commitment of the campaign. The bigger thing is that there is a 50% chance that one of the candidates will have to vacate their seat (following election).
			12. Siatta- Supports Sweet. She has parli pro experience.
			13. Selness- Leske has access to a different groups of people.
			14. Birkey- Sweet’s person as a whole should be looked at, not just her ability to easily transition into the body.
			15. Schwichtenberg- If Sweet’s campaign isn’t being run seriously, questions how seriously she will take senate.
			16. Rasmussen- Delaney has talked with him several times over the year trying to get into senate. She wants to be a senator when she grows up. She’s a wonderful person, always looking out for others. Would fill this role well.
			17. Nigro- Leske would be great. Calls to question.
			18. Vote on call to Q
				1. The question has been called.
		10. Vote on candidate
			1. A vote 8 to 7, Sweet is the new complex representative.
	2. Off Campus Rep
		1. Nusla Mohamed- First year off campus. Interest and experience in serving people. Would be able to rep first years.
		2. David Krebs- Senior nursing major. Not very familiar with senate happenings, but thinks it would be a great chance to get involved and learn more! Lives in St Peter area. Greeter and has been a CF. Wants to bridge gap between on campus life and off campus life, as it can be hard to stay connected.
		3. Discussion
			1. Burggaf-Any issues you’re passionate about that you’d like to see addressed?
				1. Mohamed- People wish that senate was more helpful with funding groups. Has heard this concern from many students.
				2. Krebs- Feels disconnected from campus as an off campus student. Wants to bridge this gap (often a problem for older students).
			2. Birkey- Time commitment?
				1. Mohamed- SLP, class rep, CAB.
				2. Krebs-Would make it work, what ever is required.
			3. Asks that all persons seeking new position to leave he room as candidates are discussed.
			4. Discussion
				1. Thrash- Very different race here. One is a freshman, one is a senior. Either would bring very different perspectives.
				2. Burggraf- Would love to see more women in this body. (majority women on campus!) She also brings a different perspective in being an off-campus freshman.
				3. Wiest- Likes the candidate’s concern with bridging the gap. Both communicated well. Krebs might have an easier time with his experiences.
				4. Siatta- Echoes a previous speaker in supporting the female candidate. Would like to add that she will bring a new level of racial diversity to the body.
				5. Vogel- Was the off-campus rep last year as a junior. It’s scary being off-campus and younger. It’s hard to get involved. Both would be good. Freshman would bring new perspective. A senior wanting to get involved spring of senior year is respectable!
				6. Schwichtenberg- Supports Krebs. Senior off-campus student. She is a first year. This wouldn’t be able to accurately represent a constituency that is the majority seniors. Feels that it is out of line to bring sex and race into the question.
				7. Thrash- Echoes previous speaker in that Mohamed is a unique situation, where as she is lives in Mankato and is a freshman (would be representing mainly seniors is St Peter). Diversity does make a difference. Leaning towards Mohamed.
				8. Nigro- Torn. Calls to question.

Birkey seconds.

Question called.

* + - * 1. Vote

5 in favor of Mohamed and 10 in favor of Krebs.

Krebs is the new off-campus rep.

* 1. Rundstrom
		1. Hayden Goldstien. Junior econ and comp science major. Was a co-ed rep freshman year and finance director sophomore year. Loves being part of senate! Running for co-pres for next year. Ready to jump on board!
		2. Qs
			1. Nigro- Favorite TV show and why?
				1. Goldstien- Community and Even Stevens.
				2. Nigro- How do you feel about the time commitment?

Going from serving as finance director last year, this will be great! Mon nights open.

* + - 1. Burggraf- Any issues that you’re passionate about?
				1. Goldstien- What ever the people of Rundstrom want! Would work towards what his constituents are passionate about. Not about what he wants.
			2. Hare- Since you were studying abroad last year, how do you plan to getting to know your constituents?
				1. Goldstien- Being open and caring will help bridge that. Already knows many people in Rundy!
			3. Vogel- What are your interests in committees?
				1. Would love to be on finance, but that’s not open. PR, tech (a comp sci major), and likes taking on the special committees that come up during the year.
		1. (Candidate leaves room for this part of the discussion) –Timmons- Two points: First years, not freshman. –Cannot refer to senators by name.
		2. Discussion
			1. Thrash- Talked with Goldstien during finance last year. He’s very dedicated to this body. (Even offered to help with a budget while he was abroad!)
			2. Nigro- If you don’t have anything important to say, don’t say it! Keep things moving along!
		3. Vote
			1. Candidate appointed.
	1. International Representative- Candidate Sharon Singh. Believes she can fill this vacancy well. Very motivated. Wants to help clubs reach goals. Part of ICC. Knows lots of international students. Born in Canada, is Indian.
1. Questions

1. Nigro- Where in Canada born?

* + - Calgary

2.Burggraf- What are you passionate about?

* + - Diversity issues.

ii. Discussion

1.Wiest- Worked with Singh on Pittman hall council. She has great things to bring to this floor.

1. Vote
	* + Candidate appointed.

**VI. New Business**

* 1. Montes- Recommends that someone make a motion to move Men’s Club Volleyball to first.
		1. Nigro- So moved
			+ 1. Seconded
				2. Vote

Pass

 **A.** Finance

 1.Women’s Lacrosse

 a. Montes- Team is looking to buy jerseys. Funded an amount that was within budget.

 b. Why the 21 (jerseys)?

 i. Montes- Still wanted that bulk discount. Controller did some calculations. Felt more comfortable.

 ii. Lacrosse- Requesting full amount. You can’t share jerseys. Must submit the roster (with names and jersey numbers) at the beginning of the season. Can’t change numbers and people. –Even in terms of the game, switching jerseys wouldn’t be practical. Relying on numbers. Do not feel right as a club sport saying that only part of the team can play.

* + - * 1. Discussion

Hare- Have you considered numbers that you can pin on? Is that legal in the game?

Probably not. Rules are very precise. (Can’t even use hair pins)

Vogel-Disagrees with the partial finding. They asked for a certain number of jerseys for a reason. Moves line 32 to $859.90.

Seconded.

Burggraf-Didn’t realize the rule. Thinks this should be funded in full.

Goldstien-Have you ever had jerseys from senate?

Not sure. The current jerseys have been around for all of their four years.

Goldstien- Supports this. A good way to help them out.

Rasmussen-What is your plan for the jerseys?

WL-Will keep them for future years. Storage shed.

Vote on amendment

Passes

* + - * 1. Siatta- Calls to question

Schwichtenberg seconds

Question is called.

* + - * 1. Vote on budget

Passes.

1. Men’s Club Volleyball
	1. Montes-They are a club sport and haven’t requested any of their funds yet this year. –St Olaf tournament. Retroactive funding, but none of these funds are due until the end of the academic year. But were not comfortable with gas reimbursement. – With new rule regarding the school requiring school vehicles for overnight trips, altered fuel rule to match this.
	2. Men’s Volleyball- Org meets 2-3 times a week. About 15 guys. Last had two tournaments, this year three, next year hope to have a full season. NIVC conference (all of the club volleyball teams in the Midwest). Season ends after last tournament on the 15th.
	3. Discussion
		1. Thayer- to Finance Chair- You kind of changed the IRS rate?
			1. Best- The school policy changed so that if you’re traveling more than 60 miles or staying overnight you must use a school vehicle. To help men’s volleyball, broke bylaw to accommodate the necessity of the school van. Would rather over allocate and be rescinded than have people be in hot water.
			2. Thayer- If they don’t spend the gas money it will be rescinded?
				1. Best- Yes.
			3. Goldstien- In my mind retroactive means funding something after it is done. Even though it’s due at the end of the year, the retroactive aspect makes me uncomfortable.
			4. Burggraf- OK with the retroactive funding because finance didn’t have quorum over jterm. And, doesn’t feel that it Is retroactive, students didn’t have to pay for this until the end of the semester.
				1. Best- Reads “Student senate will not fund retroactively”
			5. Larson- How much is reimbursed for gas per mile?
				1. Best- 64 cents.
				2. VanHecke- No one has a choice in how much they’re charged for gas miles.
			6. Hoppe- In response to previous discussion on retroactive funding. Here, the concern of groups racking up debt is not applicable. Thinks we should fund this.
			7. Vogel- With retroactive funding. We didn’t meet over jterm and they didn’t have a chance to come in. They haven’t paid for it yet. Feels comfortable.
			8. Vote
				1. Passes
2. Timmons- Suggests a motion setting the time to adjourn at the close of the agenda.
	1. Burggraf- What does that mean?
		1. Best- That we will adjourn after we’ve completed the agenda as opposed to 9pm.
	2. Hoppe seconds.
3. Gustavus Athletic Training Association
	1. Montes- Requested money for a conference. The group had maxed out their travel and lodging funds for another conference. The group couldn’t make it in.
	2. Discussion
		1. Birkey- For clarification, they already spent money on another conference?
			1. Every org maxed out at $1,100 for travel and lodging.
		2. Hare- Did they max out in this submission or a previous one?
			1. This one.
	3. Vote (On budget as recommend by finance committee)
		1. Passes
4. Pre-Physical Therapy
	1. Montes- Asking for money for admissions visits for grad schools. Didn’t feel comfortable putting fees towards that limited amount of people.
	2. Discussion
		1. Thayer- How many students attending?
			1. Montes- Weren’t given specific numbers.
			2. Thayer- Previous senates funded this sort of trip before. Moves to change line 29 to $39.83.
				1. Discussion

Goldstien- Are these specific admission events?

Yes.

Goldstien- In the past, what was funded were career/education days.

Montes- It was.

Goldstien- Against this. These are admission events, not career days.

Burggraf-Didn’t this group request money for these specific events last spring and were denied the funding?

Yes

Nigro- Doesn’t like being stingy. Would like to think that this school and students would like to help students with future education and careers. We have these funds. This is only beneficial. To do PT you have to go to grad school, this group is about PT. This makes sense.

Vogel-Does not like the idea of funding these visits. Also something to say about these being closed events. Not open to all of campus, won’t benefit all of campus. Doesn’t see this as a good use of student funds given the closed nature of it.

Rasmussen- Echoes previous speaker. Without the group here to elaborate on how many are going, uncomfortable. Does the finance committee know?

Best- Information was not provided.

Rasmussen- Not comfortable with this.

Thayer- Contingency fund?

Best- $73,665.62

Thayer- To advisor, aren’t all groups on campus open to all without discrimination?

VanHecke-Some orgs require certain GPAs and gender (i.e. Greek life). But by and large, there are not qualifications and groups are open to all.

Burggaf- Point of Clarification- Voting on amendment or ending debate?

Yes

Vote on ending discussion.

The question has been called.

* + - * 1. Vote (to amend line 29 to reflect full allocation)

Amendment fails.

* + - * 1. Discussion on budget as a whole

Burggraf-These visits are made with specific appointments, very personable.

Nigro-If anyone wanted to go, they could contact the group to go. Moves to change line item 45 to in full.

Thayer seconds.

Discussion

Nigro-Thinks that it is a fault of this body that we are too quick to tell groups no. While the amount doesn’t matter, thinks it’s silly that there are groups on this campus asking for money to fulfill their purpose and we say no. It’s disheartening. We need to be funding orgs on this campus, otherwise we’re wasting time.

Goldstien-Fully supports this org, just doesn’t feel that this is the best use of student funds. Would support a non-admissions event.

Hoppe- Currently on the fence. Even though we have roughly $75,000 in the contingency fund, just know that we spend almost every penny during the spring process. This is why we have to say no sometimes.

VanHecke- Supports and respects this point. But, also important to realize that there is usually about $10,000 in rollover each year.

Rasmussen- -Rollover funds used on things like new chairs in courtyard?

Best- The rollover money is what we use for special midyears.

Rasmussen- Money is there for special circumstances. Not a large amount to fund but, if we fund this, multiple other groups may come in asking for similar things. Don’t want to get into the snowball effect. –We have no idea how many people are going on this. Not comfortable funding without out further info.

Hare-Also hung up on the fact that it is an admissions event. It is important that an activity impacts and helps the larger students body/would make it accessible to larger groups. –Doesn’t see an admissions event as a required part of their group. There are others ways to get grad school information.

Schwichtenberg- In response to “always saying no”, we said yes to the lacrosse team. Hard to know without the group being present to answer questions. Calls to question.

Birke seconds

Vote to end discussion

Q called

Vote on moving line item 45 to in full.

Amendment fails.

Discussion on budget as a whole

Jenson-Doesn’t really think that this is senate’s role. Part of MCS club, and the department often funds such activities as this. Not sure if this is an option for the PT club.

Rasmussen- Calls to Q.

Birkey seconds

Nigro Requests roll call \*(See Roll Call Results attached at the conclusion of the Minutes)

Passes

Vote on budget

\*Budget passes.

1. Changes to Constitution
	1. Olsen- These were sent out. –Notes that when this constitution was made Chapel View did not exist. Technically not a grammatical/formatting change, but thinks this should work.
	2. Timmons-Must be a unanimous vote regarding these changes.
	3. Nigro-Our thought process for adding chapel view and co-ed was that we believe earlier bodies passed odd rules to allow other spots to exist. Was a mess, was missing many dorms. Believes that other students just didn’t list out the new dorms.
	4. Olsen-We’re sticking with the original intent of the constitution, we’re just updating.
	5. Discussion
		1. VanHecke- To friendly in college view would be the same thing as agreeing that adding chapel view is a formatting change. Wouldn’t be suggesting that it was an amendment?
			1. Marino-Would just be a friendly.
		2. Marino- Right now we’re just discussing the document as it was sent out.
		3. Vogel- Are we looking for a motion for unanimous consent right now?
			1. Marino- If any no one speaks in opposition, we can proceed.
		4. Timmons-Is there any opposition to this document and the friendly that it is being viewed as is?
			1. Passes
		5. Schwichtenberg-Friendlies an amendment to add College View to section 8 (a.
			1. Timmons- Any opposition to College View being added?
				1. No Opposition, approved.
		6. Hare- Point of Personal Privilege- Can we look at article 5?
			1. H on “with” in section 1). And then semicolons following each line. (a-c) and period after d.
			2. Timmons- Any opposition to those grammatical changes?
				1. Seeing none, it is approved.
		7. Thayer- Asks that what we see here will be true on the word docs (knowing that sometimes things happen when transferring google docs)
		8. Hare- Observation about the list of different committees. Health and Housing is listed as “housing and health”. Friendlies. –A space before “Diversity” and “Health and Housing” and change “Student and Academic Affairs” to how it is referred to on this floor.
			1. Approved
		9. Best- May we look at Art III, subsection 1.
			1. Best- Wanted to make sure that controller shouldn’t be on this list.
		10. Birkey- Article II section five. In most of the rest of the constitution everything else is listed in alphabetical order. Would like to format this list as such.
			1. Any opposition?
				1. Approved
		11. Nigro- Defer to tech director who has found a missing space in 8 B.
			1. No opposition, approved.
		12. Burggraf-The “t” in \*b should not be capitalized. Should be semicolons after sections, “and”s inserted at end of phrases(on a and b of 8). And between “junior and “senior” in section 9.
			1. No opposition, approved.
		13. Vogel- Under section 5, tech director is missing, can we friendly?
			1. No
		14. Vogel- How we define/differentiate chair and director?
			1. Marino- Not clearly defined. We carry through what has been previously used.
		15. Olsen- Suggestion to let people look at them on their computers?
			1. Marino- These are all friendlies, we can do this next week, too.
		16. Schwichtenberg- Do we have to table this?
			1. No.
		17. Timmons- Can continue formatting next week, just not altering content.
		18. Best- Art II sections 6 and 7. An extra space. (3 extra spaces) Entertains a motion.
			1. Goldstien. “I moved” (so moved)
		19. Thayer- In section listing the halls, there was an extra space before “Pittman”.
		20. Hare- Line describing Cabinet…should it be capitalized? Otherwise it refers to a cabinet. Capitalize all “Cabinets”. (All 8)
			1. No opposition, approved.
		21. Hare- Following the chair positions, there should be commas.
			1. Marino- Keep in mind that a few of you cannot talk. If you have more friendlies, make a list. (Check speaking list)
		22. Hare- And an “and” inserted before public relations chair.
2. Vote to recognize all of the friendlies that have had no opposition.
	1. So approved.
3. Olsen- Around Wednesday all of the proposed changes and amendments will be sent out. It will be helpful if you know where these changes will be made. Also look for more grammatical changes. –There’s a part in the constitution, Art III section 3 (Co-presidents elect)… If Timmons wins the election, he has to resign and become the co-pres elect. Proposes that this part of the constitution be suspended indefinitely. That being said, if Goldstien, Thayer, or Sweet win, then they would not have to resign from their positions. Not exactly sure how we should go about this. Basically we want to make it so that if Timmons is reelected, he does not need to step down and for Cabrera to nominate someone as co-president.
4. Nigro- Technically, a co-pres has to resign, but there is no rule barring a co-pre from being elected as co-pres.
5. Goldstien- (To ombudsperson)- Are you looking for a motion or just throwing this out there?
	1. Olsen- Was looking for someone to suspend it.
	2. Goldstien- (Feels too personally connected to this issue). Entertains a motion to suspend it until the end of the academic year.
	3. Burggraf- Personally doesn’t feel comfortable. Is it possible to suspend subsections? Not comfortable with this.
	4. Hoppe- Point of Information- When is the election?
		1. Monday.
	5. Schwichtenberg- Can an executive make a suggested motion of what we should do?
		1. Best- Recommends that we wait and discuss this in cabinet, and then discuss this on Monday.
		2. Timmons- This issue looks vastly different depending on the outcome of the election.
	6. Hare- (To ombudsperson) Is it possible for the committee to meet again and add appropriate verbiage and also send this with the other proposed changes?
	7. Nigro- There is part of the constitution that (Art VIII 4), (A lot of the constitution is really outdated) that we can’t change because this subsection makes it impossible to alter the language. If we can suspend this it will be a lot prettier. Moves to suspend article VII section 4 of the constitution indefinitely
		1. Vogel seconds.
		2. Best- The very first amendment to the constitution strikes section 8. But, we have to keep it, even though it is struck.
		3. Thayer- This stupid line has been the hindrance to so much improvement.
		4. Hoppe- My only reservation is that with having old amendments at the bottom it allows us to see changes. Is there a way to archives these?
			1. Burggraf- There currently are past constitutions in the college archives.
		5. Vote to suspend
			1. Passes.

VII. Old Business

 A. Dive Questions

 a. Junso is still waiting on info from architects.  waiting on meetings to solidify info.

 b. Timmons- Wants to make sure that we’re bringing forth a well-rounded well-executed referendum.

 c. Cabrera- Wants to address issues that you believe to be pertinent to a referendum.  You can also always email us.

 B. Discussion

 a. Goldstien- How does this differ from last year?

 1. Timmons- Felt that many students voted but that there was not enough information among students.  Approaching it as though it is almost identical to the former referendum.

 b. Thayer- Sat on the dive committees freshman and sophomore years.  The problem was “nonvotes” counting as negatives.  It was technicalities that kept it form working. Emily Thayer was also a huge part of this planning in past.

 c. Hare- Was there any draft of any specific intention of the renovation?

 i. This is the point of this conversation.  We want to format.

 ii. Timmons- Sees this renovation as a revamp of a student space.  If we’re comfortable with this being the representation of our student body.

d. Hare- Why did we choose to do a full renovation as opposed to a band-aid?

i. Cabrera- Band-aid approach came from a specific board member as a way to make quick changes.  It has been decided that this would be more expensive in the long run.

 ii. Timmons- Sees this as the last window for a full renovation.  If we don’t pursue it, it will probably receive a band-aid that will last for the next decade.

e. Thayer- Discussed band-aid vs. structural.. Came down to media space.  Would allow for a more creative media/performance space.

 f. Hare- Did anyone discuss changes being made in Nobel?

 i. Thayer- Plans for dive created before plans for Nobel.

 g.Hare- Informally charges everyone to visit the dive and to think about what changes could be made and what would be beneficial.

 h. Burggraf- What was the date that was set for the big vote?

 i. Cabrera- Technically it wasn’t formally set.

i. Burggraf- Do we have a timeline?

 i. Cabrera- Ref will have a two-week consideration.  Having concerns with Andrea/scheduling.

j. Burggraf- Will we be discussing this during the spring finance process?

 i. No

 k. Burggraf- Is this an appropriate use of student activity fee with all of these other renovations happening (library, Nobel)

 i. Will be a “dive fee” not an increase in the student act fee.

      ii. Best- A nominal fee would be diverted into a separate account.  It looks like it’s coming out of the act fee, but it is diverted before it hits that account.

    iii. Burggraf- Concerned that students who didn’t vote on it  will be paying for it.

l. Sweet- What will the interim space for the dive be?  Has there been any discussion?  (In regards to students’ events, etc)

 i. Cabrera- The dive would be closed for a semester and departments and groups would have to work around it.  A heads up would be given to summer programs regarding the loss of the space.

m. Birkey- How much is this projected to cost?

 i. Between 1.6 and 1.8 million.  Board would pay immediately, and the fee would continuously pay back the board until close to a million mark.

 ii. Birke- Where is the money coming from then?

 i. Cabrera- Students only required to pay up to the 1 million mark.

 iii. Thayer- We’ve already invested money into this project with paying for plans.

VIII. Announcements

 A. Nigro- If you want to go to Patty’s afterward and are of age come along!

 B. Olsen- Look at the changes and the old constitution!

 C. Montes- Osorio- Thanks for the discussion tonight!  The spring process is just around the corner.

 D. Best- In prep for the finance season... Sun March 16th 7pm is the last time and day student orgs may turn in midyears for this academic year. -March 17th (aka Patty’s Day) is the day that a budget number for next year will be presented.

 E. Vogel- Thanks to everyone for this thoughtful discussion and for everyone’s hard work!
 F. Schwichtenberg- OKs have their SNL this weekend!  Elementary school themed.

 G. Cabrera- Next Mon is election day!  Welcome to our new members! Building Bridges is Sat March 8th at 9am!  It is the only signature event that is completely run and planned by students.

**IX. Adjourned at 9:50pm**

**\*Roll Call Votes for the call to question on Pre-Physical Therapy’s Budget:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  Afreh | Not Present |
|  Birkey | Y |
| J Burggraf | Y |
|  Grossheusch | Abstain |
|  Harbeck | Not Present |
|  Hare | Y |
|  Hinnenkamp | Not Present |
|  Hoppe | Y |
|  Nigro | N |
|  Rasmussen | Y |
|  Schwichtenberg | Y |
|  Selness | Y |
|  Siatta | Y |
|  Thayer | N |
|  Thrash | Y |
|  Vogel | Y |
|  Wiest | Not Present |
|  Sweet  | Y |
|  Goldstien | Y |
|  Krebs | Abstain |
|  Singh | Y |
|  |  |