**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**March 10, 2014**

**I. CALL TO ORDER @ 7:00pm.**

**II. Attendance**

-Absent: Senators Afreh, Rasmussen, Student/Academic Affairs Chair Roland. -Arriving late (Excused): Senators Hoppe, Thrash, and Co-Pres Cabrera.

**III. Approval of the Minutes (3/3/2014)**

A. Approved.

**IV. Community Comment**

A. NA

**V. Old Business**

A. The Dive

1. Andrea Junso here to answer questions!

2. Discussion

a. Burggraff- Clarification on dive fee/student account charge?

i. Best- It is possible to have it listed separately, but the director of finance at GAC requests to have it listed separately, so that there is less backlash regarding the fee.

ii. Burggraff- Heard a rumor that the student activity fee is going to be listed as something else on bill...is this true?

-VanHecke- Are trying to minimize the amount of extra charges.

iii. Burggraff- Has received mixed reviews from constituents. Some support having the the fee be all in one, others would prefer it divided. Personally would like to see it delineated from the activity fee so to increase transparency.

b. Hinnenkamp- Constituents concerned about the necessity of renovating the dive. Brought up the items we discussed last week, still not swayed. At least half of co-ed not in favor.

c. Sweet- Feels that this renovation needs to happen. The space is not serving as the space that it needs to be. Could be a great space for clubs/groups. Thinks the amount of time it would need to be closed is completely reasonable.

d.- Thayer- Point of personal privilege- bring up the referendum.

e. Is this the wording that would be presented to students?

i. Best- Pending passage in this body, this exact wording would be presented to the student body.

ii. Junso- Would say that the wording is different and that it is taking place in a separate. election.

f. Best- Personally feels that student fees should not be put towards capital improvement. Feels that this is something the Board/school should be doing, not the other way around.

g. Singh- Received negative responses from constituents when bringing it up, but had more positive responses after explaining the need for it. At what point did it fail last year?

i. Best- During the

ii. Singh- By how much did it fail?

-10 votes.

h. Marino- Are seniors not allowed to vote on this?

i. VanHecke- Last year that was what we decided. Others thought seniors would have better perspective after hearing about it for four years.

ii. Burggraf- Seniors in this body or school as whole?

-As a whole.

i. Thayer- Feels that the wording regarding the $50 increase is awkward. Also thinks it would be better to strike “increase” in the main body. Moves to strike increase.

1. Siatta seconds.

2. Discussion on amendment.

-Best- Entertains a motion to strike the seconds occurrence of the word increase. Yields.

3. Burggraf- If we haven’t decided if Dive Fee is going to be its own entity or not, doesn’t feel comfortable having it on the referendum.

i. VanHecke- Phrase it in the way that makes sense to you. For example, there is not a “CAB” fee, but a sizable chunk of the student activities fund goes towards Campus Activities. Pass it as you think makes most sense, and then I’ll deal with Ken in the finance office.

4. Burggraf- Need to decide if it’s going to be its own fee for transparency reasons.

5. Hare- Had concerns about the fee. We either need to explain that the fee will be a $50 increase, or simply as “increase” so that it is explicit.

6. Nigro- Recommends people taking a moment to take out paper and examine the wording if that is the concern.

7. Marino-

8. Junso- Thinks that you should be discussing whether or not you want to make capital improvement changes to the campus center rather than semantics. It is actually very common for improvements to student centers to be passed on to students. Has seen this at other institutions.

9. Vogel- Thinks that wording will be very important for the success of the referendum. Calls to question.

i. Vote to call to Q.

-Passes

ii. Vote on amendment to the referendum.

-Division called.

-Hand raise vote.

-\*Amendment passes.

j. Siatta- Before this comes before students, will there be any information presented to the students?

- Yes

k. Siatta- Moves to strike the second “increase”.

i. Marino- Encourages you to rewrite the entire phrase.

ii. Siatta Yields.

l. Grosshuesch- Constituents wanting a breakdown of everything that the money will go towards.

i. Junso- Would receive that after a vote to approve it. A breakdown would come when we are committed to it.

ii. VanHecke- Thought was gone into creating the budget, but it is not super detailed and exact. That is out there, and would come later.

iii. Grosshuesch- Students had concerns about the fee not covering the entire renovation and that tuition would be even further increased.

iv. VanHecke- Can pretty confidently say that the project will be completed in less than 8 years. It’s also not possible for the college to add more costs in. We’re currently devoted to not significantly increasing tuition. Very comfortable saying to students that the dive would not impact the bottom line of tuition.

m. Hare- Moves to amend referendum to state “The anticipated new Dive Fee, which will be collected for no more than eight academic years, will allow the college to complete this renovation to better suit students’ needs.” and “I agree to the creation of the Dive Fee, a $50 fee, to be collected for no more than eight full academic years after passage. The fee increase will be used for the sole purpose of renovating the Dive.”

i. Grosshuesch seconds.

n. Sweet- Friendly amendment to the amendment “the creation of a $50 Dive Fee” so to be less redundant.

o. Vogel- What are the chances that this will be less than 8 academic years. Are we being realistic?

i. Thayer- This is something we talked about last year. We would charge the students $50 more for 8 years. If it went over, it would be the builder/the school’s fault, and would not be left to the students.

ii. Best- This was to cover the million dollar amount.

iv- Why wouldn’t we just say 8 academic years?

-Marino- If we said 8 and it was less, we would still be bound to pay after it was done.

p. Wiest- Has heard confusion from constituents about what the $50 fee means. You will pay this fee for the four years that you’re a student, and incoming students would continue to pay this. Correct?

i.Best- Yes.

ii. Wiest- Any way to make this more clear in the referendum?

iii. VanHecke- Thinks that this would need to come from the education components. This would clearly outline what this means for each student.

iv. Wiest- Thinks this would be helpful.

q. Vogel- Doesn’t think it makes sense to say “fee increase” in the final sentence as it is not an increase. Friendlies to remove “increase” and insert “This” at the beginning of the sentence.

-No opposition. So changed.

r. Siatta- Any way to clarify that it will be $50 per year?

s. Birkey- Friendlies to add quotation marks around the affirmation statement.

t. Schwichtenberg- Would like to note/add that it is a fixed fee.

i. Best- The fact that it is a per year thing is implicit that it is a fixed fee.

ii. Schwichtenberg- Will this be clear to the student body?

-Best- Will make sure that it is.

iii. Marino- Urges not to include every single detail.

u. Schwichtenberg- Calls to question.

-Vote

\*Q is Called.

v. Vote

i. Passes.

w. Schwichtenberg- Doesn’t know how the other people who have been talking feel, but this is really a nominal fee. The dive is a very lackluster space- I never use it. Doesn’t understand the aversion that so many people have to it.

x. Wiest- We’ve had some good discussion on this. Calls to question.

i. Singh seconds.

ii. Vote to call to Q

-Q is called.

y. Vote on referendum

i. Roll Call requested

ii. **(INSERT ROLL CALL DETAILS LOCATED AT THE CONCLUSION OF THESE MINUTES)**

iii. 13 TO 3, the yeas have it!

B. Constitutional Amendments

1. Timmons advises a time restraint, and entertains that someone move to end the meeting at the conclusion of business.

2. Olsen- This is just voting to pass this wording/put it before students.

3. Burggraf- Point of Personal Privilege- Will this be in the same election as the dive?

i. Olsen- No. Will happen in two weeks.

4. Olsen- In the preamble, would consolidate changes.

5. Nigro- Moves to suspend the rules and conclude the meeting at the end of the agenda.

i. Singh seconds.

ii. Vote

-Approved.

6. Marino- If you want to be on the speakers list, keep your hand up until eye contact is made or you’re up on the list.

7. Vote in favor of the first change, the preamble consolidation.

i. Passes

8. Olsen- Decided to strike ILS housing language. This is archaic and isn’t language used and understood anymore. Numbering would be changed to reflect.

a. Discussion

i. Best- Why was this not changed when the language was eliminated years before? This was struck before in a previous amendment.

ii. Has already been changed. Would make it official. (Specific bylaw wouldn’t allow for its removal)

iii. Vote

- So approved.

9. Olsen- Adding language describing class/ its def.

i. Vote

-Passes

10. Olsen- Reworded purposes/responsibilities/ moved it to the preamble. Want to strike this second preamble.

i. Vote

-Passes

11. Olsen- Striking “knowledgeable and” from point 2.

i. Vote

-Passes

12. Olsen- This gives co-presidents speaking privileges but no voting privileges.

i. Doesn’t specify what to do in the event of a tie.

ii. Discussion

-Best- Entertains a motion to stick a word between “no” and “voting” before voting privileges.

-Burggraf- With this new language, does that still maintain the idea that the chairing president would be able to assert their opinion? That would change the entire nature of this body. What’s the intent behind the full speaking privileges? What’s the intention behind this?

-Olsen- Would allow them to provide explanations, but not overstep boundaries.

-Burggraf- Should I amend it to say that the non chairing co-president can’t speak?

-Marino- Urges you to say the “non-chairing co-president”

-Marino- The charing co-president cannot express opinion, but the non chairing can provide information.

Nigro- Moves to amend this to say that the “non chairing co-pres has full speaking privileges.”

-Vogel seconds.

\*Discussion on the amendment to the amendment.

-Nigro- This was the ethics committee’s initial intent.

-Vote

Passes

iii. Vote on amendment

\*Approved

13. Olsen- This change is made for the event that a co-president were to be re-elected.

i. Vote

-Passes

14. Olsen- Striking Technology Director. It was changed to chair and will be added later on in the constitution.

i. Burggraf- Is the difference between chair and director is a stipend?

-\*Chairs lead committees, directors do not.

ii. Vogel- Last week we said there was no difference between “chair and director”.

-Nigro- We decided to streamline things.

iii. Vote

-Passes

15. Olsen- Inserted Technology Chair. Formatting changes made earlier (abc order) will apply.

i. Discussion

-NA

ii. Vote

-Passes

16. Olsen- Gives ombudsperson the right to speak, not vote.

i. Thayer- Against this. Thinks Ombudsperson should be neutral. Should state that they can only speak on behalf of the constitution or amendments.

ii. Marino- Currently they can’t even make announcements.

iii. Thayer- In the future, if we had a very heavily opinionated ombudsperson, there could be issues with the way we view them if they’re given speaking privileges.

iv. Olsen- Agrees with this. Not sure if there is some wording to be inserted to control this.

v. Sweet- Possibly amend it to say that the Ombudsperson remain neutral and not have voting privileges.

-. Nigro- Would be a problem when they brought things from their committee.

-Thayer- If it’s outlined that the Ombudsperson can speak on behalf of the constitution, this would include/allow them to speak on behalf of their committee (as this is what it covers).

vi. Goldstien- It’s the known role that the ombudsperson remain neutral. This could be misinterpreted in future senates. Should not be explicitly written as it could cause problems.

vii. Nigro- The body selects the Ombudsperson based on their ethics and neutrality. You can also impeach them if they’re really bad.

viii. Vote.

-Passes.

17. Olsen- Inclusion of Swedish House under the Carlson International Center.

i. Burggraf- Friendlies a lowercased “t” in “This includes the Swedish House).

ii. Best- Encourages adding “Center” after the word “International”.

iii. Nigro- Friendlies to add “Center” before the parentheses.

iv. Hare- For those who worded this, is it “Swedish House” or “Svenska Huset”?

-Marino- College website calls it the “Swedish House”

vi. Vote

-Passes

18. Olsen- This change moves previously made/ approved amendments into the body of the constitution.

i. Vote

Approved

19.Olsen- This change strikes the amendment amendment that strikes the previous language (Point 18 in minutes).

i. Vote

Approved

20.Olsen- This is the amendment that replaces the thing we just struck.

i. Nigro- This used to be a full block of test. We formatted and made it prettier.

ii. Vote

Passes

21. Reworded the section on “Midterm Vacancies”. - Co-presidents can nominate/appoint cabinet members, senate seats open, etc.

i. Best- Entertains a friendly to capitalize “Student Senate” at the beginning of point a and the end of point b.

-Nigro- So moved.

ii. Vote to approve midterm vacancies language.

Approved.

22. Clearer language on standing committees. Listed all of the standing committees.

i. Burggraf- Friendlies a semicolon instead of a colon after “Diversity”

ii. Discussion

-NA

iii. Vote

-Approved.

23. Felt that there shouldn’t be a maximum of ad hoc committees or limitations of the amount of people on committees.

i. Birkey- Doesn’t like that “students as the majority of committees” be removed. Otherwise students at large could be the majority and it would bog down work. Moves to keep the line “Senators must comprise the majority of all committees.”

-Singh seconds.

-Hoppe- Does think that this is a concern, but feels that our chairs have good discretion.

-Marino- Likes this. Keeps committees in senate. Prevents this from happening (a committee of mainly student at large members).

-Thayer- Has members who aren’t senators on his committee. Can’t be efficient if others can’t be officially on it and if he’s the only senator on the committee.

-Goldstien- There are some situations with ad hoc committees where some of the most knowledgeable individuals on the given topic aren’t on senate. Doesn’t want to exclude them.

-Olsen- Does think that this should be struck. There are a lot of other controls that can be held over these committees.

Vote- (In favor of preserving the current language on committees)

-Amendment to the amendment fails.

iii. Vote on striking the language laid out previously

-Passes

24. This is the single section that has made this constitution difficult to read. We would instead add the amendments directly into the body of the constitution. (This is currently suspended).

i. Discussion

-NA

ii. Vote

-So approved

25. Another amendment moved up into the body of the constitution.

i. Discussion

-NA

ii. Vote

-Approved.

26. Another amendment moved up into the body of the constitution.

i. Discussion

-VanHecke- Did you change technology director?

-Will be addressed later.

ii. Vote

-Approved.

27. All of these amendments were reworded or relocated up in some way. We would like to strike all of the highlighted mass of text.

i. Vote on removing all of the language attached to the end of the constitution regarding previously made amendments.

-Approved.

28. Removal of the International Student Position. Committee decided that it had been relatively inactive in recent years, and that it is a relatively small constituency that is represented multiple times. Diversity chair would represent. If removed, the position would be kept until the end of the year.

i. Siatta- Do you have to be an International student to live in the International Center?

-No.

Siatta- Feels that the group should still have a voice, even if they’re already represented in their dorm or class.

\*Cabrera- International Student (\*NOTE: International Student(s) abbreviated to ‘IS’ throughout the minutes following this) only reps IS students. International Center just residents of International Center.

ii. Thayer- International students currently have representation plus 3.

iii. Hare- Where in the constitution does it say that IS have three sources of representation?

-Marino- Could be repped by housing, class also.

iv.Hare- Baffled and offended that we suggest removing this. This is part of campus that already has such a small voice.

v. Marino- Was an international student until this year. Every student would have the same amount of votes.

vi. Singh- With it brought up that in the past this position hasn’t been enthusiastic...This shouldn’t dictate the future. As a whole IS are under repped at GAC. Necessary position.

vii. Burggraf- When you come here from a different country you’re spread out by year. This gives the group a voice and a vote. Thinks that “enthusiasm” is an invalid argument. Allows students from different cultural backgrounds to come together and create a more diverse body.

viii. Nigro- Ethics made this in the thought that it was a group that was over repped. Diversity is important/he understands those arguments. Doesn’t think that one minority group should have more representation.

ix. VanHecke- (History) There was a point where different orgs had rep on senator (BSO, CAB, ISO). ISO probably was shifted into IS.

x. Cabrera- Addressing this not as a co-president. Thinks that saying that there was no interest in this in the past is not fair.

xi. Thayer- You’re not allowed to speak. The amendment dictating co=president speaking rights has been altered and passed.

xii. Timmons- This has been changed.

xi. Birkey- Yields floor to Cabrera

xii. Cabrera- It’s logistically difficult to hold an election to IS. Doesn’t think it’s fair to say that there’s no interest. Finds this offensive. These are underrepresented bodies on campus. Not about equality, but equitability. There is only one international student currently on this body. This is a voice that is needed.

xiii. Grosshuesch- Doesn’t think it’s fair to remove this without having the student body vote on this. Before removing it, thinks we should go to other orgs (like DLC) to see their opinions.

xiv. Hoppe- This is tricky. There are other ways to reach out to IS without giving them an extra vote.

xv. Jenson- We can tailor questions directly to IS. The number of votes each constituency has is important, and that it should be equal no matter who they’re representing.

xvi. Hinnenkamp- Understands that multiple people represent IS. But, representation is majority. It’s not logistically possible to meet with all students. Doesn’t believe saying that we’re giving them a “third vote” is appropriate.

xvii. Hare- Equal vs. fair. Equal is a number. Fair is an opportunity. Having the same number of reps will not give them a fair voice...Think about affirmative action. There should be more equitable ways to reach a society where we can try to achieve the same opportunities and have the same voice. Just because there is not the same interest for this position does make it right to remove this position. Thinks this should have a vote on this separate from the rest of the amendments so that it does not go unnoticed.

xviii. Thayer- Thinks that if a dorm or hall rep isn’t repping their IS constituents, it is their fault.

xix. Grosshuesch- Only an International Rep can give their students what they need. -This past year only two people ran for co-ed roles. This is like you’re saying that if only one person ran for a co-ed spot you should get rid of the position.

xx.-Burggraff- Doesn’t understand the 3 votes. You can easily find a way to have multiple votes as a constituent...it’s not the same across the board.

-Marino- The insight with multiple positions is that it’s harder to get ahold of them.

xxi-Burggraf- Couldn’t the same logic be applied to IS?

xxii-Nigro- Why are IS afforded the privilege of having multiple representations as a minority. Agrees with the importance of hearing diverse voices. This position is an anomaly. Always struck him as odd that this minority had multiple reps. Thinks it’s unfair to give one minority group privilege over other minority groups.

xxiii-Hinnenkamp- Perhaps it is a failure on my part that I can’t have dialogue with every resident of co-ed. We can use the IR to balance out failings. Gives them more of a chance to have their voices heard.

xxiv-Singh- The IS are not in one location, they’re all over campus. As a minority group, if they express that need to a dorm rep (etc), it is unlikely that that would be the majority in the hall.

xxv-Hoppe- (Response to the idea that a dorm rep can’t reach all constituents.) Perhaps we should increase representation in dorms. This could be a slippery slope. (For example, reps for students from other states?)

xxvi-Siatta- We’re not talking about adding a position, we’re talking about removing it. Why are we trying to cut down voices?

xxvii-Jensen- Doesn’t think that senators should have to go door to door. Those with opinions should approach senators. No one should have more representation than another. Office hours are underused, community comment is underused.

xxviii-Sweet- Reiterate minority definition. Thinks that it is for us to bring to senate the issues of our constituents. Even if they’re not the majority, they’re still your constituency. Regardless of where you came from, you’re still from Gustavus. Calls to Q.

-Seconded

-Vote to end debate

-Passes

-BALLOT VOTE REQUESTED

-The nays have it, 9 to 8. Amendment fails.

**VI. Old Business**

1. Thayer- Can confirm that there will be a student memorial near the columbarium. Rumored to be a granite bench with names engraved into them. Committee has thought of building a gazebo, separate of the columbarium, on the West mall. Created by the students.

-Burggraf- Where is the West mall?

-Thayer- This would be placed between the chapel and the columbarium.

-Burggraf- Possible to integrate the gazebo with the prairie restoration?

-Thayer- Possibly. Wanted to bring this forward to get opinions before mid years ended.

-Burggraf- Price?

-Thayer- Nothing more than $2,000.00-8,000.00. Leaning towards $2,000. Use student labor.

2. Gabe- Diversity committee addressed Siatta’s concern. Considering an email campaign to encourage respect at costumes at parties.

-Sweet- With what’s going on with this, the student/org involved will be sending out an apology letter. There will also be workshops. A meeting from another org discussed that they thought that it would be best for the org in question to carry out their movement so as to not step on their progress.

3. Vogel- Friendlies to change every instance of “tech director” to “tech chair” throughout the constitution.

**VII. New Business.**

1. NA

**VII. Announcements**

1. Olsen- Thanks for that awesome discussion! Loves that it ended in a tie. Thanks for voting in the other amendments. Talk to your constituents.

2.Sweet- It’s Theta week! We’ll be tabling for Mr. Gustavus outside the caf all week. Goes towards Miracles of Mitch (philanthropy), cancer society. Event 6pm Thurs in caf.

3. VanHecke- Thanks to Tom for his leadership and the hard work of senators. This constitution has been a mess for years. This is a good advancement. - Speak out about cultural insensitivity. Support our peers in greater understanding. Don’t get lost in this one incident- think broadly about how to create a more understanding, global community.

4. Goldstien- Excited to be back in a new position! Let me know ideas of thing you want to see next year.

5. Best- Last time to submit midyears: Sun March 16 @ 1900 hours.

6. Marino- Yields to Timmons- thanks! This was a long night. This was a great conversation. Thanks for the way you handled not having a co-prs when discussing the dive. -Dchair -Rundy. -Next wed, a presidential cabinet forum. 7pm heritage, 19th. Day at the Capitol next Tues.

7. Thayer- Take the Hill Triathlon!

8. May- Check out those faculty reports! Update your office hours! And, In light of recent conversations, I would like to emphasize the importance of taking the Religious and Spiritual Climate survey.

9. Gabe- 7pm Heritage Room. Robin Okyes.

**\*Meeting Adjourned at 9:28.**

**ROLL CALL VOTE ON DIVE REFERENDUM**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Adwoa Afreh** | **IC** | **ABSENT** |
| **Andrew Birkey** | **First-Year** | **N** |
| **Jessica Burggraf** | **Sohre** | **N** |
| **OPEN POSITION** | **Rundstrom** | **-** |
| **Gabe Grosshuesch** | **Norelius** | **Y** |
| **Courtney Harbeck** | **Complex** | **Y** |
| **Rebecca Hare** | **Off-Campus** | **Y** |
| **Sean Hinnenkamp** | **Norelius** | **N** |
| **Sam Hoppe** | **Southwest** | **ABSENT FOR ROLL CALL** |
| **David Krebs** | **Off-Campus** | **Y** |
| **Nick Nigro** | **Chapel View** | **Y** |
| **Bobby Rasmussen** | **Sophomore** | **ABSENT** |
| **Rhett Schwichtenberg** | **College View** | **Y** |
| **Peter Selness** | **Arbor View** | **Y** |
| **Mark Siatta** | **Uhler** | **Y** |
| **Sharon Singh** | **International Student** | **Y** |
| **Delaney Sweet** | **Complex** | **Y** |
| **Joe Thayer** | **Junior** | **Y** |
| **Bennett Thrash** | **Prairie View** | **ABSENT FOR ROLL CALL** |
| **Hannah Vogel** | **Senior** | **Y** |
| **Jordan Wiest** | **Pittman** | **Y** |