**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**November 10, 2014**

1. **Attendance**
2. **Approval of the Minutes 11/3/14**

Approved.

1. **Community Comment**

Thayer: Senior. I come to senate tonight to discuss the GusBus. Senate is in charge of funding the GusBus. In years past, we funded two GusBuses and this year we limited capacity to 20. I am worried about impending winter. I am coming to senate to encourage you to fund three buses. I fear having a backlog or delay in pick up will encourage students to walk home from houses. I am also worried students may start drinking and driving, rather than taking the bus. I have always advocated for the GusBus and I would like to be a proponent and advocate for a third GusBus in the cold months particularly. It’s not a means for drunks to get around, it’s a means for safe transportation.

1. **Finance**
2. **Women's Nordic Skiing**

Branch: Came to ask for money for ski season. The first line is for registration and travel and they also have practices where they need to travel to different locations because they need actual tracks. That is also included in some travel costs. We recommend them $5422.50. They are transitioning from a varsity sport to a club sport and it is a difficult transition.

Ski Team: One of the ways that we have been able to save this year is looking at more local races to compete in. That way we only have to travel to the Twin Cities area and we can stay with teammate’s families. But registration is still expensive, we are hoping to get a reduced price for registration. We appreciate you taking time to consider out transition into a club sport.

Discussion:

Sauve: If there is a bylaw saying we can’t spend more than $4000, what is the bylaw?

Thrash: In order to replace, we just need a ⅔ vote.

Hegg: When they were a varsity sport, did we spend any money on them?

Body: No.

Hegg: So the $7000 is new money?

Body: Yes.

Jones: When the previous treasurer and I talked about how do you help the senate in the spring think about how much they should spend without knowledge of what budget will be, we estimate, and when we sat down to talk about all of that, we knew Nordic would be transitioning to a club sport. $4000 was put aside then. The money was anticipated. I don’t honestly remember if we discussed whether Nordic would come as club Nordic or if they would come as Women’s Nordic and Men’s Nordic.

Rasmussen: I’ve been in a lot of conversations about how to go about financing different club sports. There is no good way to go about it. Some thing it should be on number, others on tradition. I think there is a reason we give everyone $4000, we give everyone the same amount. Some sports cost more than others, some sports you go to more meets than others. I don’t feel comfortable giving extra money to one group. This money is coming directly out of student’s pockets. I recognize that it’s a difficult transition, but I don’t feel comfortable with it. I move to change the recommendation to $4000.

Timmons: I just want to highlight the fact that if you look at the agenda, we have Men and Women’s Nordic Ski. I want that to be pointed out. Be cognizant of that fact. Were there members of your team that specifically came to Gustavus to compete on a Varsity level for Nordic Ski?

Siatta: I want to talk about Finance Committees thought process. We understood that yes every club sport should fall under the bylaws, but in the extenuating circumstance where there were students recruited to be part of this sport at the varsity level, it was not fair to them to be delegated to not competing at the same level. I personally feel that in this circumstance it would be okay to break this bylaw with a ⅔ vote because we have students who were recruited to compete at a varsity level.

Kehren: I agree with Senator Siatta. Maybe some of these skiers made their entire decision on being able to perform at this varsity level. I strongly recommend that we vote in favor of allocating more than $4000.

Thrash: Are you required to have a coach by the school?

Nordic Ski: No.

Thrash: Are you competing against varsity programs?

Nordic Ski: Yes.

Thrash: I think that’s important to note, club sports are generally competing against other club sports. There is a higher expectation when you are competing varsity.

Nordic Ski: We are competing against D1 Schools.

Thrash: They are a varsity sport competing at a high level.

Sweet: How much money is in our account?

Bembenek: $159, 229

Sweet: We allot money for student sports like Nordic Ski every year. I know they are making cutbacks and I can’t imagine going through that transition. This money will not make a huge difference.

Sauve: What was rational for changing from Varsity to Club Sport?

Grosshuesch: Germane.

Sauve: I can’t vote for my constituents without this information.

Jones: I think that you would hear different answers from different people. I think President Ohle would share one perspective, I think the athletic department would have a different perspective, I think the team would have a different perspective. Things thrown around were finance and the low enrollment. Some thought they were being overfunded, others thought first in first out.

Sauve: Were there scholarships?

Jones: No, we are D3.

Gette: What would the consequences be if we didn’t allot the additional money?

Nordic Ski: We would have to determine how we would use the limited funds we do have. Less people would compete or we would compete at less tournaments. We had dreams of going to the National Championships. We can’t because we are not NCAA anymore, but we still want to compete at that level and show we can make it to that level.

Gette: Is there a max number of athletes that can compete?

Nordic Ski: No.

Hegg: How many participants do you have?

Nordic Ski: We talked about two tiers of membership. 1 for people who want to join now that we are a club and then those who were on the varsity team and were recruited to compete at a higher level. 5-6 on the women’s team.

Hegg: In our bylaws it does say $4000. It is unfortunate that they had to be moved to a club sport and I don’t feel that we should be giving them more money than other club sports. I feel we should stick with that decision.

Nordic Ski: In closing I would like to say that I do understand that there is a set amount. However, the people who participate in clubs know they are coming to Gustavus knowing that they are clubs. Almost all of us came to Gustavus to compete on the ski team. Maybe in future years, $4000 would be reasonable for those future students who come to Gustavus knowing it is a club.

Rasmussen: I don’t think we should differentiate between clubs and what level they are competing against. I don’t think that should go into the factoring. A club team is a club team. I know it’s not a lot of money. $1400 won’t make that big of a difference. But that’s not what the money is for. It’s unfortunate when we have to make cuts, but to be fair I don’t think we can go over the set amount. We don’t want to set this precedent. New organizations come up all the time. For teams like that it’s hard to start up. It’s a difficult transition, but we have to be aware that it happens.

Thrash: $5595 is a pretty specific number. Were there quotes that added up to that number?

Branch: It came from a list they gave us for lodging, transportation, registration. All their quotes were in order. We just tried to meet them half-way in between what the maximum is and what is asked for.

Thrash: We don’t give money based on what groups deserve. We base our decisions on what is being asked for and why. We don’t tell groups what to do, where to go. They come to us with their quotes and they justify it to the finance committee and they justify it to the body. This organization is not trying to do anything out of order, they are trying to meet a couple of different goals. This is why we can break bylaws, for these extenuating circumstances. This club needs more money than the average club sport.

Timmons: I want to give history and context. Last year, co-presidents decided not to raise activity fee at first. After we heard about this club sport, we decided it was necessary to raise activity fee to fund this activity. How much money have we allocated this year?

Bembenek: $5,540.04 so far.

Timmons: Have people considered transferring or transferred due to this decision?

Nordic Ski: I considered transferring.

Siatta: I think the money in our constituency is there to support students and whatever is necessary to improve them as college students. There are guidelines to set precedences and help us when there are discrepancies, but they are just guidelines. This is one of those times when it is necessary to step beyond those guidelines. They had an extenuating circumstance. No future participants will be recruited to come here for this sport, it is reasonable to taper down. I think it’s pertinent to vote this down and go forth with recommendation.

Gunnigle: I move to close discussion on the amendment.

Vote.

Approved.

Call to question: Fails.

Return to discussion on the budget

Siatta: I fully support funding at the recommended amount. We as a finance committee wanted to show the support in that we decided to recommend that amount and I fully support it.

Panzer: Is the coach of the women’s club team the same as the men’s club team?

Nordic Ski: yes.

Panzer: Do they practice together?

Nordic Ski: Most often yes.

Rasmussen: The school does not require the club to have a coach?

Nordic Ski: Correct.

Rasmussen: This is a new thing senate did last year. Clubs never got money for coaches, but now we do if the school requires a coach. A lot of teams, every team on campus, would love to have a coach. There is no reason to give them money for a coach if the school doesn’t require it. Students should not pay for coaches. I move to move line item for coaching to $0.

Branch: When we were in finance committee we decided we wanted to give them $1000 due to the amount the coach has to travel.

Waggoner: As far as practices go, how is the coach involved?

Nordic Ski: We have one coach and we most often just travel up to the golf course. However, it needs to be groomed for us to ski on it. Our coach spends several hours a week grooming and he teaches us exercises. He also has another role with the college. The college kept him in hopes we would get what wanted.

Singh: Similar to what the organization was stating, the coach is being paid less than he was for what he is doing. If we are looking just at the student organization, part of being recruited to varsity teams means getting a coach. I think this is a necessary allocation.

Jones: Tom Brown, the athletic director, is under the impression that part of what he is doing is paying Jed to coach your team. Are you under the impression that he is just volunteering his time?

Nordic Ski: That information has never been fully disclosed, but to spend the amount of time he continues to spend coaching us.

Jones: I had a conversation with the Athletic Director is that a portion of Jed’s salary is for his salary to partially go towards Jed’s salary.

Rasmussen: First off, I don’t want student orgs to come in later in the year to say my coach travels a lot, we need more money. It shouldn’t work that way. I strongly believe students should not be paying employees of the school. Going back to when this was created, one of the reasons it would not have happened was the student senates felt students should not be paying employees and then it was part of the deal if Gustavus required them to have a coach.

Nordic Ski: Jed is not just coaching us, he is also spending additional time waxing our skis. Sometimes up to 5 hours a day. A bunch of coaches travel and take time out of their day, but Jed is trying to make sure we can have the most competitive skis.

Hegg: What I’m seeing with this is that we are trying to allocate this money because we feel bad that they got their budget cut. I don’t think that’s right. I’m sure Jed is a great guy, but I don’t think we should be funding just because we feel bad. He chose to come back, knowing that the budget was cut. I don’t think we need to give him additional money, but as Jones said it was expect. I don’t think we should be supplementing this guy’s salary. The decision was already made. The organization was determined to be the most desirable sport to be cut and that was the decision that was made. We have to stick with that decision.

Nordic Ski: We hope you aren’t giving us this money because you feel bad, but only because we want to make the best out of this situation and we deserve this money. Our coach is there everyday. Come racing season he puts in additional time and effort, above and beyond the club coach. We are not asking out of pity, but to continue to represent Gustavus.

Thrash: The argument I made against reducing the recommendation is similar to the argument I will make here. They need the money to do the things they want to do. The only time we fund coaches is when it’s required by administration. Outside that specific area, it is not our place to hire employees of the college. We don’t want to set a precedent where the college drops the ball and we fund coaches. As much as I would like this club to have a coach, I have to put my support behind this amendment.

Siatta: I am in agreement with previous speakers, because I think there is some uncertainty regarding the coach’s salary. However, I don’t think it is our job to read between those lines. He is an employee of the school, he is receiving a salary. In closing I agree to not fund the coaching stipend of $1000 in this line. I feel that the only reason we do fund coaches is when it’s required. Seeing that this employee is already an employee of the school, I do not feel we should fund.

Sweet: If your sport is not required to have a coach, could you have a coach anyway?

Jones: yes.

Sweet: Is the contract in your coaches salary partially based on coaching Nordic Ski?

Nordic Ski: We don’t have that information.

Sweet: I don’t think we should see this as funding a coach. I don’t think it should be privileged to some club sports and not others. It’s not helping his salary, it’s a small stipend. I highly encourage people to think of it in that light.

Gladitsch: Call to question

Approved.

Vote on moving coaching line item to $0.

Approved.

Discussion on the budget:

Timmons: I want to highlight the intricacies of this situation in treating men’s and women’s separately. You don’t want to contradict yourself between this budget and the next budget.

Waggoner: Call to question on the budget.

Fails.

Discussion on the budget

Nordic Ski: We need a few more ski suits and wax. These are a huge part of Nordic Skiing and we have more people on our team now because we are club sport.

Sauve: I motion to recess for 10 minutes.

Discussion on recess

Rasmussen: I don’t see a need for a recess right now.

Sauve: I just hoped we could get more done talking in smaller groups.

Vote on 10 minute caucus: Fails.

Siatta: I understand that we would need a ⅔ vote seeing that it is over $4000. After changing coaching to $0, I strongly support this budget as recommended right now.

Rasmussen: You said we you have 5-6 on the team and you have budgeted 5 suits, are you all getting new suits?

Nordic Ski: We have 15, 5-6 of us want to be varsity.

Rasmussen: But you are using the suits that you have used in past years?

Nordic Ski: yes.

Panzer: I would like to hear more insight into the reason we compromised down from their request to a lower amount?

Nordic Ski: That’s not directly from our budget from previous years. Our cost would have been higher. We cut back this year.

Panzer: So that was already reduced from our previous budget?

Nordic Ski: Yes.

Panzer: I would like to hear discussion about funding the full request.

Branch: We looked at the full requested amount and realized that the transition was going to be very difficult. We wanted to give as much as we could and still allocate money to organizations who come in throughout the year. The other consideration was the difficulty of determining need. Where they were going, what the costs were.

Panzer: Previous speakers talk about the gray area, but if the bylaw is going to be breached, I support funding it in full.

Singh: I have a question about the wax, why are we not funding the wax?

Branch: We didn’t have adequate information about how much wax would be needed. They were still compiling a list.

Singh: If they were to come in for a mid-year, is that a thing?

Branch: yes.

Singh: I don’t understand why we didn’t fund them in full?

Bembenek: It was a tricky situation because we wanted to keep the bylaw in mind and wanted to come to a compromise. Still expecting them to transition, but recognizing that they were coming from a higher level of competition.

Nordic Ski: We will come back with a specific number for waxes. Having been a varsity sport, we do have some resources.

Skiba: I agree with the previous speaker who says that if we are going to break a bylaw we should give them what they requested. I would like to make a motion to fund the full.

Discussion on funding in full.

Siatta: I support this, not on terms of if we are going to break it we should break it all the way. But because we took money from coaching and the additional money would be similar to the money recommended by the finance committee. They showed us a list of the races they are going to compete in and it was scaled back significantly. They showed their willingness to make changes.

Rasmussen: I think we need to keep a distinction between this and coaching. I don’t like the idea of sending this motion through under the idea that if we are breaking a bylaw we might as well break it further. Where do you draw the line? I don’t like that train of thought. I think a compromise is a good way of scaling them back.

Thrash: I agree with previous speakers, I like the spirit of compromise. But we are talking about people sleeping on the floor of a house rather than in a hotel. We have seen the compromise. The halfway point is just as arbitrary as any other number we could put out. I put my support behind this in full.

Timmons: It is very difficult, it is very intricate. If you propose something for this budget, you may put yourself in a precarious position on the budget that comes right after that. Also, be thinking of your constituents.

Hegg: I don’t understand why we would add more money to this pot. They recommended that we allocate a certain amount of money for a reason. I feel what was recommended was a fair amount and I feel we should go with what the committee decided. The ski team has talked about how they want to compete and to win like they are a varsity sport, but they aren’t a varsity sport. It’s not all about the competition in club sports.

Panzer: It is important to frame this particular motion in the context of what they came to committee for and it is important to ignore previous discussions.

Sweet: There have been compromises from the committee and Nordic Ski. We need to consider, they are a varsity sport downsizing from a club sport. That’s not beneficial for the sport, not beneficial for the school. They want to do the best job providing for Gustavus students what they can with what they have. These are Gustavus students trying to do the best with what they have.

Gette: How much less money is this amount in full from your previous years?

Nordic Ski: We have not been allowed to view the previous year’s budgets. I know we have had to downscale.

Gette: A lot of previous speakers have mentioned transitioning down to the $4000. I understand the compromise. Do we think we are ever going to get to the $4000, or are we going to have to have the same discussion year after year?

Rasmussen: I think we need to be careful making assumptions about this club sport and other club sports. We are here to allocate money and give a certain amount of money and anything above and beyond that they will have to pay for. I did talk to some of my constituents and they were really unimpressed that we would spend more on one club sport than another club sport. Call to question.

Vote: Call to Question.

Approved.

Vote to move line item 41 to be funded in full.

Discussion on budget.

Gustafson: I move to make time that we adjourn to the end of the agenda.

Discussion:

Sauve: Let’s extend the meeting. That’s what we’re here to do.

Vote to extend the meeting to the end of announcements.

Approved.

Nordic Ski: What is the rest of the $100,000 being put toward and at the end of the year have you had money left over?

Goldstein: In the past it is placed towards things that come up over time. That money rolls over.

Nordic: In previous years, does the money allocated for the year get used?

Timmons: When we take into account the amount of money we think we will have based on the number of students we expect. On June 1, any of the funds allocated not used by student organizations goes back into the contingency fund. The groups that did not spend the money was collected into a pool.

Edu: In past times, how much has been spent this time of the year?

Timmons: I don’t know if we have that information.

Sauve: What happens if we vote and the vote fails?

Timmons: We will continue discussion and voting until a budget passes.

Siatta: I would like to strongly encourage people to focus on this budget. The next budget is a different organization. I would hope we use the same rational now as in the future. I feel confident with the number. I throw my support behind that.

Hegg: Before I call to question, I would like to ask if there is anyway possible we could do a straw poll to see what the outcome may be so that we don’t just go ahead and vote this down?

Timmons: You certainly have the option to take an informal poll. I think that will take more time.

Hegg: Call to question.

Vote.

Approved.

1. **Men's Nordic Skiing**

Branch: The same sort of things applied. They are going to go to an additional two competitions, which will require more money. We took the halfway point again. They want to match current uniforms. Wax irons were supported in full. They need new ones. Wax was not recommended because we did not have documentation.

Nordic Ski: The reason we asked for more money is because we had more men’s skiers than women’s skiers. We think we can meet our goals that we set at the end of last season. We want to continue to be just as competitive.

Discussion on the budget

Hegg: Amend coaching to $0.00.

Discussion on amendment

Hegg: I don’t think we need to discuss. Call to question.

Call to question.

Approved.

Vote.

Approved.

Discussion on budget with amendment.

Siatta: This is a different organization and a different budget, but I want to use the same rationale. They are going through the same transition. They have more recruited participants. The budget reflects that. I do support this. I don’t see a problem with this. If we use the rational of meeting between, I feel that’s more than reasonable.

Waggoner: I think we need to hold the precedence and I don’t see any reason to amend the budget any further. Call to question.

Call to question.

Approved.

Vote.

Approved.

1. **Old Business**
2. **Committee Updates**
3. **Public Relations**

Sweet: Sweatshirts. I’ll get a quote. Quarter-zip or hoodie. Additionally, Schitter Chatter is going out tomorrow. Senate board is being changed tomorrow. Email if you want a spot on there. If you don’t already like Student Senate on facebook, do that. We want more traffic. We are going to use the twitter more too. Send stuff for Schitter Chatter.

Discussion:

Waggoner: I have worked at B-Stark, and they will provide templates. Will you bring those before the body.

Mahan: You mentioned Schitter Chatter, what do we need to do?

Sweet: Similar to Once Upon A Potty. How people can connect with senators. I just want you to send me your year, major, involvement on campus, fun facts.

1. **Co-Presidents**

Timmons: Cabinet has been going really well. We have had really important discussions. I wanted to update on the Building Bridges review process. They are a separate group much like CAB when it comes to finances. They are given a chunk of student activity fee to do with as is advised by their advisor. Senate said we need to review this in three years to make sure it is working. Co-chair, Controller, Co-Presidents, and Senate Speaker are going to go through all of the finances of Building Bridges for the next three years. We are going to do the same thing with finance committee and finance committee along with cabinet will make recommendations. It would be in everyone’s right to see all information, but they want to be respectful regarding that information. We established a system that gets at the best process possible to come forward with a recommendation. We ask senate would respect that while knowing you all have the right to information. We want to be respectful, transparent and effective in allowing this organization to be a crucial part of this community.

Thrash: The reason I’m on that committee is to represent all of you, talk to me if there is anything you are concerned about. There are things we can do in that committee, in that small group. Bring that stuff to us. We can deal with it off the floor.

1. **Indigenous People's Day Resolution**

Grosshuesch: The purpose of Indigenous People’s day is to rename Columbus Day. Diversity Committee chose to write a resolution that would communicate that recognizing Columbus Day, you are recognizing the oppression of a group of people. Minneapolis made the change a few years ago. We see no reason why the student body shouldn’t change it. Justice is one of our pillars. In the name of justice, we advocate for change.

Waggoner: I talked to a great number of my constituents. I let some of them read the resolution. I got back a lot of negative feedback. It is a federal holiday. The state didn’t rename it. If we do want to give native Americans a day for recognition it should not be a federal holiday.

Hegg: Over the history of the United States, there have been mistreatments. However, I feel we are missing the point of Columbus day. Instead of looking at it from an Indigenous People’s day, maybe look at it as immigration day. Columbus was an immigrant. It changes the history of what we know. Columbus was a visionary. I feel that we should not rename because if Native Americans would like their own day, they should get their own day, but I don’t think we should rename a national holiday. I just have a quote from Native American Relations Chairman in US Senate.

Panzer: This student body moves really quickly from issues, and to release this statement would come across as really slow moving. We should discuss timeframe and whether it is appropriate to discuss an item that would be released next year.

Jones: I was confused about the reference to Minnesota. If the body was inclined, would it be possible to make a tiny edit?

Rasmussen: I read a Star Tribune article. Minneapolis did not change the holiday, they created a new holiday. In regard to Columbus Day going against core values, our school is named after a king who persecuted Catholics and did similar things. It seems silly to me to pick up this issue. Judging morality is like comparing apples to oranges with this large of a timeframe.

Gladitsch: I talked to constituents, they did not deliver positive feedback. They seemed to think it wasn’t our job to legislate morality or tell the federal government to do anything.

Timmons: Do you know who controls the naming and writing of holidays?

Grosshuesch: I do, I emailed and never got a response. If this is approved, I will email again and inform them of our decision.

Timmons: This body should evaluate its intentions and what we intend to accomplish. If the goal is to change the name, is the distribution of this letter the best way to achieve that. I just think conversation should be centered around what we are hoping to achieve.

Sauve: This is about what we as a Gustavus body want to say about this issue. We could approve it and send it out and put it on the calendar. Most of us are pretty white and no one celebrates Columbus Day. We legislate morality all the time. I met with a great number of my constituents and the way we celebrate isn’t appropriate anymore.

Singh: My constituents shared that they thought Columbus day was not as relevant today as it was in the past. We are not changing a federal holiday. I feel like we are making a mountain out of a molehill right now. When I talked to my constituents, they thought we should name it Indigenous People’s Day or have nothing on the calendar at all.

Kehran: Philosophically and after talking to my constituents I am in support of this resolution.

Wicklund: When I talked to less diverse constituents, they didn’t really have an opinion, but more diverse students really supported this resolution. Motion to cut line 5.

Motion to cut line item 5.

Waggoner: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote.

Approved.

Discussion on Resolution as a whole.

Grosshuesch: When it was charged to Diversity Committee, we discussed removing the name altogether. If this resolution doesn’t go through, I would prefer not to see a name on the calendar. However, the reason I brought this to the body was because I want the Gustavus Community to recognize the injustice put upon these people. One of our pillars is justice. If you are not going to vote for this, tell me so that Diversity Committee can get the name removed.

Gustafson: An overwhelming number of my constituents were in support of the resolution.

Siatta: I’m pretty much indifferent. I don’t celebrate Columbus Day. When I talked to my constituents, they felt the same way. Personally, I don’t think the change would hurt. I do agree with not releasing the statement until later so it doesn’t seem like it’s behind the times. Move to table to next week.

Discussion to tabling for one week’s time.

Siatta: I don’t mean to put this to the side, but I think in one week we can talk to our constituents again or different constituents, particularly minority constituents. Not to diminish the value of the resolution, I think tabling will make it more valuable.

Singh: On hearing rationale behind previous speaker, I think this is a good option. Or we could send it back to Diversity Committee to think it through.

Rasmussen: We have talked to our constituents, I don’t know why we would wait.

Sweet: I think it would be wise to send it back to D-Chair.

Hegg: I think we should vote on this now, get it over with. Call to question on discussion.

Call to Question to end discussion on tabling.

Approved.

Vote to table resolution by one week.

Fails.

Discussion on resolution.

Timmons: I think it is important to evaluate what this body is hoping to accomplish and whether this is the best way to accomplish these goals. This day passed over a month ago. If we are going to send something to the entire student body, it communicates that it took us an entire month to make a decision. One of the first messages this body will communicate is that it has taken a month for this body to come to this consensus.

Waggoner: Motion to send back to D-Committee with the intent of a rewrite or no name on second Monday in October.

Discussion on sending back to D-Committee.

Grosshuesch: I support sending this resolution back to D-Committee.

Hegg: The Diversity Chair asked us to say what our problems were. It came down to the justice part of it. I just want to get my views out there. I think it is effective to send back to D-Committee.

Kehren: Maybe take a poll of the student body. That could be an accurate representation of how people feel.

Sauve: Our job is to do it this year. It should not be something we are pushing off to next year.

Wicklund: Motion to amend this amendment to structure it more and have D-Committee to send out a poll.

Discussion to an amendment with a poll:

Rasmussen: We are here to represent the student body, if we send out a poll we will get a small sample size and that isn’t something that should be decided in that way.

Kehren: I don’t think the amendment to have a poll is really relevant. I do not support.

Waggoner: Call to Question.

Call to Question.

Approved.

Amendment about poll vote.

Fails.

Discussion on charging D-Committee back with resolution.

Kehren: Call to question.

Call to Question.

Approved.

Vote on sending resolution back to D-Committee.

Approved.

Rasmussen: I had a constituent call me on my cell phone a few days ago saying he had just met with someone about wifi problems and they were sent to student senate. It is a reoccurring problem. We need to do something about it. Would it be best to go talk to someone who sets the budget or getting a petition? I would like to move to charge tech committee to looking at new avenues for addressing wifi issues.

Discussion to charge to tech committee.

Rasmussen: I think it sends a statement to students.

Jenson: We are specifically looking at one building, but it is obvious that it affects multiple buildings. A lot of last year’s GTS budget came back late in the year. They waited until the beginning of this fiscal year to use this year’s budget. They have depleted a lot of their budget from this year already. It was strategic. The only way GTS will get more money is if student voices prompt it. Cabinet is putting together a poll.

Jones: The other way they could prioritize wifi is to rethink their priorities and decisions they are making on campus.

Hegg: I’m really glad we are going to be sending this to tech committee. I support it.

Thrash: Call to Question.

Call to Question.

Approved.

Vote to charge tech committee to look into wireless issues.

Approved.

Gunnigle: I brought forward idea to revamp the language houses torn down in the tornado. I would like to move to charge it to Health and Housing.

Discussion:

Sauve: I feel it is more of a Student and Academic Affairs Committee than Health and Housing.

Singh: Because the issue has specifically to do with houses, I think Health and Housing is appropriate.

Wicklund: Move to amend to charge to Health and Housing and Student and Academic Affairs.

Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on amendment.

Approved.

Discussion on amended charge.

Sauve: Call to question.

Call to question.

Approved.

Vote.

Approved.

Hegg: I would like to bring up that I strongly support getting more wifi access to more students in their rooms.

Sauve: We had a student come to us tonight again to voice concern about GusBus. I just wanted to show my support and that we do care about our constituents.

1. **New Business**

Singh: I would like to charge the Co-Presidents with looking into the GusBus.

Discussion:

Thrash: Talking about this in ignorance of the actual contract is foolish. I call to question.

Call to Question.

Approved.

Vote

Approved.

Edu: Because I’m new to the senate, I don’t have an idea of how much senate usually spends throughout the year.

Bembenek: I can send out midyears from last year to all the senate.

Jones: In the past, senate has been cautious about saving money for things that might come. They put less pressure on themselves. I won’t let you allocate all of your funds, but I think it’s good practice to allocate money as the opportunity comes.

Wicklund: Motion to suspend rule allowing non-senator and non-chair to speak.

Discussion:

Vote to suspend the rule to allow non-senators to speak.

Approved.

Community Member: I merely wanted to ask in my experience on senate, many things get bogged down in committee. I would like the motion to be actionable at some point.

Sweet: I would like to say making it completely actionable tonight is impossible. Best to bring up this discussion at next week’s meeting.

Sauve: I move to charge co-presidents to come back with an update next Monday night.

Discussion on the charge to have co-presidents come back with an update.

Jones: I would encourage you to use the next seven days to see if your constituents would want such a thing.

Vote.

Approved.

1. **Announcements**

Sweet: Note, tomorrow is the mock party at the Walker House. It’s a great way to learn how to behave. There’s a Lineus show Friday at 8pm in the Heritage Room.

Timmons: Thank you for having patience and attention and focus for 3 hours straight. I am very open to thoughts on the Building Bridges process. If you have concerns, questions, please bring it forward. Lineus! Be very, very careful on the ice.

Grosshuesch: December 1, Worldwide AIDS day tabling. December 2, Abolition of Slavery tabling, December 10, International Human Rights Party.

Gustafson: Roman Dinner at 5pm in the Dive.

Jones: While chatting with constituents about GusBus, encourage them not to ride it aimlessly.

Goldstein: Thank you for the great meeting. Thanks to the Community member. Gustavus has a lot of really good things going on. We have a great thing going on here. Recognize how awesome this place is.

Singh: International Festival November 22 in Alumni Hall.

Wiest: This is an excellent body to be part of. It’s been an honor to serve with you guys. I’ve gotten to see senate do some really cool stuff. Being able to see this body change and grow has been really cool. On a personal note, I’m spread kind of thin right now and this year has been a really good time to reflect on how I spend my time. I think just for the amount of time I can put into senate, I think you deserve an Ombudsperson of senate. With that, I resign as Ombudsperson.

Adjourned: 10:06pm