**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**November 10, 2014**

**I. Attendance**

**II. Approval of the Minutes 11/10/14**

Approved.

**III. Community Comment**

**IV. Ombudsperson Nomination**

Siatta: Two nominations. Jeff Hunt and Olivia Ward.

 Thrash: Joseph Thayer.

 Gladitsch: Nusla Mohammed.

 Kehren: Mitch Ryks.

 Wicklund: Solveig Svendsen.

 Sauve: Carl Cusack.

 Peterson: John Baron.

Jeff Hunt: Senior Business Management major. Interest because rules and regulation and moderation are kind of what I am designed to do. Senior student member of the judicial board at Gustavus. Bias training, keen observer, conflict aware, training with the US Navy Seals, training to stay calm under pressure, adaptability, psychological evaluation of people. Training has been more of a beating in of moral conduct and moral ethics. Moral compass is strong. Empathetic, but will not let people’s feelings stand in the way of what is right. Lots of community service, mostly with the homeless. Will be here all of J-Term. Looking to get more involved on campus. Not looking to provide input, but more to regulate and moderate.

Gustafson: Familiarity with Student Senate constitution?

Jeff Hunt: Have read all of constitution and bylaws, willing to get more familiar.

Wicklund: Do you believe everything in the constitution is black and white?

Hunt: Nothing is black and white.

Wicklund: Time to dedicate to this?

Hunt: Plenty of time.

Thrash: Can you explain the military training you have?

Hunt: Psychological and combat.

Thrash: Are you enlisted?

Hunt: Not right now.

Thrash: Have you been?

Hunt: Was part of the way through the process.

Rasmussen: Did you see any problems you would like to address with the bylaws?

Hunt: I don’t think you can really make any judgements by how it is written, but how it is enacted.

Hegg: How familiar are you with parliamentary procedure?

Hunt: I have used it before.

Hegg: How?

Hunt: Epsilon Pi Alpha meetings and judicial board.

Ward: First year. Small amount of experience at student senate. Working with finance committee as student at large. Not involved in a lot of other groups, would like to spend more time involved with student senate.

Thrash: If you are selected, would you resign as student at large?

Ward: Not sure yet. Would like to continue to work with finance committee.

Thrash: Would there be a conflict of interest?

Ward: I could see my involvement in the finance committee as a conflict of interest. I still think I could keep my own opinions out.

Gunnigle: What are the further qualifications that could help you with this position?

Ward: I would have to learn the bylaws and constitution quickly. I like to follow the rules and I learn quickly. I am a good listener.

Rasmussen: Did anything strike you as needing changing?

Ward: I didn’t see things immediately, but there are things that could be changed.

Hegg: How will you try to cope with the difficulty of speaking in front of Student Senate?

Ward: I am uncomfortable right now. I don’t want to come off as arrogant. I am very passionate about rules and what is right. I am currently pre-law.

Thayer: Would elevate me from current student at large on the ethics committee to a part of the committee. I want to move from my commitment on the committee to commitment to full senate and cabinet. I have been a senator in the past, but have never served on cabinet. I have been part of many conflicts addressed by the ethics committee. I enjoy dealing with these issues, I like navigating the grey area. I also try my best to use the bylaws as a guiding tool. I want to seek out and find clarity to help senators make decisions. I miss the discussion, the debate, the dialogue. In the end, the body came together to make decisions. I miss that. This is my senior year. This is my last chance to have a cabinet position. I want to sit in on meetings and collaborate with all of you.

Sweet: What do you feel like your role during meetings would be?

Thayer: Last year, when the ombudsperson moved from a non-speaker position to a position that could speak on the floor, I was against that. I would limit my commentary to issues of ethics.

Rasmussen: To what capacity in the past have you served on ethics committee?

Thayer: As a senator.

Rasmussen: Is there anything you would like to change right away?

Thayer: I would like to look at a few things. Campaign guidelines of the bylaws trying to specify. I would love to look at the proxies. In the past there was some tension and problems with proxies. Limits capacity in J-Term when we are trying to meet quorum. That would be my first priority, to bring back proxies in a very specified role.

Kehren: I wish I could have posed this question to everyone. Do you think there is an objective moral code?

Thayer: In theory there is, but in all practicality I don’t know how any person can be objective on every topic. I would be cognizant of that and look to others to ensure objectivity.

Hegg: What are your qualifications? Are you familiar with parliamentary procedure?

Thayer: Mock program to teach government. Trained in parliamentary procedure. That’s what excited me about senate in the process. I’ve come to appreciate how fluid parliamentary procedure can be. I feel that my past history would allow me to jump right in without a ton of training. As we approach finals and J-term, my past history with helping to author bylaws and constitutional amendments would allow me to speak as to why they were written.

Wicklund: Will you be on senate during J-Term?

Thayer: Yes.

Mohammed: Sophomore. Communication Studies and political science. I have qualifications. I served as ethics chair at the national level. I learned about parliamentary procedure. I have experience with ethical matters. I worked in a hospital setting. I also have experience serving in leadership capacities. I’ve read the constitution multiple times. I feel I would do a good job.

Siatta: Detail in national experience?

Mohammed: Committee of 8 people. I was the only high school students. Asked how issues fit within constitution and bylaws.

Gunnigle: Student leadership and class officers, does that mean you’ve cooperated with student senate in the past?

Mohammed: No.

Wicklund: Have you read constitution and bylaws?

Mohammed: Yes.

Rasmussen: Have you seen any need for change?

Mohammed: I would like more detail.

Rasmussen: Have you worked with the ethics committee at Gustavus?

Mohammed: No, I have not.

Gustafson: The previous Ombudsperson resigned because he did not have enough time, how do you plan to balance your time?

Mohammed: Completely devoted. Free on Mondays.

Ryks: Psychology and philosophy double major. Junior. What got me into philosophy was ethics. I pursued the major after an ethics course. I enjoyed philosophy and study of ethics. I want to be involved with ethical bounds. I reestablished a fraternity on campus. I got to do a lot with constitutions and bylaws and I actually was the driving force behind putting together our own constitution and bylaws. Passionate about ethics and experience with these issues. My experience allows me to adapt really quickly.

Hegg: Do you think there is grey area in ethics? How do personal feelings come into play?

Ryks: There is always grey area, but personal feelings shouldn’t come into play. I would dissect the situation and the constitution to try to find a resolution.

Hegg: Can you give an example?

Ryks: I like to go out and consult with others. I don’t want to just bring my own bias to the table. You can only analyze things on your own so much.

Sauve: Are you involved in philosopher’s guild?

Ryks: No.

Rasmussen: Any changes to the constitution?

Ryks: No.

Rasmussen: Have you served student senate in any capacity?

Ryks: Just sitting in on a couple of meetings.

Gunnigle: How well do you think you will adapt?

Ryks: We got guidelines, a sort of framework, in greek life. I think I can take the guidelines. There does not have to be a strong structure.

Svensen: First year. The first time I heard about this opportunity was through email. Immediately interested. Want to be part of a group that is passionate about things going on in the school. Officer at large in NHS in high school. Involved in an organization, started up TOPPLE, an organization against bullying. AP Government, presided as speaker of the house for a month. Dedicated, not overly involved. Involved in Hall Council. I will dedicate what needs to be dedicated to something. When it comes to making decisions is to look at all information for making decisions. I also think I am an approachable person.

Wicklund: Have you read the constitution and bylaws?

Svensen: Yes.

Rasmussen: Have you served on Ethics positions in student senate?

Svensen: No.

Rasmussen: Do you think there is any need for change?

Svensen: Positions are kind of vague. I would research any precedent that has been set before making any decisions.

Thrash: If you come across a situation where something has been done a particular way, a precedent, would you want to clarify that or leave it be?

Svensen: I would rather write it out because having stuff written out will help in the future. It requires agreement by entire group. Bringing that up could break precedence that could have been overlooked.

Gunnigle: Could you elaborate on your NHS experience?

Svensen: A lot of divide on turning in volunteer hours. Whether or not church hours counted. We looked at it from the idea of a separation between church and state and what we could and couldn’t allow. We wanted them to go out in their community. Found a compromise. Tried to persuade against spending all time in church.

Gunnigle: How familiar are you with Robert’s Rules of Order?

Svensen: Not familiar.

Cusack: Sophomore history major. Co-President of college democrats here on campus. Hoping to go back and look at constitution. I would like to have more experience with such matters. I’m an eagle scout, held leadership positions. Served at a conference in high school at a mock world health organization, Model UN. I have an outsider experience. Have looked at constitution bylaws. They seem clear.

Siatta: Involvement in college dems, how do you plan to balance your time?

Cusack: It was a very busy year with the election, but the election is over. It’s a lot more casual. More committed to this position.

Waggoner: I assume you have a liberal mindset—

Cusack: I would like to keep that out of decision making as much as possible. Want to look at all information before making a decision.

Thrash: Anything you would want to change?

Cusack: No.

Baron: Sophomore political science and communication studies major. Love reading about justice and ethics. It all comes back to the constitution. I think that would help with this position. If I did see a grey area, I would look to the constitution and how it can best serve the student body and the senate. I am currently a teaching assistant for public discourse and I have to work a lot with students whose projects focus on ethics and how to properly frame what they want to say. I also am office assistant in the Advancement office. I look at scripts. Ethics of how to ask for money and who you ask for money from. I keep people in line in terms of attendance and how they talk to people. Level-headed, calm. Think rationally.

Gunnigle: Do you like constitution as is or would you change it?

Baron: I like how it is structured, I am more concerned with how it is implemented. Should not be interpreted by one person, but multiple angles. Every detail is not included.

Rasmussen: Have you served on any ethics committees?

Baron: No.

Wicklund: How would you begin to implement precedent with little knowledge?

Baron: I am observant. I think I have the ability to see how the constitution affects senators and students and look forward for efficacy.

Siatta: With your time as a TA, how will you balance your time?

Baron: I don’t think there would be any interference.

Discussion:

Sauve: I motion that we move to Matt’s proposal for voting.

 Vote on Voting process: 8 to 5 to 3 to 2 to 1.

 Approved.

Siatta: I initially had a list set up. I think this is going to be a great nomination regardless of who we choose. In general, it is important to note experience. I think other qualifications with parliamentary procedure and other affiliations should be brought into consideration. I don’t think year in school should be taken into consideration.

Hegg: Move to bring this to a vote.

Vote to bring first vote.

 Fails.

Sauve: The way I grew up in my family, if something is too good to be true, it probably is. I’ve never heard a story like his. I don’t think it’s trustworthy.

Sweet: Hunt is literally too good to be true. Approachable, dedicated, follows the rules, cares a lot about this campus and students. Best fit for this job.

Thrash: I feel like my question was kind of dodged about his military experience, I don’t know how you could have trained with all of these groups. Move to extend adjournment at the end of announcements.

Motion vote.

 Approved.

Thrash: Move to make votes secret ballot.

Secret ballot.

 Approved.

Rasmussen: I don’t know the best way to go about this current discussion. We have eight candidates. I have specific points, but I think they would be better off made later. I think we need to look at experience, someone ready to hit the ground running.

Gunnigle: Previous experience is great, but a new set of eyes can bring a new perspective.

Jenson: Three candidates stood out in my mind: Baron had energy and was passionate. Hunt: Despite what has been said, he has a straight moral compass, a level-head and is always willing to listen. Thayer: Has passion and previous experience. He knows the constitution by heart. That speaks volumes.

Sauve: Previous experience is not required. Many of us did not have previous experience and we are doing a good job. It will allow them to keep with the times. Not be bogged down by how things were done 2 or 3 years ago.

Panzer: I was very impressed with candidate Mohammed and her national experience. I have also worked with her on other projects. Intelligent, aware, experienced. Very impressed with her candidacy.

Wicklund: Also impressed with Mohammed’s resume, but have experience with her not communicating on a leadership role. All applicants were incredible. I think it would be interesting to put other nominees in ethics committee in different positions.

Gersh: Candidate Ryks has a lot of passion and energy and clearly has drive to change things up a bit.

Waggoner: I would also like to show support for candidate Ryks. I know him well.

Grosshuesch: Personally, if I could vote, experience would be the most important. We work a very special way. We function very specific ways.

Hegg: I was also very skeptical of Jeff Hunt’s qualifications. It just doesn’t seem like someone in civilian life in college is training with some of the most elite special forces. I will put that aside because he is apply for ethics committee and should have the ethical standing to be honest.

Peterson: I want to support Baron. I know him well. He learns fast and I know we talked about the importance of experience. I am worried about Thayer because of his experience.

Motion to begin voting.

 Vote.

 Approved.

Timmons: New slate of candidates will be Jeff Hunt, Nusla Mohammed, Mitch Ryks, Solveig Svendsen, John Baron.

Next vote.

Timmons: Top three vote getters are Nusla Mohammed, Solveig Svensden, and John Baron.

Discussion:

Thrash: Anyone that I had any concerns about has been eliminated at this point. Having been through this process last year, we are fortunate to have this many people to choose from. I appreciated the passion of Svendsen and Baron, I felt Mohamed was qualified, but was less passionate. Svendsen said she would look back at past precedent. I think that was good. None of them have any previous background, so they are all fresh faces.

Gladitsch: I would like to speak in favor of Mohamed. I have had a lot of classes with her. She is passionate and she has experience that speaks to her qualification.

Gunnigle: I would like to voice my support to Svendsen. She was passionate, has time and would be a great fit.

Rasmussen: I am hearing one major concern: keeping past going forward. There is a very specific reason I asked the same question to all candidates. I think this is a very important position and I feel that we need to keep in mind who has the most concrete ideas for change and who can hit the ground running. Change is not set in stone until this body votes on in, so I think these three candidates need to come down to who has the most concrete ideas for change.

Peterson: I want to say it is really important that we think about time commitment they are able to give. I know Mohamed really well, she is very busy and she will not be here in J-term. John Baron is quick to learn and can hit the ground running, my support is behind him. I also think Svendsen was very passionate and would do a great job too.

Gette: I want to show support for Baron. He is level-headed and adaptable. He said senate serves the body as it is right now. He was really composed and came up with his own answers, not echoing the answers that he heard.

Sauve: I don’t know any of these candidates, but what I saw was three very qualified candidates. I want to put my support behind Baron and Svendsen. I think anyone who is that excited to go through what most policy people view as the most boring part, I would like to see their exuberance be part of this body.

Siatta: I want to throw my support behind Baron and Svendsen. Svendsen exemplified great enthusiasm and past experience with exposure to other bodies of this type. She jumped on hall council right away and is jumping on this opportunity. I think verbiage for Baron would be exceptional and he could create new concrete bylaws. If we bring it down to those two candidates, I think we would be choosing between filet mignon and lobster. I don’t want to say anything against Mohamed. I just think she is over committed.

Grosshuesch: I know we are concerned about one candidate missing j-term, but we often don’t meet in j-term. If I could vote, I would put my support behind Mohamed. She wanted to be part of senate last year and represent people she had never met. I hate when people say others are over-involved. They will make time for the things that are important to them.

Hegg: Svendsen took a different approach by saying she isn’t involved with many things. She was very involved and educated when I watched her in hall council. Securing someone as a freshman and allowing them to grow over the years is a very important thing for this body. She picked up on things very quickly.

Gersch: They all had amazing things that I would love to bring forward. I ultimately put my support behind candidate Svendsen.

Motion to call to order.

 Vote.

 Approved.

Timmons: Your two candidates are Svendsen and Baron.

Discussion:

Wicklund: I would like to start off by saying I have known Svendsen for a few years. I think she learns quickly, I just don’t know if she has the skills to voice over people who are already leaders. Baron has leadership roles already. Svendsen wanted to look at precedent. Baron wanted to look at how he could best move the body forward.

Sauve: I want to voice support of Svendsen. She was passionate and knowledgable. She won’t necessarily need to know the rules. The people presiding are co-presidents. Ombudsperson does not necessarily lead in the meeting. I guess I’m not worried about a lack of relevant experience.

Siatta: I also would like to support candidate Svendsen. She showed great poise and was calm, collected and cool. Although she is younger, she is more that capable. She is more than inclined to stand up for what is right. Her willingness to step into those shoes so early is impressive. Baron has impressive credentials. I think another female voice in this body would make it a more equal and representative body.

Hegg: I’m going to support candidate Svendsen. There was not a lot of interest in the class of 2018 for Senate and I think it would be a good step in increasing attention. She was really trying to relate to us, poised, direct in her answers. She doesn’t have the resume of someone who has been on campus for many years, but judging from her high school resume, I feel she is qualified.

Thrash: A pretty big deal has been made of leadership and credentials. I would shy away from the Ombudsperson being seen as a leader. They need to take a step back and read a room. These two are the two that I chose to be picked to be voted on right now. Baron is coming from the position of Advancement office. Advancement is role of senators, cabinet and co-presidents, not necessarily the ombudsperson.

Gette: I fully support candidate Baron. He seemed more level-headed. I think that year of being on campus allows for a level of maturity. She seemed a little jumpy to me. I really liked how Baron talked about working as a TA and dealing with ethics already. That gives him the ability to just kind of know what direction to set people in.

Peterson: My support goes to John Baron. The comment about his advancement position would not be an issue. He is the most cool, collected person I have ever met. Svendsen seemed jumpy and not ready for this decision. I would also have to say Baron will be going to law school, he has experience and qualities.

Waggoner: Move to call to question.

Timmons: The Ombudsperson administers the spring co-presidential election. Take that into consideration in your decision.

Waggoner: I believe candidate Baron would be most well suited in that role. I had a class with him. He is an ethical and collected person in my mind. Move to call to question.

Vote on call to question.

 Fails.

Grosshuesch: I think both these candidates are fantastic. I would personally like to make it a first year. If you want someone who is not staunch, a first year is a best option to be a fresh set of eyes and train someone new in. I’m very impressed with Baron’s investment in college Advancement and his experience as a TA.

Sauve: I think the first time everyone talks in front of senate they seem jumpy. It shouldn’t be taken into account.

Gersch: Whoever is elected will be working with the ethics committee before we get to the co-presidential elections. The committee is heavily male dominated and diversity is important.

Rasmussen: I think we are focusing a lot on change and Svendsen presented the most ideas for change.

Gladitsch: What does the Ombudsperson do?

Goldstein: They are in charge of heading up election, campaigning, heading up election, and meeting with candidates on a regular basis.

Gunnigle: People will be jumpy speaking in front of large group of their peers. Svendsen did bring experience and is offering ideas which is impressive as a first year.

Move to vote.

 Vote.

 Approved.

Ombudsperson vote.

 Winner: Svendsen.

**V. Old Business**

**a. Committee Updates**

**i. Co-Presidents**

**1. Senate Decorum**

Goldstein: Let’s be here. We have a lot to accomplish. We need to be here. We’ve decided any time a group is here for finance, we are going to leave a few spots open in the back for them. In the past, we’ve never really told students how to run their organizations. We look at budgets for what it is, not for what it could be. If you hear that again or have questions, feel free to ask. The things we say have so much weight. If we are harsh, that reflects on us and all of those we represent. For speakers list we are going to stop throwing placards up until co-president says “We are now opening the floor.” I want to make a formal apology for writing ombudsman. It should have been ombudsperson. If there is ever a point of order or a germane called, the co-president should be the one to decide. If you still disagree, you can appeal to chair. If you need to step out, be respectful, don’t loudly open the door.

**2. GusBus Update**

Goldstein: We had an email exchange and got a number for an additional GusBus. December 6-mid April would cost $3900. It’s pretty amazing how many people use the GusBus.

Hegg: Cost?

Timmons: $3900

Waggoner: A lot of Gusties like to go out on Wednesday nights, could we extend to Wednesday nights too?

 Goldstein: You could charge that to co-presidents.

 Waggoner: I would like to charge the co-presidents to look into Wednesday night GusBus services in colder months.

 Sauve: I have had many conversations with constituents. They brought up why we are enabling people to go off campus to party. I think we need to have a conversation about the purpose the GusBus serves. I urge you to vote against this charge.

Gunnigle: I think it’s a wonderful idea. I know as an out of stater, this cold is killing me. I urge to vote for that.

Wicklund: I think this is a good idea to charge to the co-presidents. It ensures a safe ride home.

Rasmussen: We are not making a decision, we will get to talk about it again?

Goldstein: Yes.

Hegg: I think this is very important. I have heard from many constituents. Looking at other budgets, I think it makes sense. I think we should charge to co-presidents.

Sauve: I don’t want to vote for this. We have safe rides from campus safety. I don’t think it is serving the right purpose.

Siatta: Call to Question.

 Vote.

 Approved.

Vote to charge co-presidents.

 Approved.

Sauve: I would like to charge the co-presidents with expanding campus safety safe rides to off campus with more vans. I think it would be better for the campus.

Discussion:

Siatta: I think this is a more beneficial idea rather than renting vans from off campus. Would generate more jobs and keep finances inside and on top of the hill. I don’t know what the rules would be for driving off campus. The fact that a previous speaker has already had the conversation shows a good thought process.

Sweet: I feel like this motion would be better suited under student and academic affairs.

Goldstein: This might be better suited in a different committee. Matt and I would be more than happy to work with any chair.

Rasmussen: Call to question.

 Vote.

 Fails.

Rasmussen: Move to amend motion to amend co-presidents to Student Academic Affairs.

Sauve: There is more weight put when leaders of a full body make action. Co-presidents have more authority. We are talking about the GusBus, but it’s still a GusBus related issue.

Waggoner: Call to question.

 Vote.

 Approved.

Vote on amendment to charge.

 Approved.

Rasmussen: The co-presidents will work and people will get things done. Call to question.

 Call to question.

 Vote on charge to Student Academic Affairs.

 Approved.

Hegg: When you are looking into GusBus, I feel like Public Relations should also look into it. Informal charge.

**ii. Public Relations Chair**

Sweet: Sweatshirt options! Long sleeve tee or sweatshirt.

Discussion:

Siatta: I like the idea of a long sleeve shirt. Maybe a google docs for color.

Gunnigle: I think the quarter zips are a nifty idea.

Goldstein: Let’s set up a survey monkey.

**VI. New Business**

Sauve: Lately I’ve noticed that when it comes to elections, chairs have been doing a lot of speaking. I would like to charge ethics to looking into chairs only speaking when it pertains to their committee.

Hegg: I feel this is a little ridiculous. I think they should be able to speak.

Rasmussen: Chairs are not elected. They are appointed. Call to question.

 Vote.

 Approved.

Vote to charge ethics with speaking privileges.

 Vote.

 Approved.

**VII. Announcements**

Knutson: Faculty reports.

Goldstein: Thank you for a good long meeting. Please email if you can’t be here. I want to thank you for how you presented yourself. Friday night Toys for Tots at Patricks. If you’re interested, talk to anyone involved in the fraternity.

Hegg: Congratulations, Ombudsperson Svendsen!

Wicklund: Homeless week. We are taking donations. We are donating non-perishables, hygiene products to an organization in Mankato.

Sweet: Theta shirts! Look at facebook.

Sauve: It’s cold. Dress warm.