**Student Senate Agenda**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**December 8, 2014**

1. **Attendance**
2. **Approval of the Minutes 12/1/14**

Approved.

1. **Community Comment**

None.

1. **Finance**
2. **Running Club**

Branch: Three competitions this coming spring. Subsidize cost. The first race they will compete at is the Cupid Undie Run. They want to have $45 per person and a $30 travel fee covered. Same is true for the Get Lucky and Lake Minnetonka Half Marathon.

Wren: Co president of running club. People already committed to races. This will not cover full cost. This is just a supplement. We are encouraging fundraising. We are hoping that people in Running Club will not have to pay for the entire race.

Hegg: I feel like this is a good proposal and think it is good that they are competing at a level that is not varsity, but still getting better.

Thrash: How much are each paying? School vs. Individual?

Bembenek: Senate would be paying less than half.

Thrash: What lead you to pick these numbers?

Wren: Our history with senate has not been as positive. We are really just looking for some support. We talked with our advisor and he recommended asking for this amount.

Gustafson: Do you have a projected number for what it would cost for everything?

Wren: Around $2000.

Panzer: I’m curious about student senate’s policy on not allocating funding to philanthropic events.

Goldstein: No direct monetary contribution.

Hegg: I was noticing the registration fees. Was there a formula you used?

Timmons: How was the registration fee calculated?

Wren: That is the early registration fee.

Timmons: $300 was reached how?

Wren: We asked for $300, we know that about 10 will sign up. If it’s more than 10, it is assumed they will fundraise.

Thrash: I move to amend line item 31 to $450. I think it was prudent of this group and really humble to ask for a reduced amount of money, but if we are going to fund an event I think we should fund it.

Siatta: I don’t have any problems with funding this. I just question why we are amending.

Timmons: I believe the rationale was to fund every runner in full.

Siatta: I’m not opposed to supporting this. Was it initially your intention to receive full backing?

Wren: When we started the club, our goal was to not have any student have to pay for any race. Our initial thought would be that every raced should be funded. We came up with $200 as a humble gesture.

Hegg: I run and I don’t like running. I run for exercise and for health. I think promoting student health is a good thing. Students shouldn’t have to fundraise to run.

Gustafson: I’m hesitant to fully support this because of the issue with the constitution. I would find it helpful if the Ombudsperson would weigh in.

Svendsen: Nothing in the constitution would be violated. It doesn’t seem anything in the bylaws would be violated.

JoNes: The senate does not allow a student organization to request funds to make a donation to an organization or charity.

Hegg: Let’s just say 9 people or 8 people decide to go, would this money just come back to student senate?

Branch: Yes, all of the money we allocate stays in our bank account until we are asked for a check.

Hegg: I approve this.

Wicklund: Do you have any formal fundraisers?

Wren: No, we fundraise through the caf.

Wicklund: I’m hesitant because many groups fundraise and still need support.

Kehren: We need to keep the line of thinking of other organizations consistent.

Svendsen: Section 2-11 says Student Senate will not fund monetary contributions. It doesn’t seem like this organization is doing events to donate money to charity. The goal seems to be to allow students to participate. Given that, I don’t think it’s violating the bylaws because the reason they are using it is not for charity.

Vote to move line item 31 to $450.

Approved.

Thrash: I move to amend line item 35 to $650.

Hegg: We just discussed this, I call to question.

Vote to move line item 35 to $650.

Approved.

Thrash: I move to amend line item 40 to $700.

Singh: Doesn’t this require ⅔?

Goldstein: Amendment of the entire budget relies ⅔, not line items.

Rasmussen: What about ⅔?

Timmons: To pass the line items does not require ⅔, but the travel and registration bylaw does not allow us to spend over $1100. If we move the last bylaw it will require a ⅔ majority to amend the second increase.

Rasmussen: We have $90 in travel.

Siatta: Currently, this group is not a club sport. The $1100 rule only applies to conventions. This doesn’t apply. Under section 2, subsection 6. Since this isn’t a convention, this doesn’t hold any value.

Rasmussen: I have a hard time funding this if they aren’t recognized as a club sport.

Goldstein: In the past we have viewed this as a ticketed event. In the past things like this have fallen under that bylaw.

Rasmussen: I think bylaws can have grey areas, I think as it stands this is not considered a club sport. I believe that $1100 would be fair. I hope this gets voted down. I voted in the affirmatory in the first two. I think we should view this as a club sport for allocating money purposes.

Siatta: To clarify, if we vote this down the only total would be at $1100?

Rasmussen: Right now we are voting on moving line item 40 to $700.

Timmons: I think there is a little confusion. If we did not amend this, we would return to what is recommended by the finance committee.

Siatta: I still support this being at $700. I feel like there is some grey area in the bylaws.

Svendsen: The thing we are debating over is travel right now. Considering them a club sport only applies to the fact that they cannot exceed $4000. We aren’t debating that right now. We are debating whether it can exceed $1100.

Siatta: I support this fully, looking back I don’t see this passing ⅔. I still stand behind this. I think it’s a great event. I think student senate would be well respected for supporting something like this.

Wren: I would like to speak to why we aren’t considered a club sport. We were taken off the roster last year because we don’t compete only against other schools.

Kehren: On the last two proposals, I have voted to abstain. I wanted to see a precedent set and see how people were going to vote. They seem like they need the funds and have the support. I encourage support.

Grosshuesch: They are not a club sport, we cannot think of them as a club sport. Do not see them as a club sport.

Singh: I wanted to explain my rationale, I just think if we do this now, when we get to other budgets this might not be feasible. It won’t be fair. We have to consider the precedent we are setting.

Wicklund: We are seeing a lot of orgs fundraising for themselves. We will set a precedent that every time it is a good event, we should fund it fully.

Hegg: If we are to fail this amendment and then we have the Lake Minnetonka half being less and the others funded in full. Instead of funding each race individually could we put the races into one?

Wicklund: I believe we may be able to extend the rules to make that a block budget.

Goldstein: No, my ruling is that we can’t because we have never amended a budget on the floor.

Hegg: I don’t want to keep people from competing. I would like senators to consider that when voting.

Sweet: Something I think we are deviating from that we aren’t thinking about, but the numbers they gave were kind of arbitrary. That was the rationale rather than we have the money, so let’s spend it. The numbers just made sense. They have a way to do it, but these are more tangible numbers.

Miller: My point has kind of been made. I’m hesitant to support any of these in full. I think it sets a precedent for later clubs to come in and demand that the same thing happen. I’m going to vote it down.

Gunnigle: Echoing what previous senators said about the fundraising issue, through the previous votes increasing funding of first two events in full. I think it is more than fair to have them come up with the money for the last event.

Gladitsch: I’d like to echo what other previous speakers have said. I’m not sure this is a precedent we can continue to follow.

Rasmussen: I want to point out that first two budgets passed on a slim margin. It won’t be voted because it needs ⅔. I think we should vote this down now and figure it out from there. Call to question.

Vote on amendment of line item 40 to $700.

Failed.

Thrash: Can I see the total?

Grosshuesch: $1490

Wren: The people who have indicated that they will be running are not the same people. As it stands one race will be funded in full, so the group running the last race will not have the same opportunity.

Grosshuesch: The student org indicated that they have 10-12 potential runners, but they could have more. They will still have to fundraise a large amount of money.

Wicklund: I do want to see this budget pass. Is it possible to amend lines that have already been amended?

Goldstein: Yes, if you voted affirmative.

Wicklund: I encourage other senators to reconsider.

Waggoner: This is more a question for finance. Are they able to disperse the funds equally between races?

Thrash: They have to keep it as allocated.

Rasmussen: We’re in a weird situation. We are funding a group that is participating in an athletic event, but not considered a club sport. They came in asking for a certain amount of money. They want that. I think we should go back to what they wanted. I move to change line item 31 to $200.

Wicklund: You can discuss amendments on amendments, yes? I would be interested in making this number more than $200.

Timmons: The motion on the floor is to reconsider.

Siatta: Seeing as we are in reconsideration, and the original fee was $45 per person. We initially motioned to fund $450. I think they deserve more than what they asked. I think we should reconsider.

Hegg: I just have one question, if we made another fund so that we can give them more money, could we distribute it?

Timmons: No.

Vote to reconsider.

Approved.

Reconsideration of line item.

Goldstein: Discussion to fund $200, the original, or $450, the motion made on the floor.

Siatta: Can I not motion to fund a different number?

Timmons: You can move to amend the amendment.

Siatta: I move to amend line item 31 to $225. I think $225 is right in the middle. It would make sense. I think that’s more than acceptable.

Rasmussen: If we do all of these as half, we would be at $990.

Wicklund: I still think it should be higher.

Gunnigle: I move to call to question.

Vote to call to question

Approved.

Move to vote on changing 31 from $450 to $225.

Approved.

Waggoner: Can you clarify what we are discussing now?

Goldstein: The discussion we are having is whether we are amending. Now we have to vote between $200 and $225.

Waggoner: Call to question.

Vote on Reconsideration.

Approved.

Rasmussen: I move to reconsider line item 35.

Rasmussen: Same thing we did on this one.

Vote to Reconsider.

Approved.

Reconsideration of line item 35:

Rasmussen: I move to change line 35 to $325.

Timmons: I like that we seemed to find a compromise. I do want to say we never bat an eye at giving $1100. That is pretty standard and appropriate.

Singh: If we tack this extra money on, we can’t just add it to the next one, don’t we have to reconsider all?

Goldstein: You can basically do whatever you want, but I would accept a motion to add a consistent amount to all three lines.

Hegg: Call to question.

Vote on changing line 35 to $325.

Approved.

Waggoner: I would like to make a motion to extend meeting time to the end of announcements.

Vote on extension.

Approved.

Vote on line item 35 to move to $325.

Approved.

Rasmussen: I would like to support continuing with the mindset we have been voting on. I move to change line item 40 to $350.

Hegg: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on line item 40, move to $350.

Approved.

Rasmussen: Call to question on the budget.

Approved.

Vote on Running Club Budget.

Approved.

1. **USITT**

Branch: USITT came to us. Stands for United States Institute for Theatre Technology. Want to go to a conference this coming spring. Want to make up what they will spend this coming spring. Covers flights, hotel rates and conference fee. Additionally, the $15 for printing, they usually send out little cards that people can fill out.

USITT: We are just asking for funding to attend a national conference. It is a huge national organization. It is the only thing we do all year really, the only money we ask for all year. We are asking for flights, lodging and registration costs. The printing cost is for a fundraiser.

Goldstein: This will require a ⅔ majority vote.

Hegg: I would like to point out, we just set a precedent where we don’t break this bylaw. I motion to amend line item 35 to $1100.

Goldstein: We cannot amend the top line item.

Hegg: I move to amend line item 29 to $100.

Hegg: I think this makes sense. I would like to turn this over to discussion.

Vote on amendment of line item 29 to $100.

Approved.

Discussion on the original budget.

Hegg: I don’t have any problems with it.

Wicklund: We just amended that. I feel this conference is costlier.

USITT: We normally have about 5 participants, but people decide not to go due to cost. We have 6-8 members.

Wicklund: Is it the full cost?

USITT: Fundraising does not raise a whole lot of money. This will pay for about half.

Wicklund: I would encourage that we don’t really need to base this off of precedent.

Sweet: I would like to reiterate what people have said earlier. We need to take budgets on a case by case basis. I would encourage people to reconsider that amendment.

Thrash: Bear in mind, this group right now does not care that we went through a whole debate. Our chair asked us to keep order. It shows respect.

Branch: To make a point that a previous speaker had, just the conference alone was going to cost $200, they are only asking for a portion of cost for this budget.

Waggoner: Can I see the updated budget? I would like to call to question on the budget.

Failed.

Rasmussen: I know I’ve kind of said this before, but I feel like it isn’t senate’s place to decide what is more important and what isn’t. We have a set limit of $1100. I feel like to be fair, we have to stick with $1100. As cool as this event may be, there are bylaws for a reason.

Siatta: I agree with previous sentiments, but I would like to echo a previous speaker in saying each individual budget is its own. Each group deserves the respect of a full senate focus. I still see this as something that is understandable.

Grosshuesch: If previous speakers and the body feel like this is a precedent of $1100, then we have to put every group to $1100.

Mahan: Now we are funding ⅓ of what they asked for. Clearly finance found this budget appropriate. I would encourage giving some consideration to additional funding.

Hegg: I would like to echo a couple of previous speakers. We have our set amount. I don’t believe we have the votes and we talk a lot in here about precedence. We just made a decision with the last group not to break precedence. I move to call to question on the budget.

Approved.

Vote on the budget.

Approved.

1. **The Fourth Crown**

Branch: The Fourth Crown needs different funding to accompany the website name. These are the costs that cover it. When they came in and talked to us, we thought it was necessary to keep The Fourth Crown running.

The Fourth Crown: The costs are mainly just website upkeep. Getting a domain name, linking to wordpress and custom design software. Printing money is used just for posters as needed throughout the year.

Waggoner: I think this is extremely reasonable. Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on budget.

Approved.

1. **Cheerleading**

Goldstein: We should be discussing so that there is a reason for funding in the record.

Branch: Cheerleading came in for their budget. Regarding line item 21 for pompoms, finance decided not to fund those. They did not seem necessary for the uniform. In regards to the skirt and the shell, they are getting new uniforms that are longer in length as a way to attract girls and a better way to represent Gustavus as a whole.

Cheerleading: This is for 16 uniforms. Currently we have 16 girls and one boy. We are not asking for boy uniforms. The uniform consists of a skirt and a shell top. We are fundraising on our own for turtleneck, undershorts, shoes and bows.

Siatta: I fully support this. The only rationale coming from finance committee was that pompoms weren’t part of the uniform seen as uncomfortable. In terms of pompoms, is this necessary?

Cheerleading: We don’t have enough good pompoms for everyone right now. I had to throw out about 5 pairs at the beginning of the season. Our poms are about 5 years old. They are ratty because they are stored in a bag, shoved in the athletic office.

Siatta: That rationale was more unbenounced. Seeing as those are the conditions, I would be in favor of funding pompoms in full. The way the current budget stands, I am in full support of skirt and shell. The concerns of faculty mean that this would represent Gustavus more accurately. I support funding pompoms but I will leave that for another speaker.

Gladitsch: What are they classified as?

Branch: Club sport.

Svendsen: Speaking more on the fact that they are considered a club sport, bylaws state they cannot exceed $4000. It would not be a violation of budget. All this meets the bylaws right now, as is.

Singh: I have a question for the organization. Has anyone that may have voiced their concern approved the uniforms?

Cheerleading: We just got designs, but I have a meeting with an athletic director on Friday.

Singh: Has appropriateness been approved?

Cheerleading: They don’t have to be approved.

Singh: I would like to move line item 41 to $336. There’s no reason not to. They have clarified that this is equipment for them.

Gunnigle: I come from a place where cheerleading is a fairly big deal. Pompoms are a big part of that. I think they are in need of some new ones.

Siatta: I don’t necessarily think that it matters what the line item is, if it is pertinent then it should be spoken upon. What student senate does is provide for student organizations. Pompoms are like anything else that is pertinent for groups to function. Cheerleading is a prominent thing in a lot of places and pompoms are important for cheerleading.

Hegg: I think we should keep in mind what our constituents would want us to do. Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on amendment to line item 41.

Approved.

Singh: This organization came to us with their budget, they presented themselves very well.

Edu: The amount requested is not the full amount needed?

Cheerleading: No, it’s not. But this is for the uniform pieces needed that will stay here. The other pieces are for individuals and will be taken.

Edu: I wasn’t too comfortable with us approving something that hasn’t been approved by the athletic director, because I’ve worked with marketing before.

Thrash: To answer the previous speakers point, the uniforms will be ordered. It may not necessarily be that desire, but we are funding uniforms either way.

Gustafson: Could you describe in detail why these are necessary based on the current uniforms?

Cheerleading: Right now our midriff is showing. We are not able to wear these uniforms all year round. We have warm up jackets, but the zippers are broken. We cannot wear these to public events to get the Gustavus name out. If our teams are to go to championship games, we travel with them. We cannot wear them in public. A lot of potential cheerleaders are taken back by the style of these uniforms.

Rasmussen: Did finance committee receive quotes for these?

Branch: Yes.

Edu: I was getting the impression that outfits were wearing out. But you also spoke to being cold, that is a big concern. That’s a concern of safety and comfort. I don’t think anyone should be cold. I think we should approve this.

Vote on budget.

Approved.

1. **Student Senate**

Branch: Student Senate came to us for funding of hydration stations in buildings without in room sinks. They wanted to make sure there was one hydration station in every academic building. We funded Prairie View, Uhler, North and Norelius for at least one. We did not fund two in Norelius because one would be right around the corner from a water fountain. North is a central location. Those are the locations that were picked. Uhler was funded for both because finance committee did not want to pick a side. Not one more high traffic than another. The only connection is a tunnel in the basement.

Student Senate: Bobby has been working on this project for quite some time. Has put a lot of time and effort into it. The budget had to go to cabinet and we did discuss it at length. We thought it necessary to have the conversation on this floor.

Rasmussen: I’ve been working on this for a year and a half and I’ve always heard people talk about the need for more hydration stations on campus. It came time to prioritize where on campus would we put these? Those locations without personal sinks seemed like the answer. It seemed uncomfortable filling up bottles in these public sinks. Sanitary reasons. I worked with physical plant to come up with different options. High traffic areas were prioritized. And to have them in the most central place possible. In your room, lounge, computer lab, we wanted them to be right there. We talked to hall councils. We talked about options. The reasoning for extra in Uhler was because first floor seemed best. Piping is right there, easy. Nice and cheap. One floor above homework and lounging and nearest the doors as possible. We thought one was appropriate for prairie view. We thought Norelius might necessitate two due to the layout. If we can only get one, hall council said they would like it in the lounge area. Moving to complex, having so many residents, the biggest residence hall, we thought the number and the size would be best to have one on each end. Right inside the doorways.

Physical plant is going to be getting rid of the bathroom. It isn’t really used. This is the only spot that would really work. Having this done at the same time would lower the cost. They would already have a carpenter in there. Sorensen, having it right by the door would make sense. Piping is right there. I think it is really important to have two in those, the number of residents and the size.

Timmons: I would just like to make the point that Norelius and Complex equal almost half of this campus. I think that should be thought of in your discussion. I don’t know which door is more highly trafficked. With over 1000 students living in Norelius and Complex combined, I think that should be considered.

Rasmussen: I think Sorensen has the biggest lounge area in Complex. You will notice that these numbers are really rounded. These are the best approximations. Physical plant says they will cover any costs that are over the budget and maintenance costs along the way and down the road.

Gunnigle: It looks like this was thought out the last couple years and was approved by finance and the executive committee. The vote by Norelius proves that it is a great location and I support the budget as is.

Kehren: Lived in complex last year and living there this year. North is the most highly trafficked door. Although we did vote saying North is optimal, both are encouraged. There is quite a bit of traffic from Sorensen. I talked a lot to my constituents as well. They thought Sorensen was viable.

Hegg: I feel this is a really good proposal. I feel this will directly benefit many of our constituents. I feel like we should give complex both of them. I move to amend line item 50 to the full $2300. For one, encouraging people to drink water is a healthy choice, a lifetime thing. They don’t have sinks in their rooms.

Miller: Sorensen is high traffic. Right above the lounge. I’m in full support of this motion.

Panzer: From a Health and Housing standpoint, funding as requested is a great move. I feel the same logic should be applied to Norelius as it is to Complex.

Edu: I know we are trying to deal with what’s on the table now, is the plan to put hydration stations in all other dorms?

Rasmussen: My hope is that the school sees this and it becomes a bigger initiative.

Edu: I would say one is fair in Complex for now. It is progress from what we have now. Sorenson is actually the most expensive and they could use that cost.

Senate: I have been working on this for over a year and a half now. It’s been worked on for two and a half years. With my hope being said that the school does take this and create a bigger initiative out of this. Showing that this has been progress, I don’t see the school jumping on to this anytime soon. I wouldn’t hold that expectation too close.

Siatta: I guess in terms of Sorensen, and Complex in general, it is progress. Yes, they do have the largest population, but this is progress. If we don’t amend this for Sorensen, it doesn’t mean we can’t come back here next year. The budget the way it was brought to senate stands perfectly fine. I would be a fan of not amending this to $2300.

Hegg: How much money do we have in this account?

Bembenek: Roughly $84,227.

Hegg: With as many students as are living in complex, just putting one hydration station in won’t show the effects of putting in both. I feel it’s ridiculous to push the can down the road. We have all the plans ready, someone working on it, physical plant is on board. Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on Sorensen Hydration Station funding.

Approved.

Peterson: This is what our constituents want. I think we should fund it now. And fund it in full. Move to fund line item 53 in full.

Miller: I’m not in as much support of this one, the distance is not as great in Norelius. It’s across one lounge area. Is the water fountain still around the corner? I think the water fountain is good enough. I’m in support of one right now.

Gunnigle: There is a water fountain currently where the second hydration station was proposed. I don’t know why we would need to put a hydration station in where there already is one. I’m not in favor of a second.

Hegg: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on amendment to line item 53.

Failed.

Edu: You said the hydration station in North hall would be by a trashroom?

Student Senate: No, it will be by a bathroom. The bathroom will be removed.

Wicklund: Seeing as Pittman and Sohre don’t have a water fountain, I think it would be appropriate to put the hydration station in the same spot. Motion to move line item 52 to $0.

Failed.

Gunnigle: Call to Question.

Approved.

Vote on the budget.

Approved.

Move to 10 minute recess.

Approved.

Vote on 10 minutes recess.

Edu: Move to shorten to 5 minutes.

Hegg: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on amendment of 10 minutes to 5 minutes.

Approved.

Vote on 5 minute recess.

Approved.

1. **Old Business**
2. **The Dive Vote**

Goldstein: We are going to split this up into three sections. 1. Explanation. 2. Question session. 3. Discussion

Timmons: Two years ago, Student Senate brought up the opportunity to renovate the dive. Over 8 years, the student body would pay back the $1 million it would cost to renovate the dive. It failed by ten votes. Last year, we brought it back to the student body with the intention to have better education on the vote. That may have fallen short. However, it was decided that seniors could not vote on the dive renovation because they would never be affected. Freshmen and Seniors voted. We then found out that Juniors would never pay for the dive renovation, but Juniors got to vote. Co-presidents declared the vote out of order. This body has decided we would discuss this vote again. We do not necessarily have to go through with that. We could table this vote indefinitely. If the motion to table indefinitely fails, we cannot make the same motion again. I urge you if you decide to end the discussion by tabling indefinitely and it fails, we cannot vote to table indefinitely again. The body last year voted to bring up this issue again in the fall. We are bringing it up again the last meeting of the fall.

Hegg: So if this motion to table indefinitely fails, could we still table for a set amount of time?

Goldstein: Yes.

Grosshuesch: Can you please highlight the process of publicity last year and why you think it was downgraded and the scheme of the renovation itself?

Timmons: I think the advertising failed last year was that senate was very formal. We pushed ourselves into a position where if we were going to consider the question, we only had two weeks to advertise the vote. We did not feel comfortable advertising if the vote wouldn’t make it to the student body. That’s the reason I think advertising failed, not necessarily why it was voted down. The proposed renovation was pretty neat. It allows for a larger dance floor. A larger performance space. There would be a courtyard cafe style food place and there would be gender neutral bathrooms. Office space would be accommodated.

Grosshuesch: Can you also elaborate on the poster campaign?

Timmons: Senate and CAB partnered on advertising and the advertising was very affirmative. It made senators and constituents uncomfortable because we were supposed to advertising the vote. Then advertising was taken down. Delaney and I both know a lot too and if you would like to see the plans I will pass it around.

Gladitsch: If we were to table indefinitely, would it require a ⅔ vote?

Goldstein: We will get back to you.

Kehren: Will the email vote be counted?

Goldstein: No, we have not described absentee voting in our constitution.

Gersch: I had a question. If this was brought forward to the student body, would the Board of Trustees still be willing to fund at this point? If the intent of the body is to bring this forward, I would encourage tabling this conversation. We would need to look into many things.

Wicklund: Is there a way we could kind of do an initial vote and see where everyone is sitting?

Timmons: You could take a straw poll.

Wicklund: With the caf excluding student orgs from performing in there, do we foresee there being a performance space?

JoNes: You have to deal with this issue tonight regarding whether you want to take this from the table or not. You were supposed to do that sometime in the fall. If you are interested, you can figure out if anyone else is interested. With regard to the footprint, there is only so much square footage. You won’t gain enough feet to gain a performance space the size of Alumni Hall or the Caf.

Grosshuesch: The renovation has a built in stage next to the dance floor. The space is not the best place to host events to appeal to more events down there.

Sweet: If we were to table this indefinitely, the money still has to be spent on capital improvement, correct?

Timmons: Yes. A large contingent last year thought it was inappropriate to spend money on The Dive if there were teams and faculty being cut.

Sweet: We are going to have to renovate the Dive at some point, regardless of whether Student Senate pays for it. If we table it indefinitely, what happens if we have to vote again?

Timmons: It just cannot be worded the same way.

Gunnigle: Would we use student activity fee to pay?

Timmons: If senate tonight moves forward, we would be setting up the parameters to administer a vote to the student body.

Rasmussen: The capital improvement fund, is that the $.8 million.

Timmons: I cannot speak to the money in the fund, but renovation would cost $1.8 million. The Board would pay for the $1.8 million and over 8 years, the student body would pay them back $1 million.

Rasmussen: If we table tonight, we can still talk about The Dive, but we would shoot down this vote, right?

Timmons: As long as it wasn’t the same wording. It could also be reconsidered from the table.

Mahan: What would happen to the Courtyard Cafe?

Timmons: It mimics the food options. It wouldn’t be able to pump out like the caf can, but could create more food options.

Mahan: Is the capital improvement fund only for table and chairs and paint, could that be put towards wifi?

JoNes: Student Senate is pretty specific, the college isn’t quite as limited about it. Traditionally, things like IT improvement have come out of the operating budget. Not much comes out of capital improvement, most comes out of operating budget. Capital improvement is major major major projects.

Siatta: In regards moving to a student-wide vote, would an abstaining vote count as a no? Or failure to vote count as a no?

Timmons: It would not count as a vote.

Siatta: If a student stayed logged on, what would happen to the vote?

Timmons: Typically, it’s been yes or no.

Siatta: When would we decide who would vote and when completion would be?

Timmons: Technically we have to decide when to take this vote and who will be involved. But I would caution that we wait to make those decisions until we have more information. What I’ve sensed is a want to move forward with this vote.

Goldstein: To clarify, the discussion may not actually end tonight.

Edu: Is the objective tonight to bring the vote to the student body?

Timmons: The intention is when to administer the vote and who can vote. But instead we will talk about whether it is appropriate to continue Dive renovation discussion at this time.

Discussion:

Gersch: If we table indefinitely, we can reconsider in this meeting only. If it fails, we cannot postpone indefinitely again.

Thrash: I was part of this discussion last year, the reason The Dive vote failed last year is not the fault of last year’s senate. PR didn’t go how we wanted to. We had to vote the vote out of order. It put us in a bad spot. We lost a lot of trust. Even though CAB ran the ad campaign, people thought senate was trying to put pressure on the student body. As much as I would love to see this revived, we would have to exert a tremendous amount of effort. We would have to explain ourselves and start in a bad place. No one wants to get that deep into what we do here. I think this body, if we could just do this next semester, we could do it. But we couldn’t possibly ask that of the people who would have to do this. It would take so much time to do this and do it right.

Sweet: Voting on the Dive is going to become a thing of Gustavus now. I saw the mistakes that were being made, I saw votes slipping by. I guarantee the PR campaign would not provide any cracks to slip through. It’s a nightmare on the PR side, but it’s something that needs to happen and I feel like if it doesn’t happen in the next couple years it won’t happen in a long time. Working in Admissions, we aren’t even allowed to take prospective students down there. If we decide to re-administer, PR won’t be a concern.

Grosshuesch: I understand the concerns. It is not senate’s fault that The Dive vote failed last year. Something this body needs to do is to be more transparent. We postponed to keep people from being angry. Senate last year was too sheepish. We chose to put it off until the fall. We represent the student body, we need to be honest with them about the issue. This body is different from previous bodies. Don’t just table it indefinitely and get rid of it. We have the right and ability to talk to constituents. You can encourage them to listen to this recording. It is more important for us to have a discussion than to table indefinitely. The plan is phenomenal. Large stage, speakers, space to host events. This is giving student orgs the option to have another space. It also provides the opportunity to use the space. Most don’t use it because of the perceptions of the dive. This is the chance to make something really cool happen. Renovation, gender neutral bathrooms, coffeeshop, fireplace. It is designed to be comfortable, that’s what student senate is about. We need to talk about this more.

Gustafson: I support bringing this to the student body. Currently that space just isn’t functional. I spend a lot of time in the WAC. The WAC is really inconvenient. It’s not fun to have people walking through sensitive conversations every time they need something. The bathrooms are disgusting. The bathrooms are also going to be gender neutral! This will make us more accessible to a portion of the population that is underrepresented. This is a change that is under our control and supervision. We have a duty to our constituents. We also have a duty to better Gustavus. I think Chair Sweet has a great understanding in the duties she has taken on. My constituents have voted on this twice. I know they will be hard to convince.

Grosshuesch: At Gustavus we are always trying to make Gustavus more appealing and this will set Gustavus apart and make us more appealing. It’s something great for the college.

Gustafson: I’m very supportive. All good things.

Hegg: I would like to address a few points previously brought up. I’ve noticed that the freshman class is not going to The Dive. Why are we spending $1.8 million to revive something that is already dead? I support gender neutral bathrooms, but I don’t think it has to be a portion of this renovation. I think we could do this without spending $1.8 million. People have voted on this and said no many times. I think people are going to be very opposed. Out of the respect of my constituents I strongly urge that this vote not go to the student body. I move to table the discussion of The Dive vote until June 1.

Timmons: I think tabling the discussion until June 1 when we can’t discuss it is not the most effective way to take care of this discussion. I think we need to decide to kill this or we need to move forward.

Hegg: Could the next person call to question and fail this motion please?

Wicklund: I still want to address some of the things said. I spoke to students. I feel it’s not appropriate to table it because there is interest in it. Call to question.

Approved.

Vote to Table until June 1.

Failed.

Hegg: I would like to now make the motion to table The Dive indefinitely.

Hegg: I feel people in here have made up their mind. We are putting the burden on students here 8 years down the road. I feel there are more cost effective ways. I don’t think this is a question of whether you support gender neutral bathrooms or not. I don’t feel we need to discuss this any further. Call to question.

Failed.

Siatta: I think this is extremely important to continue talking about. If there’s that many people on the speakers list, there are still many voices to be heard. We can move to a further date later in J-Term. There is opportunity to speak with the Board, see if there is still backing, if costs have changed. I personally think that there should be a willingness to be open to the conversation. The vote last year didn’t fail, it was just deemed out of order. Two years ago, the vote only failed by 10 votes. It’s not really passing the buck if you think about all of the students that will benefit. On top of that, this capital improvement money is there to be used. This definitely needs to happen for the wellbeing of the school in general. To see another 50 years it is imperative that there is some sort of renovation done. The fact is that the dive renovation should be focused on as a student arena. I encourage continued discussion on this matter and that if discussion is positive, we table until J-Term and then reconvene on the actual logistics of dive renovation.

Wicklund: I would like to encourage speakers not to call to question when the speaker’s list is this long. I think this is an important conversation and should be taken to students. Many are worried about what it would cost them, not the renovation in general. Many of my constituents saw that this would be a useful space for a variety of reasons. Being part of the organizations that meet in the offices in the Dive, there is an opportunity to fix problems in the office spaces.

JoNes: I don’t think there is office space planned to be in the Dive. Before you get all connected to a better WAC space, I don’t think the plan has a WAC space. That becomes Dive.

Wicklund: Gender neutral bathrooms are only a part of this. Chair Sweet is extremely competent. I think we can make this happen.

Grosshuesch: As I am not a voting body, but I talk a lot. It is not germane to silence another senator’s voice. We cannot decide until all of you talk on this. We cannot just call to question. Allow conversation to happen regardless of how long it will take. Get used to being here for a long time, that’s what we’re supposed to do. In regards to how and when we will re-administer, it needs to be late enough in spring to make sure it can be done right. The time in which it needs to happen is late spring to allow enough time for conversation. Who it is supposed to be administered to all depends on when it will be done. The day of the voting last year, I noticed the renovation plan had changed from what we had been told and it would actually be done next fall, meaning current juniors would not ever see the finished Dive as a student. A large portion of student body was not supposed to be allowed to vote on it. To just say the vote failed was wrong because a large group of people was not supposed to have a vote. The largest group of people who will get to vote will be first years. They aren’t using The Dive, that’s a perfect opportunity for renovation. This all comes with the discussion.

Edu: It is nice to see people passionate about this discussion. But we can only talk about it for so long. I think we can actually reduce a lot of stress. We need to talk to our constituents. I think if they are interested we need to talk about this. I think we should really focus on the interest level of our constituents. Try to put yourself out of the picture, you are the voice of who you represent.

Hoang: I support Dive renovation. My constituents support it too. I strongly believe they have more fundamental issues that should be touched on. The first point I would like to make is that the Dive is being used by students. I want to also say that there has been a mindset among us that we are giving the Dive a fresh start and I do not agree with that because the current issue, the main reason, is that the bad behavior of a portion of students happens there. That needs to be solved first.

Rasmussen: The Dive is not a dance room. It is a student space that happens to host a dance on Friday nights. Second, it’s stated that this is a $1.8 million project, but students are paying $1 million. What is on the agenda right now, I don’t think we are supposed to be talking about whether The Dive renovation is a good idea. We are talking about bringing the vote to the student body. Technically, that vote didn’t happen last year. Is there enough reason to bring that vote back next year? I think we could anger a lot of students. I think many could reflect on it in a negative way. I think this needs to be tabled indefinitely. I think there is a technicality, for our best interest, for student’s best interest. We can have this conversation later, but I feel this is a better route to take than putting the exact same vote in front of the student body. I hope we can keep the conversation to that topic.

Sweet: I have a question. Are there different rules for different votes? How would that be handled?

Timmons: It depends on what vote you’re having. We have a set election committee. I would guess the election committee would determine the best course of action.

Sweet: We had such a set plan for last year, but now that isn’t clear anymore. To me, to table it indefinitely right now doesn’t make sense because we don’t have all the information. I don’t feel comfortable tabling indefinitely without everything in front of me.

Johnson: I’m going to echo what a previous speaker has said. I think we need to table indefinitely, we can still discuss The Dive. If we do decide to table this for a set period of time, we are still limited to discussing when to administer and how to administer. We wouldn’t get into discussion about constituent opinion. If we table indefinitely, we can have a more open conversation about merits and time table.

Gette: How different does the vote have to be?

Goldstein: It has to be a completely different vote.

Gette: I have talked to a few constituents and I think right now there are too many questions. We need to table it so that those who voted in the past don’t have biases. We can bring in clear heads. Talking to constituents, even in the most positive light, there is still so much bias left.

Gunnigle: As a first year, I’m not going to debate the benefits because I don’t really know what they are. The constituents we represent should know the extra money that would cost for this to go through. There are students who are here just on scholarships and financial aid.

Gladitsch: I would like to echo what previous speakers have said. I think many are poisoned to a Dive vote. I don’t know if we can overcome the biases of the past few years.

Singh: To bring back the conversation, I agree with a previous speaker to administer the vote in late spring. I think that this vote is almost required because when we administered the vote last year, it was invalid. I feel like we’re obligated to bring it back. Then, if we table indefinitely, we would have to start over with the proposal. That took a lot of time, money, and effort. It’s possible to bring it up again, but the work already put in would be a waste.

Waggoner: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on postponing indefinitely.

Approved.

Mahan: Update from Health and Housing on building steps from the Wallstrom Lot.

Panzer: We will look into it in the spring. January and February.

Sweet: Sweatshirt poll. Black Quarterzips. I can get final prices to you the first week of February.

Gladitsch: What was the approximate cost of those?

Sweet: $35

1. **New Business**

Siatta: Charge Student and Academic Affairs to the closing of the Student interaction room, Beck 371. Background, this is one of the rooms in the atrium, if you’re looking at the library, it’s up and to your right. It technically says student interaction room. I assume it to be any student that wants to interact in that room. But the Communication Studies department and History Department have claimed this room is particularly for Communication Studies students because there are not enough places in Beck. I think there are student interaction rooms for a reason, they should not be departmentalized. That room sits idle while students are looking for rooms. I’ve taken pictures of when it is used and when it is not used. The second floor student interaction room says Psychological Studies Student Interaction room. It states a major, but the room is still open to the public.

Vote on charge.

Approved.

Singh: I’d like to charge the co-chairs to look into a new Dive plan. I want to bring up another discussion. Particularly regarding Sophomores and First year students.

JoNes: Senate is working on a SurveyMonkey questionnaire, would your needs be met by adding a question about The Dive.

Singh: I don’t think so. I’m looking specifically at information from the Board.

Grosshuesch: We need to be more transparent. A discussion should occur. People don’t know the vote was out of order last year. You need to make an effort to have a conversation.

Hegg: Would it be at all possible to have this conversation in J-Term or in the spring?

Singh: I don’t think I could have articulated it better than Gabe did.

Rasmussen: I think this doesn’t force us to go together with a new plan. I would like to see where everyone stands on this issue. I would like to see if that could earn some respect for us from students.

Skiba: On discussion for new Dive investigation, I think we should look to new funding options. Taxing students could be part of the reason the last vote failed.

Hoang: So, we already know that if we bring this issue to the student body there will be certain biases. I think it is a good idea to address possible biases. I would like to reiterate that the way people think about The Dive starts from bad behavior. I think we need to address that.

Wicklund: I think that the co-president are competent and I believe the next senator’s mind has been made up so I call to question.

Approved.

Vote on charge.

Approved.

Wicklund: I am astounded by actions of this body. We rushed a lot of stuff and were not showing respect. We didn’t address each budget individually. I would like to encourage senators to take the break and think about why they are here. All constituents deserve to be represented. I charge co-Presidents to look into rights. I think we saw a lot of speakers lists ended when there was still discussion to be had.

Hegg: I feel that this is not a co-Presidents thing. I think this is an Ethics committee thing.

Miller: I have a question on this charge. Are you charging the co-President to look into the right to deny our call to question.

Wicklund: In other bodies I’ve been in, Presidents could decide on appropriateness. I think we all have valuable voices.

Gersch: I do think this is a job for the Ethics committee. We would work with the co-Presidents.

Mahan: I move to amend the motion to have ethics committee look into this. I think a lot of us know what we want to vote on an support this. Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on Amendment.

Approved.

Wicklund: Can I add onto the motion to have co-presidents added?

Goldstein: Yes.

Wicklund: I move to amend to have co-presidents and ethics work together.

Siatta: I was under the impression that this is happening.

Goldstein: It formalizes it.

Hegg: It runs into bias, it would give more power to the co-presidents.

Timmons: The charge is to look into options. Let’s keep moving.

Hegg: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on amendment to add co-presidents.

Approved.

Discussion on Ethics and Co-Presidents looking into cutting off speaker list.

Wicklund: Constituents deserve more respect from us and co-presidents have good judgement.

Gunnigle: Call to question.

Approved.

Vote on charge.

Approved.

1. **Announcements**

Grosshuesch: Thank you for a fruitful discussion. I am very proud. Senate is a hate-love relationship. Kwanza is on Thursday at 6pm in the banquet rooms. Good food, speaker, really cool. D-Committee is tabling on Wednesday for Human Rights Day.

Timmons: I was pretty surprised by some of the reactions that were taking place. I want you to remember that you have a constituent that agrees with words being said. I’m glad we have passion, but I felt somethings borderline violated decorum. Remember we treat each group equitably in finance. Faculty reports are due. All of that being said, I am so glad to be part of this body. I am very proud and thankful. I’m very excited for the semester. I hope that finals go well. Lineus is having a really quirky fundraiser. Food and wrestling.

Goldstein: Also, you can vote for Jordan to wrestle himself. Cabinet will have a quick meeting after this tonight. We do not allow absentee voting. Sorry for the candy canes, they turned everyone’s mouths green. If something will be called germane, don’t say it. When Delaney said there was going to be a senate seal on the sweatshirts, I thought it would be an animal.

Kehren: Tonight was one of the coolest nights I’ve had this year. We just did something really important. That was cool.

Rasmussen: I was just going to say, wow. That was a rollercoaster ride. We started the meeting spending an hour changing $100 on a budget. We made a big difference.

Johnson: Quick note to my committee, we will be meeting this week.

Edu: I apologize for any gesture. We are all Gusties. We have no parties. It’s a win-win situation.

JoNes: I hope the irony does not miss you that you used a call to question on a discussion about calling to question. I see an opportunity for you to spend some time with my friend Robert. You have an understanding and now you can move it to the next level in parliamentary procedure.

Svendsen: You have some time over winter break, I have been receiving a lot of of questions about bylaws and constitution, but look them over. It’s been an amazing few weeks. Thank you for being so inviting.

Wicklund: I would like to thank you all for a mostly good semester. Keep in mind the good and bad we did tonight. Reflect over break. Happy Holidays. The roads are icy. Be safe.

Hegg: I’m looking forward to seeing you all next year. I’d like to thank Senator Rasmussen for his work on hydration stations. I know things were heated, a lot of things were said.

Sweet: Tonight was super fun. I love senate. I really appreciate the discussion tonight. If my committee could just meet for 10 seconds. That would be great.

Gersch: I would encourage what JoNes and Ombudswoman stated. There’s a cheatsheet online. If you want to see the speaker’s list, you can mouth to Chair Jenson.

Goldstein: If you are writing any notes to cabinet members, please sign your name if you feel comfortable.

Grosshuesch: Last year in senate, I didn’t really speak up until the spring. There are things I am extremely passionate about. Many of you understand. I’m sorry for any gestures I made tonight.

Adjourned: 11:19pm