**Student Senate Agenda**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**January 12, 2015**

**I.** **Attendance**

**II.** **Approval of the Minutes 1/5/14**

 Approved.

**III.** **Community Comment**

None.

**IV.** **Old Business**

**a.** **Board of Trustees Meeting**

Edu: I don’t know how important this is, but Gustavus cafeteria is run very well. I went to the head of the cafeteria and talked to him about how expensive the food at Gustavus is. He pulled out a list of food prices at colleges in Minnesota and we have the cheapest food in the state. I think we could let them know the students appreciate the cafeteria and good food.

Panzer: Breakfast with professors event being discussed. Trying to get logistics figured out. I would like to have something more presentable to this body soon. Educational mission of the college brought to the cafeteria.

**V.** **New Business**

**a.** **Ethics Reprimand**

Svendsen: On December 1 of last semester, we heard about a resolution from Building Bridges. We passed the resolution. Then a concern came up that we had not made a decision within the previously decided timeline. There will be a reprimand of the entire Student Senate. We will sign the reprimand at the end of the meeting.

Timmons: I don’t think this is the fault of the body. When Hayden and I read the minutes of the senate, we read three years. It said 2015.

JoNes: I should clarify that most of you weren’t here three years ago. Building Bridges decisions were made then and they didn’t want to make a decision forever. So they charged the next decision to be made three year later, spring semester.

Timmons: The time line we chose was intentional. Building Bridges would have new leadership. We never thought of the conversation needing to have in spring of 2015. I think your signature is recognition of a detail you were not made aware of. It was not your responsibility to go back in the minutes.

Hegg: Does the decision made in December count?

Svendsen: Yes, we decided it would count. We were not going to punish Building Bridges for something that we overlooked.

Rasmussen: First, I know who brought this to ethics and why they did. I have problems with that. Can I ask how the conversation went.

Thrash: In Article One of the constitution, it says senators will keep track of previous minutes. We failed to do that. We went against the constitution in running the vote the way we did. If we start ignoring the constitution on small things, we set a precedent.

JoNes: There was an intentional conversation about whether to reprimand just the co-presidents or all of senate.

Rasmussen: Do adhoc members get to vote in ethics committee?

Svendsen: The only time someone can come into ethics committee is if someone has a conflict of interest. If there are complaints, they should be able to be anonymous if they want to remain anonymous.

JoNes: There was a conversation about whether people should recuse themselves from the committee. The charge was against the entire senate, so almost the entire committee would have to recuse themselves. Thus, no one did.

Rasmussen: Was it a unanimous decision?

Svendsen: Yes. It was a lengthy discussion. We decided to do a formal reprimand so that we could bring it to the body and have a conversation on the minutes.

Rasmussen: If senators chose not to vote on this, do they still have to sign it?

Svendsen: I think everyone should sign it. If the reason for refusing to vote was that the timeline was wrong, they should have spoken up.

Siatta: Are we required to sign it? Or is it an option?

Svendsen: You are technically required to sign it.

Kehren: Could we motion to overrule or overthrow this?

JoNes: No, Ethics committee is not asking you for permission. They are going to reprimand you whether you want them to or not.

Svendsen: We just want to have the decision in the records for future senators.

Siatta: Can we know who brought it forward?

Svendsen: No, it’s anonymous.

Hegg: I will sign it. I don’t think we should have this recorded in the minutes. I don’t think constituents need to know.

Svendsen: The reason we put it in the minute was for future senates to be able to see how this decision was made.

Thrash: In the lead up to this ethic meeting, I spent a lot of time reading old minutes. I can tell you, having gone back and read old minutes and not very good old minutes. It’s very hard to know what happened. What we don’t want is in 6 or 7 years for someone to decide to change timelines because we allowed it and didn’t reprimand it now.

Timmons: Because Ethics is a closed committee, when there are discussions, we can recognize that something went wrong. We want to recognize that we realized our mistake. Future bodies and future members can have that knowledge.

Siatta: What would happen if we choose not to sign this?

JoNes: I would imagine that you go back to the ethics committee and have a conversation.

Svendsen: This was not just a vote, we looked at it from different view points and made sure that we decided unanimously.

Siatta: If it’s a reprimand directly from the ethics committee, I don’t see why we have to sign it.

Svendsen: It’s in the constitution. Everyone will be signing it.

Siatta: Does that mean cabinet members will be signing too?

Svendsen: No. Their roles are not delineated.

Siatta: Does that mean Building Bridges co-chairs have to sign too, because they were in the room?

Svendsen: No, they are not part of full senate.

Gustafson: My view is that the decision was made a long time ago and the co-chairs decided to talk about it in fall because of the Building Bridges co-chair situation. Can the co-chairs make a friendly and change the timeline?

Svendsen: No.

Gustafson: Couldn’t the co-presidents decide it would be better this way?

Svendsen: No, we don’t want to set a precedent.

Skiba: This is my first year on Student Senate. I was not aware that Building Bridges had ever come forward. I think it’s a little ridiculous to expect a first year senator to read minutes. I think it’s the job of the leaders of student senate to lead us down the right road.

Svendsen: It is in the constitution that every senator has to go back and read the minutes.

Skiba: Where is the line? 8 years, 12 years? Unless I’m instructed to read, I shouldn’t be expected to.

JoNes: In all of my time in Student Senate, there have only been two resolutions with timelines. So it doesn’t happen often. I also think you are giving this too much weight, with all due respect. I fully support the decision of the Ethics committee. You don’t really have a choice but to sign it.

Nick: The signature is not necessarily approval, it’s a way of ensuring that we don’t set a precedent of breaking the constitution.

Timmons: As I prepped this conversation, I think we lead you into this situation, but I don’t think this is quite as big as some of you do.

Svendsen: This is just to get the conversation in the minutes. It’s nothing that will taint your involvement on student senate.

Edu: At my old job, if you were reprimanded three times you were out. Is that the case?

Svendsen: No. Decisions are made circumstantially.

Peterson: Thank you to Ethics committee for all of the work that went into this decision. I think it’s awesome that we all get to put our signature on something that says we take responsibility for our actions.

Grosshuesch: I’m not even a voting member and I’m signing it. It is your job and your duty to sign this.

Hegg: I’ve heard about as much as I’m willing to hear on this. But I have some questions. Who is on Ethics committee first off?

Svendsen: We have six total members. Seven if JoNes sits in. There is one person that is not on the senate body who sits in on ethics committee, the student-at-large.

Hegg: If this is a senate issue, why is there a student-at-large?

Svendsen: We’ve always done it that way.

Rasmussen: Why do those on ethics committee believe that we have a student-at-large?

Svendsen: The student-at-large keeps the senate in line. If it was only senators, we wouldn’t have a checks and balance system.

Gustafson: I want to remind you that we voted on the student-at-large.

Siatta: Why did they choose to make it anonymous?

Svendsen: They wanted to make it anonymous. If anyone asks to be anonymous, we honor that.

Timmons: I want to formally apologize. I never thought twice on this. We made a decision we thought was the most sensical and most appropriate. We should have followed the timeline, but getting the work done was more important. We got the work done. I apologize, but I don’t really regret it.

Rasmussen: Senators that aren’t here right now…?

Svendsen: They will be forced to sign this.

Hegg: In light of this long discussion and the confusing nature of ethics committee, I would like someone to look into why we have a non-senator on the ethics committee.

Timmons: If you don’t want it to go to ethics committee, I would recommend that you send it to cabinet.

Hegg: My issue is that if we send it to cabinet, we only have one voting member on cabinet.

Timmons: If you are asking us to look into why we have a student-at-large, we have already discussed that. If you are having a conversation about getting rid of the student-at-large, that’s a whole new conversation. You would have to make a motion to amend the bylaws. I want to caution you against that. I think it is very important to have an outside perspective.

Hegg: Voting members, if they were on ethics committee, would they know more?

Svendsen: If they ask to be anonymous, they will be anonymous.

Hegg: Well, someone has to know. They complained to someone.

Svendsen: The email we received asked that we keep the source anonymous.

Hegg: Does that mean the discussion also has to be anonymous?

JoNes: I think Ethics Committee does well at bringing up the important points.

Svendsen: I told you about every step in the process.

JoNes: One of the things that Ethics committee deals with is attendance. Confidentiality is very important because failing attendance would be a personal issue.

Svendsen: I think it would be great to go back and look into why the student-at-large is a position on our committee and in other senate bodies.

Timmons: Our ombudsperson has a document about all of the documents that have ever changed and the original copy.

Rasmussen: My concern is, if we want a mind outside of the senate body, I think it’s weird that we only have one student that can vote. I guess that’s something that can just kind of be thought about. I had a student come to me before break to ask if it was possible to have a schedule set up online so that students can plan around sports teams.

Branch: The weight room is technically always free for everyone because it’s so small. They have that small weight room upstairs. The swim team has random practices during the day during Jterm.

Rasmussen: I think it would be nice to have a schedule so students know. There is limited space. That’s been an issue brought up many times this year, where we can get more athletic equiptment.

Kehren: I agree, the boxing bag in the aerobics room has a schedule for the day but you have to go to the door to check.

Rasmussen: I charge health and housing to look into a weight room schedule for athletic teams.

 Second goes to Hegg.

Hegg: This is really good. I think we should send this to committee.

Edu: I think if there is a schedule, that makes it harder for athletes.

Rasmussen: I think we should just see what we can do, I don’t think we need to restrict who can be in there. It’s just an informational thing that could benefit children.

Vote on charge to health and housing.

 Approved.

Grosshuesch: I have a complaint from a student who has been in a room in Lund and was kicked out by a sports team. I don’t understand why a sports team was allowed to have a banquet in the aerobics room in the first place, but it’s also not fair to the student organization.

Thrash: I don’t think it needs to be a friendly to look into scheduling in Lund. I think one investigation can look into both.

Bembenek: Sports teams still take priority even if they fail to schedule their practice.

Panzer: Does that include if they have the space reserved?

Bembenek: Yes. They have that power as a varsity sport. As far as a team using that power, to notify the student organization.

Hegg: Let’s just try to share Lund the best we can. The motion was trying to say we want to let students know when Lund is going to be busy and when it’s going to be quiet.

**VI.** **Announcements**

Panzer: The Fourth Crown has applications open. If you are funny or intelligent or neither, please apply.

Wicklund: How is Solveig pronounced.

Svendsen: Sol-veh.

Wicklund: Enjoy Jterm. It’s almost over.

Svendsen: Thank you all for signing the reprimand. It’s really just recognition that something happened.

Grosshuesch: March 13 is Africa Night. 90s Dive is on Friday. Sunday is 80s and 90s themed dancing in Alumni. I know that the opinion editor for the Weekly is looking for five writers. Come talk to me afterwards.

JoNes: I had a little conversation with Charlie Potts and neither of us remember there being an ethics committee in 2001. I would guess it was formed between 2001 and 2011.

Thrash: The next step is to ask Scott Brody. I want to give a shout out to our recording software which gave out at the worst possible time.

Timmons: Thank you all, be safe. I left the state last week and just got back late last night. Students were not discouraged by the first question. I’m not going to edit or change the structure of the survey. But I will try to get rid of the brown.

JoNes: We had a really decent response rate. I think you will be able to draw sophisticated statistics from the responses. Safe travels to those leaving!

Gersch: Let me know if you notice anything wrong with the website.

Wicklund: There is an ongoing series of sessions talking about MLK. There will be free food. We are packaging school supplies. It’s a cool service thing. Make good choices.

Gustafson: Courageous Conversations happening in the DCenter tomorrow. There’s a shirt involved as well.