**Student Senate Agenda**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**January 19, 2015; 7:06pm**

1. **Attendance**

**II. Approval of the Minutes 1/12/15**

Approved.

**III. Community Comment**

Community Member: Students off campus do not have key card access to dorm buildings under any circumstances.

**IV. Budgets**

1. **Women’s LaCrosse**

Branch: Women’s LaCrosse is asking for a lacrosse stick. They don’t currently have one. They are lucky enough to have people in the past who had their own, but they don’t this year. They gave estimates. Around $100. We thought $100 was fair. They didn’t know shipping costs.

LaCrosse: We’ve been lucky in years past to have a goalie stick available. It hasn’t been necessary. We have a girl willing to play as our goalie this year, but she is coming from the hockey team. She doesn’t have a lacrosse stick. We are hoping it would be the designated team stick.

Siatta: They did have quotes. This is a necessity for their club to play. We need to fund this. We are not dictating which stick they buy. I feel comfortable supporting this.

Wicklund: Motion to allocate full $100.

Second goes to Kehren.

Vote.

Approved.

Kehren: What is contingency right now?

Bembenek: $94,997.53

**b. Tennis Club**

Branch: Tennis Club is asking for new uniforms for the section tennis match. Uniforms will be staying with the club. Design has already been approved. We thought it was fair to recommend them the whole $178.33 for the jerseys they are looking to purchase.

Tennis Club: We had a quote. They have already been approved. They would stay here on campus. We will make sure they get washed. They will last for years. We have a locker that they can stay in and they will last for years. I’m happy to answer any questions.

Wicklund: Why are you looking to get more uniforms?

Tennis Club: We are double in size this year. Returning members don’t need new uniforms. They still have them and wear them all the time.

Timmons: How many current uniforms do you have in the team possession?

Tennis Club: None. The people who have them purchased them by themselves.

Vote.

Approved.

**c. FCA**

Branch: Fellowship for Christian Athletes. Bringing a speaker in March. $1,500 for quote of the speaker. They came in for $1500 and $500 for travel costs. But travel costs was not correct, it’s just a deposit. We are recommending just the $1500.

FCA: The speaker is an illusionist and magician. It’s a 90 minute show in Bjorling Hall. First half is tricks, the second half is the testimony of truth and how faith has influenced what he does now. My sophomore year there was a show that packed Alumni Hall. I think Illusionist, magician would be something that would really bring campus together.

Wicklund: Is there a limit on speaker funding for organizations?

Svendsen: This is not a ticketed event? If not, then it just has to be requested more than 15 days before an event.

Thrash: The speaker’s honorarium is $1500?

FCA: Yes.

Edu: Is it open to all students? Will your organization pay for publicity? If we are paying a lot for a speaker, we want to make sure people know about it.

FCA: Yes. He will send us posters and we are partnering with another campus christian organization.

Peterson: I think this sounds like a really cool event. Freshmen have hypnotist, but that fell through and this is for everyone. Even if you aren’t christian.

Timmons: This is a speaker’s fee and not a donation, correct?

FCA: Yes.

Vote.

Approved.

**d. STLF**

Branch: Students Today Leaders Forever. A convention up North later this month. For a pay it forward campaign. These costs are for a convention to prepare them for a long trip in the spring. This is to get them prepared to deal with different situations. We are supporting them for travel costs. We thought everything was reasonable that they were asking for. We recommended their budget in full.

STLF: We did go to a fall conference and we are fundraising to pay that off. We just have not been able to fundraise to pay for this conference. It is a mandatory conference for our spring break trip.

Kehren: This actually is essential. I’m going to abstain from voting. I’m secretary of this organization.

Svendsen: Can you explain a little more about what your organization is and what your trip will be?

STLF: The Pay It Forward event is the signature of STLF. It’s a multi-city service and leadership trip. This retreat is for STLF. It’s to get a better idea of what the organization is and what your chapter looks like. It seeks to energize student leaders. Energizing student leaders through service, relationships in community and interaction.

Jenson: I’m not sure how far North it is, but that’s round trip cost, right?

STLF: Yes.

Timmons: Has your organization received funding from student senate this year?

STLF: No, we were approved after the spring budget process.

Vote.

Approved.

**V. Old Business**

Rasmussen: I hate to bring it up again. I still think what happened last week was wrong. Personally, it bothers me. I feel I was forced to sign something without understanding it. I feel like one of the bylaws was done incorrectly. I was told last week we were signing a reprimand that we were signing because in Article One of the constitution it states that senators are supposed to read minutes. But minutes do not appear in the constitution. I’m surprised by how little our duties are laid out. There was one thing, I forget where it was. At the beginning of the year, it is on the co-presidents duties to have the retreat and you are supposed to look at and talk about past senates and see what was done. There is no record and our ombudsperson wasn’t even at that meeting. Moving towards an official reprimand, a formal reprimand is signed by just one member and acknowledged by the senate body. Maybe if we have it here we could read what we actually signed.

Svendsen: As far as the whole, looking over past minutes is supposed to be delineated in the constitution. That might be completely on me. I swore I read it somewhere that we were supposed to, as senators and members of this body, read the minutes. “This is a formal written reprimand for your \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Rasmussen: I disagree with our being forced to sign it. I felt like we were told we had to and like JoNes said, the Ethics committee gets to decide what happens yet.

JoNes: Something like that. I don’t mean it as a threat, but that’s all that you all can do with each other, against each other or for each other.

Rasmussen: I looked in the constitution bylaws and couldn’t find anything about challenging a reprimand. Having to sign that and having it go on permanent record seems wrong to me.

JoNes: Your only choice on the matter would be for you to form a committee that allows for an appeal process to the Ethics Committee.

Kehren: Article 5, the senate must hold a retreat and after the retreat they must look over minutes. That’s all I’ve found so far.

Rasmussen: That’s what I was talking about that I couldn’t remember the wording. I guess even if nothing comes of this, I think we should have something in the constitution bylaws that allows us to challenge Ethics Committee. I move to create a committee chaired by myself to look into bylaw changes to create such a group. I recommend that anyone who has not signed that document not to sign it because I think it needs to be looked at a little closer.

Second goes to Kehren.

Rasmussen: The naming of the article would not be exactly what I just said. Giving senators power to overturn Ethics Committee isn’t the best.

Thrash: I thank the previous speaker for clarifying. I agree that voting out of Ethics Committee negates the Ethics Committee intention. Previous senates have used JBoard to be an outside force between senate and ethics committee. I encourage you to look to an outside group to do this, not something within senate.

Wicklund: Maybe consider not allowing Ethics Committee members in this adhoc committee.

Skiba: I would like to point out that we have a finance committee. They take in information and then allow the body to vote on it. I think Ethics Committee should also be like that.

Svendsen: If we were to operate in the same way finance committee was, it comes back to telling someone they did something wrong and then them coming back and denying that. That’s Ethics Committee’s role. We are supposed to watch and listen as an unbiased party. The one we were looking at was Article Five that you are to review the previous work of senate. I was under the assumption that everyone was to look at the minutes.

Thrash: Germane. We are discussing the previous senator’s motion.

Svendsen: I think you make a good point and I encourage you to look into it.

Rasmussen: I am not looking to overthrow Ethics, I’m just looking for an avenue to question decisions like we could with any other chair.

Vote.

Approved.

Gustafson: We discussed the survey email. I’m just wondering where we are standing on that

Timmons: I thought we agreed that it would be dorm representatives.

**VI. New Business**

1. **Graduation Cords**

Ruble: I am the Assistant Dean of Students. One of the items that the AOC has been talking about that I offered to bring back to a student group is the adornment/commencement attire policy. It has to do with things allowed to be worn during commencement ceremonies. I understood it as an academic honor. But now, it has grown to include many different adornments and honors. Leadership, honor, and even membership. The AOC wants to put more boundaries around that now. They are struggling with where to draw the line. I think you can see the big picture and understand the why. But how we can also be inclusive at the same time. Groups with adornments: Honors Societies in many majors, social fraternity/sorority, senate, leadership, Latin American, Latino and Caribbean studies minors, veterans, International graduates, Collegiate Fellows, Peer Assistants, students honored by Diversity Center.

Siatta: I like the academic tradition of it. But I also like some of the other organizations. The Latin American Caribbean minor recognition and some of the diversity ones. If there’s so many recognitions they are almost devalued in a sense. I wouldn’t be against some limitations or constraints. Academics should be main focus.

Wicklund: Having all of the cords can devalue it. It’s not intended to display your resume. I think academics and diversity are important. I think this is a tricky situation that will take a lot of thought.

Gersch: I think when we value all parts of an education at a school like Gustavus, we can’t place restrictions on what is considered an accomplishment. I think taking away recognition for involvement could be detrimental. Individuality would be restricted. I agree that academic honors are important, but I think it could be taken the wrong way would make people upset for their individuality being repressed. If we do decide to restrict things, then I think it’s on the grounds that it can only be for academic honors. I think making exceptions, it could lead to resentment. If we do decide to do something, I believe it should have a suspended release. That sounds self-serving as a college senior, but I think that having groups who already assume that they are receiving these cords have the cords taken away would be upsetting. I think that’s a good way to keep everyone calm.

Ruble: There are policies in place already. Ex. You can’t decorate your hat. There is a policy intended to get at this that leaves a lot of room for interpretation. Right now you go to see the Dean of Students office and they love students and don’t want to say no. The thought is that the interpretation is too lose and if the AOC wants it to be a tighter policy, they need to write a tighter policy.

Thrash: What is your current definition of veteran?]

Ruble: I don’t know.

Thrash: I would recommend that you be really careful about who you do and do not consider a veteran. I would also encourage something that is fish or foul. Organizations that are based on GPA and those that are not. I think that any time people have to say yes, you but no, not you, you are going to have people feel hurt, you are going to have a debacle. I also encourage a decision about whether or not service members are able to graduate in uniform.

Edu: How long ago were cords strictly academic?

JoNes: I think around 1988, it was just cords, but in the early 90’s, the Diversity Center started recognizing.

Edu: What do other schools do? We are a different school, but we can’t be that different. I also think we need to consider consistency. If I graduate, I wouldn’t want things to change that much over 50 years. I searched honor and one thing that comes up is distinction. I noticed it last year, but I was new to the culture. I think we need to remember that it is a distinction.

Singh: How did we think about addressing this problem?

Ruble: I think it has been growing as the number of groups have been growing. For example, one social greek organization picks it up, then all of them do.

JoNes: I also think it came to a head last spring when they were working on the graduation booklet and they came to me for a list of honor cords and they didn’t have room for it.

Singh: I think this is a sticky situation. If you take it away now, people are going to be upset. But you also don’t want it to be so abundant that they don’t mean anything anymore. Maybe it’s about earning the cord. I think with academics it is easy because you have a 4.0 scale. Finding a way to scale the honors is how we should go about this. I think they need to be deserved, not just given for membership. In the Diversity Center, you have to do something significant toward diversity at Gustavus. There are a lot of honor societies, if you are a senior you get a cord if you pay a certain membership fee. If you have a way of showing these students are doing something above and beyond. You could limit the amount of people who are wearing them.

Timmons: What is the concern?

Ruble: I think it depends on who you talk to. I think for faculty there is a focus on academics. It kind of waters down and devalues those really specific things. I think there is a question of membership vs. honor. Because you joined this organization and you were a member, then are they honor cords? We shouldn’t call them honor cords then.

Timmons: I think if we are to believe that education occurs everywhere, organizations, work study. I see both sides, I see if restrictions need to be made, then it needs to be everything. It can’t be piece, picking apart, it has to be large scale restrictions. I think it creates a tense and hostile conversation. I can see that we want to elevate certain honors. I also think that gets into a really uncomfortable situation of someone else placing value. If restrictions need to be made, I say large scale. I think students would be upset. I think there would be some frustration. But that would change in a generation of students.

Gustafson: My first issue is who pays for these things? My understanding is that the group itself pays for adornments. I think if you want to pay for something, go right ahead and pay for it. Second, graduation is a celebration. You are celebrating graduating from a four year institution and that is amazing. This is your moment to celebrate. I think membership is also an honor. If you take a social greek organization, you got along with 100 other people, that’s an honor. I think membership in student senate, you committed to a year of being a senator. You had time in your schedule to belong to this body. My last question is how would you go about enforcing this?

Ruble: I think faculty marshals have that control.

JoNes: Faculty Marshals have the control.

Gustafson: I personally feel like restriction is unnecessary.

Ruble: This feedback is exactly what I was looking for.

Rasmussen: I find it ironic that you can’t decorate the top of your hat. I could have sworn on the college website… I don’t think if you buy it you should be able to wear it. If you are trying to choose what it important and what is not, I think people will be upset. You mentioned that there were grey areas. People are going to feel they should be able to celebrate anything. But it is a celebration of an academic accomplishment. But as President Timmons stated, I think we celebrate more than reading a book here. I say be extremely careful about how it is done. I think there will be pushback. The intention was to make academics stand out. Maybe have something new. Someone with a GPA that’s high enough gets to wear a golden cap or something and then say from that moment that they only way to get a golden cap is to meet the academic standard.

Kehren: According to the five pillars and a lutheran affiliation, we are trying to move students forward. Cords represent what you became at college, how you were trying to shape yourself as a student. If you say we want to be individuals, but we only want to be individuals in relation to academics, that doesn’t seem fair. I think the cords are fine even if we have to put 37 pages in the graduation program, that’s fine with me.

Peterson: Don’t we have an involvement dinner thing? The Night of Distinction recognizes involvement. Maybe we could do pins instead of cords. That’s an idea. Just to have cords recognize academics.

Branch: I don’t know what I would do if I were in your situation. I think that’s a really difficult decision that you will have to come to. I warn against you making it this year and restricting seniors who worked to earn cords for this spring. I feel it’s unfair to do that to the seniors. The organizations that you named off, a lot of them affiliate with the five pillars of Gustavus. I realize graduation is about academic achievements. I think individuality and community recognition is important.

Wicklund: I think that getting a 4.0 GPA and a membership of a club are classified differently. Because of that, I do think it’s important to recognize them differently. I’m a first year. I wouldn’t have a problem if there was some restriction in place. If we knew about restrictions by next year, I wouldn’t have a problem with it.

Gersch: In the sense of restriction, this frivolous example of students celebrating their accomplishments. I feel we are restricting because we think graduation is too colorful from a viewer’s standpoint.

Timmons: What is your email and the best way to get ahold of you?

Ruble: mruble@gustavus, or forward your ideas to your advisors.

Timmons: I am uncomfortable with having only some in an organization get a cord. If only leaders get cords, that makes me uncomfortable. We have leaders everywhere. The academic accomplishment doesn’t get watered down in my opinion. I think it’s antithetical to a Gustavus education if we restrict. So far, from what I understand the concerns on, I don’t feel it’s worth acting upon. If it seems goofy, what have you, it should be your way to celebrate your four years. I think students would be very hurt if that was changed in any way.

Ruble: Thank you. I’m not a voting member of AOC, but I will bring these ideas back to them. Faculty and students vote.

JoNes: You could also contact your student representatives.

Kehren: Time is going fast. I would like to move to extend time to the end of our agenda.

Second goes to Thrash.

Vote.

Approved.

Siatta: Does every department have a distinction?

Gersch: Not all of them do.

Thrash: A lot of them are the greek organizations affiliated with departments.

**b. Board of Trustees Agenda Items**

Kehren: Do you think it would be pertinent to discuss the key card situation that community comment brought up?

Timmons: No, unless there was some really weird circumstance moving forward.

Gustafson: There is still a fairly large push toward divestment. There is a conversation around February 13 about climate change and Gustavus’ role and ideas to move forward.

Siatta: I’d kind of like to hear their opinion on graduation cords. I know some are alumni and obviously most have graduated from some institution.

Rasmussen: Comment on divest, just be careful in conversation with them. I know during breakfast with a board member, it was during divest. They heard it loud and clear, but his conversations with the other board members, there is just a financial side to it.

Timmons: Anytime we bring a hot button issue, we try to be tactful and represent every student.

Singh: Thank you for breakfast with students. That is really cool.

Gustafson: Divest is not planning anything like last year. It is still being talked about. It is a concern for students. There is a larger conversation.

**c. Ethics By-Law Amendments**

Svendsen: Ethics committee has been looking at some amendments to bylaws.

Siatta: Where did these concerns come from? Inside of senate or outside of senate?

Svendsen: Inside of senate.

Svendsen: A lot of these have to do with the co-presidential campaign that’s coming up. We are looking for these to be voted on next week and for you to bring them to constituents.

Rasmussen: The constitution reads: any bylaw changes must be voted for consideration at the meeting after they were first presented.

JoNes: The way we defined consideration last year was that we had to have a consideration before the vote. Introduce them tonight, vote to consider next week, and the week after that consider. I think that’s how we did it last year.

Wicklund: Just responding to that, I know co-presidential election are coming up quickly. Maybe we can vote to consider this week and then consider next week.

Svendsen: There are two that apply directly to the co-presidential campaign that will be taking place starting spring semester.

Timmons: I’m going to say that, we will read the bylaws, next week we will vote on considering them, and then we will decide to consider them.

Grosshuesch: If you consider something, couldn’t you make a decision on them that same day?

Kehren: If we don’t meet quorum, do we violate that?

Timmons: No. I understand that we can vote to consider them next week. Consider them next week. Vote the following meeting.

Svendsen: The first is setting another timeline for co-presidential election. Right now, there is no set time for when you can start campaigning. We would like to put forth some language that allows campaigning to begin the second Tuesday of second semester at noon, the day after the application is due. Just to ensure the process is fair and no one has advantage over anyone else. Two is about office hours. Each hall, class representative will be available online and each senator must table twice within the senate year. The time is directed by the co-presidents. The next is a line of succession. That’s not really outlined by the bylaws right now. If neither of the co-presidents are unable to make the meeting, the meeting would go to the parliamentarian because they are supposed to have the best understanding of constitution. Then it would go to finance chair and administrative director, because their positions are outlined in the constitution. Then speaker, Senior class representative, junior class representative, sophomore class representative, and freshman class representative. The next is to change Article 8 to Article 9. Strike Article One about Administrative Director residing. The next is keep and store resolutions (as Administrative Director) and make them digital. Add the bylaw to Article I that requires co-presidents to review previous senate resolutions. Amend Article IV to keep co-presidential candidates from reserving all tables and display boards. Amend bylaw Article IV, section two. Change #18 to #16.

Siatta: Will seniors be restricted from voting because this won’t affect them?

Svendsen: No.

Thrash: I am open to answering questions. Also, if you are concerned about not being able to vote as a senior member of the body, I encourage you to abstain.

Peterson: I move to have Technology Chair look into keycards brought up in community comment.

Grosshuesch: It hinders senior tour guides from showing residential halls.

JoNes: I think you could take care of that in about 10 minutes in residential life.

Vote.

Approved.

Wicklund: I have seen a lot of inconsistency of how senators are viewing their position. I would like Ethics to look into the bylaws to expanding duties of senators and make them more unified.

Second goes to Siatta.

Vote.

Approved.

**VII. Announcements**

Kehren: We just approved this budget, if any of you are looking for something to do on spring break we would love to have you come on this STLF trip. It’s fun and productive!

Rasmussen: The committee that just got formed, if you want to let me know you’re interested, that would be awesome.

Gustafson: There was a question about departments that do cords. I think it’s on the Gustavus website. Conversation was really intelligent! I’m happy to be a senator tonight.

Svendsen: If I could have people from the PR committee meet with me for a moment, that would be great!

Branch: I would like to thank everyone for a smooth budget process tonight! Also, say happy belated birthday to Bembenek!

Gunnigle: Next Thursday is the Show Choir concert.

Timmons: Board of Trustees, get ahold of Hayden or me! If you have any dire need to speak to Hayden, he will be on campus.

JoNes: There are just a couple of spaces left for space for breakfast with the board. Shoot me a quick email in the next day. 7:30-8:30 on Friday morning.

Timmons: Apologies, I never thought the Building Bridges timeline would be a hiccup. I apologize for the frustration and discontentedness. I think we did something really cool. I think we best served the organization. I’m very sorry. Thank you for tonight! It went really well!

Grosshuesch: Friday in the Dive, multiracial mixer. 7pm Dance class in Alumni on Sunday. Happy MLK day!

Adjourned: 9:06pm