**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**October 10, 2016**

Co-President Shaikoski calls the meeting to order at 7:02

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: What’s your favorite season?

**II. Approval of the Minutes 10/3/16**

Clark: there are spelling errors, and his words were misinterpreted

Hannan: I move to table the minutes

Facendola: I second

Vote to table – Passed

**III. Community Comment**

None

**IV. Appointments**

1. **Finance Committee**

Choenyi: Jack Keeley and Brandon Muganga, both filled applications and have financial backgrounds. I have worked with them on several projects and he has always gotten things done on time. Muganga was a senator last year and we are excited to have his insight an experience.

**Discussion:**

Ward: Muganga is a great applicant

Schwartz: Keeley was on my floor and he is a really nice guy

Haberman: Brandon was a senator last year, intelligent and hard working

O’Neil: Brandon is a great guy very easy going

Edholm: Keeley is very hard working great guy.

**Vote**

**Brandon Muganga Approved**

**Vote**

**Jack Keeley – Approved**

**V. Old Business**

a. **Committee Updates**

1. **Student and Academic Affairs**

Andersen: working on increased student interaction with Pres. Bergman – waiting to hear back. The Unity event which will be October 19th, it will also be a celebration of diversity as well.

1. **Health and Housing**

Martinez: Take your prof to lunch, encourage your constituents. Visitation hours update: Potts has not done anything with the formal request because he wants more conversation. Mixed Gender housing, more people applied this year. Bringing animals to campus ~3 times a month. International housing over winter break – Potts says for safety reasons students must stay in Hostels over winter, but he will try to see how many people apply from a certain building for the spring to see if students can stay in the same building.

Facendola: how would that work for the town houses?

Chair Martinez: I will look into it.

JoNes: Potts would treat the town houses as a whole (chapel View) and if there is enough presence he would treat it the same as the halls.

Haberman: Explain what Potts means about wanting more conversation about visitation hours?

Martinez: I’m confused and we are figuring it out as we go. I am meeting with him again later to discuss more.

1. **Ethics**

Robbins: we are meeting later this week, and our insight will better come up later in the agenda.

**VI. New Business**

a. **Resolution on Discourse**

Martinez: The email is drafted? Can you read it?

Singh: reads the email...

Haberman: I like the resolution, very neutral and to the point. It addresses the community comment concern brought up last week. I especially like the last point.

Edholm: I think we should address that the viewpoints should be appropriate. I move to insert the word appropriate in the second BE it Resolved before viewpoints.

**Discussion:**

Clark: I find it restricting, and do not support it.

Robbins: I think it over-steps our bounds

Vierzba: I think it weakens the resolution in general.

Hannan: the word respect is important. We are saying we respect all viewpoints even if they are incorrect.

Ward: Does Edholm have a specific viewpoint in mind for this motion?

Edholm: I think it’s important that the viewpoints stated are appropriate.

Robbins: the 3rd Be It Resolved address’s Edholm concern in my opinion.

**Vote –**

**Fails (appropriate not added)**

Shaw: This resolution is great as a whole!

JoNes: I am wondering if there is a way to get there by saying in 2nd Be It Resolved that “while abhorring Hate speech the Senate respects the Variety…” rather than the word appropriate.

Anderson: I move to add the word respectful before the word variety and strike the respects before, also add “while abhorring to hate speech” at the end.

**Discussion:**

Schwartz: I find this wording to be too specific, I think we need to be less pointed and more transparent

Clark: I find it pointed as well, and opens the door to what is Hate speech

Baron: we are opening a door to what kind of speech we allow and don’t. This is a letter to say that the Gustavus Community is open to all viewpoints.

Robbins: you can’t abhor to something, it is grammatically incorrect, and I think the 3rd be it resolved addresses the concerns.

**Vote to add the language**

**– Fails**

Pemberton: I move to add “the identities” after the variety of viewpoints in the 2nd Be It Resolved (BIT)

**Discussion:**

Clark: I like it

Vierzba: I like that it address’s identity because it is not included elsewhere

Antes: I like it as well

**Vote – Passed**

Ward: Move to edit the 3rd BIR, point 2 to say “respectful” before conversation, and after participate in.

Clark: I agree this gets to the ends we are looking at, without opening a can of words.

**Vote – Passed**

**Resolution of a whole Vote –**

**APPROVED**

1. **DLC Dakota Pipeline Letter**

Toeben: I sent an email with the DLC letter. It takes a stance on the Dakota access pipeline, so that’s why I said we will not be making amendments. Just to be clear, if we do pass this letter then we as Student Senate are taking a stance on the Dakota Access Pipeline.

**Discussion:**

Clark: I don’t think we can sponsor it without the comment of the Gustavus community.

Ward: I’m not sure about how my constituents feel about this.

Toeben: If you are worried that you don’t know how your constituents feel, then Student Senate could do its own thing on the topic of the Dakota Access Pipeline.

Hinnenkamp: I read the letter and I do not like the stance that it takes. I feel that as Student Senate we should not endorse it because we haven’t had a conversation with the community. I am against this and I am trying to encourage discussion.

Haberman: When we were elected, we were elected with the belief that our opinions are something that the student body respects. If you do want to have an opinion on this, it is not against any constitutional law, and if you do want to take a stance then your constituents then they will support. We should stand as a community and help people.

Robbins: I am uncomfortable with Senate taking a stance. Even if we did a survey and only 3 people were against it then I would be uncomfortable supporting this. We should not make a political statement, we are the governing body.

Shaw: Has Senate ever taken a political statement?

Toeben: Changing Columbus Day to Indigenous Peoples’ Day was seen by some to be a political stance last, but that is the only instance I know of.

JoNes: That is the only time I can think of in the past 5 years.

Pemberton:I think that stay silent is a political stance as well.

O’Neil:I feel like that making a stance on this might set a precedent for other stances in the future

Barron: Taking a political stance against this issue is not Senate’s job.

Andersen: I understand the fear of previous speaker. This is an issue that has grown more on our campus, our campus has talked about this and the conversation is growing. We consider most issues and most of the issues come forth to Senate and we have a discussion on it.

Hinnenkamp: There are many avenues that we can take, even if we don’t pass this letter. Is our best option to sponsor this as Student Senate?

Cella: You were elected to represent the constituents, so please let’s have more discussion.

Shaw: People at Gustavus are being affected by this, and we should take a stance against this.

Facendola: A previous speaker said that we had many other avenues, but I can’t think of one that wouldn’t be taking a stance?

Toeben: Standing in solidarity is a way where we can be neutral on the topic.

Vierzba: Based on constituents, many of my constituents are opposed to this issue and I can’t ignore those people.

Pemberton: To take a stance against contaminated water is a local issue since they are just a state away, we should take a stance for it since it could affect us in the near future.

Vierzba: I agree with what a previous senator said, with the contamination we also have the livelihood of the indigenous population.

Ward: We shouldn’t be focusing on the effect on us because it is not affecting us.

Robbins: this letter is a bad way to take a stance. We do not want to start taking a political stance, because the minority opinion will feel underrepresented.

Clark: I am personally against this letter. Supporting this letter would not be the most productive way to invest ourselves in this issue.

Edholm: I don’t think we should take a stance, because people who are against it may feel that they are out of place.

Baron: No matter how you feel about it, we need to focus on how the body as a whole should feel about the issue. It’s a thing to keep in mind.

Hannan: I don’t think endorsing this letter will do anything drastic to alienate anyone who is opposed to the pipeline. This will encourage dialogue and it would be a wise decision for us to endorse this letter, because its possibility for positive impact is greater than the possibility for negative impact.

**Vote- Supporting the letter.**

**Division was called.**

**2nd Vote: NOT APPROVED**

1. **Anti-Hazing Campaign**

Cella: Hazing is something often overlooked on campus, and it is something that happens here. I recommend that Senate does something. Hazing should not be tolerated.

Haberman: I charge SAA and HAH committees to put together information on the harmful effects of hazing by the next meeting. I think hazing is degrading to all involved.

Cella: I strongly encourage this to be time relevant and be amended to happen before the next meeting.

Martinez: clarification on the charge, what avenues?

Haberman: I would support an email or tabling if needed.

Clark: I move to amend the charge to include the PR committee to create a poster by Wednesday to inform students what constitutes hazing and where to report it

**Discussion:**

Ward: I agree that this is time sensitive, and the small group starting the anti-hazing campaign could greatly benefit from our support.

Antes: I think the time line may be too short – I don’t know how long it takes to make a poster.

Jeon: We can make it happen!! Is it physical posters because that would be impossible?

Singh: physical posters due to timeframe are impossible, but we do have access to the digital TV’s and they are highly visible.

Clark: I move to amend the amendment by clarifying that PR has to make a digital poster and have it out by Wednesday, and physical posters can be out by Monday (17th).

**Discussion on the Amendment to Amendment**

Haberman: I like this it gives PR more time

Edholm: We as a Senate do not condone hazing – I like this

Antes: Is this possible for next Monday?

Jeon: It is possible for physical posters to be out by Monday.

**Vote on the Amendment to the Amendment – PASSES**

**Amendment – PASSES**

**Discussion:**

Robbins: how is the hazing campaign going to be approved? Wording?

Schwartz: What would happen if hazing was completely taken out of Greek life or sports – it would still exist?

Yield to JoNes: I don’t think anyone thinks that it doesn’t exist, and we do have Greeks on campus that their entire way of life is about not hazing. But I do acknowledge that hazing is a problem on our campus.

JoNes: Hazing campaign has been charged to three different committees working on it.

Singh: Senator Input will come through the committees, email, and conversations.

Haberman: Resources should be put on the posters. I call to question.

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote (Charge)**

**Approved**

1. Clark: There are perceptions on this campus that have hazing as such a major part of their identity that if hazing were removed they would cease to have their same identity.

Hannan: There are ways in which hazing can be harmless, and I think we should emphasize the harmful aspects of hazing

Hinnenkamp: no hazing is good hazing, I was distressed that any org I would fund as controller would have that as a part of their identity. If that is the case it is a problem that needs to be addressed

Robbins: Clarification – what are we talking about?

Singh: just a discussion

Robbins: Hazing definition is the un-intentional mental discomfort. It is good to show our distaste for hazing, but ensure we are not adding to a stereotype of sports or Greek life in general.

Ward: As a member of a Greek org, it is founded on not hazing, I think it’s ridiculous that hazing may be seen as a crucial part to an orgs identity.

Singh: JoNes please share the GAC definition of Hazing through our Policy

JoNes: Hazing is any action taken, or any situation created whether on or off campus, that causes un-intentional mental discomfort …etc.

Schwartz: I didn’t mean to imply that sports teams or Greek orgs need hazing. I just meant that it may be unrealistic to believe that hazing may never exist.

Hannan: I appreciate this discussion. I wanted us to all understand the definition of hazing and talk about the confusion around what hazing means.

1. Clark: I move to charge H&H to play the 3rd debate on October 19th on the big screens in the Caf.

Edholm: I think we are asking for a “Bru-ha-ha”. I would leave this viewing to the separate political parties

Facendola: It is being shown by the political orgs that day already in a different location

Baron: It is a way to test and see if our resolution works (respectful dialogue)

Robbins: if it is something that affects everyone I believe it should be shown

Hinnenkamp: we just passed the resolution, this will be a moment where your views will be challenged and this is an opportunity for you to engage in a conversation

Ward: this will reach an audience that didn’t know or look into the viewing the debate through the political parties

Haberman: the debate will be shown on the smaller TV’s anyways

Clark: If we assume there will be a brawl due the debate that’s bad, and I don’t see any riots happening. As adults we can handle it.

O’Connell: the SAA will be holding the Unity event right outside the caf that same day.

Hannon: will students be informed of this being shown?

Singh: We could send an email

Hannan: sending an email could be going too far, but this election has caused very strong feelings, such that this showing could cause emotional distress for some students.

Facendola: I’m not against this, but since there is already a scheduled viewing, if we are going to hold a viewing we should inform the groups that have already scheduled this.

Edholm: I think it’s a good idea for people who aren’t informed of the election to have this in the Caf. Keep in mind how stressful this event could be for some.

Clark: I move to include an email to be sent out to the students saying that it will be happening in the caf - neutral statement

Shaw: if we do this ask the political orgs first. We don’t want to step on toes (Unity).

Facendola: We shouldn’t include the word only because it is being shown in Wallenberg

Clark: I think it’s great that people who might be intimidated to attend an event hosted by a bunch of political science nerds, have an opportunity to view the debate

Ward: I don’t think the political orgs would be against making the debate more accessible

Martinez: This is kind of an amendment, so keep it in mind.

Hinnenkamp: I like the email because it addresses the problem of students coming in that don’t want to see it, allowing them to avert their eyes, or avoid the caf. This election is bringing up a lot of powerful stuff.

Arshad: on behalf of constituents, it’s a great opportunity for people to watch the debate who maybe won’t go to Wallenberg.

Haberman: I move to extend the meeting to the end of announcements

JoNes: you can’t extend the meeting right now, but you could at the end of the meeting.

Discussion on the Amendment – none

**Vote on Amendment to include email sent to the student body –**

**APPROVED**

**Discussion on Amendment:**

Facendola: I move to include an email to the political parties holding the viewing

Clark: Can we clarify what the email to the orgs would be entail

Haberman: I call to question

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote to add the email to the political orgs –**

**Fails**

Martinez: I think the point of emailing the orgs was being courteous – not stepping on toes

Mullenbach: can we add that we are showing with the orgs?

Martinez: no we would need the orgs approval.

Clark: I think that emailing the orgs does nothing because our email will be neutral informing the students it is happening.

**Vote on charge-**

**Approved**

Haberman: I move to extend the meeting to the end of announcements

**Vote to extend –**

**Approved**

1. Shaw: Because we didn’t endorse the NODAPL DLC letter, can we explore the different ways to support the NODAPL movement? I charge the ethics committee to explore ways to support the NODAPL movement.

**Discussion:**

Friendly – to look into ways to determine the campuses stance on the DAPL movement.

O’Connell: I feel a lot of my constituents support the NODAPL and this is a good way to explore the campuses stance.

Antes: we could just talk to the chairs about things like this

Martinez: Doing that eliminates the discussion we have in senate

**VOTE on CHARGE to Diversity charge –**

**Approved**

**VII. Announcements**

Haberman: A few things I noticed: abstentions means a personal stance, it doesn’t mean you can’t make up your mind. Good job on not referring to senators by their name.

Hinnenkamp: PA physical health week, also keep your mental health in mind. Great discussion, use moments like that to create a conversation.

Singh: Q&A week, check out the events. Today Mark Dayton declared that Minnesota will recognize today as Indigenous peoples day. Thanks to Chair Toeben for organizing the Indigenous Peoples day event. It was a Student Senate sponsored event, and I am a little disappointed there weren’t more senators present, so please try to attend future events sponsored by Senate.

Clark: Sukkah celebration is happening all next week (starts on the 15th).

JoNes: Senators should communicate to constituents that they need to partake in the survey she is going to send out (ONE QUESTION SURVEY) so she can have the vast majority of students respond to her email and we can beat St. Thomas.

Robbins: Thank you for all the passion brought here tonight.

Shaikoski: I want to talk to PR and tech chair tonight. I would like to thank the individuals that stayed even though they didn’t have to (finance two students at large).

Martinez: Thanks for the great discussion. Shout out to Chair Toeben for taking minutes tonight.

**\*Meeting Adjourned**