**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**February 6, 2017**

Co-President Singh calls the meeting the order at 7: 01

1. **Attendance**

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

1. **Approval of the Minute from 1/23/2017**

Approved

1. **Community Comment**

None

**IV. Unfinished Business**

1. DAPL Decision

Toeben: I would like to hear what you think we should do about the DAPL results. I’m opening this up to discussion.

**Discussion:**

O’Connell: Can you show us the results again?

The pie chart on…

Toeben: 395 responses in total. Equal representation across classes: 20.2% for freshmen; 27.2% for sophomores; 26.4% for juniors; 26.2% for seniors. 60% of the responses (237) strongly against the implementation of the Pipeline, 18.5% of the responses (73) against, 6.3% of the responses (25) neutral, 8.1% of the responses (32) for, 7.1% of the responses (28) strongly for.

Hannan: I think it’s resolved as it is. I don’t think it would be in our best interests to pursue it further.

Martinez: It’s a great place to be at. More needs to be done.

Shaw: I support the continuation of environmental education.

Ward: We need to find a way to publish the results

O’Neil: The comment at the top is interesting.

Shaikoski: I think that the comment is a reminder to talk to our constituents. We need to pursue things the student body cares about.

1. Controller:

Singh: The controller is not here today but has the following announcements: Rafay is now joining the finance committee, Her Campus will be invited to speak with us on Thursday. Committee will meet on Thursdays, likely at 5 like last semester. The Spring Calendar will be set this meeting.

1. Finance Committee

Choenyi: Potential change of meeting time.

1. Gus Bus

Singh: The prices for GusBus will increase by $20/hour. We have different options to cut hours, remove a day,…to reduce the cost.

**Discussion:**

Lamberty: Colder months…more hours but maybe reduce hours later.

VanHecke: It’s hard to find drivers who want a part-time job.

Ward: How much are we spending on the GusBus right now?

Singh: $31,393

Shaw: I yield

Edholm: What hours does the GusBus run?

VanHecke: 8pm-12am on Wednesdays and 9pm-2am on Fri-Sat

Edholm: They seem like reasonable hours. The hours to cut would be 9-10pm. People don’t start using the hours until 10pm.

Antes: How many weeks a year?

Singh: All year.

Haberman: I move that we cut Wednesday GusBus all year. And I move that 9-10pm be cut.

**Discussion:**

Haberman: Wednesday is not as popular.

Shaw: How many students use the GusBus

Singh:It’s constant

Ngabirano: Why is the cost being raised?

Singh: Hiring a dispatcher.

Lamberty: I think that students use the GusBus for various reasons and it doesn’t matter what time.

Clark: I amend keep Wednesday…cut weekend hours

**Discussion:**

Ward: If we cut hours, we are cutting the dispatcher’s hours as well.

Schwartz: I completely agree that we shouldn’t remove the days. Let’s just reduce the hours.

Andersen: I would be more in support of removing a day. We shouldn’t start the GusBus later…it’s used for different purposes and it’s used at different times.

Edholm: There should be some type of compromise. Removing hours would be more effective.

O’Neil: If there’s so few people on Wednesdays…why hire a dispatcher?

VanHecke: The GusBus is the Saint Peter Transit. It was merged with the LeSueur Transit. Drivers felt like the phone was ringing all the time and it would be best if dispatchers could take the calls and coordinate the transportation. A bigger system…more effective. Safety higher.

O’Neil: It would be inappropriate to negotiate this since they are doing a huge service to us.

VanHecke: It’s not an option not to have a dispatcher.

Baron: I’m not in favor of this proposition of cutting hours.

Clark: We should vote.

Hannan: I would talk to my constituents first…I would lean towards a better quality on the weekends.

**Vote**

**Fails**

**Discussion:**

Clark: We should oppose this motion

Robbins: What effects on our budget?

Choenyi: I don’t have the perfect answer…it’s obvious that it will impact how much we fund the orgs.

Robbins: The Contingency?

Choenyi: Not that I know of.

VanHecke: Historically, orgs come back to Senate for money~20,000. I would argue that you allocated more fewer dollars. Your contingency fund is more larger than normal. In the past years, there was only one Spring where the money was really down…The advantage of spending the money is that you have a lot.

Ward: We have money that hasn’t been allocated yet.

Ngabirano: If we have money, let’s spend some of it for this semester. And we can decide what to do in the coming semesters but for now we have an urgent decision and the contingency can be put to use in situations like these.

O’Neil: I will echo the previous speaker. Not pass it. Reevaluate it next year.

**Vote**

**Fails**

**Discussion:**

Clark: It would be a great idea to save money while we can. Wed 9-12; Fri, Sat 10-2am.

Schwartz: I would cut it on Wednesday.

Shaikoski: It might be difficult to find an employee who will work for a part-time job.

Edholm: I agree with previous speaker.

Hannan: I move to table the motion. Ask the constituents.

Seconded by O’Neil

Robbins: I would be uncomfortable moving forward without knowing the situation of finances.

Ward: This is my third year. From experience, this won’t affect our finances.

Choenyi: I agree with the Ombudsperson. How much does it cost to us…we can research it.

VanHecke: If we table it, senate leadership should look into other unanticipated decisions.

Martinez: More time to talk with constituents. To cut one whole day would be unfair to them.

Schwartz: Can we get an idea of what’s in the Contingency?

Singh: The Controller is not here today

**Vote**

**Motion tabled**

Robbins: Helpful for a more detailed usage report about the GusBus.

Clark: Do we have to take no as an answer?

Singh: Since the charge was exploratory…yes. But senators have the ability to go and talk to the concerned.

**V. New Business**

1. Finance Budgets

None

1. Immigrant/DACA/Refugee Statement

Singh: Our President Trump made different executive decisions and one of them affects different people on campus. President Bergman drafted a statement. After talking with different Senate members, I will read out loud the statement we came up with:

**Dear Gustavus Community,**

**As representatives of the student body, composed of members from each resident hall, class, and international students, the Gustavus Student Senate would like to declare our support for students, employees, and friends of Gustavus impacted by the recent Executive Order on immigration issued by President Donald Trump. We emphasize our opposition to the Executive Order as it is a clear act of injustice and discrimination. As President Bergman has stated, our core values of community and justice implore us to use our democratic right to speak out against decisions that are not in the best interest of our peers and our society as a whole. The Executive Order counters not only the resolutions passed last year by Student Senate endorsing diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts and standing in solidarity with those facing oppression and discrimination, but also our institutional efforts to increase global learning and support for our international students.**

**Student Senate recognizes the importance of each and every member of the Gustavus community, especially international students and employees, because of their contributions to our campus in the form of shared culture and an invaluable perspective. Senate works hard to serve the needs of the student body to the best of our ability, and thus choose to stand with our peers, specifically from the seven predominantly-Muslim countries addressed in the Executive Order: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. This support also extends to DACA recipients, undocumented members, and others whose safety and wellbeing is  impacted by the Executive Order.**

**Student Senate encourages the campus community to engage in conversation, to act against injustices, and to stand with those who need you now more than ever.**

**Discussion:**

Clark: This statement should be stronger actually. My suggestion…cut the words after contribution.

Haberman: I think that this is a great start. I move that we send this to the student body and have the Co-Presidents hold a demonstration against Trump’s decision.

Robbins: I like the goal of this letter. I have said before that I really don’t think that condemning decisions helps Senate in any way. We can stand in solidarity with people. I would also like to have the people send the message themselves

Hannan: It’s important to reach out to the students affected and add resources. On the other hand, I think that it’s appropriate to stand in solidarity without such a one-sided stand. It alienates some students.

Arshad: This is a really good letter. Student Senate needs to respond to this. Gustavus Student Senate at the end instead of ‘Co-Presidents’.

Asghar: I think that this is really important. The letter from President Bergman was a great relief. We should also do something visible…some kind of demonstrations.

Martinez: Can we add Donald?

Toeben: Echo previous speaker. A strong support can’t be neutral. Students need to feel like they are really supported.

Schwartz: We need to keep in mind that we don’t represent everyone in the community. This should be a wide-open discussion. Is it fair to make decisions for students?

Singh: The Letter is Student Senate taking a stance.

VanHecke: The Cabinet was appointed. The senators were instead elected to represent the student body.

Schwartz: Have senators talked to their constituents?

Arshad: I have talked to my constituents.

Edholm: I love the purpose of the letter. I agree that it’s not Student Senate responsibility to take one-sided strong stance. The sentence after the second paragraph is expendable.

O’Connell: Can we show solidarity without strongly opposing?

Singh: To show solidarity without opposition…I would say that making a direct statement is action. Opposing the oppressor might be a way of being in solidarity as well.

Ward: We got a very professional letter from President Bergman…another way maybe.

O’Neil: I think that revising the 2nd half of the program is okay. We are taking a humanitarian stance and not a political stance. I suggest adding a quote “People don’t care how much you know until they know how much you care”. Get this to the student body.

Andersen: This is your place to get political. Life is political.

Choenyi: I don’t know what solidarity means in this situation. Let’s take action.

Lamberty: I haven’t read the whole executive order…I don’t know the best way to go about it. But I agree with some of the previous speakers.

Shaikoski: Some students might feel alienated because of the strong stance of the letter.

Pemberton: I think that some people will be upset by the letter but we can make it about people affected by the letter. It should be more about inclusion of the people affected…

Baron: I think that it’s okay to get political. We need to agree on the intent though…

Clark: I think that a good change I would amend the core values and add faith. I’ve been very conscious about taking political stances…but this affects people in our community directly. The content is good. We should add something about securing our nation but this might not fit in so well.

Seconded by Haberman

**Discussion:**

Hannan: I like the clause. It’s an important thing to keep.

Andersen: I would recommend that you amend it…

Hannan: I move that

Seconded by Ward

**Discussion**:

Clark: Friendly for “particularly”

**Vote**

**Approved**

**Discussion:**

Asghar: Some people within Gustavus might be supporting the decision. Include them as well.

Haberman: Germaine

Asghar: Include both sides.

Singh: Retract…including “faith” the values that we already have.

Shaikoski: I want to clarify that this vote is the same.

**Vote**

**Approved**

**Discussion:**

Asghar: It should less political and more supporting people. More should be done after the resolution.

Haberman: I call to question

Seconded by Clark

**Discussion:**

Robbins: The discussion has been about one part for most of it. We shouldn’t move fast with this.

Baron: Call to Question is undebatable.

**Vote**

**Not approved**

**Discussion:**

Robbins: Convincing argument about how to support the people. Be more supportive and not spend too much energy in being negative.

Hannan: If it’s our desire to stand on behalf of the students…it’s important that we define what’s political and what is standing with other students. We need to think about politically…

I move to strike the word “discrimination’…I see the blatant injustice happening. Discrimination is stronger than what’s seen.

Seconded by Ward

**Discussion:**

Clark: I think that discrimination is an accurate explanation. Let’s keep the word.

Arshad: I want to say that all these countries have been involved…

Haberman: I personally believe that this is discrimination. I call to question.

Seconded by Ward

**Vote**

**Question called**

**Vote**

**Not approved**

**Discussion:**

Andersen: I would encourage this body to reflect on what it means to take a political stand. It’s impossible to feel pain.

O’Connell: I think that if we want this to be pretty personal. We should send a hard copy letter to everyone.

Baron: A comma in the second paragraph.

Clark: I like what we have.

Ward: Big fan!

**Vote**

**Passed**

Edholm: I move that we add the quote.

O’Neil: “People don’t care about how much you know until they know how much you care”.

Shaikoski: More love in the letter?

Hannan: You instead of your.

Facendola: The quote ruins the whole thing…at the end of the discussion.

Pemberton: I like it the way it is.

**Vote**

**Approved**

**Discussion:**

Schwartz: Can we please try not put any emotions in the letter?

Clark: We don’t have to wait. This an urgent issue…it needs to go out this week. I call to question.

Yes

**Vote**

**Approved**

c.Haberman: I move to extend Senate until the end of Announcements.

Seconded by Ward

**Vote**

**Extended**

d.Haberman: I move that the Co-Presidents hold a demonstration to speak against President Trump.

Seconded by Facendola

**Discussion:**

Edholm: I strongly oppose this. I think the letter is enough.

Clark: I don’t think that this is Senate’s role. It’s a waste of our time.

Ward: I don’t think that it’s appropriate for Senate to attend the demonstrations.

Toeben: I’m not really for this. It would cause a divide in our community.

Shaw: Amend to Demonstrations against the executive order.

Seconded by Haberman

**Discussion:**

Haberman: We should do more than a letter.

Edholm: Some people need to have a demonstration. I’m not comfortable with this body sponsoring a demonstration. It wouldn’t reflect very well on our organization.

Clark: Both the charge and the amendment are stepping into an area that Senate should not step into.

Ward: I’m in support of more of the support.

Asghar: There is a need to do more but this can’t be the more we’re looking for.

Robbins: If we’re going to put our name on it…previous speakers talked about different speakers. Once we’ve decided about sending the letter, I think it’s hypocritical to do less. If we’re choosing to oppose something, we should actually oppose it.

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Approved**

**Discussion:**

O’Connell; What kinds of demonstrations?

Haberman: They can come together and decide what’s most appropriate.

Singh: I would say that holding us on demonstrations is restricting. We’ve done forums, debates, etc. Demonstrations is very specific.

Ward: I think that a candle vigil would be more powerful.

Clark: I think that the letter would be more in line with our letter than walking around campus. That would not be our best way to conduct business.

Haberman: By demonstrations…I wasn’t specific.

Robbins: I don’t think that we have any choice but be angry about it.

Toeben: We could do the Courtyard…reserve it as a safe space with banners. Have food…have it be as a common dialogue. At the end, we can support this.

Andersen: I think that this a direction we can agree on.

Baron: Exploratory…

Haberman: No

Baron: Amend it

Seconded by Clark

**Discussion:**

Ward: This is time-sensitive

Shaw: It’s more time-sensitive.

O’Neil: It would be more appropriate to think this through.

Clark: Whatever we do, it will take time logistically speaking. The order is on hold right now even. If it is reinstated, we should have a candle-lighting vigil regardless.

Andersen: The amendment is unnecessary.

Baron: I just wanted to clarify…we want a more specific idea of what’s gonna happen

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Approved**

**Discussion:**

Clark: I oppose the amendment. I like both ideas of event in the Courtyard and the candle lighting vigil. I amend the charge to be about “supporting the people in our community who could be affected by this”.

**Discussion:**

Antes: This will be exploratory.

Robbins: The letter says opposition…the letter needs to be about opposition.

Ward: Because it’s exploratory, it can still do what the motion was getting at.

Edholm: A person might be looking into more confrontation…using the same confrontational approach is using the same thing. I think that if we were to do something, it should be more helpful.

Pemberton: Either way would be very peaceful. We can do a Candle light event. We’re opposing the executive order in the letter already.

Clark: I would like to clarify that we’re supporting the letter.

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Approved**

**Vote on the following letter:**

**Dear Gustavus Students,**

**As representatives of the student body, composed of members from each resident hall, class, and international students, the Gustavus Student Senate would like to declare our support for students, employees, and friends of Gustavus impacted by the recent Executive Order on immigration issued by President Donald Trump. While we understand the need for a safe and secure country, we emphasize our opposition to the Executive Order as it is a clear act of injustice and discrimination. As President Bergman has stated, our core values of community, faith, and justice implore us to use our democratic right to speak out against decisions that are not in the best interest of our peers and our society as a whole. The Executive Order counters not only the resolutions passed last year by Student Senate endorsing diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts and standing in solidarity with those facing oppression and discrimination, but also our institutional efforts to increase global learning and support for our international students.**

**Student Senate recognizes the importance of each and every member of the Gustavus community, especially international students and employees, because of their enumerable contributions to our campus and community, including but not limited to, shared culture and an invaluable perspective. Senate works hard to serve the needs of the student body to the best of our ability, and thus chooses to stand with our peers, specifically from the seven predominantly-Muslim countries addressed in the Executive Order: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. This support also extends to DACA recipients, undocumented members, and others whose safety and wellbeing are impacted by the Executive Order.**

**Student Senate encourages the campus community to engage in conversation, to act against injustices, and to stand with those who need you now more than ever.**

**“People don’t care how much you know, until they know how much you care” - John Maxwell**

**With Love and Sincerity,**

**Gustavus Student Senate**

**Approved**

e. Clark: I charge Finance to bring numerous figures on the GusBus.

Seconded by Haberman

**Discussion:**

Ward: Yes!

**Vote**

**Approved**

f. Facendola: I move to have statements like these to be sent to the Senate body beforehand.

Singh: I wrote the statement last Friday. Cabinet looked it over over the weekend…next time we will do that.

g. Asghar: I want to charge Student Affairs to have more charging stations in the library.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Discussion:**

Ward: It’s just exploratory…why not?

Discussion ended

**Vote**

**Approved**

**VI. Announcements**

a.Singh: Nominations for Student Leadership Award, Civic Engagement Steward Award, Community Partner Award (2/8/2017).

b.Shaikoski: Baron has his sheet about Robert rules. Let’s have them constantly to run smoothly meetings and let’s please yield when we’re done speaking.

c.Toeben: Multifaith Space open house on Feb 10th. PASO has a movie screening about the prison system, check it out. Panel discussion on Feb. 20th at 6:30pm.
d. Clark: Thanks for a wonderful discussion. Civil discourse is important. Thanks Cabinet and the Co-Presidents for a great job.

e.VanHecke: If you’re free next week on Monday afternoon, Senate should be there when the secretary of state comes to honor Gusties as the most active collegiate citizens in Minnesota. I will send an invitation this week, please be there!

f.Baron: This Saturday…home tour concerts!

g.Robbins: Ethics committee meet me.

h.Choenyi: Finance same.

i.O’Neil: Tennis games this weekend.

j.Singh: Great meeting. Thanks everyone! As someone who is from a different nation, it’s comforting to see how we take a humanitarian stand on issues like these by having a civil discourse about it. Co-Presidential Elections coming up…applications are out from today.

**\*Meeting Adjourned**