**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**March 13, 2017**

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

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: What’s one thing that you admire about someone in the room?

1. **Approval of the Minutes from 3/6/2017**

Approved

1. **Community Comment**

Bode: I’m a Poli Sci Major. And by the way, I voted for Hubert and Solveig. My comment is coming from an outside perspective. There needs to be more looks into how the election went. The election was won by 3 votes. I would argue for another election. I’m available for anyone who would like to discuss about anything.

Diezel: I’m a sophomore English Major. I have to say that…I think that the results need to be upheld. I think that amending the Constitution is a problematic way to go down. New things need to be instituted. I don’t think there should be another election. Senate voted to uphold the election results. The only reason for a reelection is because of the vote margins. I would encourage not to have a poll…Not every student has the time to look into these issues. We trust you to make informed decisions on these kinds of matters. If there was a revote, people would vote based on people they want and not necessarily in an objective way.

Bode: I worked in Obama’s Campaign. I know little about this Senate body. A lot of students don’t know what this body does. If you want to change that, you start with legitimacy…illegitimate vote count can’t be a thing. I urge you to reconsider this. The bigger picture of what it is…You can amend your by-laws.

Riste: I want to echo what Peter said. I have concerns about the election. I’m here to see how the issue is resolved. From a future standpoint, why should the margin not be released?

VanHecke: It was put in when a very small percentage of the student body was voting. If Senate had advertised then how many people voted, it would have caused legitimacy problems.

**IV. Appointments**

1. Ethics-Student at Large

Haberman: We have Tim Pacyznski as our student at large. He is a Philosophy major…he knows what he’s talking about.

**Discussion**:

Clark: I know Tim. He’s a Math/Phi major. He is unrelenting. He questions things and gets you to take a stand. He would be a great addition to the committee. I support him.

**Vote**

**Approved**

1. Administrative Director

Ngabirano: This is Sam Harbeck. She is a Communication and Management double major.

Harbeck: I’m on the executive Board of the Gustavus Women in Leadrership, the Communication club and I play ultimate Frisbee

**Discussion:**

O’Neil: For the sake of argument, if some of the community members hold a revote…

Singh: You can have one position at a time in Senate. It’s our obligation to appoint someone else.

Clark: I would like to be cautious… we are jumping ahead. We should take this seriously.

Ngabirano: This position requires clear communication and a strong organization and I can attest that Sam is a great fit for this role.

**Vote**

**Approved**

**V. Budget**

1. Day at the Capitol

Hinnenkamp: This is last minute. We are the ones who fund transportation. We have funded this in the past. We did a mid-year for our budget. Senate is a legitimate organization. The amount is $750 for transportation.

Singh: Day at the Capitol is important in terms of the State Grant that many Gusties benefit from.

**Questions:**

Clark: Cost for transportation?

Hinnenkamp: Exact number as in the past

**Discussion:**

Clark: We should absolutely endorse this. I think that there is no reason we shouldn’t vote on it.

Andersen: At the end of the day, there is a networking event where current students get to meet Gustie Alumni working at the Capitol.

Haberman: I fully support this.

**Vote**

**Approved**

**VI. Unfinished Business**

1. Co-Presidential Election

Singh: Last week, you charged us with different possibilities about what we should do. We came up with a couple options:

*Cabinet generated list of possible options to take about the election (gathered on 3/9/17)*

*\*\*\*\*This list does not have to be exhaustive and senate can come up with other ideas as well\*\*\*\**

*-Ethics original idea--Poll student body to see what they think should be done*

*-Co-Vice Presidents*

*-Table to see what the student body thinks should be done about by-laws so as to make election process more viable in the future*

*-Examine policy changes in general to see what can be done to better the Constitution and by-laws*

*-Referendum without required outcome (just host referendum to see what the student body thinks without having to require any specific outcome based on the results)*

*-Get behind current co-president elects so that they can move forward as soon as possible, reform the by-laws*

*-Potentially add student-at-large positions to committees so there will be more of a presence by the student body in the goings on of student senate*

*-4 days of tabling; Senate, Ethics, Cabinet, and Co-Presidents---ask students about their frustrations about what happened during the election; Send a detailed explanation of what happened and why certain actions past/future are unethical; Change the bylaws.*

*-Poll student body/proportion of student body for a super majority to host reelection*

*-Week of Atonement. Three to four days of tabling. Each day by a different senate body. We share and gather info. At the end of the week, a survey is sent out to see what if anything needs to be accomplished.*

Shaikoski: I open the floor to discussion

**Discussion:**

Haberman: I was a big fan of the list. I would like to hear what the senators think. I move that we revoke Cabinet Speaking privileges.

Seconded by Haberman

**Discussion:**

Haberman: You are the ones who vote.

Vanhecke: I would like to remind you that you are giving one set of candidates a say and not the other.

Clark: I amend it to include the Co-President Elects

Andersen: I like the charge…the chair of the meeting?

Hinnenkamp: I don’t care. I would say that it’s seriously problematic if we want to take away speaking privileges. I encourage discussion.

Ward: I think that because the idea is coming from Cabinet, we might need to hear from them. Can I amend it? I would encourage you to vote this down.

Baron: I think that allowing Senators to have their own opinions should be valued…if this is voted down.

Haberman: This will remain… Question? If Cabinet wants to talk

Cella: They would need to yield the floor to them.

Clark: The clarification of yielding the floor is reasonable.

**Vote**

**Approved**

Singh: I appreciate everyone considering the voices of the Senators. I would like to voice some concerns. If you continuously yield to others, it might create confusion…you might consider taking away the privileges of Candidates.

Andersen: I would encourage everyone to think why we have speaking privileges first.

Ward: Does that include Emmett?

Singh: Yes

Hinnenkamp: As you’re taking away their rights, give them an opportunity to speak.

Facendola: I’m hesitant to take away speaking rights.

Shaikoski: It’s disrespectful for Cabinet to do this.

Clark: We should pass this. Yielding will be quicker.

O’Connell: Can I make an amendment?

Ngabirano: I personally am not in favor of this charge. I believe that this floor is a place where discussion should constantly be encouraged and not obstructed.

Ward: Can we give privileges to Senators over Cabinet?

**Vote**

**Fails**

**Discussion:**

Ward: I move to give speaking privileges to members of the community

Facendola: I support this

O’Neil: I call to question

Seconded by Haberman

**Vote**

**Question called**

**Vote**

**Approved**

Cella: Put your hand up if you want to speak.

Haberman: I move that we get rid of Xs for unlimited speaking time.

Seconded by Asghar

**Discussion:**

Clark: Amendment, Keep Xs for Cabinet

Cella: Every Cabinet will still be able to speak three times.

Clark: I move to have Xs for Cabinet and nor Senators (except Solveig and Hubert)

I call to question

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote (Amendment)**

**Fails**

**Vote**

**Approved**

Haberman: I want to say that I’m in support for the 4 days tabling option.

Asghar: I think that the 4 days tabling is the way to go. Then people can talk to everyone in Senate.

Clark: I also like the idea. I would like Senate to be honest about what happened. People have been coming to me and asking when is the revote.

Ward: I don’t think it’s a question of honesty. If we’re tabling, we need to be clear.

Cella: Remember that you will decide on this. Cohesion will be important and anything that goes against the election will be taken care of.

Singh: This was a summary of a lot of things we talked about in Senate. We need Senate to go out and meet with Students. Having 4 different aspects of Senate…we wouldn’t be tabling all day. We would table during rush hours. Let’s keep in mind that we want to listen to what students want to say. From my understanding, there would be a detailed explanation of what happened. The quote was taken in terms of “Campaigning” and not the actual election day. Changing the by-laws is very critical. I also talked to many professors in Poli Sci. This is a powerful place of action.

Baron: I think e-mails have been sent already. It’s not a lack on our end. That’s not a big issue of transparency. I would worry about…changing the by-laws…before we table, the PR Chair should let the student body know.

Clark: If we do this, we should do a non-binding pool to get some information from the student body.

Singh: Non-binding?

Clark: We know that it won’t be representing everyone. It would help us going forward. It would be interesting for future Senates. I’m still referring to the referendum…If the election is illegitimate, Next Year’s Senate will be illegitimate.

Arshad: Have people who couldn’t vote maybe vote.

Shaikoski: We can’t find information from individuals.

Bode: This tabling idea is a great idea to get a sense of where things got. Don’t use this as an excuse of what happened. On the level of legitimacy, it won’t cut anything.

Pemberton: I like this idea. I like the by-laws change idea. This could put us in a tough position.

Facendola: I like the idea as well. Four days of tabling…same time? I’m concerned for Students who choose to go to Chapel. I’m handling this logistically.

Singh: Busy times are when we know we can get the highest number of people.

O’Neil: I think that another election wouldn’t solve the legitimacy problem. Ethics met last week. I don’t like the non-binding survey idea.

Ward: If we do it over four days,…I don’t like an idea of a formal poll. As Senators, we need to think about this.

Hinnenkamp: It took us a lengthy discussion to put this together. Two differences with the Week of Atonement: the title; it has a survey at the end. Senate should not shy away. Polling at the end of the week says that the survey will allow you to hear more people. Action needs to be taken.

Clark: I’m against a revote. I don’t like though how this disregards what those who came to the floor said.

Singh: Whoever makes a motion…it’s not to ask whether there should be a revote or not. It’s more about the election process. There is an ethical way to have an election.

Clark: People will see Student Senate and we need to be clear. Why did we delete the election stuff?

Haberman: As a member of the Elections committee, Peter asked what to do with the previous data, Joe came up with a suggestion of taking a screenshot.

Shaikoski: We discussed that the vote had failed.

Antes: I’m in huge favor of this. We should take a deep look at what went wrong.

Haberman: I want to remind you that there is no motion yet. Quiet senators, speak up.

Pacyzynski: First, tabling is a great idea. Have each committee’s perspective. I like getting out before the community. Talk to people instead of e-mails.

Baron: I move to reword this.

Singh: Because you don’t have to pick any of the ideas. You can read it out however you want it to be.

Baron: Each senator sends a link to a Google form for people to voice concerns. This will allow senators to read what their constituents are saying. Maybe add “week of atonement”. Remove …sending people to the …remove change the by-laws.

Seconded by Asghar

**Discussion:**

Arshad: Who is standing by the election table?

Shaikoski: Speaker Haberman

Ward: A reelection is not gonna probably happen. Consider getting behind those who won and make the future better.

Clark: This is very good. I don’t like the idea of having separate parts. I amend the charge to not have separate groups. A roster and their positions.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Discussion:**

Facendola: Specific times. Sending who is doing what and when?

**Vote**

**Approved**

Bode: I think there are two issues. One is improving the election process. The other issue is what surrounds the legitimacy of Student Senate. I heard a Senator saying that a reelection won’t happen because no one wants to take action.

Antes: We should bring our placards to the tabling.

Clark: I think that what’s being brought up is important. Now, we are talking about going forward. The question of legitimacy is still there. That has not been addressed.

Singh: The conversation is important. We will need to get behind it. Before the margins were released, everyone knew that the by-laws were broken. The concerns are understandable. We went forth with that. I would like to add that there is no way to prove that the election was swayed one way or the other. Legitimacy through another election would not work. We made an unbiased decision.

O’Neil: As far as legitimacy goes, this addresses the problem somewhat. The sooner that we resolve this issue, we can restore the legitimacy.

Baron: The realistic side is that we are a group of students. Mistakes are going to be made. I think that …another election won’t make everything right. Let’s be realistic.

Clark: I think that there is no way to prove that. The fact is that our constituents are perceiving things one way. We should focus on this. The referendum idea should be taken in consideration…we should support this.

Bode: The inability to prove…Dr. Knutson would disagree. You can’t have an educated guess. No Poli Scientist can say that 3 votes is a real difference…the chances of that might sway things. Data can’t show you that. The margin is very low. I want to say that it doesn’t seem to me that this is the best course of action.

Clark: I think that we should be honest. We have ethical concerns. We should express it to students.

Choenyi: Have you thought about how things could have been swayed?

Baron: We have no good idea. I call to question.

Seconded by Clark

**Vote**

**Question called**

**Roll Call Vote**

**Motion Approved (Week of Atonement on)**

Haberman: I move to end the meeting after Announcements.

**Vote**

**Approved**

**VII. New Business**

1.Ngabirano: I have the regret to announce the resignation of our Ombudsperson. He wrote:” I am deciding to resign my position as Ombudsperson. I firmly believe that leadership requires the ability to inspire confidence in people. Without that confidence, I cannot be comfortable continuing in a leadership position. After listening to the minutes from prior Senate meetings, I do not feel comfortable holding a position that people are unsure of my ability to perform adequately. I hope that my resignation serves to be a significant step in repairing the image of senate with the student body, and I wish you the best of luck for the remainder of the year.”

2. Jeon: Clarification on my charge?

Shaikoski: We’ll work with you.

3. Clark: I move to charge Cabinet to draft an apology from Cabinet and an acknowledgement that what was done could have impacted the results. A catchy title.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Discussion:**

O’Neil: I think it’s good. I call to question.

Seconded by Asghar

**Vote**

**Question called**

**Vote**

**Approved**

3. Clark: The Swedish House ballot isn’t functioning. There is only a submit option. Election…7pm for the Swedish House.

Facendola: Uphold the vote until the Swedish House review it. Then call it what it is.

Toeben: I don’t think that this will work….

VanHecke: We know who those people are. You close the IC reelection and reopen an election for just the Swedish House residents. And then add their votes…

Facendola: Either way, wait on the results.

Antes: This happened today?

Shaikoski: Correct.

Clark: I move that we hold on the results for IC and redo for the Swedish House before Friday.

Seconded by Mullenbach

**Discussion:**

Haberman: Can we have it within the week? By Monday

Clark: Absolutely

Haberman: We should also look into reprimanding Peter Schwartz more than we did last Monday. I move to call to question.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote**

**Approved**

4. Svendsen: Make sure that the e-mail goes to IC tonight so that they know what’s going on.

Clark: It’s a thing.

Shaikoski: I’ll do it.

5. Clark: This a second election in a row. Come on, let’s reflect on this and become a more effective body.

Bode: Thanks for hearing me today. I’m encouraged by the steps today. I’m willing to give a hand with anything if you need it.

Asghar: We should ask the Tech Director about the situation before moving towards any decisions that affect him.

Ward: Ethics will look into it?

VanHecke: Committee first and the it comes to the floor.

Ward: Our Parliamentarian…

Haberman: A meeting involving the Election committee and our advisor will decide. Chances are: something more severe will be done. A proposition will be brought up…

Facendola: Senator Clark brought it to the floor…conflict of interest?

Clark: I was tabling at the time when a student brought the concern to me. I tabled 4:30-5:30pm.

Clark: We can talk more about that.

VanHecke: We don’t have in place a procedure of bringing up concern. We should look more into that.

Svendsen: The appointment will come in the first meeting after Spring Break…the plan?

Singh: Things to consider? We can’t not have an Ethics Chair. We will be sending an e-mail to the student body to fill the position.

VanHecke: Anyone who wants to file a complaint with the Committee can send it to me or one of the Co-Chairs or Emmett.

Clark: I don’t think we should dive a lot in this. Let’s have a new Ombudsperson and then they have to apply again.

Ward: In my experience, I did not apply. I was only nominated.

Singh: An e-mail…

Svendsen: An e-mail went out and someone on the floor nominates you. You can’t apply for the position but you can seek a nomination.

Ward: If we nominate and we nominate again…

Singh: The formality is because they start to operate in the Fall for next year.

Haberman: Do we need to send out an e-mail right away?

Singh: Yes

Haberman: Can we nominate someone right now?

VanHecke: Transparency…an e-mail would be appropriate before the nomination.

6. Asghar: I was there. A person at the Swedish House came in and didn’t show us everything.

Clark: What we did was right.

**VIII. Announcements**

Haberman: Not every Senator spoke today. I’m disappointed in that.

Ngabirano: Welcome to our new Administrative Director. Over the past two years, I’ve experienced a tremendous amount of respect and support and I hope that you will do the same for our new Admin Director.

Singh: Cabinet see me after this.

**\*Meeting Adjourned**