**Student Senate Minutes**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**March 6, 2017**

Co-President Singh calls the meeting to order at 7:00

1. **Attendance**

Attendance Question: What’s the perfect weather for you?

1. **Approval of the Minutes from 2/27/2017**

Ward: A friendly to write correctly Sigma Sigma Sigma. It reads Zeta instead of Sigma in the community section comment.

**Approved**

1. **Community Comment**

Lorenz: I have concerns with elections. A few incidents might have caused changes in the vote. The vote should be redone.

Dull: I’m Nathan Dull. I’m here for the Co-Presidential Election. Given the ethical violations, if not for a revote…have people who couldn’t vote vote in the same timeline that the computer was away.

Severson: I’m here to talk about Day at the Capitol. Paget can’t be here tonight. What this is, on March 21st…60-70 students each of the private Colleges participate. We will be lobbying for the Minnesota State Grant. The Grant can be taken to any College in MN. That’s effective because it’s a bipartisan thing. We will dress nicely and we will be able to meet with our senators at the state level. Even if you have no idea who is your representative, you can come and learn to talk to your senators. In the afternoon, we will be meeting about 60 Gustie alumns. We’ll be eating GREAT food…This thing changed my Gustavus Career. Tim Kennedy and Kate Knutson will be leading the team. We will have Student Senate table and the computer will be up this upcoming week. If you have questions, please come and talk to me. Oakley and Emmett can testify that it’s a great experience.

Gustafson: I spoke about my cynicism. Both groups heard about them. I’m here to ask that justice in your constitution be served. We heard about the censures…one was the informal reprimand to Oakley. The candidate was involved in some ways. Someone on the committee can’t run. I think he should be censured as well, I have no bias. I’m concerned by the integrity of this organization.

Morningstar: I have concerns about the elections. Especially considered the violations and the by-laws. The candidates’ names…absence of computer in the Chapel time…

Riste: I’m also here to discuss the election…the names not being listed and with no write-in option…

Mir: I’m here for the same reason. No write-in

Toeben: It was 12-12:25 and not Chapel time

Pastir: Both pairs were suitable for the position but I have the same concerns expressed previously.

Grossuetsch: As someone who served on Senate, it concerned me that you shied away from the By-laws. I personally didn’t vote because I was expecting a revote…the number on the margin was broken…impeachment of the Ombudsperson. By the way, this Wednesday there is the “Gustavus without a woman” event.

Long: I’m here about the election. I’m concerned about the violations. I feel like students have lost faith in Senate. I would call for a revote and the call of the censure of the Ombudsperson.

Adebisi: I’m here to hear the discussion.

Lorenz: The anonymous reports are weak…is there any way to look into that?

Gustafson: I’m in favor of upholding the results of the election by the way.

**IV. Unfinished Business**

1. Justine Stein

Stein: I am the new Title IX Coordinator. I’m here to say hi and I’m here to let you know that I’mhere if you ever need me. I have some things to hand out. You can grab them if you want them. If you want steps to take as a Senator. You are not mandated and you can take the steps following. They are your advocates…you can start there. They have a counseling background. If they go straight to Title IX, you have the right to investigate. Our Title IX deputies are Steven…

If you can’t read it, I can provide the documented version. The other part of my job is sexual misconduct prevention. I’m helping with prevention work in some offices and areas in Senate. I want people to know that I’m here as well. I’m hoping that we can have a holistic prevention education on campus. As Herchran said, please e-mail Herchran and she will be in touch with me. You can set up one-on-ones with me.

1. Committee Updates

Jeon: The apparel is still on. If there is another person who might be interested.

Toeben: I have 4 things: pronoun initiative (Executive Summary creation), paradigm (getting speakers in health care settings), I’m working on Annual class tree proposal. I forgot the 4th.

Hinnenkamp: We have released our Spring Budgeting. All the dates are in.

Toeben: 4th thing…DLC is creating an Ethics Committee…that’s happening. They want as many voices as possible throughout the process.

1. Co-Presidential Election

Haberman: Ethics Committee decided with two censures and an informal reprimand. Oakley was on the committee…it was a hybrid between election and committee. Peter Schwartz up to censure for two reasons (no write-ins or last names until 10:42am).

Singh: Ethics Committee can sanction based on their decisions but censures and informal reprimands do come to the floor for approval.

1. **Schwartz Censure:**

Arshad: If a censure was to happen…what happens?

Haberman: If we vote on it, it’s on the record. If you want to do more, add something.

Singh: If we censure people, send it to the student body.

Robbins: It’s already sent. It’s like getting impeached. Publicly humiliating us.

Hannan: I don’t completely understand…I thought that the wording was by the Ombudsperson.

VanHecke: The censure has to be voted on.

Shaw: I don’t know what the student body thinks.

Ngabirano: Any replies from the e-mail?

Haberman: Yes one.

Facendola: Maybe do something else. Maybe that’s a sign of something else.

Pemberton: I think I’m good with the censure. Maybe a way of checking the mistakes…

VanHecke: The Ethics Committee proposed the censure. You would need to do it through a motion and vote on it.

Martinez: I think that if a censure is decided upon, the student body should know.

Haberman: Article 4…simple majority vote for most serious reprimand.

Facendola: I move to add Community service

Seconded by O’Neil

**Discussion:**

Baron: There were more punishments…were there for the Technology Director?

Haberman: This motion is vague.

Facendola: Options?

Vanhecke: Your Constitution talks about informal, formal reprimand, censure…there was no specific list.

Martinez: How many people did the Director show the results to?

Clark: Ombudsperson Robins…

Schwartz: I just checked and the write-in was my fault. Until the election was over. I got last names from the Ombudsperson…I could have screwed up. We are looking into putting ethical guards.

Toeben: Can we clarify? Who was on the committee?

Haberman: Two senators, JoNes, parliamentarian, speaker, ombudsperson

VanHecke: Students in question were out conversations concerning them.

Clark: I think that we should go through the censures as the Ethics said. We still need to talk about what we will do as a body.

O’Neil: I don’t think that Community Service would help the Tech Director to learn what he did wrong.

Martinez: I think that Community service should not be…two people did the mistake. It was a simple mistake. The censure is enough. It’s not our place to impose this.

Ward: I think that we can wait on the individuals. The student body doesn’t care about community service. We should focus on what’s next.

Choenyi: I totally agree with previous speakers. We should all take responsibility for this.

Singh: Express your concern and let it go away.

Arshad: I call to Question.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote (Motion)**

**Not Approved**

**Discussion:**

Martinez: I think a motion should be made that an e-mail should be sent out.

Toeben: I know that a censure…it’s a various serious thing.

O’Neil: We recommended a censure. One of the other punishments is to address questions about the process of Senate.

Clark: I need that all reprimands are documented and sent to the student body.

Singh: Hold it until New Business.

Baron: Whatever happens should be sent to the student body.

Hinnenkamp: There can be other censures later. I would like to stress that a number of students came in.

Hannan: We should censure the Director and move on with the discussion.

**Vote**

**Tech Director Censure Approved**

1. **Robbins Censure:**

Haberman: Censured because of gap (12-12:25pm), he was aware and forgot to act. He shared the margin to Oakley Clark and Henry. He broke the intent. We believe that Joe should be censured and send an e-mail of apology to the student body.

**Discussion:**

O’Neil: I move that we add that Joe conducted …by-laws to the constitution.

Singh: Later in New Business.

Robbins: I’m gonna leave…any questions?

Baron: Why did you tell the totality?

Robbins: I felt that given the other concerns, I thought that discussion of the margins make the discussion of all these matters important.

Clark: Did you only share it with us?

Robbins: Absolutely not. Decision in good faith.

Baron: Did you share the vote counts during the day?

Robbins: No.

**Discussion:**

Ward: The censure is insufficient

Hinnenkamp: There should be more discussion on this. I don’t endorse or not…a lot of people came to this meeting for this concern. I think enough serious discussion needs to be out.

Shaikoski: Fraud…things are at fault. I think that the recount is a big deal if it were.

Baron: I think that the recommended censure and the apology e-mail are fitting. He should have conferred with the committee before revealing anything. I think that the tabling thing is that if he knew about it…

Clark: I will abstain from this vote. I think that the option of impeachment is not the most viable option.

VanHecke: It has been more about margins than counts. Historically, it has been more about the actual margins than the total votes.

Andersen: I would be in favor of a serious reprimand although it doesn’t solve the problem. I would be more in favor of having another Ombudsperson. He qualifies for a removal for office.

Shaw: I second previous speaker. It’s the Ombudsperson’s position…

Gustafson: Why did you ask for margins?

Clark: I was curious.

O’Neil: How often have impeachments been up in the past?

VanHecke: In the 8 years I’ve been here, there has never been an impeachment. There have been removals because of absences.

Toeben: I’m maybe biased…I had to leave for class. We heard a community comment about impeachment. You need to discuss more about this. It’s a big deal.

Pemberton: I’m in favor of an impeachment.

Hannan: I don’t think that what happened is what concerns me but rather his attitude. I feel like that the attitude…lack of engagement is the most concerning thing to me.

Hinnenkamp: I’m torn on this. I want to point out that theoretically…I question any further actions if this one is not encouraged.

Ward: I don’t think that the margins are a big issue. I think it would be fair…they didn’t break the by-laws.

Haberman: I move to call to question

Seconded by O’Neil

**Vote**

**Not Approved**

Baron: I think that all the decisions by him should be executed in consultance with the whole committee. We recognize the lapses in judgment…a friendly? On Ethics Committee for the rest of the semester.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Discussion:**

Baron: I also think that it’s a friendly.

Martinez: He should have been doing this all this time.

Andersen: To some extent, I agree with previous speaker. We can’t afford keeping an incapable Ombudsperson. I think he should be held accountable.

Clark: The Ombudsperson has been conferring issues with us in the past. The motion is from now on…

Hannan: I’m in favor of this motion. I think that losing the Ombudsperson would be a big loss.

Hinnenkamp: Our entire election integrity is being put in question.

Ngabirano: A reminder that the Ombudsperson position will be open soon.

Shaw: I yield

Baron: This shows that we are not confident in his own judgment.

O’Neil: I call to question

Seconded by Asghar

**Vote**

**Question Called**

**Vote**

**Approved**

Cella: One of the points of concerns are concerns about the election…

O’Neil: If we choose to impeach the Ombudsperson, vote on a new Ombudsperson before other Student Senate activities.

Singh: The Ethics Committee still stands

Haberman: One of the Co-Presidents would sit on the meetings.

Andersen: I’m advocating for an impeachment of the individual.

Shaw: I move to extend the meeting passed the announcements

**Vote**

**Extended**

Shaw: I move to the impeachment.

Clark: I move to strike the X on the speaker’s list

Seconded by Arshad

**Vote**

**Approved**

Clark: I think that we will feel amazing after this but we are not getting at the root of this.

Haberman: An impeachment requires a 2/3 of the full Senate.

Martinez: I think that impeaching the Ombudsperson would help start making the changes necessary. The Ombudsperson made simple mistakes that could have been made by anyone.

Lamberty: I don’t believe that this was purposefully malicious. One of the most hurt people is not calling for impeachment. Let’s not push for this.

Ward: It’s more likely that those who are unhappy and those who don’t care are conflicted on this.

Hinnenkamp: This is a great start. We will need more than one action. We need to show that we will uphold our laws in this.

Clark: After 9pm, nothing happens. I think that spending time on impeachment is unnecessary

Haberman: We need to remember that it’s our mistake as a body

Andersen: This is a very productive action to take.

Schwartz: For me, he did the one thing that screwed everything over. This was extremely frustrating.

Hinnenkamp:We are at fault. When we look to where some of the problems happened…the ship captain is the Ombudsperson who needs to be held accountable. This is a good start.

Cella: Do you think that revealing the margins affected the outcome? I don’t think so. Don’t put your blame on the Ombudsperson.

Martinez: The body is at fault. Last week, the body decided not to wait on the results. This is the perfect opportunity to redeem ourselves.

Ward: We’re the ship. Put yourselves in the Ombudsperson’s position.

Shaikoski: The word revote has been tossed around.

Cella: I believe that all your concerns will be addressed.

Shaikoski: The Ombudsperson is at fault. We are in a loose situation.

Clark: Last week, we made a decision to go ahead. The Ombudsperson said that the mistakes weren’t going to affect the results.

Hinnenkamp: In impeaching, you remove him from power. It was still his decision in the end. Last week discussion, that’s not a non-issue. This is being voted upon within Senate. We can do more things still.

Lamberty: We are a team. He realizes his mistake. I call to question.

Seconded by Asghar

**Vote**

**Question called**

**Vote on the impeachment**

**Not Approved**

Ward: I appreciate that the margins were made aware. We’re talking about transparency…

Cella: We should end this discussion

Martinez: A preview of what’s next?

Cella: We decided the censure and the reprimands. We decided that something about the election needs to be done. Our solution comes from a legitimacy…solution (compile the concerns and have a vote whether there should be a reelection).

Toeben: I’m frustrated by the Ombudsperson’s lack of care.

Ward: Academics come before Student Senate.

Toeben: He never took the initiative to plan on something in case the table was unattended

Ward: I don’t know what I would do

Singh: The Ombudsperson is the Chair and their job is to take action in case a law was to be broken.

Baron: I call to question

Vote

Discussion ended

**Vote**

**Censured**

Haberman: I move that we recess until 9:20

Seconded by Clark

**Vote**

**Recess**

**After 10min:**

Cella:This will be 2/3 vote. This is the most legitimate way to go about an election.

**Discussion:**

Shaikoski: If the student body so chooses, break all by-laws?

Cella: Break the by-laws as a packet.

Svendsen: Will it be mentioned that we will be breaking by-laws?

**Discussion:**

Ward: There is a vote fatigue. We are asking a lot.

Jeon: Students will vote whether to have a reelection or not? How to decide?

Cella: Simple majority.

Singh: How did you get to the simple majority idea?

Cella: The Senate would vote 2/3.

O’Neil: If we do take this, are we disregarding that we decided to uphold the election last week? The timeline?

Cella: Not a full decision yet.

O’Neil: We should consider how a revote might favor one side over another

Clark: I think that the vote fatigue is a huge thing. This is a Senate problem. The idea that the student body is there to fix our problems, it’s not the best way to go about things. If we have a revote, Henry and Oakley win, then we have another half student body that is mad. I encourage everyone to think of more solutions.

Ward: People who are angry are more likely to respond. Other solutions: reopen the vote for an hour at the same place. The poll can be reopen. That’s a viable option to me. For the Tech Director. Can you see who votes?

Swchartz: No

Shaw: We had a chance last week. Let’s figure something else now.

Baron: I’m more in favor of reopening the polls. Revote?

Cella: This is a terrible bad decision. Since that Student Senate decided to uphold the results, we need to do something. One of the key things is that we can have the students heard. We need creative solutions here.

Svendsen: I have an obvious bias already. A few things: the margin could have been larger as well, we don’t know how it was affected…there is some frustration from us. Because this hinders our actions. Knowing how the student body will react…if there is this vote.

Shaikoski: A potential revote…it can’t exist without flaw. There are some points: it’s dangerous to overrule last week’s senate because of hindsights. If a revote was to happen, can we make it more fair…can we guarantee anything? Can we trust the Ethics Committee to run the election again? I have no solution right now.

Facendola: We’re split…let’s do a revote.

**Discussion:**

Ward: You can only vote from the Senate laptop.

Svendsen: if the poll was to be open…there is a problem of schedules.

Adebisi: The presence of the table can remind people to vote. It would make things less legitimate. Working together to move forward.

Baron: One student who didn’t vote because of the infractions. There is something to be said about the infractions.

O’Neil: I’m intrigued by how they all work together.

Toeben: The results will be biased in some way. I like the idea but it’s not the whole. Thing that happened. How can we go about going back

Campaign guidelines: how can they recampaign? The non-student at large on the Ethics is problematic as well. I think that…the results would be different…decrease our integrity even more? How would that collaboratively look?

Clark: I think that we need to have an out-of-the-box idea. A unity action can be done.

Svendsen: We discussed about sending an e-mail to the student body…saying that we hear that there was things they liked about us or them. We want to make sure that the students know that we are here for the betterment of the community.

Andersen: I like the direction that this is taking.

Haberman: I do not agree with opening up for that specific period. I move that we give Adebisi the same speaking privileges.

Seconded by Facendola

**Vote**

**Approved**

Clark: I don’t think that this motion targets the ballot. Every Marketing piece had our last names on it. The current motion doesn’t fix the problem.

Cella: You censured the Ombudsperson. The out-of-the-box solution is to throw it to the student body.

Hannan: I don’t think that this is a very good solution. It doesn’t address issues and it won’t increase the trust. I call into question.

Seconded by Baron

**Vote**

**Not Approved**

Hannan: We don’t need to discuss about what students will do…let’s send it to the student body.

Shaw: I yield

Baron: I’m thinking of having some sort of referendum. Whether the students approve of the job they are doing. 50%...Oakley and Henry take over after January. A referendum in December. Approval of the job?

VanHecke: The Co-Presidents Vs Cabinet relationship. Shift leadership…shift the cabinet. I’m worried that you might create a year where little gets done.

Clark: What if we apply to be on Cabinet?

Toeben: Rig the Cabinet?

Clark: We need to think of different ways…

Cella: If we stand by our vote, seniors who voted will be disenfranchised. Let’s get to the root of the problem.

Haberman: Why the end of Fall Semester?

Baron: Give the student body a decent chance to see what the Co-Presidents would have done then.

Haberman: Referendum?

Baron: Similar referendum?

Haberman: It puts future election committees in a strange situation that they don’t have full knowledge of that. Co-Presidents vs Senators.

Toeben: I agree with a lot that was said. We shouldn’t give ourselves the power to give and remove the power to our current Co-President elects. Everyone who came was mad. No one was happy. There is a bias.

Martinez: We don’t know what the margins were…it’s us overstepping our boundaries. We should focus more to change things in the student senate body. It’s not the fault of any of the candidates.

Robbins: For me, I like the referendum idea. We are weighing the question of the integrity of the body. If there is a situation that arises, that looks much worse. Senate needs to take responsibility and apologize. We need to think about future senates. I like that this is a good possibility but it holds us accountable. Maybe hold the referendum alone without any strings attached.

Lamberty: I agree with the previous speaker.

Ward: Let them know ahead of time. Breaking by-laws is bad.

Clark: This is an unprecedented situation. A referendum might require by-laws changes. I think that a referendum…I’m cautious about having Henry and Oakley choose.

I call to question

Seconded by O’Neil

**Question called**

**Not approved**

Cella: The spirit of that was that not the people who caused the problem…no term limits. Throw it to the student body.

O’Neil: Create an ad-hoc position…advisory position.

Ward: Not the same students who will vote.

Clark: A one-time thing.

Baron: We are in an unchartered territory. The class we’re representing …those who were happy didn’t come in. I think that the reality is that the whole school knows that something wrong happened.

Andrew: A referendum is not an answer.

Baron: I move to have the Cabinet choose new Co-Presidents in case of a failure.

Seconded by Ward

**Discussion:**

Toeben: Senate handles everything in house

Martinez: Cabinet is not elected by students

Singh: The Cabinet will be approved by this Cabinet

Martinez: This gives more power to the Cabinet than they deserve

Cella: If the results weren’t being challenged, things would go well. This would mean that we are endorsing both Cabinets …the idea of legitimacy. The legitimacy will be made only and only by the students.

Andersen: I don’t think it makes sense for one time. Changes should be permanent.

Hannan: I have a big issue with this. Approval ratings don’t delegitimize an election.

Seconded by O’Neil

**Vote**

**Called in Question**

**Vote**

**Fails**

Baron: I want to hear more solutions

Adebisi: Something that would give power back to the students. Have everybody decide.

Lamberty: I move to have Co-vice Presidents.

Seconded by Asghar

**Discussion:**

O’Neil: It’s my understanding that it’s working project. An ad-hoc position for one year. All four were qualified to lead.

Toeben: I kind of agree as well. We can’t go back on our word. We need to choose a side and stick with it. I like the unity idea.

Haberman: I’m not a fan of these. Two new positions. Three new positions…Cabinet members monopolizing the discussion.

Hannan: I’m not a fan of two new positions. I like the idea of perhaps asking the current Co-presidents to approach Oakley and Henry to work together.

Cella: This is a cowardly approach. The whole point of vote is plurality. Give them the opportunity to start moving forward.

Clark: An illegitimacy anyways. This is saving a face. This disregards. The result must be a major change of by-laws and the constitution. A VP position is not the best solution. I’m abstaining.

Schwartz: I’m tired of the idea that Senate has broken all these by-laws. We are ready to move forward, let’s listen to the Parliamentarian and do something. We’re passed that and let’s move forward.

VanHecke: If you want to include more positions, look into how those will work. It strikes me that what you want is …making have one of them be an Ombudsperson. Alex raised the question that you’re not engaged anymore. Maybe rest.

Shaw: We are awkwardly splitting the baby…what’s the longest Senate meeting?

Robbins: I think that the best thing to do is to charge Cabinet to come up with the best options.

Singh: Because the idea was brought up, this can be tabled

Ward: We shouldn’t worry about having the Cabinet monopolizing the conversation. I move to table this discussion until next Monday.

Seconded by Asghar

**Discussion:**

Ward: I’m not functioning anymore…

Martinez: I have an idea…

Singh: Later

**Vote**

**Approved**

1. **New Business**
2. O’Neil: I move to charge Cabinet to come up with viable options at our next meeting.

Seconded by Asghar

**Vote (Charge)**

**Approved**

1. Clark: I move to charge Ethics things to look into how new positions fit in the constitution.

Seconded by Baron

Seconded by Asghar

Called into question

**Vote (Charge)**

**Approved**

1. Martinez: I think that we should put the blame on Senate…I’m proposing that each senator will apologize to their constituencies…each senator will table about an hour outside the Caf…and explain why a reelection is not the best solution. Take requests about what Senate can do. No reason to find a place for the other candidates.
2. Baron: I like the spirit of the idea. I move that the Co-presidents send an e-mail to the student body summarizing the actions taken tonight and mention that the discussion will be tabled. If you have suggestions, e-mail Cabinet.

**Vote**

**Approved**

1. **Announcements**

Svendsen: It’s nice to meet all of you. If you want to grab coffee, let me know.

VanHecke: You need to think about…more clarification on the rules.

Singh: Day without a woman on Wednesday…Africa Night on Friday.

Hannan: Thanks for your engagement tonight!

Shaikoski: I hope to see everyone at the meeting next week.

**\*Meeting Adjourned**