**Student Senate Agenda**

**Gustavus Adolphus College**

**May 8, 2017**

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

1. **Attendance**

Question of the day: Do you like rain?

**II. Approval of the Minutes**

1. 5/1/2017

Approved

1. **Community Comment**

None

**IV. Budgets**

1. Block Budgets

Choenyi: I just want to give a big overview on the budget and the amount we recommended. We had 268,000 total, initially planned to put aside 75,000 but as we started budgets we ended up recommending close to 130,000. Only left us with… which is very low compared to other years’ budgets. We’ll be taking out close to $40,000 from contingency so we’ll only be left with $33,000 for next year.

DLC asked for $33,000 in block budget so we can just allocate that to them and we picked $28,000. This is what they got last year and we can’t go into detail on what they can or can’t do. We only used about $10,000 from the contingency this year.

Habiba: I saw that they cut the budget and last year we had 21 budgets and now we have 23. Those new orgs have already asked for 3,000 this spring and they said they would be asking for more next year as well.

Ward: When you looked at the contingency for next year you weren’t counting the org’s that will be coming in asking for more next year?

Choenyi: No, that’s where the contingency comes in. We’re comfortable with this contingency because we only spent $10,000 this year.

Clark: Did you look at any other criteria other than what they got last year?

Choenyi: We don’t get any extra information; with the regular budget we can go line by line and decide but with the block budget they only submit one number.

Clark: The DLC does a lot and has a lot of organizations.

Larrow: When you talked with the Model UN budget did you ask them about…

Habiba: …

O’Neil: Now that Model UN is under the umbrella are they allowed to come to us as a regular group or are they only able to pull from the block budget?

Choenyi: Yes they would still be able to come to us and request another budget.

Habiba…

Barron: Did DLC spend all of their budget from last year?

Habiba: Yes.

Clark: If block budgets run out of money in the middle of the year they can come back for more money right?

Singh: Yes, they can come back for a midyear.

Clark: I think that’s important to keep in mind and if they had to come back it’s important to know that that’s a possibility.

O’Connel: So last year…

Habiba…

Arshad: Because of all the events the DLC and clubs they sponsor I recommend we allocate the 30,000 for them and they know that they can come back in for more money.

Pemberton: The reasoning we’re going to keep it consistent it would make sense that if they add more org’s than

Anderson: That lowers the contingency to $31,000 and everyone else is going to want more money as well.

Antes: We have a lot less money this year and I don’t think we should set a precedent already.

Clark: Important to remember our financial limitations but they also do a lot on campus.

Arshad: We do have financial constraints but since we only spent $10,000 last year I don’t think we have to be worried. We should fund DLC.

Barron: Does Habiba still need to be here?

Singh: Usually they stay.

Barron: Are we going to vote one by one?

Shaikoski: One by one.

Choenyi: I agree with Anderson, there are a lot of org’s coming in that requested a lot more money and I don’t think we should lower the contingency very much. They can always come back and request more money.

Habiba: I understand the concept of the contingency but we don’t foresee any clubs coming forward needing more money. We’re trying to create a campus that promotes diversity.

Singh: To answer an earlier question, we have to look at each budget independently and not how they effect each other.

Ngabirano: For the $28,000 given to you last year, how was it used?

Habiba: We used all of it. We were able to use some from another fund we had but now it is all out. We need to make sure we can support our events.

Ngabirano: I support the charge.

Clark: DLC sponsors a lot of events and it’s important to realize that they have two more organizations this year.

Hannan:… I think they should receive the extra money and am very happy with everything the DLC has done.

Ward: I would be more comfortable with this increase if more of their org’s came in for their own budgets. Their lack of initiative on the front end shouldn’t change what we’re trying to do.

Pemberton: I’m not sure if it matters because DLC is funding these org’s anyway and they know what to do with the money better than we would.

Clark: I don’t think… there’s always been this idea that you can’t get money through the mid year process through Senate.

Vote

Approved

Roll call vote

Approved

SAVE Budget

Choenyi: Save is student athlete volunteer educator that asked for $

Decker: Everything we do is focused on athletes, throughout the year we host different programs, much of which we use isn’t even on there. Most of the budget we wanted to have maintenance for Gusties on the Go. We also put money towards a mental health speaker every year. I think we didn’t get the full part for the apple conference. We’ve gone to it three times and decided to make an organization of it, which is why SAVE is an organization now. We’ve gotten the grant twice and we have to make a plan of action coming out of the conference. 400 or so athletes did the survey, which is a very high number.

Clark: When do you apply for the grants, is that an option for you again?

Lamberty: We can’t apply for it again because we’ve already gotten it twice so we can’t apply for a couple of years.

O’Neil: When is the apple conference?

Decker: January

Toeben: Can we go over why SNL is so expensive?

Lamberty: We fund every single SNL.

Vote

Approved

Senior Week:

Choenyi: We decided to give then $17,200, they asked for $28,180

Poffenberger: Can you explain what isn’t getting funded?

Choenyi: We can’t do that.

Singh: The point of a block budget is just to give you a

Choenyi: We’re recommending this because this year we have a lot less budget available to distribute.

Ward: What constituted the $11,000 increase?

Poffenberger: We’re actually requesting $11,000 less, we’re cutting Valleyfair out.

Svendson: Are they able to come in for midyears?

Edholm: Is the $17,000 already adjusted to the new contingency?

Shaikoski: Yes

Ward: How worrisome is this to you?

Poffenberger: I talked to Andrea about it and she was fine so.

Vote

Approved

Svendson: Any block budget that comes in can come in and request more money.

IGS:

Choenyi: We recommended $27,518.46.

Ward: Yeah we’re happy with it.

Martinez: How many org’s are no longer a part of IGS?

Ward: We had 14, are now at 8, next year we’ll be back up to 11.

Clark: Would we devastate IGS if we took some away?

Ward: It would be very difficult.

Clark: There will be less organizations so..

Haberman: I would maybe think about cutting some money..

Ward: There are less org’s but most of the org’s that come to us come as a spring budget, and since many orgs this year can’t, they’ll be asking for more money. Punishing them with less money would be unfair.

Haberman: I move to cut $2,000 from the block budget. They are going to have less org’s than previously, true that they’ll have three more coming back but I have a hard time believing they’re still going to need that much money.

Clark: If there are

O’Neil: Incoming sophomores are a smaller class so likely there will be fewer members.

Ward: The number of org’s going through rush doesn’t affect our budget. I call to question as a senator?

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

PA’s:

Choenyi: Last block budget, they asked for exactly what they got last year.

Haberman: Sean wasn’t connected to this in any way was he?

Choenyi: We were consistent in our logic no matter what but he wasn’t part of any discussion.

Clark: Do we know if there are more or less PA’s next year?

Singh: No.

Vote

Approved

1. Senate Mid-year

Choenyi: This is the budget for the charging station, $1810, we recommended the full amount.

Clark: I think it looks great, do it quick.

Svendson: The biggest decision was whether to break the law which was already decided.

Antes: Are we buying two?

Schwartz: We’re buying one, GTS is purchasing the other.

Vote

Approved

**V. Unfinished Business**

1. Ombuds-Bus Ethics

Shaikoski: Any changes or additions?

Barron: I wanted to pull out Article 3 section 5 subsection E. The protests are a bit vague.

Antes: JoNess sent out an email, I friendly Article 4 section 2, typos.

Clark: Pull article 3 section 7. And Article 3 section 5 subsection L.

O’Neil: Article 3 section 5 subsection A.

Svendson: Article 3 section 5 A and B.

Anderson: I would also like to pull C from that section.

Edholm: Article 6 section …

Grosshuesch: …

Facendola: Is everything that JoNes emailed about pulled? Can we just pull everything JoNes emailed about?

Svendson: I like these but there is no longer anything about a voting station, now it just looks like a random time that it’s open. I think the language should be rearranged a little.

Clark: I make a motion to bump down subsection A and make the new section A say the election may be open between the hours of 9:30am and 10pm.

Svendson: This accomplishes what I thought when I pulled it originally.

Edholm: That 12.5 hour period, we only want that to be open for 10 hours??

Clark: We made it so that at the end of the day if we tabled for 10 hours we did our job.

Vote

Approved

Andersen: The language that they will be punished is slightly unprofessional. And we didn’t censure anyone this year so we should discuss if that’s what we want.

Clark: I’m all for changing the verbiage but I think no one was censured because a lot of our conversation centered around how we were all to blame. Even if we have a scheduled vote on something we still discuss it.

Grosshuesch: I move to change it to what Andersen said.

Hannan: Is it necessary to say they will consider a censure?

Barron: That’s what we’re changing,

Shaw: I support this amendment and the softer language to have more of a conversation.

Schwartz: Is this just for senators?

Adebisi: It’s for the full group and would make it the responsibility of everyone.

Clark: There is a discussion in ethics, there wouldn’t be a verdict right away.

Haberman: Maybe using an informal reprimand would be a good idea. I think the amendment was fine just the way it was.

Grosshuesch: Will someone explain what all of these are?

Adebisi: A reprimand is private, saying you messed up. Formal reprimand is when it is brought to the floor and everyone knows. Censure is put on the record.

Clark: I move to change the word from censure to formal reprimand.

Hannan: I support this, it addresses the problem more appropriately.

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

Barron: What is meant by no protests are allowed?

Adebisi: We actually didn’t change that, it’s always been there.

Adebisi: We didn’t discuss this as a body.

Clark: We didn’t touch this one but someone pulled it. This means you can’t complain after the election is done.

Haberman: I move to extend the meeting until past announcements.

Vote

Approved

Shaikoski: Now we have …

Barron: I think we should be more transparent about it and it might spur more participation. I make a motion to add my phrasing into L.

Clark: I like this, our buzz word is transparency and I support it.

Shaw: Are these numbers readily available?

Schwartz: Yes.

Singh: I would be wary of putting in specific results, opening a pandora’s box and if you’re adding this clause you’re creating a way for people to share their frustration about the election.

O’Neil: My only thought was that, I like the part about publishing, but I think the part about publishing how much of the student body might hurt their credibility.

Svendson: I like this, as ombudsperson I was always asked if I could discuss the results but I couldn’t. I understand that people could be upset but it could also lead to discussion. As far as the percentage, you can do math to figure out how many votes each candidate got, if someone would put in the time and effort to do that.

Schwartz: This is pretty much right up my alley but I really like the publishing of percentages because it might encourage people to vote. I’m not a fan of publishing the vote totals at all. It’s the most important thing that you just don’t disclose.

Haberman: In committee I was very against this idea at first because I think it would de-legitimize senators and presidents but I realized that would only be in the short run. I call to question.

Vote

Not approved

Antes: The wording is kind of weird.

O’Neil: I propose a friendly to reword it.

Andersen: Right now it reads as…

Andersen: I don’t think the purple fixes it but I think the green does. You need to be specific about which percentage to be publishing- per day or per election.

O’Neil: I think our intention was just for co-president elections.

Andersen: I think you need to make clear what you want published.

Hannan: I think the voting percentages would encourage people to participate.

Ward: I don’t understand the worry we have about publishing, that’s how most elections work. Public officials who have power get elected by small margins all the time.

Shaw: I think the GAC student body is adult enough to handle vote margins.

Barron: My intention was just the co-presidential election, but I’m going to propose a friendly when I get to speak.

I want to change the wording of the green section, which is a friendly.

Ward:…

Toeben: I don’t want to publish votes, it will create difficulties.

Singh: If we wanted to allow election results to be displayed, that needs to be in a more well thought out conversation than we’re having right now. From my understanding, the ethics committee wasn’t 100% in unity with how this bylaw was brought up. I think it’s too rushed right now in this setting.

Schwartz: Even if we published the vote totals, there’s still the problem of what if that’s not 100% accurate? The next person would have to be amazing to fix it.

Larrow: If we’re going to have this conversation about transparency, this is a democracy and if you’re going to say these things protests are going to happen at Gustavus no matter what.

Andersen: I think we should remove the by election part, it’s redundant and confusing.

Clark: I think these edits are good and we should support more transparency. If you’re in a democracy, publish the votes, it’s not that hard.

Barron: I have a friendly for a rewording. I think this clears up any confusion.

Hannan: I don’t understand how we can simultaneously say that it’s a done deal and we publish the vote margins.

O’Neil: The margin of the election is not grounds for protest.

Hannan: I appreciate the dialogue of democracy but people are talking about the US elections but we also have recounts for a reason. If it’s close enough people recount it.

Grosshuesch: I think this is such a big thing to do it needs much more thought than what it’s getting. I think we should make a motion to remove this specific section from the omnibus to have further discussion on it.

Clark: I’m baffled by the hype about this specific issue. This is more on the candidates and the senate themselves. I oppose this motion.

Singh: … I am just thinking that if by chance bylaws were broken and …

Barron: I oppose this motion. I don’t think a recount would be an issue. We’re also still voting on everything next week.

Ward: I agree with the previous two speakers and would like to remind the senators that they’re voting for their constituents and I’m sure they would all want to know the results.

Edholm: It might be more harmful to not release the results. It’s important to be informed to know the margin on which you would like to improve. All elections I’m familiar with post the vote count.

Haberman: We only have one senate meeting left.

O’Neil: The argument about protests is not regarded in this ombudsbus so we can always talk about that late. I’m going to call to question. For Gabe’s motion.

Vote

Approved

Vote

Not approved

Andersen: I want to encourage you to move it to subsection 3, makes more sense there.

Grosshuesch: I think we’re rushing and there’s no reason we couldn’t talk about this next fall.

Hannan: I’m neutral at this point but I think we need to make sure we think about all the problems that could arise.

Schwartz: Yeah lump this into next year and kill two birds with one stone.

Clark: We’re doing it right now, we can’t push it off anymore. I’ve thought about this quite extensively and I’m very happy with what we have now.

Barron: I think that we’re trying to fix mistakes this senate has made so we should do it.

Ngabirano: I don’t feel comfortable how it’s phrased. I would like some flexibility one the phrasing “they shall publish”

Shaw: …

Clark: If we vote we vote on putting L in right?

Svendson: This talk about changing it to could be published because then you get to the fuzzy conversation of when should ethics be publishing this. Makes the statement wishy washy.

Haberman: I would like to remove speaking limits.

Vote

Approved

O’Neil: Do we say how we’re going to publish it? Friendly

I’m in favor of it.

Clark: I move to amend L, I want to

Singh: For clarification, we can’t do anything with L.

Clark: We just need to vote on L right?

Okay I want to amend the green text.

Vote

Approved

Clark: I want to put M in front of L but make them one and just put it in the beginning. I want to do this because those two work together really well and we can check the ethics before publishing.

Andersen: I think the body needs to clarify if M falls under all elections or only co-president elections.

Haberman: So moved.

Shaikoski: We’re still on Clark’s original motion.

Svendson: My objection is purely organization. This isn’t a timeline and I don’t think it fits there.

Haberman: I would like to make an amendment saying it will be posted the Monday following the election by at least an email.

Shaw: Does M still count to the section that’s highlighted currently.

Andersen: I would like to entertain the motion that they add after the ethics committee has reviewed the election.

Clark: I thought my original amendment was to combine the two.

Adebisi: It was previously elections committee but you also said ethics committee.

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

O’Neil: I move for a 5 minute recess.

Vote

Approved

WE’RE BACK.

Barron: I move to add the very last bit in that message.

Vote

Approved

Grosshuesch: …

Adebisi: I think it should be changed to voting.

Grosshuesch: I friendly that.

Vote

Approved

Article 3 section 10-JoNes

Svendson: I was considering pulling this but at some point if someone votes outside of the vote it could lead to bias.

Clark: I think we should keep something like this in just for during the day. I move to change the phrasing.

Ward: It’s a letter. I make a friendly to add that the senate can know.

Andersen: I think the body should discuss and come to a consensus …

Toeben: I feel like this is ambiguous if it can be shared or not in the wording.

Grosshuesch: I think it should be vote percentage to stay consistent.

Cella: Then anyone pulling up the results would automatically break the bylaw.

Andersen: You should just move the end of that then.

Grosshuesch: I think we should leave it as it is.

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

Grossheusch: I think you should change redo to administer a new.

Ward: It’s not hard to type the names without an error.

Grossheusch: I want to friendly my thing to say may readminister

Shaw: I amend the must to may.

Hannan: I agree that it’s very easy to misspell someone’s name and somehow we’re not very good at doing easy stuff.

Clark: We have to be held accountable and just have must.

Edholm: If somebody misspells a name the election must be readministered?

That would just be too much unnecessary work.

Svendsen: we have the fall election and if it’s every name for every position and one name was spelled wrong then the entire election would have to be redone.

O’Connel: Then you also have an invalid ballot.

Cella: If we switch it to may then senate could ignore it.

Adebisi: …

Clark: The full names of every valid candidate…

Hannan: could we just make an exception for misspelling?

Adebisi: That’s the point of the ethics committee reviewing.

Ngabirano: I don’t think we need part d.

Toeben: I agree, putting too many hoops to jump through is a bad thing. We should have faith in the future senate.

Cella: That was the recommendation of the ethics committee.

Clark: We have to be accountable.

Vote

Approved

Barron: Can we change the word from the to an.

Shaw: That could imply that you could have new people.

Barron: I’m going to friendly that to say in question at the end.

Ngabirano: People can mess up names and we keep ignoring that. This will stir some interesting discussions next year. We don’t need this point.

Vote

Approved

Svendson: As someone who has had to set up the debate two times, it comes down to whether or not all the candidates are able to make it. If some of them are unable to make it then you’re giving one candidate a foot up. Including it in the bylaws makes something a necessity and limits the election committee.

Clark: I move to change the language of this.

Shaw: I think this addresses the concern.

Singh: I’ve been through four years of Student Senate and the debate has always been inconsistent. I find it hard to see that this is going to work.

Clark: I think this makes perfect sense.

Grosshuesch: Cabinet would be the best people to run a debate.

Shaikoski: This has been an ongoing debate, Ethics decided that it was the right decision even if I don’t agree with it.

O’Neil: The goal of this was to prevent any sort of line of succession between co-presidents and any future co-presidents.

Singh: I’m still confused as to how you think this is solving this issue and why you would think cabinet would create a line of succession at all.

People talking I am falling asleep

Vote

Division

Approved

Vote

Division

Approved

Clark: I move to have a 5 minute recess.

Vote

Approved

Clark: I would like to amend it from 10 to 5.

Singh: I think it’s an issue that if we have ten posters for every single candidate pair that’s running that’s a little ridiculous. And it’s unfair for us to monopolize poster space since it’s already monopolized.

O’Neil: These already cost money so I think 5 is okay.

Clark: It’s only two weeks and everyone should know the importance of the election.

Vote

Division

Approved

Grosshuesch: I would like to amend 3/5 and something about the tv’s.

Barron: I want to propose to adding a sentence before the table tents.

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

1. St. Olaf Response

Clark: I like the meaning behind this but I feel like it focuses on Gustavus too much when it’s for St. Olaf.

Is it directed towards Gustavus students.

Barron: I want to add a statement talking about the systematic issue

Vote

Approved

**VI. New Business**

Shaw: I charge the tech committee to look at the elections website.

Svendsen: Do you want to friendly that to the Co-President elects since we only have one meeting left?

Vote

Approved

Vote

Approved

**VII. Announcements**

O’Neil: Tennis!

Grosshuesch: You are here until senate is done, otherwise don’t run for senate.

Shaw: Thank you Harbeck for writing all these minutes.

Singh: Thank you everyone for coming.

Barron: Political Science forum this Friday.