

Student Senate Agenda
Gustavus Adolphus College
November 20, 2017

I. Attendance

II. Approval of the Minutes 11/13/17 - APPROVED

III. Community Comment

IV. Finance

a. Tri Beta

Keeley: This was tabled last week and it was a total of \$696.30

Edholm: Joel Carlin is the advisor and could not be here this week. The main concern was that not everyone from tribeta was informed this could be a possibility, but I was told that anyone who was eligible to present at ACBS were notified before the abstract date.

Keeley: Finance recommends in full.

Co-President Ngabirano: Questions

Wicklund: So everyone eligible to present was notified of the conference, but were they notified they could try to get funding through Tri Beta

Mir: The only other student going was informed but she had found her own funding already.

Young: When you applied in September did you anticipate getting funding from Tri Beta

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion

Wicklund: it seems like everyone has funding so I support this budget

Keeley: Finance reviewed it and saw nothing wrong with it

Vote - Passes

V. Old Business

a. Parliamentarian Rule

Edholm: Amending a main motion can be done when the floor is open, it requires a second and majority vote. To amend the amendment the floor must be open and a majority vote is open.

Mir: what is friendlying an amendment

Edholm: friendlying an amendment is less formal it is a subtle change. No vote needed if the person who made the amendment is okay with it

VI. New Business

a. Title IX Letter to Secretary DeVos

Co-President Svendsen: We have sent the email out to all of you and it included a letter which was from students at Georgetown.

The letter is addressed to Devos and they are asking other students to sign the this letter as well The letter has to do with the proposed title IX changed and the letter urges her to reconsider. If Hubert and I sign this it will be as the

Co-Presidents of Student Senate

Allen: will this letter be brought to congress to influence senators?

VanHecke: It would be encouraging her to back away from the changes she approved back in september. And it is only addressed to Devos

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion

Co-President Svendsen: For those who feel they do not know a lot about the changes is it possible for you JoNes to speak for what it means to us.

VanHecke: in 2011 the office of civil rights wrote a letter to colleges and it suggested that higher ed institutions have a responsibility to protect students rights to education by responding to sexual misconduct. In 2014 there was an additional letter that provided further guidance and colleges worked towards implementing this guidance and it is strictly guidance but if an individual feels their access to education has been denied the student can file a complaint and the association can impose changes and fines against the university. In september 2017 the office of civil rights wrote additional guidance and it rolled back things from 2002 2011 and 2014. Much of the 2017 guidance was irrelevant because we are in MN and in 2016 some of the guidance was added to MN laws, so we have to follow the laws of MN. For us the OCR guidance rolled back college's being recommended to use preponderance of evidence and it rolls back the requirement of how long we should take to conduct an investigation, which is misleading because it currently we need to tell people if the investigation will take longer than expected. Something new is that they said

that if both parties are okay with mediation it can be resolved that way.

Co-President Svendsen: Please take all this into consideration because if we sign it will be as student senate co-presidents.

Let's have a great discussion

Wicklund: the 2011 letter had a recommendation that schools not appeal a guilty verdict. Title IX is very important and it has made huge advances in how colleges handle sexual misconduct.

We are about to vote for an entire school so i suggest discussion

Allen: I agree, I think that even if these changes do not affect our policy we have a duty to the schools it will affect

Lang: I am uncomfortable going forward until I get a response from some of the students I represent

Wicklund: People should be discussing this, and I echo sentiments of previous speaker and table this in order to talk to constituents

Schugel: I agree with the first two points, but I have issues with disagreeing with the mediation one. I think we need to talk to our constituents

Young: how soon do they want a response?

Co-President Svendsen: There wasn't a specific date but they want to deliver it in early December. I could send an email to ask for a specific date if need be.

Co-President Svendsen: keep in mind if you do table it there needs to be an effort to talk to your constituents

Allen: Would there be a way to send out a survey over Thanksgiving break to get input, so we could have the results before the beginning of December

Co-President Svendsen: In order to make sure it is an unbiased survey it will need to go through IRB approval and that can take several weeks.

Allen: What do you all think of this? How should we go about reaching our constituents to talk about this

O'Neil: We have a meeting next week right?

Co-President Ngabirano: Yes

O'Neil: It says proposed guidelines, what does this mean

VanHecke: she was leaning toward having guidance codified by law rather than OCR guidance

O'Neil: it is vague and ambiguous at times, it seems to be more about reconsidering things and not proposing actual changes

Edholm: I think discussing with constituents and emailing them would be a great way to hear from constituents. If we want to table it a senator needs to make that motion

Schugel: I move we table this until next week

Second: Asghar

Wicklund: Next week is CinCC so I don't know how many people will come, and I encourage you all to use a content warning if you are emailing them regarding this.

O'Neil: This week's agenda is lighter so i encourage more discussion

Allen: We all need to read about the issue and get in contact with our constituents

Wicklund: We do have time that we could discuss this more this week. Would it be possible to do a straw poll on who might be missing next week. I think we should be having a better discussion than we have been

Young: I don't personally have enough understanding of the issue so I am in favor of tabling.

Allen: I think we need to research on top of this letter because of the vague wording.

Harbeck: Even though it is vague it may be better than having it be so specific. And these changes do affect colleges all across the country and we should show support for them

Co-President Svendsen: I think they wanted it all to fit on one page. It is short and makes a statement. It does just ask her to reconsider moving forward with all of it. It is asking her to think more strongly on the impact it will have on students lives.

Wicklund: if we are going to table we should discuss who should be sending out emails, I personally think it should be hall reps. Also many do not check emails over break. I am not in favor of tabling at this time.

Steinwand: with previous speakers, and the likelihood of many being gone next week, I think there is value in trying to figure this out tonight

Vote: - division: Fails

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion

Allen: I motion to suspend speaking limits for the duration of this conversation

Second: Wicklund

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion on suspending speaking limits

Wicklund: We are a small group tonight and we need to be able to discuss this

Vote: Passes

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion on the original topic

Mir: I don't understand what the changes are specifically

VanHecke: in the document Hubert and Solveig sent to you that has the changes they want to remain constant and the pieces I talked about earlier have to do with Gustavus a little more specifically

Wicklund: the letter is vague because it only asks for reconsideration. I would hope people feel a little more comfortable signing this. It is not a strong political statement

Co-President Svendsen: the discussion has died done and you all voted to not table it for next week so we need to have a great discussion or we could talk about postponing it for two weeks

Edholm: I think the risk of supporting this letter is low, but it is important that as a student governing body we are putting our name on this letter we are in support of this so I am in favor of signing this

Harbeck: Can we make a motion to either table or sign it

Schugel: I move to table for two weeks

Second: Asghar

Asghar: if we move this for two weeks can we send this letter to our constituents

Co-President Svendsen: yes

Allen: If we wait we may not be able to sign it, so I would like more discussion

Wicklund: We do not know about the timeline so we may not get to sign this. The risk is low, and the letter is relatively neutral and we have knowledge many do not feel comfortable reporting. We know many may be disenfranchised by this and it doesn't hurt to encourage someone to reconsider how they are going to affect thousands

Mir: Their plan is to deliver it in earlier december and I feel many colleges may also be struggling like we are so I think we will have time.

Lang: we represent the students and we cannot do that if we don't hear their voice

VanHecke: there is a political stance associated with this letter, so you should look deeper into this because it seems you are missing half of the discussion.

Allen: We are representatives and that can be interpreted in us getting direct feedback from them or them trusting us to vote on their behalf

Keeley: I think it is low risk and it is vague, but I think we need more input from all constituents so i am in favor of tabling.

Senator Pham: I am in favor of tabling, and I would like to discuss this next monday

Schugel: I think this is a situation where we should be getting direct feedback because we are signing this and representing the entire student body

Wicklund: should the cabinet be talking about their support of this

Co-President Svendsen: They are a student voice in this situation and they are encouraged to not dominate the conversation

Wicklund: I encourage cabinet to speak within their purview. The purpose of electing people is that in the case of things getting done quickly

Chair Ha Nguyen: By the Co-Presidents of Student Senate signing this it represents the entirety of Gustavus and that means all students should be notified and their input considered.

Obama required preponderance of evidence but Devos is now giving colleges the option to chose which will make the process harder for victims/ the implications and consequences are what we need to consider. I am not if favor of the majority of Devos's changes because they overall make the process harder. I entertain the motion of tabling this

O'Neil: As someone who likes to read letters closely, there is a lot of fluff in the letter. I think we should take a closer look at the actual letter

Mir: Is it possible for you two to email to get a more specific time frame.

Co-President Svendsen: I will email them and try to get a specific date for the deadline

Chair Ha Nguyen: We feel pressure to show support for other colleges, but we have to consider that that is only half of this letter and the other half is disagreeing with the department of education and what they have proposed

Wicklund: The email has a phone number, so could we propose a recess so we could call them now?

Edholm: You can propose a recess at any time

Wicklund: I move to take a recess

Second: Allen

Co-President Ngabirano: Recess over - back to discussion on the motion to table for two weeks

O'Neil: if we table for two weeks and he gets back to us and that's too late could we talk about this next week?

Edholm: We can rescind the motion (has to be someone who made the motion or someone who voted in favor of it) to tabling to the motion for two weeks and then motion to discuss the letter next week.

Vote to Table for two weeks: Passes

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion on the general topic

Co-President Svendsen: Since you all voted to table for two weeks please go out and talk with constituents and get their

feedback. I believe it is also okay to post on facebook pages like hall pages asking for feedback.

Lang: I request we are on the same page for how to approach our constituents on this topic without being biased.

Senator Pham: I have the same question, and do we have an email format to send out to our constituents.

Co-President Svendsen: you can request if you would like an email formatted. There are also resources on campus you could all seek out

Schugel: I think I am going to do a general outline of how we got the letter a quick unbiased summary and attach the letter at the bottom

Anderson: are class or hall reps sending this out

Wicklund: I caution against facebook groups because comments can get out of hand and hot all have facebook. Again content warning should be in the subject. I recommend that all of us should send out an email and as long as the warning is in the subject they can delete it.

Chair Ha Nguyen: Can we request how many colleges or universities have signed this letter. I want to know the atmosphere of this letter

Allen: I think it is redundant to send the letter twice. I think the hall reps should send it out, and they are easier to access. I move to have all hall reps send out an email by Wednesday

Second: A. Anderson

Wicklund: I am not in favor of this

A. Anderson: I think having overlap is a cause for error.

Schugel: I like this but it should also include the option for them to reach out to their class rep

A.Anderson: i think the argument that they may not get the email until they get back from break is not valid

Lang: It might be more prudent to have class reps send out the email because then it is only four sending it out and they can reference the hall reps at the end. I prefer that.

Asghar: if ethics get charged with formatting a template then two emails is redundant

Wicklund: Let's not base this on ethics writing a template, I am okay with just class reps sending out the email. They are all here and have the information. I am concerned with the email going out over break because people are less likely to check email over break and actually responding.

Schugel: My reservation with class reps is that is four people sending out emails to four hundred people each.

Vote: Passes

Co-President Ngabirano: General discussion on the letter.

Lang: I charge ethics on creating a template for us by Wednesday

Seconded: A.Anderson

O'Neil: I don't think I will be able to get ethics committee together, so I can write a template but I do not think I will be able to get the committee together

Wicklund: I echo the Ombudsperson

Young: I don't think it is feasible to get all of ethics together. I motion to amend the charge to say ethics chair instead of ethics committee.

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion on Amendment

Young: I think this addresses what we want

Allen: O'Neil who do you think is the most qualified to write the template?

O'Neil: I don't know, but if anyone feels strongly they can write it

Co-President Svendsen: It is a template so they you all can change it. But he will be providing you with an unbiased email

Vote on the Amendment: Passes

Co-President Ngabirano: Discussion for ethics chair to write a template by Wednesday

Allen: let's pass this

Wicklund: we need to make sure that members who are not here are notified of this.

Vote: Passes

VII. Announcements

Co-President Svendsen: Yay for discussion. I am happy people are thinking about these things. Please remember it is I move to. Be safe on your travels

Co-President Ngabirano: I apologize the letter is in the office. Thank you to all who came on Friday. I ask cabinet to stay

Wicklund: For those traveling safe travels, make it back alive. CinCC is happening immediately when we get back so get a ticket.

VanHecke: For all not leaving know I am on call and you should behave yourself.

Asghar: I must thank O'Neil for writing this template

