Student Senate Meeting Minutes Gustavus Adolphus College Monday, December 6, 2010

- **I.** Call to Order by President Thayer 7:07
- II. Attendance by Administrative Director, Alison Hoffman
- III. Approval of Minutes from November 29, 2010
 - **a.** Move to vote to approve minutes, none nay, motion passes
- **IV.** Community Comment
- V. Senate Speaker Clark Kampfe
 - a. A number of us, including some of the cabinet, weren't satisfied about how the meeting went last week. Abstaining from votes is fine under some circumstances, but if you are abstaining because you don't know whats going on, that's bad. There is no shame in asking a question, otherwise you aren't doing your job. Don't be afraid to feel embarrassed. We have breaks written into the agenda now to help people stay tuned in. Students really need your vote. I have prepared a worksheet, take a few minutes and fill it out in silence.

VI. Appointments

- **a.** Prairie View Representative none
- **b.** Southwest Representative Claire Sagstuem
 - i. Senior honors history major, double minor, diversity development chair last year, complex representative before that. On speech, co-president of ambassadors, reign ends at end of this semester. Big fan of knocking and not repeating, not using name tag incorrectly. Didn't run this year because Kunkel really wanted to.
 - ii. Questions none
 - iii. Discussion
 - iv. Prince moves to nominate, Gust seconds, motion passes

c. Off Campus Representative

- i. Lora Felix
 - Interested in parliamentary procedure, people have suggested she would be a good representative
- ii. Tom Greiner
 - Senior environmental studies and political science major, had to work with a lot of administrators to get off-campus approval, familiar with the system, love to work in groups

iii. Questions:

- Kampfe: what are some issues on campus you can see yourself working on?
 - **a.** Tom: gusbus issue, living off-campus would like to represent
 - b. Laura: Gusbus
- Gust: How as a sophomore do you live off campus?
 - **a.** Laura: have a house on broadway, would have to take out loans to live off campus because she is paying for her own school
- Sande: are you in any other activities
 - a. Tom: intramural softball, lacrosse
 - **b.** Laura: basketball
- iv. Discussion
- v. Move to vote, secret ballot, invalid vote, move to re-vote
- vi. Prince moves to appoint Lora Felix, Sande seconds

d. Finance Committee Appointment - Blake Gust

- i. Hirdler: Gust is a sophomore senator who is active on the floor, would be an asset to finance committee
- **ii.** Gust: I have a lot of opinions, talk a lot on the floor, would love to serve on the Finance committee
- iii. Questions none
- iv. Kampfe moves to appoint, Fogelberg seconds
- v. Discussion
- vi. Move to vote, passes

e. Ethics Committee Appointment - - Josh Sande

- **i.** Bryz-Gornia: There is a spot open on the ethics committee, Sande emailed interest. Has class with Sande, would be a great fit. Entertains motion.
- ii. Gust: Did you enjoy your time on the ethics committee?
 - Yes, chair wasn't really inclusive though, read all bylaws by self
- iii. Kampfe motions to appoint, Gust seconds
- iv. Discussion
- v. Move to vote, passes

VIII. Finance

a. New Bylaws

- i. Bylaws Section 2, Number 6
 - Amend to say:
 - 6) Funding for food may be provided for events advertised and open to the whole campus.
 - Discussion:
 - a. Last week's suggestion failed
 - **b.** Hirdler: We will deal with food on case by case basis, only requirement is that it is open to all campus
 - c. Nowariak: similar to last week's
 - Gust motions to consider this next week, Sande
 - Move to vote, all yay, motion passes

IX. Old Business

- a. Finance Bylaw
 - i. Section Five: Penalties 1)
 - Amend to add:

1) Any organization that fails to meet any of the requirements outlined in these bylaws may be subject to penalties at the recommendation of the Finance Committee with the approval of the Student Senate.

- Discussion
 - **a.** Gust: "requirements" means you would have to fail more than one, strictly grammatical, should be changed to "any of the requirements" friendly amendment, no dissenting
- Move to vote to adopt, roll call
- ii. Section Five: Penalties 2)
 - Amend to add:

If found by the Finance Committee that an organization misled, purposely presented falsehoods, or mismanaged funds they will immediately be put on probation. The Finance Committee will recommend a length of probation and the full Senate will decide the financial future of the organization.

- Discussion:
 - a. Gust: friendly, "a" should be "an"

- **b.** Hirdler: started out reading old bylaws, this is word for word from an old finance guideline, 1 may not have enough teeth, wondering if we should throw out 2
- **c.** Lundborg: doesn't like how "financial future" sounds, but doesn't know how to say it better
- **d.** Nowariak: first, did we ever decide a definition of probation? "Financial future" probation sounds like if they keep screwing up we shouldn't fund them any more aka ther financial future
- **e.** Gust: we should reword, its SAO's job so all finance committee CAN do is determine a financial future but should reword
- **f.** Tessmer: sounds severe and is vague, likes how it sounds, Senate can interpret it as it will, likes that flexibility, it should sound sever because we shouldn't be lied to when handling other people's money
- g. Lundborg: because probation could mean anything at this point, it means you don't get funded for a set amount of time, Senate decides that set amount of time "full Senate will decide the length of probation..."
- h. Prince: "financial future" could mean anything to me, could talk about it the rest of the year, rest of the decade. Finance committee could decide how they use and spend money for the next ten years, gives so much room for them to operate, doesn't know of a case using the term "financial future" in the past, all for allowing for a greater authority and not tying our hands in the bylaw but this is too vague, new wording could be a little more specific, but cant think of a better wording off top of head
 - i. Tessmer: point of info it's the whole senate, not finance committee
- i. Thayer: this could potentially help a student organization, in past they were allocated money and over spent and since they were in the red they weren't recognized as an organization and could ask for more funds even thought they had a big event coming up
- i. Helt where did this come from?
 - i. Old by law 2000/01, probation not defined there either
- **k.** Helt: we should also say that a group in question should be able to come in front of Senate and argue, more clarify the process
- **I.** Hirdler: I also like the vagueness of "financial future" allows flexibility to decide whether the organization that misled Senate, whether that situation was severe or minor. Number three is all about mis-managing funds and suggests two penalties.
- **m.** Ostendorf: we already control financial futures, we do it everyday, entertain "will decide future funding of"
- **n.** Gust: keeping "financial future" is all encompassing, future Senates can decide what that means to them, we don't need to spell it out in five bylaws. Its good the way it stands.

- **o.** Nowariak: we had to rewrite thee food bylaw because it didn't allow us to do something, this doesn't tie our hands like that
- **p.** Helt: point of clarification, if they have RFP's that haven't gone through yet are we putting a hold on EVERYTHING? It has to be put on hold during this process.
- Sagstuem: motions to add "with an opportunity to present their case before the full Senate and/or the Finance Committee" after "be put on probation", Gust seconds
 - **a.** Lundborg: this fundamentally alters the original amendment, this way probation happens after the finance committee meets or Senate meets or both, I don't like the and/ or at least pick one or the other
 - **b.** Thayer: this is germane, if this is adopted it allows group to come in to talk to finance committee or Senate about why it happened, we can get more information
 - **c.** Nowariak: I don't think the amendment is germane in regards to "financial future", we need to define probation explicitly and not in a bylaw, it isn't be something that could cause a hold or a freeze.
 - **d.** Lundborg: we haven't talked about whether the Finance committee does it or Senate does it, can one overrule the other? We need to pick one, entertains a motion to strike "the finance committee and/or" from amendment
 - **e.** Tessmer: dislikes that, viewing it as a process, meets with Finance committee, recommends a length of probation committee, then full Senate decides.
 - **f.** Prince: so moves Lundborg's amendment to strike "the finance committee and/or", Kampfe seconds
 - i. Prince: would give the necessary time and context, couldn't be called in twice. The finance committee is an arm of the Senate, the Senate is a guard of the money, would feel best about these issues coming before the whole Senate body
 - **ii.** Bryz-Gornia: supports this, financial matters go to Finance committee and eventually to full Senate, it should ultimately be decided by full Senate, should be BOTH or just Senate
 - **iii.** Lundborg: if you do not strike this line it is not like the finance process as previous speaker stated, bad wording, doesn't talk about the recommendation, only the length.
 - iv. Blake: against this, if someone wrongs the entire Senate, it first goes to a committee to hammer out the details and THEN brought to the Senate, may be appropriate to change "and/or" to just "and" but otherwise this is bringing committee work to the Senate, shouldn't take the Finance committee out of the entire process
 - v. Fogelberg: call to question, Gust seconds, passes

- vi. Move to vote on the amendment to the ammendment, all nay, motion fails
- **g.** Nowariak: urge all to vote amendment down, on account of it partially defines probation, which needs to be defined itself, anyone that cares or is interested in defining probation should during the break and we can come up with a new amendment for next week.
- **h.** Move to vote on amendment, all nay, fails
- Nowariak motions to add "finance committee will recommend a length of probation, which must be approved by the full Senate, and the full Senate will decide the financial future of the organization", no second

Discussion Continues

- a. Prince: we are doing committee work right now, this is a bad way to do this, we don't want to rush out a bylaw, would like to see this entire thing voted down and sent back to committee, we can talk about it next semester if need be. We have heard seven different opinions and interpretation, still don't understand what "financial future" means and still don't have a definition of probation. Parliamentary procedure is such a nit picky way to work on a bylaw. Call to question, Gust, division, fails
- **b.** Bryz-Gornia: we don't have to approve this tonight, it is possible to bring it back to the committee, should do this the right way
- **c.** Kampfe: how long as this portion of bylaws been a part of our business? (Three weeks at this point)
- **d.** Kampfe: the bylaw has been considered already, shouldn't be brought back to committees, we are capable of completing this tonight, it would be okay to table it until next week, there's not a whole lot wrong with this, we need to hammer out some of the intimate specifics, won't take a whole lot of time. We shouldn't be such sticklers, ambiguity is useful in some situations. We should define probation, but supports "financial future".
- e. Eric Huemiller SAL on Finance Committee: Sending it back to finance committee wont do a whole lot, even if we could come up with some definition of probation you would spend two weeks talking about whether it's a good definition, you should take a few people and hammer it out during a break. It is important to get these bylaws out before next semester before Finance. Highly encourage you guys to figure it out tonight.
- f. Prince: this is a bad time to use ambiguity, groups wont understand the process how to interact with Senate, neither will we.Hammering out details is really key to bylaws, especially in this case, we need to eliminate ambiguity. The Senate talks about what it wants to talk about, but most of the work is done in committees, Finance committee needs to decide if they even want to present something like this, they ought to have some input in their own process. Encourages to shoot this down and either send it back to committee or just let it die.

- g. Bryz-Gornia: Was a fan of eliminating ambiguity
- **h.** Nowariak: there is an ambiguous phrase in "financial future" but saying you will be on probation is not ambiguous. It is a very clear statement saying that misleading the Senate can lead to Senate denying funding for mismanaged funds or being misled.
- i. Kampfe: Senate could potentially take that group to J-board, there are a number of things we could do, left wide open
- **j.** Nowariak: there is nothing ambiguous about this bylaw, it is very explicit bylaw that simply needs a definition of probation
- **k.** Fogelberg: sick of ping pong discussion,
- Fogelberg moves to extend the meeting until the conclusion of business, Nowariak seconds
 - **a.** Move to vote, motion passes
- Fogelberg motions to suspend the rules to move the break up, Hoppe seconds
 - **a.** Move to vote, motion passes

X. Break 9:02 to 9:18

XI. Old Business

a. Finance

- i. Section Five: Penalties 2) (Continued)
 - Gust moves to amend definition probation: Nowariak seconds:

Probation is defined as a period of time in which an organization must be approved by Finance Committee before spending any of their allocation or receiving any future allocations from Student Senate.

- **a.** Nowariak: I like it, this strengthens it
- **b.** Lundborg: question about document continuity, do we do subsections?
- c. Tessmer: Yes
- **d.** Laura: if we're going with continuity it should be in parentheses
- e. Move to vote, passes

Discussion Continues

a. Kampfe: just to get this out there so everyone is on the same page, those of us who are in favor of leaving "financial future", whereas probation is explicitly defined, financial future is a potentially broad term that allows Senate to pursue a wide range of actions against the organization.

- b. Lundborg: the way that probation is currently written up there, don't see how it is at all separate from "financial future". Confused about what Senate does financially that isn't part of probation, wants to see that probation becomes what we mean by financial future, doesn't sound politically correct. It is unnecessarily ambiguous, when we see probation there is not definite amount of time.
- **c.** Gust: we took a break to hammer this out, which we did, everything is okay with this, call to question, Hoppe seconds
 - i. Move to vote, division, passes
- Vote to adopt, roll call, passes
 - 2) If found by the Finance Committee that an organization misled, purposely presented falsehoods, or mismanaged funds they will immediately be put on probation. The Finance Committee will recommend a length of probation and the full Senate will decide the financial future of the organization.
 - a) Probation is defined as a period of time in which an organization must be approved by Finance Committee before spending any of their allocation or receiving any future allocations from Student Senate.

b. Bylaws

- i. Duties The Technologies Director Shall: 7)
 - Amend to insert
 - 7) Create a back-up of the student senate computers prior to the end of the academic year
 - Move to vote, roll call, passes

XII. New Business

- a. Reorganized bylaws
 - i. Grammar change, doesn't require a vote
- b. Transition Document Kampfe

"Article VI, Section 1, Subsection 5 will not come into effect until the 2011-2012 academic year"

- i. Kampfe motions to adopt, Gust
- ii. Martin: I thought we wanted to adopt it Spring semester
- iii. Move to vote to adopt, none nay, passes

XIII. Announcements

- **a. Ostendorf:** Forum with DLC went well, not many people from DLC came but not a huge surprise, hopefully we answered a lot of their big questions, they will inform the rest of their group that wasn't there things that we said. Maybe use the display case for frequently asked questions?
- b. Lundborg: congratulate Tasha for organizing that
- c. Kampfe: Webinar for Compost committee
 - i. Gust: Warren and Steve are really receptive to composting, our committee just has to hammer out two or three more details and looks like they are going to start something, props to Skjerping. Other schools do amazing things.

d. Alison: Santa Gramse. Gust: Rock for Tots

f. Lundborg: Clark and I rode the gusbus, quality experience

g. West: The Gusbus was cancelled Friday, only day for the trial, make sure to send out an email to your constituents, grab a handful of handouts from the Senate office

h. Redden: save your emails during the trial run or send them to Redden

XIV. Meeting Adjourned 9:49

	Roll Call Votes								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	ı
		Penalties 1)	Penalties 2)	Technologies					
Chang, Angela	International Rep	-	-	-					
Felix, Lora	Off-campus	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Flannery, Jessica	Complex	-	-	-					
Fogelberg, Sara	Sohre Hall	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Gust, Blake	Sophomore Class	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Hagadorn, Casey	First Year Rep	-	-	-					
Hoppe, Sam	Pittman Hall Rep	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Juran, John	Off-campus	-	-	-					
Kampfe, Clark	International Center	-	Υ	Υ					
May, Zoe	Norelius Hall	Υ	Υ	Υ					
McAdams, Stetson	Norelius Hall	-	-	-					
Nelson, Megan	Rundstrom	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Nowariak, Joey	Senior Class Rep	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Prince, Nick	Junior Class Rep	Υ	-	-					
Russell, Emmett	Complex	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Sagstuem, Claire	Southwest Hall	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Sande, Josh	Uhler Hall	Υ	-	-					
Schmitt, Andrew	Arbor View	Υ	Υ	Υ					
Skjerping, Sean Cain	College View	-	-	-					