

Student Senate Meeting Minutes  
Gustavus Adolphus College  
Monday, March 7, 2011

- I. **Call to Order** by President Tessmer 7:00
- II. **Attendance by Administrative Director, Alison Hoffman**
- III. **Approval of Minutes from February 28, 2011**
  - a. Move to vote, none nay, motion passes
- IV. **Community Comment**
  - a. **WAC and MPACT**
    - i. Take Back the Night – wants support for a night with designated speakers, open discussion, walk around ring road with candles
  - b. **Assault Discussion and Resolution**
    - i. Sara Fogelberg moves to address the resolution regarding the recent attempted assaults on campus, Flannery seconds
    - ii. Tessmer: Tessmer and Lundborg drafted a resolution to release to Gustavus student body regarding the assaults: ***SEE APPENDIX A***
      - Barnard: would like to see something in the resolution about the dial-a-ride system for Campus Safety
      - Gust: already passed a resolution last week regarding that
      - Barnard: think it should be mentioned in this one as well
      - Gust: I understand the point behind the word “abhorrant”, not sure if that is the right word choice
      - Fogelberg: Its good were doing this, we don’t need to go through every word and look up synonyms
      - Prince: abhorrant comes from the word to “cause fear”, its perfect
      - Margarite Novack: Asks to have better cameras set up for campus safety
      - MPACT: keep better track of who enters buildings, key cards?
        - a. Tessmer: its part of commission 150, tier 3 (next 9 years)
        - b. Lundborg: someone is already working on it
        - c. Nelson: has a lot of information together, just need to form a proposal to present
    - iii. *Lundborg moves to adopt resolution, McAdams seconds*
      - Discussion
        - a. Lundborg moves to add a new sub-category after URGES: “REQUESTS Campus Safety Escort Service be changed back to a dial-a-ride service.” No second.

- b. Sagstuen: friendly amendment to lowercase “faculty”
- c. Flannery: this should be a resolution to show support, not to put demands on anyone, that should be a second document
- d. Gust: calls to question, Skjerping, motion passes
  - Move to vote on adopting resolution, motion passes

c. **WAC and MPACT - Questions**

- i. Fogelberg: Are you looking for funding for candles
  - Rep: Have candles, not looking for anything but support and volunteers
- ii. Barnard: should maybe talk about it in the resolution
- iii. Prince: location?
  - Rep: Maybe chapel
- iv. Gust: logistics aren’t set for the event, shouldn’t include it in the resolution, may cause confusion.
- v. Rep: perhaps in the resolution should include something urging males to

d. **Assaults Discussion and Resolution (continued)**

- i. Lundborg moves to reconsider resolution, McAdams seconds, passes
- ii. Discussion on Resolution
  - Lundborg: if we add a bullet expressly directed at men, we should add one directed at women
  - Thayer: sexual violence can happen to males and females, we should keep it gender neutral
  - Fogelberg: looking at the situation its only been women targeted and we should support them
  - Gust: support is already expressed, this will get the message across, Senate is doing something, let’s move on
  - Rep: men’s voices are important against the men that are doing this
  - Prince: it is one or two males that have assaulted one or two females, it’s unlikely it will affect males in a directly physical way, the way it affects males is indirect harm, they are now labeled as the aggressors, sexual assault is something that is gendered. Entertains motion to make addition.
- iii. *Fogelberg moves to make addition, Schmitt seconds*

***“ENCOURAGES the men of the Gustavus community to be supportive and respectful of all women, especially during this difficult time.”***

  - Allie Stehlin (Rep): doesn’t like the word “especially”
  - Prince: understand if we want to take it out

- Gust: we are ignoring speakers list, should go back
  - a. Tessmer: I recognized Sara's motion, we are still on topic
  - b. Move to vote Lundborg, Gust seconds, motion fails
- Lundborg: friendly moves to amend to cut everything after "especially", Fogelberg accepts the friendly
- Gust: This to me completely solidifies the stigma that men are attacking women, the last thing we want to do, it says men aren't going to do this on our own without senate telling them, this doesn't need to be men vs women, creating all men as perpetrators and all women as victims, don't need to put that label on every man's back, we need to be supportive of everyone and each other
- Dierdre: Consider the difference between individual experience and institutional. Consider what kinds of things going through men's heads?
  - a. Erik: Be aware of surroundings
  - b. Tessmer: none
- Dierdre: what kinds of things go through women's heads?
  - a. Fogelberg: get out phone, carry keys in between fingers
  - b. West: carry pepper spray and tazor
  - c. Thayer: nothing
- Dierdre: Women do 269 things a day to protect themselves from possibility of attack, women live in constant fear of being attacked, appreciates the notion of "were all in it together" but we're not.
- Lawant: Men harass other guys and are less likely to talk about it, including this statement will further discourage them to talk.
- Fogelberg: last year wrote a paper about political correctness, this is becoming ridiculous, we are talking about two specific instances, not the whole world. We are being rude to each other as well.
- Nowariak: agrees, Dierdre's statements shed new light, maybe the entire Gustavus community should be supportive of women. Women as well need to support each other.
- *Nowariak Moves to amend the amendment, Gust seconds*

***"ENCOURAGES the Gustavus community to be supportive and respectful of all women"***

  - a. Allie Stehlin (rep): Men are the ones who usually commit these acts, its not horrible to say the men need to do something
  - b. Gust: Personally likes this amendment
  - c. Hirdler: Doesn't like this, keep the original language, its important for men to stand behind and support women, women deal with their own security a lot more than men do. This is an area that men can stand together and help. We need to show that we are here to help women thru this and help this community.

- d. Ostendorf: Maybe leave it at community and then add a sentence after about men?
- e. McAdams: worried about this because of the power we are putting on the word 'men'. Reads this as men have more power to be supportive.
- f. Lundborg: likes the motion because encourages women to support other women, places the responsibility on the community, not just men. Reads that without the support of men, women can't do anything. We don't want to say that. Likes the motion.
- g. Tessmer: Not usually the most sensitive to gender issues, defer to people who this affects and who know a lot about this. Being a man, haven't largely been affected by this. Thought about friend's safety but that's the extent of it. In favor of it, most women in this room seem to be for it, and they are the ones that are affected.
- h. Sande moves to call to question, Schmitt seconds
  - i. Motion Passes
- i. Move to vote on amendment to the amendment, motion fails

- Sande moves to call to question on amendment discussion, Flannery seconds, Motion fails
- Gust: The event that will happen on Thursday. Feels there should be awareness that the majority of men are not committing these acts. There is a heightened awareness of gender. This should be a neutral resolution, that can come out on Thursday. We can get in a scary place if all of a sudden all men are viewed as people that can hurt you. These discussions about who is going to help who should be done in a facilitated manner at an event like the one Thurs. This discussion can be better had elsewhere.
- Margarita Novack: Agrees with majority, encouraging the whole community involves more than just students, not just men, but everyone: faculty, etc. We all need to be in this together. Came to this school because sensed a great community here. Women can help themselves, not just rely on men.
- *Lundborg moves to amend the amendment to say "encourages men.. to continue to support" Russell seconds*
  - "ENCOURAGES the men of the Gustavus community to continue to be supportive and respectful of all women"***
  - a. Gust: calls to questions, Sande seconds, passes
  - b. Move to vote, division requested, motion passes
- Move to vote on entire amendment, motion passes

iv. Move to vote on final resolution, motion passes ***SEE APPENDIX B***

**e. Tips on Preventing Sexual Assault – Martin Barnard**

1. *Don't put drugs in people's drinks in order to control their behavior.*
2. *When you see someone walking by themselves, leave them alone!*
3. *If you pull over to help someone with car problems, remember not to assault them!*
4. *NEVER open an unlocked door or window uninvited.*
5. *If you are in an elevator and someone else gets in, DON'T ASSAULT THEM!*
6. *Remember, people go to laundry to do their laundry, do not attempt to molest someone who is alone in a laundry room.*
7. *USE THE BUDDY SYSTEM! If you are not able to stop yourself from assaulting people, ask a friend to stay with you while you are in public.*
8. *Always be honest with people! Don't pretend to be a caring friend in order to gain the trust of someone you want to assault. Consider telling them you plan to assault them. If you don't communicate your intentions, other person may take that as a sign that you don't plan to rape them*
9. *Don't forget: you can't have sex with someone unless they are awake!*
10. *Carry a whistle! If you are worried you might assault someone "on accident" you can hand it to the person you are with, so they can blow it if you do.*

- i. Gust: This is making a mockery of assault
- ii. Barnard: Reads this intentionally, we put the blame on women as a society, men need to step up and take some of the responsibility on the issue, not trying to make a mockery of assault

**V. Appointments**

- a. Prairie View Apartments – none
- b. Residential Off Campus x2 – none
- c. Junior Class Representative – none

**VI. Recess 8:05 – 8:35**

- a. Lundborg moves for recess, Skjerping seconds, motion passes

**VII. Old Business**

**a. Impeachment Proceedings – Martin Barnard**

- i. Barnard – Apologizes for the three hour meeting last week regarding him. When I resigned at the last meeting in January, did have the intent to resign. When found out he was able to get Mondays off of work, he realized he could still be in Senate. Assumed Andrew Schmitt would have been elected tech director so he could just take arbor view rep position. Monday the 21<sup>st</sup>, ran into Eric Kunkel who informed him he had a complaint filed against him for not doing his duties. Went through the constitution and bylaws to make sure he was doing his own duties and also found a possible 19 ethics complaints, but not in a threatening way. If we can't follow governing documents, how do we service students. Wish he could take his word back and say them in a more astute ways. Should have taken action to correct it sooner, we needed time to calm down and process. Sorry that this all played out the way it did.

## ii. Questions

- Nowariak: if you had the intent to resign, why did you not file a written letter/ email to administrative director?
  - a. Barnard: forgot to do it
- Sande: What is your ideal outcome, how do we move forward/ fix things
  - a. Barnard: remain as tech director, and also work through the ethical problems that he has brought forth and either fix them or take them out of governing documents.
- Sande: You feel that you coming back is best thing for Senate?
  - a. Barnard: Sean and Emily are willing to work with me, capable of fulfilling the position
- Sagstuen: How are you going to communicate better w/ Senate as whole?
  - a. Barnard: In the future will say things to the floor, was asked not to by the ombudsperson during the ethics process
- Flannery: Will you be taking back the technologies committee?
  - a. Barnard: Its not in the bylaws, Co-Presidents want it split, one person chairing committee and another doing technical work, really just wants to do the technical work.
- Hagadorn: In your email, you said that you wouldn't have time to train in someone new, do you now?
  - a. Barnard: worked Friday, sat, Sunday so didn't have time to train someone new in before elections. Working on developing a test to screen people out, this job requires technical skills that some people just don't have. Will have time for that.
- West: When you had initial intent to resign, why couldn't you also take off Wednesdays for cabinet meetings?
  - a. Barnard: Was already asked at that point to work Wednesdays. Bylaws don't require it, will send out email updates every week.
- Gust: at what point did you get everything on the website that was supposed to be there?
  - a. Barnard: the 19<sup>th</sup>, before that there were technical difficulties that prevented him from being able to add files to the website.
  - b. Gust: for a substantial person of first semester, very little was added to the website (PR releases, minutes) how long does it take to resolve that? S eems like a very extended amount of time.
  - c. Barnard: It was late December when He wasn't able to put things up any more. Duties in bylaws are vague and took it as his discretion, Redden never contacted him to inquire about the releases being added.

- Gust: Should people be able to hide behind the “I wasn’t told but it was in the constitution” excuse?
  - a. Barnard: Press releases and minutes are not expressly required by the bylaws/ constitution. Has been consistently been updating the workbook and audio.
- Gust: Why was nothing ever brought up to any of us until what I believe the point that your interests fell through.
  - a. Barnard: not pertinent, no answer
  - b. Gust: If you were to be impeached, it would be working against your interests. What are your thoughts?
  - c. Barnard: My goal is not to dismantle senate, but to work on our guiding documents. I’m going to bring them forward either way. If I am outside the body, all I have to work with is ethical complaints. Inside the body, has more options.
- Gust: What should our future actions be when members try to pull a “switcheroo”
  - a. Tessmer: not pertinent
  - b. Barnard: We need to put it in the bylaws that when you resign on the floor, it counts as resignation
- Gust: Do you believe that your character represents Gustavus’ values?
  - a. Barnard: Not pertinent, no answer
- Fogelberg: Question about Martin’s work hours, when you are a new employee you are low on the totem pole and cannot write your own hours, correct Martin?
  - a. Barnard: They needed weeknight availability, I gave them the availability minus Mondays. If I don’t have weeknight availability, won’t be working there long.
- Sande: We don’t have an official code of conduct, but the way that you go about things is important, especially in a leadership role, Gusts question is pertinent
  - a. Barnard: yes, what I was doing is in the best interest of the student body, upholding our governing documents
- Hagadorn: Do the bylaws say you have to attend cabinet meetings
  - a. Barnard: No, only 80% of full senate meetings. Have offered up availability during the day to help people get things done.
- Halvorson: It looks like there was a threat of impeachment and then a lot was done to look like things were getting worked on. How do we know that things will continue to get done?
  - a. Barnard: Because I began on th15th, before all of this started

- Gust: A lot has been said about how Senate has been perceived. I really think that the body has made great strides to portray selves in a positive light. If how we go about things is wrong, it sheds a negative light. How do you seek to change that.
  - a. Barnard: rumors were flying on all sides, not just me. Already proposed a solution -ending in an administrative conference. Co-presidents, Dierdre and I decided to discuss it on the floor first
  - b. Tessmer: Point of info, administrative meeting is sort of the first step before a J-Board hearing, involves paperwork and sanctions

**iii. Discussion – (Barnard leaves the room)**

- Gust: knows there have been discussions going on since last week, can the co-presidents fill us in on what
- Lundborg: Do you think you can still work with this individual?
  - a. Tessmer: yes, moving forward could work with Martin, but told him he should resign because he resigned in January, but he should resign not be impeached
  - b. Thayer: In my position, its whatever Senate decides
- Nowariak: Martin mentioned some solutions, can you elaborate?
  - a. Tessmer: We talked about the ability of whether or not we can work with Martin, that's one solution. Another is the administrative conference, me and Thayer decided not to so that we could clear the air on the Senate floor. Those were the two options
- Nowariak: A lot has been brought up about the constitution. There are flaws in the constitution, it was written by college kids who did a fairly good job ununder the circumstances, but they aren't the founding fathers who wrote the U.S. Constitution. We are trying to follow it so closely and interpretation is a big issue. In the ethics committee, we didn't feel like impeachment was the correct sanction but that's what we were bound to. We have to realize there are flaws in the constitution that need to be interpreted. Noticed last meeting, would like SAE members to claim conflicts of interest and remove themselves from the vote. Has heard things that trouble him. Coming from ethics committee, didn't feel like impeachment was the correct punishments but given the ethics complaints that concern sheer character, impeachment is appropriate. He made a proclamation of impeachment and he forgot to write the letter, and coupling that with character issues, wouldn't feel comfortable serving on this body with an individual who uses governing documents as weapon against him, considers leaving his position.
- *Nowariak motions to impeach Barnard on basis of improper resignation and inappropriate character.*
  - a. Tessmer: Is it ethical to impeach someone on basis of character?
  - b. Nowariak: He had resigned. The reasons he un-resigned were because his master plan didn't work out. His moral character is



something that needs to be addressed. In Roberts Rules there is a provision regarding moral fortitude.

- c. Tessmer: previously impeachment was considered for not performing duties, now impeachment on basis of moral character and ethical complaints may not be ethical.
- d. Prince: reads constitution provision on impeachment
- e. Tessmer: This isn't the same ethical complaint, if it's a new complaint it needs to go back to ethics committee
- f. Nowariak: just supporting the impeachment with his reasoning, not changing the complaint.
- g. Tessmer: there's no reason why the senate floor cannot adjust the recommendation of the ethics committee, using finance recommendations as precedent. Needs a ruling from parliamentarian or ombudsperson.
- h. Hirdler: Thayer should be the standing ombudsperson because she chaired the ethics committee in the event that Bryz-Gornia stepped down due to conflict of interest. We need to decide who our ombudsperson is.
- i. Prince: Bryz-Gornia, did you excuse yourself from ombudsman last meeting?
  - i. No
- j. Prince: Did you excuse yourself from ombudsman from this meeting?
  - i. No, only as chair of the ethics meeting
- k. Tessmer: According to Roberts rules, Bryz-Gornia has to remove himself, he did not, still ombudsperson for meeting.

**VIII. Recess 9:30 - 9:39**

**IX. Old Business**

**a. Impeachment Proceedings (Continued)**

- i. Tessmer: We are going to go by the charges that ethics committee brought forward, we will make a total resolution on the floor, that resolution can include new things.
- ii. Sande: In Barnard's frat, wants to make sure no one objects to Sande talking about Barnard and the ethics decisions. No objection.
- iii. Discussion on First Charge: Failure to update the website
  - Halvorson: This is one of the major central jobs of the tech director. The podcast server according to Martin was a little iffy, trust him on that but there were other things that also were not updated. Wasn't updated to what looked like to the best of his ability.

- Gust: Position has changed from last week. As soon as it was found out that he wasn't doing these things, he did it. If he truly felt that it wasn't in his duties to put up the minutes and press releases, why would he have done it all of a sudden. That's what led me to believe he is aware of what the tech director is supposed to be doing, what he's supposed to be doing, not what he is mandated to do. I do believe he has failed to perform this duty.
- Schmitt: He did in fact update the website. The things that were missing were things he didn't have. I saw him do it before complaints were brought. The blog isn't in his duties, neither is twitter or press releases. The documents that weren't on there were not his fault. Computer problems had to be fixed with previous tech director. Isn't guilty of anything, did them before he knew he would be coming back to claim his position.
- Gust: There was a big blanket of info put up in the course of a few days that should have been up throughout the course of the semester. All the things he apparently needed to do, he did. Doing everything in a two day span is not fulfilling his duties, not continuous fulfillment of role.
- Lundborg motions to extend meeting until end of business, Gust seconds.
  - a. Move to vote, passes
- Lundborg: As a previous member of cabinet, remembers Barnard saying through most cabinet meetings that the podcast system doesn't work. Redden has said that Barnard has been difficult to work with, doesn't answer emails, but Barnard has also said not to email things only once because they get lost in his millions of emails.
- Schmitt: The "dump" didn't occur because he was going to get impeached, it was because there was no one in the position and elections were coming up. He does get lot of emails. He did his job, has done job.
- Nowariak: Vague language of "maintain the website", posts weren't there, constitutes failure to maintain the website. Constitution is probably intended to be vague. Even though its not explicitly stated, the blanket term of "maintain the website" was not fulfilled.
- Halvorson: read the dates of the blog posts, he went from sept 16 to december 2, to February 2. There is not a gradient of failure, cannot call this having done it.
- Move to vote on whether Barnard is guilty of failure to maintain website
  - a. Secret ballot requested.
  - b. Guilty, 9-4, one abstention
  - c. Barnard voted Guilty of Failure to Maintain Website

**iv. Discussion on Second Charge: Actively monitoring the Conduct of Senate**

- Lundborg: The instance this was based on is the resignation issue. This should be a clear "not-guilty", he brought it up to the ombudsperson at the first instance he was able. He made it clear he didn't know in advance where that was coming from.

- Flannery: Is this specific to his position or is every cabinet member supposed to do this?
    - a. Tessmer: Every cabinet member
    - b. Flannery: We have failed in this particular instance, it wasn't just him. Any cabinet member or senator could now be impeached regarding this.
  - Thayer: Looking at solely Martin, ethics committee ruled that actively monitoring is when there are allowances of actively breaking rules. There are things that are accidentally done, but its when things are intentionally done. When Sean and I were holding interviews is when he should have stepped forward. We tried to appoint an individual during the meeting his resignation was stated, Barnard stated interviews should be held. Took it as permission to move forward with interviews and that resignation was final.
  - Lundborg: In this circumstance, its whether you believe Martin or you don't believe Martin. He says he didn't discover the part of the constitution that allowed him to unresign until after he resigned before senate. It basically comes down to whether you believe he was lying about that. Doesn't personally believe he was lying.
  - Halvorson: Basically we said we don't know from someone elses perspective to what extent they are seeing or looking for things, it's out of our ability to know this. Its not in our power to say someone wasn't properly looking for infractions.
  - Move to vote
    - a. Secret Ballot requested
    - b. Not Guilty 12-1, one abstention
    - c. Barnard voted Not Guilty of Failure to Actively Monitor Senate
- v. *Nowariak move to amend charges to make addition:*
- Barnard is charged with displaying ethical and moral character not in line with the standards of student senate (Robert Rules, Chapter 20, section 61)*
- Schmitt: This is a personal attack on Martin, these are charges that Barnard does't know about. No one is perfect. We should be addressing the concerns that the ethics committee presented. He wasn't actually going to try to take down senate. He handled things wrong because he was told his position could be taken away. He wants this position, he's the only one who can do it.
  - Ostendorf: Doesn't even know if this actual complaint is ethical. We shouldn't try to determine whether a person is an ethical person or we will all have to be subjected to that. This has nothing to do with his ability to do his job.

- Lundborg: We are basing this on a code of conduct that we don't have written anywhere. The only screening process for people who run for senate is to be in good academic standing with dean of students. No minds are going to be swayed, everyone has already made up their mind
    - a. Calls to question, Skjerping seconds.
    - b. Motion fails
- Sagstuen: Everyone's feeling were hurt hearing that Martin sent a list of threats. Everyone has acted childish. Although he did hurt feelings, he did acknowledge it and has given personal apologies and is trying to make up for the things that he did poorly. Its difficult to put this on Martin when everyone acted in a poor manner talking badly about one another. Not everyone is perfect. Maturity should have been at a higher level overall.
- Gust: Conflicted on letting individual moral code coming into this, everyone has a personal code that they follow about what is right and wrong. We need to look at how he acted towards Senate, the institution he is a member of. Threats were made against this body and against individual members of the organization that serve this body. As far as Senate is concerned, there has been moral violations. Outside senate hasn't spoken with Martin, and interactions with Barnard outside of Senate aren't relevant. If we can truly say that outside of this body, moral violation wasn't committed, would agree with that. I have personally felt that my role on Senate is threatened. If anyone feels that their position is in jeopardy because of the decision they are making, that should be a sign in itself. The threat has been made, its there, we are all feeling it. On those grounds, we should vote guilty on this charge.
- Hagadorn: The fact that Barnard came in and addressed everyone and sent the email shows he does care about this, but feels his emails maybe him making excuses for himself, but he did address it even if he didn't own up to everything, speaks to his moral character.
- Lawant: I didn't hear the threats, who did he say them to?
  - a. Ostendorf: they were made in private conversation
- Nowariak: This is based on demonstrated past actions, although they were in private conversations, they were conversations with people in this group. Roberts rules states that a body can enforce its own moral rules, wouldn't be out of line for the body to rule Barnard out of line
  - a. Calls to question, Lundborg seconds
  - b. Motion passes
- Move to vote to add charge,
  - a. Division requested
  - b. 4 yes, 9 no, 1 abstention
  - c. Motion Fails

**vi. Discussion on Penalties**

- *Lundborg moves to amend the motion to impeach to a motion to issue a formal reprimand in a form the co-presidents choose, Schmitt seconds.*
  - a. Bryz-Gornia: although I am comfortable with seasoned co-presidents leading this decision, would be much more comfortable with the entire senate making the decision.
  - b. Nowariak: This is ridiculous to just give him a slap on the wrist. We have found him officially guilty that the constitution says is impeachable. When the complaints came to light, impeachment wasn't the correct statement but the ethics committee didn't think a slap on the wrist is appropriate either. Suggests taking away a stipend.
    - i. Tessmer: Don't know if its legal no matter what
    - ii. Lundborg: its in the constitution
  - c. Gust: We all sit here for four hours every week for frère and serve on committees. If taking away a stipend isn't possible, he should be asked to step down because that's the respectful thing to do. We are all conflicted, that's why its taking so long to discuss this. If you are fifty/fifty consider that we have candidates willing to stepp in and take on this role. Just because it was a private conversation, it still got to senate. Consider the values of Gustavus committee, what he did was detrimental to this community. Someone else has expressed interest in this position to make a positive influence. Its impeachment or nothing, we should hold ourselves to a standard where we value eachother.
  - d. Sande: We are talking about wanting follow the constitution, we cant pick and choose what parts to follow, its happening on both sides. Everything has to be done by the constitution, can't go against it to withhold a stipend. All we have to go on is the charges for which we have evidence.
  - e. Halvorson: We have basically ruled out a slap on the wrist...
  - f. Lundborg: This isn't related to the amendment at hand
    - i. Fogelberg: I think it is
    - ii. Nowariak: You aren't the ombudsperson
    - iii. Fogelberg: Alison, I resign from Senate, you will be receiving my email
  - g. Halvorson: the only way we can move forward is if there are legitimate other options, the only thing we are left with is a slap on the wrist
    - i. Lundborg: apologizes for cutting Halvorson off
  - h. Tessmer: does Roberts rules allow for fining?
    - i. Yes but not authorized in the bylaws

- i. Schmitt: it is martin's first offense, the co-presidents have a grasp on whats going on, they can come up with something, we are going in circles, people are out for blood to impeach Martin
- j. Gust: We are running around in circles, emotions are too high, the co-presidents were elected by student body, would respect and applaud any decision they make. Hopes everyone supports this.
  - i. Calls to question, Schmitt seconds
  - ii. Passes
- k. Move to vote to charge co-presidents, one nay, motion passes
  - Lundborg calls to question on impeachment proceedings, Skjerping seconds, passes
  - Move to vote on proceedings decisions as whole, one nay, passes
- vii. Barnard Returns to the Room
- viii. Tessmer: Senate has ruled you guilty of failure to maintain the website and not guilty of failure to actively monitor Student Senate. Senate has charged you with a penalty left to the discretion of the co-presidents
  - Barnard: We have no standing laws, can't enforce due to Robert's Rules
  - Tessmer: Roberts rules states we can give a formal reprimand Ch 20 section 61
  - Gust: Calls for quorum

## **X. Announcements**

### **a. Election Results**

- i. Bryz-Gornia: Nick Prince and Jen Fox elected Co-President Elects

### **b. Africa Night – Andrew Schmitt**

- i. Event over \$2000 in funding, Andrew Schmidt delegated senator to attend
- ii. Awesome event, very organized, ran smoothly, could have used more pamphlets

## **XI. Meeting Adjourned 11:10**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Proposed Senate Resolution**

---

Submitted to: The Gustavus Community  
Subject: Regarding the Assaults of March 5 and 6

GUSTAVUS STUDENT SENATE,

CONSIDERING the abhorrent acts of violence that have taken place on this campus over the weekend of March 5 & 6;

ACKNOWLEDGING the on-going nature of the investigation;

EXPRESSES COMPASSION to the survivors;

COMMENDS the members of the Gustavus Community at large for their outpouring of support and concern regarding these acts of violence; and

SUPPORTS: The Dean of Students Office, Sexual Assault Response Team, Campus Safety, Counseling Center, Saint Peter Police Department, and student organizations in their efforts to help the Gustavus Community cope with these heinous actions;

CALLS UPON the student body to heed the advice of the Dean of Students Office and Campus Safety in regards to safety precautions;

URGES, Faculty, students, and staff to assist in the on-going investigation however they are able;

PLEDGES to work with interested members of the Gustavus Community to prevent future acts of sexual violence.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Final Senate Resolution Passed**

---

Submitted to: The Gustavus Community  
Subject: Regarding the Assaults of March 5 and 6

GUSTAVUS STUDENT SENATE,

CONSIDERING the abhorrent acts of violence that have taken place on this campus over the weekend of March 5 & 6;

ACKNOWLEDGING the on-going nature of the investigation;

EXPRESSES COMPASSION to the survivors;

COMMENDS the members of the Gustavus Community at large for their outpouring of support and concern regarding these acts of violence; and

SUPPORTS: the Dean of Students Office, Sexual Assault Response Team, Campus Safety, Counseling Center, Saint Peter Police Department, and student organizations in their efforts to help the Gustavus Community cope with these heinous actions;

CALLS UPON the student body to heed the advice of the Dean of Students Office and Campus Safety in regards to safety precautions;

URGES faculty, students, and staff to assist in the on-going investigation however they are able;

ENCOURAGES the men of the Gustavus Community to continue to be supportive and respectful of all women;

PLEDGES to work with interested members of the Gustavus Community to prevent future acts of sexual violence.