

Student Senate Meeting Minutes  
Gustavus Adolphus College  
Monday, February 28, 2011

- I. **Call to Order** by President Thayer 7:06PM
- II. **Attendance by Administrative Director, Alison Hoffman**
- III. **Approval of Minutes from February 21, 2011**
  - a. Move to vote to approve minutes, none nay, motion passes
- IV. **Community Comment**
  - a. none
- V. **Appointments**
  - a. Prairie View Apartments – none
  - b. Off Campus - none
- VI. **Finance**
  - a. **Student Senate**
    - Finance Committee recommended what they asked for (\$1544) plus \$100 (\$1644), Tessmer wrote report wrong, Nowariak caught the mistake and increased
    - Discussion
      - Lundborg: Good work ORC committee, thinks we should adopt can we put a caveat for plaques saying “paid for by student senate
      - Tessmer: We will when we gift it, they will probably pay for it. There is precedent, few years ago funded hand dryers and didn’t get plaques
    - Vote to approve, none nay, passes
  - b. **Society of Physics Students**
    - SPS Representative: requesting funding for transportation and lodging in Dallas to the American Physical Society, organization for physicists, 7700 research papers will be presented, hope to make contacts that they can bring back to Gustavus. Many people have committed, price is still an issue. Trip for seven students and one advisors. Sent a group partly funded by senate about 10 yrs ago.
    - Requested \$2,672, Finance Committee recommended zero
    - Questions:
      - Lundborg: \$450 registration fee for advisor, free for undergraduates
      - Helt: What is past precedent, do we fund advisors?

- a. Tessmer: No
- Helt: Can you use previously allocated money to the org for this trip
  - a. Rep: Possibly
- Helt: Are you presenting research too?
  - a. Rep: No
- Helt: Have you gone to the provost office?
  - a. Rep: No
- Lundborg: previously funded a similar IGS conference and we funded their travel
- Kunz: their midyear travel was 1,080 for lodging, busing 825
- Move to vote to allocate \$0, motion failed
- Prince moves to allocate \$2,336 to throw out a number, Lundborg seconds
  - Helt: we haven't funded faculty before, we are supposed to be funding students, they have already exceeded their travel expenses
  - Hirdler: doesn't like allocating in full just to get the ball rolling, we have a guest here, treat him with respect
  - Tessmer: doesn't like the precedent of sending departments on trips like this because other departments will see that and want to go on similar trips too. The group didn't go to provost office first, hesitant to allocate money before they do that.
  - Lawant: does every department have a budget for that?
  - Tessmer: yes, but provost office has a fund for this type of activity
  - Helt: have you asked your department for money?
  - Rep: that was our next step, there is no instructions out there saying he should have gone to provosts office, thought senate was a good place to start.
  - Prince: A lot of groups can fall under different categories, we cant just say they need to go to departments/ provost office before we even consider giving them money. We have paid for a lot of students to go to conferences. But they are already allocated to their maximum. Would like to see more discussion on this.
  - Gust: Agrees with previous speaker. The bylaws for transportation allocation is \$600, they have already had that allocated. If we surpass that for this group it may invalidate our bylaws, which is another discussion that will need to happen. We need to have a clear set of guidelines that we follow. Vote this down.
  - Nowariak: agrees, vote this down
  - McAdams: agrees we shouldn't fund because they have already reached maximum transportation allocation. Asks Lundborg if the Eppies went to provost office for funding for their event fund. Because there is physics in the name of the group doesn't mean we should ignore the budget. That

being said, because they have gone over \$600, we definitely should allocate the full amount.

- West: Apples and oranges are being compared. The application for provost office is called “Application for Student Conference Travel Funds”
  - Lundborg: Of the 7 going, are any not physics majors
  - Rep: five upper classmen that have committed on basis of getting funding. The people going are very involved in physics department, haven’t advertised at all to under classmen, plan on finding two more people.
  - *Lundborg: Moves to amend to \$2,044 because don’t want to fund advisor, Flannery seconds*
    - a. McAdams: Still believes this is too much, we have already allocated \$600 to the group for travel. Maybe we can fund the hotel, but questions the airline tickets.
    - b. Gust: We’re still over the limit. Call to question on the amendment. Vote this down and vote the motion down.  
McAdams seconds
      - i. None nay, passes
    - c. Move to vote on amendment, motion fails
  - Move to vote on motion, all nay, motion fails
  - Gust Calls to question on budget, Prince seconds
    - Move to vote, passes
  - Move to vote on budget as a whole, allocating \$0, motion passes
- c. **Contingency Fund Update: \$45,121.47**

## VII. Ethics Committee Recommendation – Impeachment Proceedings of Martin Barnard

- a. Thayer: Complaint against Martin Barnard, Ethics Committee met. Roberts Rules states that after hearing the committees decision they will recommend to Senate the procedure. As for the absence of the individual, Roberts rules states hearing should proceed in his absence at his appointed time.
- b. *Lundborg moves to table the issue, Prince seconds*
  - Lundborg: He should be here, its ridiculous and unfair to do this without him here. Calls to question, no second.
  - Gust: If we choose not to table and we discuss it and then at some point during discussion we deem it appropriate to table, can we table at that point?
    - Thayer: Yes, if there is a question on the table
  - Gust: Tabling before discussion isn’t productive at all.

- Flannery: Martin was informed that today was his impeachment proceeding prior to today. It was his own decision to not be present to defend himself. We have a duty to continue with business.
- Ostendorf: Point of information, he payed \$130 on these tickets three months ago prior to this incident, life goes on outside of this room. Life doesn't need to revolve around Senate.
- Lawant: At a courthouse if you aren't there, trial goes on. But everyone there should know what is going on. Personally doesn't know whats going on, wants to know both sides.
- Hoppe: Most of us want to do this tonight,
  - Calls to question, Skjerping seconds
  - Motion fails
- Prince: It's a common courtesy to allow the person to defend themselves. There is a lot that has gone on in the past week. Because everything is so heated, understands why we want to get this over with, but he has had this conflict.
- McAdams: this is not a court. Sees no harm in letting him state his side. Cautions senators to please act based on the constitution not personal feeling towards the individual.
- Thayer: there is reasoning behind discussion being held tonight, Roberts rules states the hearing should be held, we are trying to follow our governing rules and set precedent. Senate still can vote to over-rule, not out to get anyone.
- Nowariak: It was said that one of tech directors main duties is the election, but nowhere in the duties does it state that. Talked to Barnard last night and he said he wouldn't be here tonight due to a concert, but he had the choice to come here or to go there with full knowledge that his proceedings were on the agenda tonight. He should be held to a higher standard, attendance wise, he needs to be a leader as a member of the executive board of this body. We didn't choose to put it on the agenda tonight because he wasn't going to be here, we did it for constitutional reasons. Would personally
- Lundborg: Writ of habeus corpus, it is ridiculous to deprive him of his right
  - Calls to question, McAdams seconds
  - Roll call vote – **SEE APPENDIX A, Vote #1**
  - Requires 2/3, motion fails
- Hagadorn: lets not assume that everyone knows whats going on. This is not about getting Martin back.
- Gust: Lets not assume that if we don't table this, the impeachment proceeding is going to run smoothly. It is within our rules to hold these proceedings. By being a member he agrees to the rules of the body. We all give up a million other things we could have done to be here tonight, it doesn't matter why, he isn't here on a very important night. His absence is not reason to suspend everyone else's lives.
- Lundborg: if we choose not to table but decide to table in the middle of proceedings, Barnard can have access to tonight's minutes.

- Lawant: Regardless of the reason why he isn't here, he could have contacted the senators with his side of the story.
  - Thayer: he submitted a statement to be read in the proceedings
- Bryz-Gornia: Its been previously stated that this concert is something that happens once every five years, compare that to a championship tennis match, a final exam, etc. Its something you don't want to miss. Cites US Constitution. He has a choice to go to the concert or not- are we giving him liberty and due process?
- Helt: I'm worried we're becoming too much of a political organization. We all have to make choices, wont be here next week to take little partner to timberwolves game. There a lot of other things we need to worry about. We funded grills tonight, we had an open house yesterday, those are the reasons we are here, not to police ourselves.
- Nelson: a previously impeached senator this year was here for her impeachment and we still proceeded.
- Lundborg: the tech director is an important position on the body, the discussion is mundane and we are talking in circles, Skjerping seconds
  - Call to question, Skjerping seconds
  - Roll call vote – **SEE APPENDIX A, VOTE #2**
  - Requires 2/3, motion passes
- Move to vote to table until next meeting
  - Roll Call Vote – **SEE APPENDIX A, VOTE #3**
  - Requires majority, motion fails

*c. Gust moves to recess ten minute, Skjerping seconds, motion passes*

#### **VIII. Ten Minute Recess 8:37 – 8:49**

- a. Lundborg, moves to extend meeting to end of business, Sande seconds
  - Move to vote, motion passes

#### **IX. Impeachment Proceedings**

- a. Bryz-Gornia: is not chairing Ethics Proceedings due to conflict of interest and had no part in the proceedings that took place this week – Thayer serving as ethics chair, Tessmer will be chairing the meeting.
- b. Thayer: This information should not leave this room or be shared with outsiders. Barnard will also have access to the minutes. Make decisions based on the facts presented during this meeting, not on things that you have previously heard outside of the hearings.
  - Complaints were filed last Sunday by a student at large. The Ethics Committee meet that Thursday to address these raised issues. Due to a conflict of interest, Erik stepped down as chair of the meeting. I filled this position. Improper attendance, inability to fulfill duties as technical director

- I would just like to say that no one is seeking out to impeach Martin. A complaint was filed, the committee looked into it, and found issues that should be brought before the full senate.
- The committee felt that the Constitution only allowed us to either dismiss the case or recommend impeachment. We decided to recommend impeachment because a legitimate concern existed. We ask that the senate hear all points of the case and then decide how to move forward.
- The committee examined the case from the following standpoint: Only activity prior to the complaint being filed would be examined and play into the decision.

**c. Formal Complaint:**

*“Martin Barnard for improper attendance and inability to fulfill his duties as tech director. If he is trying to claim that his resignation, one that is recorded in the Student Senate minutes, is not legitimate then he is in ethical violation of the constitution and should be duly impeached.”*

**d. Ethics Committee examination of Complaints:**

- Improper attendance: no do not have proper records to adequately examine this, voted to discharge.
- Improper resignation: While the committee felt that he did officially resign in the meeting, he did not send a letter or email to the Administrative Director about this. We voted to dismiss this on the grounds that he did not violate our governing documents.
- Inability to fulfill his duties as technical director: The committee examined the items under Tech Director in the by-laws. (We did make a mistake here however and did not look at other duties that are located in other areas of our governing documents, so if the senate finds other duties that are listed and feel they were not fulfilled, these must come from the floor). Upon discussing and voting each item here is the outcome and reasoning for each. Technologies Director Shall:
  - Maintain gacspot.com and Senate website
    - No, the committee felt that the site had not been updated in a fashion that previously matched previous outline for site;
    - Blog was lacking... committee felt that Kate had written up Press Releases and Martin should've been posting on main page like previous Tech Director, had not posted on site for election instead Kevin did
    - When asked Martin had failed to update site; at time of hearing still had old governing documents on the site; still has not changed John for site as of today and had not changed members when asked, Finance had not been updated when asked, Student Affairs section lacked information on the Gus Bus trial with results, did not list other things they had been doing,
    - Podcasts had not been updated (at time of trial all January ones were missing, recent ones added after Martin knew of complaint)

\*\*\* Martin did say system had issues at times and was not always able to post right after meetings

- The twitter account did not have postings for awhile. There were many things going on in Senate that could have been put up
- o Ensure technology in meeting room was ready
  - Not enough votes (tie vote and didn't have tie breaker)
  - dismissed, cant judge properly
- o Record audio of all full Senate meetings and make those recordings available on the internet
  - dismissed; had recorded and not enough votes (tie)
- o Be sure that the Senate computer hardware and software are being maintained
  - dismissed because unsure if it was
- o Work with the Controller to update allocation information weekly online
  - Dismissed, didn't know, didn't have info from controller
- o Actively monitor the conduct of the Senate and report any possible infractions of duty concerning this Constitution or its by-laws to the Ombudsperson.
  - No; As a committee it was decided that certain definition "May be looking, but may not be seeing", we cannot judge the efforts of people in that sense unless there is evidence that someone is blatantly letting things "slip through the cracks"; In this instance, the committee felt that Martin had purposely used this to his advantage to maintain his position since he did resign but did not send in a letter, then in our meeting as evidence said he never intended to resign and waited to submit a letter if he did need to resign cuz of his job.

e. Questions about recording

- Bryz-Gornia: expressed concerns about not recording the proceedings, citing constitution
- Thayer: not in the best interest to record this to preserve the individual's reputation unless Senate votes otherwise
- Prince: Understands desire to protect individual feelings, last time we disobeyed the constitution we rewrote the constitution. It says the bylaws supercede Roberts rules, so we should be recording.
- Lundborg: We probably should record this.
- Gust: We are stewards of the student body, they should know about our mistakes
- Hirdler: Ombudsperson said we need to record it, we need to be record it.
- Recording turned on, Thayer reviews Charges for the recording

f. Discussion:

- Skjerping: asks Emily to re-read Roberts rules about reprimands/ expulsions
- Lundborg: Is this his first offense? First time he has been informed? It seems wrong to impeach somebody for something if they weren't aware that they weren't fulfilling their duties.
- Hoffman, Redden, and West have sent him reminders to update website
- Lundborg: did anyone tell him that if he didn't get his act together he will get impeached
- Tessmer: no, but doesn't like to threaten people to get things done.
- Lunborg: doesn't feel like impeachment is the first conclusion to jump to, in favor of some other form of reprimand
- Gust: agrees with previous speaker, because of this situation we need to make sure we require written notification of resignations. Also doesn't believe that impeachment should be the first sanction.
- Gust: he has made effort since the complaint has been made. motions to repeal stipend if any more than two of the aforementioned duties are not fulfilled before end of semester.
- Bryz-Gornia: treading a thin line with the constitution, it requires a stipend
- Kunz: has been meeting weekly with Martin as duties states, she was gone for a week so it may not have worked then but it has worked since then.

g. Email from Kevin Seitz, former Technologies Director - ***SEE APPENDIX B***

- Bryz-Gornia reads email sent to co-presidents and himself from last year's Technology director.
  - Many of the situations are beyond Barnard's control
  - He is not ignoring his job
  - Broken links happen
  - Meeting audio has always been sticky, there is no good solution due to file size
  - Blog updates are responsibility of PR chair
  - He's doing his job, keep him around

h. Barnard's Explanation of Events – ***SEE APPENDIX C***

- Bryz-Gornia: Reads email from Barnard to himself after complaint was file before Ethics committee met.
- Nowariak: comments from former tech director were insightful. However, ethics committee felt like he had not fulfilled his duties, maybe hold him to higher standards than should be expected. Readdress resignation?



- Point of info Hoffman: Martin's was the only resignation this year not formally filed with me, so no precedence
- Nowariak: the two members who resigned on the floor did so by saying resignation on the floor. Barnard had used a loophole that he failed to see in others, saw others apparently using loophole but did not address it until he found it beneficial to him.

i. Recording of the January 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting – Barnard's Resignation

- Thayer: I suggested we motion to go back to new business to appoint Barnard's suggestion for his successor, but Barnard stated that it was Tessmer and my job to appoint one and hold interviews.
- Helt: when did you start interviews?
- Tessmer: right after touring break sent email, waited one week, got two responses

j. Discussion

- Nowariak: Multiple people had taken his floor resignation seriously, especially because he had made a recommendation for who to succeed.
- Sande: There's nothing we can do
- Fogelberg: as someone referenced earlier, you do not mess with the constitution, he did not resign along the rules that are stated in the constitution no matter what was said because no letter was sent to administrative director. Think about what previous tech director says, a lot of the problems can't be helped. Also thinks that we need to think about how to proceed without impeachment.
- Hoppe: Doesn't feel like he deserves impeachment, but deserves some sort of sanction. Until this point we had to threaten impeachment to get him to do what we want him to do. We need to stop circling, table it for next week.
- Hagadorn: he know that he wasn't doing his job and that if you don't do your job you can get impeached
- Thayer: As ethics chair wanted it to be resolved effectively. Did not think impeachment was appropriate for Barnard, but after hearing the impeachment situation Barnard proceeded to take on behavior that was not appropriate for a member of the body, got very protective of the senators and we need to stick together. Considers his behavior was a serious offense which is punishable under robert's rules. Previously didn't think Barnard should be impeached on previous charges, but after his behaviors now thinks that its absolutely something to consider because he is a threat to our organization. Threatened to try to impeach every senator on the floor if he should be impeached, brought up 19 complaints to the ethics committee that could be formally filed, and that if the hearing were held today the co-president election results could be held null and void.
  - Tessmer: got emails from a concerned student saying that Martin's complaints were in fact threats
- Prince: Bylaws supercede Roberts rules. This is the third time we have considered violating our constitution. Think of J-board things that could come of

intentionally breaking our constitution. Think that the former tech director's statements are compelling, he was considered a wonderful tech director and understands that Barnard is doing the same level of work as him. Barnard's grumbly attitude may be affecting people opinions right now. We really should have Barnard here. The constitution spells out very clearly the rules of resignation. We cannot impeach him for making us follow our own constitution.

- Helt: This is all interesting. We are now coming to try to question everything we do, not sure if we are even getting anything done right now. Intent is one of the most important things of a message. In the recording you hear intent, you hear intent by choosing a successor. There were a lot of cabinet members upset about the issue and the idea that Barnard intends to take down the entire organization with him. Point of info, Barnard only made the website corrections when he was in fear of getting in trouble.
- Sande: Doesn't think should make decision tonight, people need a wk to process
- *Sande moves to table, Prince seconds*
  - Discussion
    - a. West: whichever way you vote, please use your discretion between fact and fiction, rumor and truth, leaving the room know that things that were said officially in this room on the record are the things you need to consider
    - b. Sande: make sure that you understand all the facts of the case
    - c. Thayer: lets all be respectful of one another and not attack anyone for what was said during this meeting.
  - Move to vote
    - d. Roll call vote – **SEE APPENDIX A, VOTE #4**
    - e. Requires majority, passes 10-3

## X. Old Business

- a. Housing Open House
  - Helt: Yesterday was a success, going to send around thank you cards for the non-senators who opened up their dorms. Got a lot of positive feedback, had up to 50 people come to some dorms. Appreciates hard work.
- b. Transportation Committee - Gust
  - Gust: It was asked of transportation committee to draft a resolution last week regarding Campus Safety's Escort System – **SEE APPENDIX D**
  - Moves to adopt resolution, Skjerping seconds
    - West: Has anyone talked with campus safety?
      - Gust: contacted them three times through email and phone convos, will continue that conversation this week. Discussed last week that they would draft a resolution with intention to work with them on the issue and make sure that their needs are met as well as ours.

- West: Do we know that it was made without any student input? Don't want to be accusatory
  - Russell: Works for them seems like they just went with it without student input.
- Prince: Has seen how resolutions can go badly, lets make sure they didn't talk to students/ dispatchers/ anyone else before we pass this.
- Ostendorf: can we remove "made without student input"?
- Gust: motions to change to "that many senators have received negative feedback concerning the recent change to Campus Safety's Escort System and"
  - Helt: friendly amendment period at the end
  - Move to adopt resolution, passes

**XI. New Business**

**a. None**

**XII. Announcements**

- a.** Thayer: Created two new websites for transparency and communication of cabinet and senate members
- b.** Hoffman: Lawant is looking for Open Committees
- c.** Redden: Senate photo, wear normal clothing

**XIII. Adjourn 10:45 PM**

# APPENDIX A

## Roll Call Votes

<b>Roll Call Votes 02-28-2011</b>					
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>
		Call to Question	Call to Question	Motion to Table	Motion to Table
<b>Felix, Lora</b>	<i>Off Campus</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>Flannery, Jessica</b>	<i>Complex</i>	Y	Y	N	Y
<b>Fogelberg, Sara</b>	<i>Sohre Hall</i>	-	Y	Y	Y
<b>Gust, Blake</b>	<i>Sophomore Class</i>	N	Y	N	N
<b>Hagadorn, Casey</b>	<i>First Year Rep</i>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Hoppe, Sam</b>	<i>Pittman Hall</i>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Lawant, Julia</b>	<i>International Rep</i>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Lundborg, Jacob</b>	<i>International Center</i>	Y	Y	Y	N
<b>May, Zoe</b>	<i>Norelius Hall</i>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>McAdams, Stetson</b>	<i>Norelius Hall</i>	Y	-	-	-
<b>Nelson, Megan</b>	<i>Rundstrom</i>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Nowariak, Joey</b>	<i>Senior Class Rep</i>	N	Y	N	N
<b>Prince, Nick</b>	<i>Junior Class Rep</i>	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Russell, Emmett</b>	<i>Complex</i>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Sagstuen, Claire</b>	<i>Southwest Hall</i>	N	Y	Abstain	Abstain
<b>Sande, Josh</b>	<i>Uhler Hall</i>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Schmitt, Andrew</b>	<i>Arbor View</i>	-	-	-	-
<b>Skjerpig, Sean Cain</b>	<i>College View</i>	N	Y	N	Abstain
<b>TOTAL</b>		4 / 15	15 / 15	6 / 14	10 / 13
		<i>Motion Fails</i>	<i>Motion Passes</i>	<i>Motion Fails</i>	<i>Motion Passes</i>

## APPENDIX B

### Email from Kevin Seitz, former Technologies Director

---

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2011 13:00:55 -0600  
From: "Kevin Seitz" <kseitz10@gmail.com>  
Subject: Martin as Technologies Director  
To: [thayer-tessmer@gustavus.edu](mailto:thayer-tessmer@gustavus.edu), [ebryzgor@gustavus.edu](mailto:ebryzgor@gustavus.edu)  
Cc: "Deirdre Rosenfeld" <drosenfe@gustavus.edu>

Sean, Emily, and Erik,

After recently speaking with Martin Barnard about his Technologies Director position on the Student Senate, I thought I would take a moment to offer my thoughts to you all. This letter should outline my thoughts about Martin's role during this academic year, and the Technologies Director position as a whole. Let me apologize in advance -- this message will be a bit brief (and not super formal beyond this point) since I'm currently on my lunch break and don't have a lot of time. Feel free to share this with the rest of the senators.

I've worked with Martin on several occasions throughout the year in order to help him complete his duties as assigned. Let me be perfectly clear... all of these situations involved something beyond his control or something not 100% documented by myself when I was filling the position. (When the voting system decides to deny an entire residence hall the ability to vote, that's my fault!) He is quite capable of performing the duties that are assigned, but some things do require my assistance. My point is this though: he's not ignoring his job.

Other criticisms that were brought to my attention:

- Broken links happen.... file misspellings are not always obvious. I'm guilty of this too. (I'm also EXTREMELY paranoid about this sort of stuff, and even I let things slip through.) At the very worst, Martin is on par with any other college student in this category.
- Meeting audio... that has ALWAYS been a sticky situation. I've talked with Steve at GTS several times about podcasting, and we can't quite get it working. It's a known issue. The best solution I've come up with so far is to drop the files on GACspot. Of course, the Senate voted to get rid of GACspot, so that's no longer a solution. Due to file size, putting these files in the Senate's web directory is likely not feasible. In this category, Martin is on par with my performance as Technologies Director... you just do what you can.
- Blog updates.... this is PR fail. According to the by-laws, this is the responsibility of the PR chair, not Martin. If press releases are being written (keep in mind I never saw any for a good portion of last year) then the PR chair should be inquiring why he/she cannot post these to the blog in some fashion. Yes, I managed the PR aspects of the blog when I was the Technologies Director, but it wasn't technically my responsibility.
- Website updates.... I see minutes, I see contingency fund, DONE. Our finance updates weren't that frequent last year, either.
- GACspot.... Deirdre, Martin, and I had a little discussion over e-mail about GACspot. Martin was as responsive as ever.
- Misc.... I spent two hours with him fixing the website file permissions. It was a cluster. Thank UNIX and GTS for that one.

That's all I have to say about that. He's doing his job, so keep him around. I wouldn't vouch for him if I didn't think he was good for the job.

Cheers.

-Kevin Seitz

## APPENDIX C

### Martin Barnard's Explanation of Events

---

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 2011 22:51:24 -0600  
From: "Martin Barnard" <mbarnard@gustavus.edu>  
Subject: Explanation of events  
To: "Bryz-Gornia Erik" <ebryzgor@gac.edu>

Senators,

I feel that I owe everyone an explanation as to what happened with the role of Technology Director. This may get lengthy so I apologize in advance.

On January 24, during the second j-term meeting of Student Senate, I announced that I would be resigning from my role as technology director. I had just been offered a part-time job position with Apple and feared that my workload and job would not allow me to continue my job as Technology Director. At that point in time I had not been offered to fill out an availability schedule and did not know if I would get the chance to fill one out or if the hours that had been discussed in my interviews for the job would be used to create an availability. On February 3rd, my first day of work I was given an availability form to fill out. I intentionally requested Monday nights off so that I could continue to stay involved in Student Senate. I realize now that I should have delayed any announcement regarding my potential intent to resign until after I knew I would be given the opportunity to have Monday nights off of work.

However, I was asked to work the first monday of the semester, despite my availability. As a new employee, I really had no choice but to agree to work that night. Because I knew that I could not make it I had arrangements made to record the meeting in my absence. Since that time Emily and Sean began interviewing individuals to fill the seat. However, I had not, in my opinion, formally resigned my position as required by the bylaws in writing. As of February 20th, I have only missed one meeting. I have been updating the website as required by the duties in the constitution/by-laws. I spent over two hours updating and readying the senate voting system for next weeks election. As I realized on Sunday night, I have not formally resigned and do not intend to do so. I plan on finishing out the semester in this role. The reason I want to do this is three fold:

- (1) I do not have time to train a new individual into this position (it took Kevin the former technology director several months to train me on all of the systems that we use);
- (2) elections are next week and we plan on utilizing on-line voting which I have been updating and prepping for the election and;
- (3) I have time to fulfill the job duties as written in the constitution and by-laws and there should be no reason for a mid-year transition in a role if it is unnecessary.

Senate is an organization that I do enjoy and have dedicated a great deal of time to over the past two years. As of this time, there has been impeachment proceedings brought forward against me which argue that a floor resignation is still a resignation and that I have not fulfilled my job duties. I urge you senators to examine this by-law regarding resignations so that we can update it to include resignations made on the floor of the senate if you wish. I am sorry that this has caused any commotion in Senate and has caused any conflict between senators and friends. If anyone has any other questions please email me and I will get back to you as soon as I can.

Sincerely,

Martin Barnard  
Student Senate Technology Director

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Transportation Committee Resolution**

---

Submitted:

**SUBMITTED TO: The Gustavus Community**

**SUBJECT: The New Escort System**

GUSTAVUS STUDENT SENATE,

**CONSIDERING** that the recent change to Campus Safety's Escort System was made without Student input and that many Senators have received negative feedback from their constituents and

**COGNIZANT** of Campus Safety's desire to rework the system:

**PLEDGES** to work with Campus Safety to retool the Escort System in such a way that will satisfy the needs of both the students and Campus Safety.

Revised/ Adopted:

**SUBMITTED TO: The Gustavus Community**

**SUBJECT: The New Escort System**

GUSTAVUS STUDENT SENATE,

**CONSIDERING** that many senators have received negative feedback concerning the recent change to Campus Safety's Escort System and

**COGNIZANT** of Campus Safety's desire to rework the system:

**PLEDGES** to work with Campus Safety to retool the Escort System in such a way that will satisfy the needs of both the students and Campus Safety.