

- I. Opening Prayer
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
- IV. Executive Announcements
 - a. **Sibonay Shewit:** The two resolutions are being taken off the docket for this meeting.
 - b. **Sibonay Shewit:** Morgan Williams and Linde Hoffman won the selfie competition!
 - c. **Sibonay Shewit:** In-sessions for RAs on sensitivity on low income students are coming up soon!
 - d. **Sibonay Shewit:** Thank you for filling out the feedback survey from Senate!
 - i. Who wants to make a playlist for Senate→ Katie Hearn, Morgan Peck, and William Huffman
 - ii. You all want more policy change→ would it be more helpful to block out time for you all to learn how to change policy during the week?
 1. Unanimous yes
 - iii. I'm going to sit in on committee meetings to help streamline projects.
 - iv. How do people feel about assigned seating?
 1. William Huffman appreciates assigned seating, and Molly appreciates William Huffman.
- V. General Orders
 - a. SO1718-03: Voting by Paper Ballots
 - i. *Constitutional Review Committee*
 - b. SO1718-04: Article III Formatting Changes
 - i. *Constitutional Review Committee*
 - c. Discussion Re: Senate Involvement in the Housing Policy
 - i. King Fok, *Club Coordination Council President*
 - ii. **Sibonay Shewit:** King wanted for us to talk about whether we should have a role in drafting a response to the housing policy change.
 - iii. **King Fok:** Senate is a platform to talk about issues on our campus like the policy change in housing. A lot of us feel blindsided by the change, and a lot of us couldn't make it to the town hall that followed the email the next day. As the Student Senate, since we are the most representative body on campus, we may not be able to change the policy, but we can share our views and talk about how this will take form. I think we should write a letter to SAO and ask for clarification on the policy and what it might look like for future Notre Dame students. I want to hear some discussion about this and hear what your constituents are saying about the policy change.
 1. **Sibonay Shewit:** Letters go to Office of Student Affairs. Do we have a responsibility as Senate to respond and what is the most effective path?

- iv. **Michael Conlon:** I think it's important to show that we are with the student body. The financial needs of students need to be something the administration thinks about, and we should show that we are not in agreement with everything that comes from the main building.
- v. **William Huffman:** I strongly support a letter→ we need to do something about the change in policy.
 1. **Sibonay Shewit:** Becca, Prathm, and I have been vocal about saying that we did not contribute to this change.
- vi. **Chris Scott:** I think we have a responsibility to respond to these changes in some way because it affects our entire campus community as a whole. While not all of us are personally affected by the policy change, it affects the community to follow. This housing requirement may have the opposite effect that they intended because if the administration requires students to live in a dorm for three years, it becomes something students have to do rather than something they want to do. A letter would be a good start, but I'm not sure what actions we could take.
- vii. **Steven Higgins:** I agree, but I think we can take a step further. A lot of people have expressed dissatisfaction, and if we use polls in the dorm, we could demonstrate what people in our dorms have to say. A Senate wide dorm poll about this policy change would be a constructive step in reaching out to the administration.
- viii. **Matthew Gartenhaus:** Partially what upsets me about this is that the dorm community is forced now. To fulfill our role, we need to ask specific questions about the issues we have with the policy. I think we deserve to see how this policy will play out. Maybe the administration has a better idea or vision, but it seems like they have a pretty vague idea of how this will affect community with no specific potential outcomes.
- ix. **Katie Hearn:** In the initial email, they published the percentages of sophomores and juniors that move off campus. With this policy, they aren't drawing back in that many students as a whole. Are they just doing it for the policy in name? The people moving off before senior year are obviously doing it for specific reasons.
- x. **Sara Dugan:** My understanding is that they are afraid of more and more juniors moving off campus. In the future, the new policy could inhibit people from moving off sooner. This policy stands, so what are we going to ask for or work toward? They aren't just going to reverse the policy. One of the recommendations we could give is instilling the incentives and changes.
 1. **Sibonay Shewit:** I want to point you to page 9 of the Constitution: Powers and Duties of the Student Senate→ d outlines letters.
- xi. **Jackson Herrfeldt:** If they didn't listen to Becca, Michael, Corey, Sib, or Prathm, they aren't going to listen to us. More seniors are going to move off campus because of this policy change. What are we going to say in this letter? In my opinion, it won't have that large of an effect.

- xii. **Joseph Witt:** We talked about this in CLC. Because this won't be reversed, the real opportunity here is to look at why sophomores and juniors move off campus. We need to push forward on the incentives and recommendations. We are still three years away from this policy truly affecting students, which is a lot of time to look to the roots of issues in dorm community and work to improve them.
- xiii. **Steven Higgins:** Were there any students asked about this policy change?
1. **Sibonay Shewit:** I think they did focus groups. They asked us, Michael, Corey and Diversity Council, but based on our conversations with Diversity Council representatives, they gave similar answers as us we did.
 2. **Steven Higgins:** The letter should ask what information was obtained from students. We should poll for information and create a report about what the students said. In light of all the pushback, we are in an advantageous position because we were taken advantage of. We could follow the letter with resolutions.
 3. **Claire Saltzman:** One part should concern content and moving forward with the policy and the other part should discuss transparency between the administration and student body. What can we fix moving forward? For example, the computer system → we as students deserve more than an automated system. Our needs aren't put before the convenience of an automated email. Administrators are very out of touch. How do we do damage control?
- xiv. **Eduardo Luna:** How early were you informed?
1. **Sibonay Shewit:** A week before they sent the email. We were blindsided.
 2. **Eduardo Luna:** How transparent are they being? This isn't fair to the student body. What are they willing to change/throw on us? In addition to that, we should call for our university to be more open about major changes to campus life. If they want to change things, they should call on those who are going to be affected. They are in the ivory tower and we are peasants.
- xv. **Linde Hoffman:** Do you know if a student can move off campus for financial reasons?
1. **Sibonay Shewit:** There will be waivers, so potentially.
 2. **Linde Hoffman:** That would be a good option for students to have.
- xvi. **William Huffman yielded speaking time to Prathm Juneja:** What would a waiver system look like? The Student Senate could have a lot of influence on creating an effective waiver system.
- xvii. **Morgan Peck:** I'm a little confused about the wording of the policy; is a transfer mandated to stay on for three years once they are on campus?

1. **Sibonay Shewit:** It sounded like that wouldn't be a concern, but we can double check.
- xviii. **Morgan Peck:** To play devil's advocate, by instating this change early on, the students who will come here will be more dedicated to the dorm and community life. Also, I think we should ask the administration to spell out the specifics of the policy. The administration doesn't have a waiver system to propose, which is worrisome. This policy change seemed preemptive. We should ask students what changes they want to see on campus to make those three years as positive as possible.
- xix. **Claire Saltzman:** I know a lot of people were upset about how it was communicated to all of us→ it came out of nowhere, and we should call them out on how awful it was. If they're concerned about student input, they aren't approaching us in the right way. They need to work harder to be more available.
- xx. **Alyssa Lyon:** Our advisor offered an opportunity for someone related to the decision, such as someone from the Office of Housing, to talk about the policy and the execution of it. If we had someone come in, people could get some of their questions answered.
- xxi. **Chris Scott:** Going back to Linde's point, I was thinking that we should work towards a change in the campus culture. We need to make this campus more inclusive and respectful to the LGBTQ community, as well as other marginalized groups on campus. I was talking to Isabel Rooper about the campaign she began called "Stand 4 IX," and she wanted a waiver system for LGBTQ students who don't feel like they have a place here. We should push for a waiver system like that. The root of the issue is that a lot of the students are forced/pushed off campus→ it's such a sensitive and divisive time in our culture.
- xxii. **Morgan Williams:** (To Claire Saltzman) In CLC we talked about the timing of the email, and Lissa Bill let us know that that's the way the system works. Going back to changing dorm culture, we could collect data concerning what students want in a waiver system. Do they like the new housing policy→ yes or no. I've only met one person who's in favor of the housing policy→ the numbers might be powerful if ineffective.
- xxiii. **William Huffman yielded his speaking time to Rebecca Blais:** It could be useful to come up with a proposal on what a waiver system should look like. If we set the standard instead of being handed a waiver system we aren't satisfied with, it would be proactive and powerful.
 1. **Sibonay Shewit:** I want to look towards action. It's the start of November, so, the faster we work, the better.
- xxiv. **Pat Paulsen:** It was made clear in Father Jenkins' email that the intent of the change in policy is to keep seniors on campus, but that's not going to happen. It seems obvious that we need to make student voices heard. There are great discrepancies in dorms. Also, the woman dorms are under much stricter standards than male dorms.

- xxv. **William Huffman:** With the waiver system, would people apply to live off campus? This might restrict people because it would out them a little bit because they had to work hard to get off campus for a particular reason. It would also restrict people who don't have a real reason to move off campus but still want to. If you want to move off campus, how do you find someone to live with? It would make it more difficult for those people in some respect. However, if the university is inflexible on changing this policy, we need to make future applicants aware that there are positives in this policy change.
- xxvi. **Sibonay Shewit:** It sound like the focuses are data collection/report, a letter to the administration, and the formation of a waiver policy. We will create task forces to tackle all three of these areas.
- xxvii. **Chris Scott:** I agree with Pat. This is something that the administration shoved down our throats, and we didn't get to give any feedback on it. The administration has a lot of power, but we are the students, and we should have a say in the process. The google poll would be a great way to show cold hard numbers on how people are feeling about the change in policy. We should write a letter about how the community feels about this. There could be some kind of stigma about moving off campus, but I think that it's important for people to have a choice to live on campus or off campus.
- xxviii. **Sibonay Shewit:** Be very careful about talking about the administration being the bad guys. Don't approach with anger→ ask for transparency.
- xxix. **Joseph Witt:** When we asked about the email, I was very angry. However, the administration sat down, had a discussion, tossed around the option of how they do it with a student death, but they decided that any way they were going to do it, they were going to upset someone. Put your frustration into something productive.
- xxx. **Matthew Gartenhaus:** One option is having some sort of alternative housing. Maybe something that isn't dorm culture but more along the lines of apartment living on or near campus? Something where people aren't so constrained, but they're still a part of the Notre Dame community.
- xxxi. **Linde Hoffman:** Bringing it back to action. A lot of us don't know how to write a letter or resolution. The constitutional review hasn't gotten started writing those things. Let us know times when you are going to be in the student government office this week so that we can talk about the process.
1. **Sibonay Shewit:** We will have brainstorming sessions in the Student Government office.
- xxxii. **King Fok:** It's been a great discussion. I like the idea of asking the administration to be accountable and looking for the root causes of their policy change as well as being proactive about a waiver system. We should demand more as a Student Senate. With dining halls, D&I, drugs, alcohol culture, sexual assault→ there are so many ways to tackle the

problems concerning the dorm culture and community life. If future students are boxed in for six semesters, how does the university meet them halfway?

xxxiii. **Jackie O'Brien:** We should ask if the administration thought about the implications of this policy for every student on our campus. We have a lot of leverage at this point, and most of us agree on that account→ this gives us a lot of momentum. The University Policy Department with Kel is doing a lot with TRAC and the implementation of Callisto and housing and gender inequities→ we should collect student opinions on every single student issue.

xxxiv. **Patrick Quinn:** If everyone is against this, what about organizing a peaceful protest? Maybe until the administrators see something like a protest, they won't be motivated to do anything.

xxxv. **Brittany Cahill:** There are such disparities between the physical states of the different dorms. Also, people aren't getting what they're paying for. This can't be overlooked. It's not reasonable.

xxxvi. **Matthew Ross:** In the interest of time, we should reach out to someone from housing. A letter of inquiry would answer most of our grievances. We can tackle finding someone to speak here in the next couple of weeks.

xxxvii. **Sibonay Shewit:** I'll send out a google form and create task forces for each area of this: the data collection/what we are looking for, letter, and formulating waiver system. Each task force should have a rough draft before Thanksgiving break. I will bring someone in from the Office of Housing.

xxxviii. **Chris Scott:** (To Patrick Quinn) Concerning the peaceful protest, it would be a way to get the administrators to listen and then we could also ask the Observer to write on it. People could start getting involved. However, I also think about the groups on campus who would criticize having another protest.

xxxix. Eduardo Luna moved to end discussion

1. Sara Dugan seconded this motion

VI. New Business

VII. Announcements

- a. **Michael Conlon:** For the next 30 minutes, come downstairs to get chick fil a and write letters to your friends abroad!
- b. **Jackson Herrfeldt:** Acousticafe at 1:30 in the morning on thursday in LaFun basement
 - i. Guardians of the Galaxy Thursday/Friday 8 and 10:30 and 10:30 on Saturday in Debart 101
 - ii. Movember: if you want more info, follow Movember ND on FB and insta

VIII. Adjournment

- a. Eduardo motioned to adjourn the meeting
 - i. Katie Hearn seconded the motion