

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME STUDENT SENATE -- SPECIAL SESSION

March 18th, 2019

Meeting Agenda

- I. Opening Prayer
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Motion: Zach Spitzer
 - B. Second: Jack Usher
 1. Vote: All approved
- IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. Karen Kennedy: I'm not going to be at next week's meeting, so this is my last Senate meeting. I just wanted to say thank you for letting me be the advisor, and so going forward in your Notre Dame careers, if I can be helpful, please don't hesitate to reach out. I've enjoyed getting to know you throughout the year.
 - B. Corey Gayheart: This is also my last Senate meeting with you all. I bought tickets to an event not realizing it was on the Monday and I can't miss it.
 - C. Gates McGavick: You'll get a poster on the way out for the State of the Student Union in the LaFun Ballroom at 7:00. This usually is only given to Senate, but we're inviting everyone, so please invite people and we also will be live streaming it.
 - D. Corey Gayheart: It is constitutionally mandated that the Senate hears the State of the Student Union.
 - E. Bri Tucker: Another announcement is dorm maintenance. We've been working with Residence Life and we're going to have that sent out to the Student Body.
 - F. Bri Tucker: The Back the Bend website is up and running so you now can sign up to volunteer -- backthebend.nd.edu. Gather a group of friends from your dorm, and we want everyone there. We've been working really hard on it.
- V. General Orders
 - A. SS1819-07: A Resolution Calling for the University to Include Residence Halls in the Grind2Energy Technology Implementation
 1. Daniel Rottenborn: Motion to table that to next week's meeting
 2. Second: Erin Hiestand
 3. Vote: All approved, TABLED

B. SS1819-08: A Resolution Supporting Efforts to Diversify Religious Art on Campus

1. Alyssa Ngo: (*reads resolution*)
2. Alyssa Ngo: We want to have more diverse art in dorms. The new hall is Baumer Hall, and they're being secretive about the chapel, but they said that when you go into the new chapel, you will see something different. One of the newest chapels in Jenkins Nanovic has African Stations of the Cross. It's not something that I was aware of, but it's important to Campus Ministry.
3. Erin Hiestand: Do you know if they're planning on changing art in existing buildings?
 - a) Alyssa Ngo: It's hard to change things up. One of the things they're tackling is thinking about crucifixes in each room that could be changed to have more diverse representations of crucifixes that wouldn't be as controversial. They would change art as dorms are renovated and something they would do respectfully because they don't want to get rid of the previous art. As they are renovated that would be an avenue to update the religious art.
4. DC Morris: What would the new crucifixes entail?
 - a) Alyssa Ngo: They are small and abstract, but one you could think of ones that are more obvious, and in terms of race, it's not just skin color but the features on the face and the style of the crucifix. Not just the race, but in different Catholic cultures there are different types of crucifixes. On a worldwide global scale, they don't always look like the ones that we see.
5. Caila Lindsey: Diversity can mean a lot, so maybe changing the language to specify what kind of diversity you mean specifically, like racially or something else.
6. Alyssa Ngo: Can we propose a friendly amendment to add 'racially' or 'ethnically' diverse? We will put it in the last clause as well as the resolved statement.
7. Elisabeth Lasecki: Can we capitalize Notre Dame du Lac? Friendly amendment.
8. Zach Spitzer: Motion to end debate and move to a vote
 - a) Jack Usher: Second
 - b) Vote: All approved

(1) Vote on resolution: All approved, RESOLUTION PASSES

C. SS1819-09: A Resolution Recognizing Rev. Peter Rocca, C.S.C.

1. Aaron Benavides: (*reads resolution*)

2. Aaron Benavides: The University announced that Father Rocca will be retiring over the summer. Over the past 22 years, he's put a lot of effort into working in the Basilica and it is an important part of our campus and a lot of students go there to worship, and it's a nice idea for us to recognize his dedication to our Notre Dame family.
3. Erin Hiestand: Motion to end discussion and move to debate
 - a) Zach Spitzer: Second
 - b) Vote: All approved
4. Mark Spretnjak: Motion to end debate
 - a) Zach Spitzer: Second
 - b) Vote: All approved

(1) Vote on resolution: All approved, RESOLUTION PASSES

D. SS1819-10: A Resolution Encouraging More Transparency in Future Bylaws of the Club Coordination Council

1. Corey Gayheart: We are adding a friendly amendment to add Sam Scaglione as a co-author of this resolution.
2. Lindsay McCray: *(reads resolution)*
3. Corey Gayheart: This resolution comes right before the Club Funding resolution that we proposed previously. We went back to the drawing board after that meeting and met with the Student Union heads and to bring everyone's concerns to the table. In requesting more transparency, bylaws aren't able to be changed midyear, which means they aren't able to change their current bylaws, but when they start drafting their new bylaws after April 1st, that's what this resolution is calling for. We're now open for discussion.
4. Gates McGavick: I know her name's not on here, but the fact that Sam is co-sponsoring this shows a good consideration on her part and the quality of the agreement to make this happen.
5. Patrick Harris: I'm the Vice-President elect of the CCC. We took the feedback last time, we had a discussion, and we decided that we want to be more transparent directly to the Senate. We're extremely transparent with clubs and to clubs, and we meet with them at least 4 times a year per club, but we realized that we never have that same sort of time to meet with the Senate. What we feel, in addition to supporting this resolution, once a year, someone from the Executive Board could present to the Senate and give you those figures that you voiced that you desires. I've come prepared with such a presentation should you want that. We will walk you through what we say to clubs and how we meet with them to make the most equitable solution for all clubs. We have important

statistics for a projection of what the following year's spring allocation would look like.

6. Patrick Harris: We have two large group meetings. Clubs are required to be at this meeting. We discuss what we do and the avenues for funding. The second is detailing specifically how we go through the spring allocation process, which is important in deciding how to vote on the following resolution. The CCC is the body which allocates money to clubs (six divisions). The allocation system, besides tiering clubs, is division agnostic. Their final requests are put in the same system of cuts, which is to the benefit of each division. Division reps, in addition to meeting with them, we have weekly office hours, we're always there to help out. We can't collect via Venmo. Clubs have a method by which they can fundraise. Clubs are allowed to make that number whatever they choose for fundraising. We have about 400 student clubs, with about 90% of the student body. They project to spend over \$2 million, but we have only about \$340,000, which is the 37% number in the student union budget. That number is what the following resolution wants to change, which would make it about \$360,000 or a little bit more. That number includes what we had from last year rolling over. There is spring allocation, appeals, and winter allocation. This is coming up for the incoming senate. Each club has to present a budget to us. The tier system is what I brought up earlier. Because clubs must fundraise at least 20% of their expenses, the highest tier can be funded up to 80%. Academic clubs must fly more, go to conferences, while cultural clubs might need more food and such. The tier system is supposed to incentivize them to fundraise at least 20%. When we look at budgets, we see that there's a figure that we can't fund, because that's more than the entire student government has to fund for the year. We don't want to give to clubs that can support themselves. We are need-based funding. If you're rolling money over, we take that out of their expenses request because they can already afford to pay for that. Their dues is also taken out. Then we start tiering things and get into the final requests. New this year, we are changing the final cut and the incentive structure up. We're going towards a more fundraising based cut. You all should have a handout about how clubs get funding, so I'm going to move into spring allocation. We have a spring budget meeting, and then they can meet with division members to fill out their budgets for next year. Our budget sheet includes a lot of things. They can list what they're going to do next year so we can gauge how much they need to spend. They can project their revenue through dues, apparel, concession stands, and other

things. Once all the budgets have been submitted, we meet with each club individually, with well over a hundred clubs submitting budgets just so we can make sure we treat clubs fairly. We go over the sheet line by line to make sure it's reasonable just so they're accurate and reflective of the project expenses, and then intra-division review and inter-division review makes the budget as accurate as possible. Then we have a nine hour spring allocation meeting, and that gets down to \$600,000 which we still have to get down to \$360,000, which incentivizes clubs to have more active members and more fundraising. Finally, we get to the final allocations given out to clubs in the following weeks. The things that you care most about is the summary statistics: We went to work and decided we would give you the numbers as detailed as we possibly can. These are estimates based on what we had last year, but it will be very similar. From there, the final number isn't reflective of how equitable this is because each division has different amounts of fundraising and members and such, so we came up with an equitability ratio. I will yield my time to another CCC representative.

7. Michael (CCC Rep): One thing you may have noticed is that there's a tiny thing accounting for clubs that can't fund themselves, who can't project enough fundraising, or have funds that roll over. This is the number of clubs that aren't self-sufficient, who demonstrated need.
8. Patrick Harris: With that, I'd be happy to field any questions, but I just want to recapitulate that we would be happy to do a presentation such as this each year to the incoming Senate and we really want to work with Student Government to make this as transparent as possible.
9. Corey Gayheart: I'm actually going to suggest that we draft a separate resolution, stating a constitutional requirement for the CCC to give a yearly presentation to the Student Senate. I don't feel comfortable adding a friendly amendment to something right off the bat.
10. Patrick Paulsen: Motion to end discussion and move to debate
 - a) DC Morris: Second
 - b) Vote: All approved
11. Zach Spitzer; Motion to end debate
 - a) Patrick Paulsen: Second
 - b) Vote: All approved

(1) Vote on Resolution: All approved, RESOLUTION
PASSES

- E. SO1819-15: A Resolution Increasing the Amount of Student Union Funds Allocated to Clubs

1. Gates McGavick: (*reads resolution*)
2. Michael Conlon: A lot of student leaders met a couple weeks ago to talk about concerns we had with this resolution, and Sam and I will be introducing new business later, but Class Councils were opposed to this in the past, and we now really support this Club Funding Resolution because they use as much as they can. We are definitely in favor of this now.
3. Zach Spitzer: Is there any difference from this as to the one that we have before?
 - a) Corey Gayheart: They're the same resolution with supplementing us sitting down at the table, hearing everyone's concerns, as well as Lindsay's resolution before this. I believe we have some members presenting under New Business that pertains to this.
4. DC Morris: If they're presenting under new business, are we going to vote before that?
 - a) Gates McGavick: We were talking about what the majority threshold should be in the committee on the budget, and that was one of their obvious concerns that they wouldn't have the members to push back on being treated unfairly.
 - b) Sam Cannova: It brings in a safeguard which makes us more comfortable to shift this money over.
 - c) Gates McGavick: Michael has a letter supporting this also.
5. Corey Gayheart: We can vote to table this to new business and then vote on it later, if that order matters to anyone.
6. Erin Hiestand: Motion to table to after new business
 - a) Zach Spitzer: Second
 - b) Vote: 1 opposed, 2 abstaining, RESOLUTION TABLED

VI. New Business

- A. Sam Cannova: When the FMB comes up with the budget, if the majority likes it, it moves on. This changes it to $\frac{2}{3}$ needed to make it move on to make sure that no particular student union organization is targeted or has extreme cuts. It will be done in a more equitable way. This doesn't really grant any right to anyone in particular but makes it more safe to get each budget through instead of $\frac{1}{2}$.
 1. Michael Conlon: I just pretty much wrote that it ensures that when the 3% is transferred over, it's safeguarded. We had a really good discussion, and we're good with passing the 3% as long as we get this passed too.
 2. Patrick Harris: I have a question. How many voting members are there on FMB that vote in this matter and how many of those are class council?

- a) Michael Conlon: There are 9 voting members, and 4 are class councils.
3. DC Morris: Who are the other 5?
 - a) Shady Girgis: Judicial President, HPC, CCC, SUB, Executive Controller.
4. Corey Gayheart: This would increase the required from 51% to the $\frac{2}{3}$ majority for budget passage. Getting more people to agree to the budget.
5. Alyssa Ngo: In the other resolution, they list 13 areas, but out of 13 areas, who doesn't have a voting member?
 - a) FMB President-elect: (*lists groups*)
6. Dillon proxy: So at least 6/9 would need to agree to the budget?
 - a) Zach Pearson: Yes.
 - b) Corey Gayheart: Usually they are approved unanimously.
7. Mark Spretnjak: You said that this is to make you more comfortable. Numbers wise, Class Council could veto anything.
8. Michael Conlon: That's assuming you have a good relationship among each other. Saying we're going to vote together assumes a good relationship, but as Freshman CC president on Senate, I didn't have a good relationship. Now it takes into account not only our concerns but SUB's concerns as well.
9. Patrick Harris: To bring up what was said in that meeting, the example of last year's precedent vetoed and then bounced back was presented in the last senate meeting as an example of why the system as it currently stands doesn't work, whereas it should be seen as an example of how it does work. If the Class Councils decided to vote as a block, they would have veto power.
10. Michael Conlon: What historical precedent have we vetoed?
11. Patrick harris: I just meant voting as a block.
12. Michael Conlon: I would say that that's not a lot of faith in us. I would hope the members of the Senate would have faith that they could take the 3% and make sure it's a more equitable cut.
13. Sam Cannova: Even if you think of the worst case scenario, there are safeguards.
14. Mark Spretnjak: I would like to yield my time to Michael.
15. Michael (CCC): The Ethics Commission has nine members on it, the same members as the FMB, and it requires a higher majority, which means the Ethics Commission would be powerless. This is entirely to get veto power. This is not to make waves of fairness. The reason they are signed on to it, they felt like they were unfairly treated last time. This is not a bill which is

designed to make everything more fair, but it gives the four class councils veto power.

16. Patrick Paulsen: If we raise it to six votes requiring and they voted as a block, theoretically they would have veto power, but right now the non-class councils can pass anything without the class councils. You can say that never happens and there is a history of that because that occurred last year.
17. Bri Tucker: Jin isn't here, but what happened last year was that all the treasurers voted that down, and it wasn't 4 against 5, everyone agreed that the budget wasn't strong. Jin assured us that if you come in with a strong budget, at least 95% of it would be approved. There was consensus that the budget wasn't strong enough. They went back to the drawing board and it became more specific, but you have to come in and do your homework.
18. Michael Conlon: If we're going on historical precedent, these are generally passed unanimously.
19. DC Morris: It's still not clear to me who the other five voting members are. It's not my concern that they have veto power but if there are two other similar branches that they can gang up on six and cut off three other groups.
20. Halena Hadi: They are the Student Union Treasurer, the Executive Controller, SUB Director of Finance, HPC Treasurer, CCC Controller, All Class Treasurers, Off-Campus President, and Judicial Council President.
21. Lindsay McCray: Class Councils would only get 4 votes for anything. What happens if there's no budget approved? The administration could probably step in? Maybe? Veto powers matters to an extent, but six people have to say that this is a great idea and that's not going to happen if it's completely Class Council-powered.
22. Corey Gayheart: Class Councils are technically separate by their class, and they are not one voting block. It hasn't always been that way. Each one is an individual class council.
23. Alyssa Ngo: If we're going off of that point, the non-class councils are even less of a block, and each one is an individual organization. Yes, if we do $\frac{2}{3}$, any four people could have veto power, but there are 4 organizations that fall together more naturally. I'm also confused about the $\frac{2}{3}$ vote: if they operate in good faith and we trust that they're good people, this won't happen, we're saying this is four the rainy day, it seems strict We should also have good faith in the other five people that they're not going to screw over class councils all the time.

24. Matt Ruddy: That precedent means that JCC got 40% of what they had last year, but they moved that to SCC, and now you're using that as complaints. Even if you were in a voting block, you still get the same piece of the pie and it's split four ways. If you vote together, you get a bigger piece that's split four ways.
25. Lakumi Sivanandan: The notion of ganging up and getting more people to agree with us can also vote the other way around. That wasn't enough but it took work to get other people to see that as well when they were happy with their allocations. Sometimes we're the vulnerable ones, but we just want to make sure we're given a fair amount to work with.
26. Caila Lindsay: We shouldn't base everything based on last year, and we might not have these four be friends every year and so we should base it off what is being said in a total sense and not just what happened last year.
27. Erin Hiestand: Isn't FCC's budget allocated the same every year?
 - a) Michael Conlon: Correct. Sorry to jump in, but we don't divvy money up amongst ourselves. We don't present a four person budget.
28. Gates McGavick: The initial confrontational nature of this the first time has allowed this conversation to be framed in a negative way about people screwing other people over. It's resulted in a confrontation. We have to get back. This is a very minor procedural edit to one committee that's increasing numbers by one vote, and it's a chance to give clubs thousands of more dollars. I haven't had the experience of working poorly with the other people my past four years. A little more tangible would be useful in this conversation.
29. Bri Tucker: It's all about the strength of the budget. No one's out to screw students over. It again comes down to each organization working as an individual. We have to assume that each organization is going to do what they need to do.
30. Patrick Harris: The initial point of debate is that the system as it currently stands is not broken and the fact that there are so many hypotheticals, why would we change something that's not broken to implement something that could go wrong?
31. DC Morris: It's your perspective that it's not broken.
32. Erin Hiestand: A lot of other things in the Constitution require $\frac{2}{3}$ majority, so it doesn't make sense that this wouldn't.
33. Lindsay McCray: I don't understand the emphasis on veto power when we should be talking about $\frac{2}{3}$ because wouldn't we want a budget that more

than half the FMB approves of? If something gets vetoed, it's not like we don't get funding, you just go back to discussion.

34. Zach Spitzer: It seems that whenever someone has proposed a bad budget, those voting on the budget have been in accordance with you guys and so with that in mind, if you could clarify what your intent is?
 - a) Michael Conlon: We want the 3% cut to be more equitable, and that requires more deliberation among the nine treasurers, and with the $\frac{2}{3}$ majority, this would be more equitable.
35. Dillon proxy: It seems that the concerns about whether we should trust they don't vote as a block, we should also trust that the other people aren't going to act badly as well. Benign acting should be assumed by all, so why do we need to make the bureaucracy more complex? Making it as simple as possible while assuming that everyone's going to act well.
36. Gates McGavick: If you don't want to assume bad will about everyone, why would you assume that they can't get to a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority? This is just grounded in the Constitution.
37. Dillon proxy: It makes a lot more needlessly complex which requires more discussion.
38. Shady Girgis: If the Ethics Commission were to act maliciously, there's 4 CC's on the ethics commission, and it's simple majority there and they wouldn't also control that.
39. Corey Gayheart: I want to make a point of debate from myself. I see this resolution as ensuring that we have good compromise happening here. The current US Senate now requires only 51 votes rather than 60. I view this as compromise and ensuring that everyone comes to the table in good faith.
40. Laksumi Sivanandan: This resolution is the result of a meeting with all of the student leaders and if we agreed on that, I would hope that you can trust that this is the best thing for everyone involved.
41. Caila Lindsay: I just want to say that we do vote in the people that are voting in the budget, and so we should think about putting trust in the people that we are voting for these positions.
42. Mark Spretnjak: How wild would it be if we made it unanimous?
43. Bri Tucker: It's generally unanimous anyway.
44. Jack Usher: This is kind of minute detail, and it's fun to think about, but let's be practical because what here comes down to the final vote? A budget with the $\frac{2}{3}$ majority requirement would make the budget stronger and not as contentious. I wouldn't read as much into this as people seem to be reading into it.

45. Alyssa Ngo: Why are we letting a simple majority do it, it should be higher? I think the concern is that $\frac{2}{3}$ is just the right number for the Class Councils to have suspicion over them. A compromise would be to raise that number. I would scroll to the random page and see what the voting requirements would be because there are a lot of fractions.
46. Halena Hadi: Historically, we usually go with $\frac{2}{3}$ because that is thought to protect the rights of the whole group. We do have higher fractions when there is a suspension of the rules or a special meeting is called. In this case, $\frac{2}{3}$ is that number that's thrown about when you're going to specify a number.
47. Patrick Paulsen: Making it a super majority isn't a big thing, because the ability to approve is more important than the ability to veto, and I don't think one block is going to be openly obstructionist. The purpose of this is to make sure that everyone is represented well. That being said, it's also important to remember that four years from now, we're not going to be here, so we have to think about what it would look like going forward.
48. Michael Conlon: We're not the USA here, we can't pass a resolution to keep the Student Government funded. It's not like if Class council is going to hijack student government, that can't happen, because we can't go budgetless.
49. Zach Spitzer: I want to echo the point about keeping things simple as far as parliamentary procedure goes, it's just making it 6/9 instead of 5/9. We do still have another resolution to go through today.
50. Erin Hiestand: This might just be my confusion but I thought that Freshmen Class Councils were allocated because they didn't have anyone there to vote for them?
- a) Sam Cannova: There's no freshmen there.
51. Matt Ruty: Are we voting on this today?
- a) Corey Gayheart: Yes.
52. Matt Ruty: My issue is that it seems like we're saying this in collaboration, but the reason it's being switched is so that if it goes wrongly, you can stop something wild going on, and i don't understand how that would increase collaboration because we already have good collaborative budgets in the past.
53. Erin Hiestand: Motion to end debate and move to a vote
- a) Jack Usher: Second
- b) Vote: All approved
54. Caila Lindsay: Motion to move to a secret
- a) Mark Spretnjak: Second

b) FAILS

55. Vote on resolution: 26 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstaining, RESOLUTION PASSES

B. TABLED ITEM FROM GENERAL ORDERS: SO1819-15

1. Jack Usher: Motion to end discussion

2. Dana Plagenz: Second

a) Vote: All approved

3. Zach Spitzer: Motion to end debate

a) Jack Usher: Second

b) Vote: All approved

(1) Vote on resolution: 1 abstain, RESOLUTION PASSES

VII. Announcements

A. Alyssa Ngo: Next week, the 25th, there will be an Etiquette Dinner held by MSPS.

B. Zach Spitzer: The Not-So-Royal Shakespeare Company is putting on a Midsummer's Night Dream in Washington Hall.

C. Meghan Howat: BP's Meal Auction is this Saturday in Midfield Commons from 11:30-4:00.

D. Zach Pearson: Glee Club Concert is on Friday.

E. Erin Hiestand: On April 7th, Ryan's Wheelchair Basketball is happening, for \$5 a person and teams of 5. I will send the link to sign up in the Senate GroupMe.

F. Caila Lindsay: On Thursday from 5:30-7:00 is the Snite at Night, partnered with NASAND.

G. Mark Spretnjak: Sorin Spelling Bee is coming up. It's only Sorin guys but you can watch. I might be hosting it.

H. Alex Miskimon: This Friday, March 22nd from 1:00-3:00 we are having our Spring Housing Fair on the 8th floor of the Student Center, with a lot of good resources.

I. Laksumi Sivanandan: Tomorrow from 7:00-9:00, JCC is selling leftover JPW apparel with ice cream floats.

J. Michael Conlon: Next Wednesday there will be a workshop on renting in New York City from 7:00-9:00. Also Bookstore Basketball got pushed back another week.

K. Sam Cannova: SCC is selling apparel, and we are giving away tea and donuts from 9:00-12:00. This Saturday from 11:00-1:00 we will be making sandwiches to be donating to the Center for the Homeless. We are planning a field day for staff and students.

- L. Shady Girgis: Please submit nominations for the three awards that Student Government hands out.
- M. Eric Kim: We are hosting a Literary Week, we're having Coffee Hour in O'Shag, on the 21st we have a Creative Writing Workshop, and on the 22nd we have Stories at the Snite.
- N. Halena Hadi: Transition is upon us, and each of you is responsible for talking to your incoming Senator. In advance of next Monday, you should do this because they are supposed to be coming next Monday as audience members.
- O. Corey Gayheart: Thank you guys, it's been a wonderful year. I'm really appreciative of the time I've spent with all of you.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. Motion: Zach Spitzer
- B. Second: Patrick Paulsen
 - 1. Vote: All approved