

- I. Opening Prayer by Sarah Galbenski
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Agenda
 - A. Thomas Davis: Appointments cannot be on the agenda in any fashion. The resolution that would bring forth such appointments require executive approval during an academic week. I suggest we scratch that from the agenda.
 1. Noelle Dana: Is there a way around this because it is a legislative point. This is a pertinent issue on a tight timeline, and it is very important in advocating for students and supporting them.
 2. Thomas Davis: It is very far from a legislative hogtie. It is the constitution and a separation of powers. Any way to get around that is definitely a big problem in terms of constitution reaching.
 3. Michael Dugan: If the resolution is passed by the Senate today, Rachel would you immediately approve it on the executive end?
 4. Thomas Davis: Point of order- Non-germain to the topic.
 5. Michael Dugan: I move to suspend the rules to yield my time to Rachel on that question.
 6. Karen Kennedy: Point of order: I think we are debating this point on the agenda which Thomas has said is non-germain.
 - B. Debate:
 1. Noelle Dana: The importance of this committee being nominated and approved is important today.

2. Thomas Davis: Given there is no scope here it is not clear how parliamentary procedure is being suspended. To suspend parliamentary procedure for such a non-germain topic would be a big issue. It would cause issues in debate and procedures down the line.
 3. Michael Murakami: What exactly would the suspension of rules look like; I am not exactly sure?
 4. Sarah Galbenski: To be perfectly frank, I am not entirely sure either. I believe we should elucidate on that. Are we voting on calling on Rachel, which would be minor, or are we voting on completely disregarding procedure?
 5. Michael Dugan: I want to motion to direct my time to Rachel not completely disregard parliamentary procedure.
 6. Thomas Davis: If I could offer some advice to Michael, the correct route to addressing non-germanity ruling or opinion of the Chair is to appeal the position of the Chair rather than suspending parliamentary procedure.
 7. Michael Dugan: I will rescind my motion and move to take out the Chair position of the agenda.
 8. Dual verification process of voting by Sarah Galbenski and Thomas Davis
 9. Simple majority was not reached.
- C. Motion to remove appointments from agenda.
1. Motion passes with a simple majority.

- D. Matthew Bisner: I was alerted last Thursday of some of the senators wishing to call an emergency meeting. I met with those five senators along with Sarah, Karen, Thomas, and Grace Stephenson. Just before that meeting, the Judicial Council was able to access the order and resolution. It was not until Monday night that the Judicial Council had completed the review of these documents. On Tuesday, Thonmas Davis and I had a meeting with Senator Dugan about the memo of what the review brought about. The memo ended with a recommendation that the Senate does not approve the order SO2021-03 for four main constitutional questions and those still remain. The first is that the interactional student fund discriminates against students on the basis of nationality, which violates the nondiscrimination clause. It also violates constitutional reallocation of funds, as FMB has to be the first to bring this to the Senate. The third and fourth have to do with misuse of student funds. There is also a prohibition on charitable funds given to students. This order was modified after we had this briefing to include a blanket constitutional suspension of any article or constitutional section that goes against it. At that point, it requires SAO approval. The Judicial Council does not think the Senate should consider this order right now.
- E. Michael Dugan: It is on the agenda as an informal discussion. We do not wish to bring it forward for a vote. It is more to be a benefit in prompting conversation around these issues with it.

- F. Karen Kennedy: I have been involved in many conversations around this. As adviser, the blanket constitutional suspension is a very dangerous precedent. Especially for the Senate to take over an issue that is really within FMB's field. As an adviser, I feel it necessary to bring up these concerns.
- G. Michael Dugan: That is exactly the informal discussion I want to have surrounding it. The slides I have for this discussion is to see what limitations the Senate has and understand these. I wish to use it as a tool to discuss. If I recall correctly, Thomas Davis had a topic for informal discussion rather than to be for a vote.
- H. Thomas Davis: In response to Michael, perhaps the miscommunication between the two instances is it was a miscommunication to the Chair to be used as a tool for discussion. It was linked as an informative tool as an addendum to the agenda, rather than an order designed to be voted on. If it was submitted with that intent and it is not submitted with any voting purposes. With that in mind, that means it cannot be brought up at all for a vote within the Senate meeting.
- I. Voting on the agenda as is:
1. Agenda approved.

IV. Approval of Minutes

The bylaws were approved; nominations for Student Union Parliamentarian, Judicial Council Vice President of peer advocacy, and Judicial Council Vice President of Elections were read and voted in support. Discussion on the resolution (SS2021-05) implementing Native culture into the Moreau FYE continued, but the resolution did not pass. Order (SO2021-01) to postpone

remaining elections to the fall passes. Grace Stephenson, Student Union Treasurer, provided a discussion on the surplus from this past academic year. The order (SO2021-02) to establish an independent financial account related to impacts of Covid-19 is passed. The resolution (SS2021-06) calling the Ethics Commission and Committee on the Constitution to action is passed.

- I. Michael Dugan: I move to postpone the approval of the minutes to the next meeting. I believe I was referred to at one point as Matthew and a complete part of what I said was omitted at the beginning.
 - II. Supermajority approving the motion to postpone the approval of the minutes.
- V. General Orders
- A. COVID-19 Response Presentation, Michael Dugan (*Dillon Hall Senator*) and Noelle Dana (*Howard Hall Senator*);
 - B. [SS2021-10: A Resolution to Put Students First by Supporting Vulnerable Students, Especially Low-Income and International Students, in the Absence of Adequate University Support During this Pandemic;](#)
 1. Quorum is lost
 2. Thomas Davis: Without quorum, no decisions can be made. We cannot even formally adjourn so we would have to move into recess. No decisions can be made today without quorum unless considered to be an emergency by the Chair.



3. Noelle Dana: I cannot even emphasize this enough, this situation is very time sensitive. Is there a list of senators not present we can contact to get quorum back?
4. Madison Nemeth: In order to try to get it ratified would we have to call another emergency meeting? I feel like all the voting members knew how time sensitive this was going into the meeting. To be honest, I am quite frustrated given the move out starts tomorrow.
5. Ben Erhardt: Do you, as Chair, have power to send an email to senators to regain quorum given the time sensitivity of the situation?
6. Michael Dugan: I believe Michael Murakami and Maggie Allen have rejoined.
7. Michael Dugan continues to read the resolution with quorum restored.
8. Questions:
 - a) Patrick Lee: Mike, you just read that we are asking campus to swiftly make decisions about what campus life is going to look like in the Fall. Why would we pressure the University into making those guidelines when we all know a lot can change in that time? I hesitate to say they have all the information right now. It is still eighty days away, and they could very likely have to change that again and could alter students' plans.
 - b) Michael Dugan: I do not expect that they have all the information. It would be reasonable for them to give some guidance to students

who are vacillating back and forth on whether to take a gap semester or year. As quick as possible, within reason, it would be really helpful to students in determining their academic future.

- c) Anoop Sunkara: When we vote on the resolution, are we voting to approve everything the resolution states or as a frame moving forward for the order to be looked at the next meeting?
 - d) Sarah Galbenski: A reference is by no means binding, and the order will not be presented for a vote this meeting.
 - e) Noelle Dana: Literally anyone who has questions and is considering saying no, please raise those questions now.
9. Movement into debate:
- a) Thomas Davis: I would like to propose to the Chair to break the resolution up for debate given very different topics being discussed.
 - b) Sarah Galbenski: I agree, right now we are debating all of the information up to the eighth page.
 - c) Michael Dugan: I would like to make a friendly amendment to insert clause 5-c-10 about students whose study abroad has been cancelled and availability of housing.
 - d) Thomas Davis: That is noted. Given it is a friendly amendment we would just need consent from the cosponsors.

- e) Madison Nemeth: I saw something that students who planned to study abroad would be guaranteed housing?
- f) Michael Dugan: I have a constituent who is supposed to study abroad, so he is not registered for housing. He is concerned about whether he will be able to end up in Dillon as he has in the past.
- g) Sarah Galbenski: We are only discussing the part in general orders- everything up to the first “further resolved” statement.
- h) Benjamin Erhardt: I ran a survey amidst my own constituency in Keough. I strongly urge that we do pass this resolution, even if we do not all agree on all the points. We never know what the University is or isn’t going to respond to. I am not sure how accurate this is, but did you have any meetings with Erin Hoffman Harding or administration? If so, I for one would love to be aware of what these conversations were like to give us a better picture of what these plans might look like.
- i) Rachel Ingal: The Office of Student Enrichment has been mentioned a lot throughout this presentation, so I just wanted to fill you in on a conversation Sarah and I had with the director of OSE, Consuela. The way it functions usually is two-tiered through student experiences and then general necessity items. This has shifted recently, as they have been able to advocate for at risk students to stay somewhere on campus, to pay for groceries for



students facing food insecurities, they have ensured every student has internet access, and they have created wage replacement for students struggling with loss of income. The move-out plan proposed was the best plan for the students that they work with- they do not have the capacity to cater towards students in an a la carte manner. They look for ways in which they can adhere to the needs of the majority of their students. They worked with Handled to establish a link for students involved with OSE to use for these costs to be covered by OSE. Handled has agreed to not charge any OSE students for additional boxes. In terms of how many people OSE has been able to serve so far, right now there are 190 students that have been served from the pack and store option and twenty by the pack and ship option. The office does not discriminate based on nationality, so they have been able to work with a number of international students in need. Any student that comes to them that is eligible will be given help. The question of who is eligible or ineligible is worth having, but I think it is important to note all of the efforts the Office is having. Yes there are a lot of unknowns for us as students, but also it is important to keep in mind the staff and that they are human too. They are adapting to new ways of life and new hats they are wearing. Sarah, Aaron, and I meet once or twice a week with our advisor and we are actively

working on listening with concerned constituents. Next week, I will have a video chat with Erin Hoffman Harding to answer student questions.

- j) Aaron Benavides: Rachel, Sarah, and I have had several meetings and we have been a constant sounding board to our advisor. A lot of these issues have been raised in regards to vulnerable student populations and the unknowns of the fall semester. We have thought about how starting early could affect students in terms of housing and internships.
- k) Sarah Galbenski: If you are interested, I know Rachel would be more than happy to share the statement she sent to the five involved Senators following our meeting with Consuela. This was Aaron's brain child, his passion project to have a meeting with Erin Hoffman Harding to go over all of these questions, so I strongly encourage you all to tune in on that discussion.
- l) Anoop Sunkara: I particularly have some problems with clause 3 and clause 4. Our money should be going to those most in need, so money should not be given to international students just because they are international. That would then take money away from those who are truly in need. Looking at clause 3, based off of Rachel's comments just now it seems like OSE has enough money

to help those they work with as it is now. Although I do agree with clause 1c regarding proxies.

- m) Michael Dugan: To directly respond to Anoop's concerns. I do not think there is anything here that would give money to international students without need. The very specific reason for clause 3 comes directly from concerns of the OSE student advisory board. I don't think anyone wants to be forced into a new packing service that is an Uber of shipping in many ways. I do think the University should be taking its money and putting it where it is best. I think the OSE thinks they can handle everything, but students on the OSE advisory board think we can do better.
- n) Madison Nemeth: From what I understand, this is not binding by the University. I think we should vote for this since there are concerns across the student body.
- o) Noelle Dana: I heard concerns about why are we specifically helping international students who would qualify by OSE. The international group is feeling incredibly frustrated with the lack of recognition by administration. Our job is to advocate for students and try to get the attention of the administration showing their inadequacies. There is currently a petition circulating of international students who are unhappy.

- p) Sarah Galbenski: I would like to acknowledge that same petition. Rachel, Aaron, and I were able to connect with the author of that petition with Leah Zimmer who could be of service to them and their concerns through our connection with the adviser. Of course the work you all are doing is so important and so exciting, but remember there are always multiple outlets in which we can work through.
- q) Aaron Benavides: At the end of the day, OSE feels confident that they can serve every student involved with them. Consuela did not seem constrained by limits on who they are able to help. We did run this idea by Consuela that OSE is very reliant on the funds that are directed to them by FMB from the Shirt fund. She was concerned how this may impact the fiscal year 2021-2022, particularly for medical funds. It seems far off, but we do need to be looking ahead to the wellbeing of student life.
- r) Anoop Sunkara: I completely agree with what Aaron said, that is why I have a problem with clause 3 and clause 4. There are so many potential risks for financial years in the future, so, if OSE is already meeting the needs of low income students, then a blanket statement for all international students is ineffective and does a disservice to the student body in the future.

- s) Michael Dugan: We are not touching any of the money from the Student Union fund. On that note, OSE can only help those who are eligible for their funds. Because Notre Dame is need blind, it is known that many international students do not qualify for financial aid.
- t) Madison Nemeth: If there is a widespread issue for clauses 3 and 4, would it be possible to suspend these and vote on the others?
- u) Thomas Davis: That is a fantastic question and is the exact situation for an amendment. If you and another Senator do not think it works how it is now, then you can make a motion to amend the resolution.
- v) Aaron Benavides: I do want to make a point about clause 5 and trying to get those directives published. In the meetings that we have had, the University is still figuring out where they are at and how they will move forward. I do not think it is the best idea to rush the University through this because I believe they will spend as much time as necessary to cover all their bases. I personally do not think we should force the university to scramble to bring something together, which could so easily change.
- w) Michael Dugan: This is not rushing the University into making decisions. Even other institutions will put statements out of what they plan to do in the future to allow for people to prepare. It is

very important for students to have such information and that it is responsible to ask for advice and guidance.

x) Noelle Dana: If the purpose of using this language is to encourage the University to publish things ahead of time. Two weeks, as we have had to move out, is just not enough time to prepare. If they do the same thing for the Fall, that could affect if students take a gap year and what they plan to do. If they have even the simplest idea, it is really vital to students making decisions for the future.

y) Michael Dugan: I am reclaiming my time, so I move to end debate.

10. Movement to vote on just the first part of the resolution passes.

11. Karen Kennedy: I just want to make it clear that the University does intend to send out an update about the Fall semester mid June. Everyone is working hard to get answers and plans out as soon as possible. I myself work closely with the move out process and on the plans for next semester, and I can assure you all every effort is being made to produce these plans. I have spent thirteen hours this week on this Senate meeting, which ultimately takes away from the ability to work on these plans.

12. The first part of the resolution passes.

13. Questioning opens up on the second part of the resolution.

14. Noelle Dana: Because everyone is now very well educated about the purpose of the committee, can we open back up to voting on hearing from Rachel on exec to form a committee?

15. Michael: Can I yield time to a member of the executive cabinet during questioning or must that be saved for debate?
16. Thomas Davis: I would say no, best practice is to keep german topics within questioning. The point of questioning is for the voting members to have a better idea of the sponsors' intentions.
17. Madison Nemeth: Is Noelle asking if we can do appointments today?
18. Noelle Dana: Yes, mostly because the intention of this part is to make it where we can act quickly and respond to students evolving needs. From all of the information we heard from Rachel, Sarah, and Aaron, a big part is compiling information, finding continuity, and being a sounding board to different bodies. I really hope we can hear Rachel's support because it is us using our voice as representatives of the student body. If that is not the point of the Senate, then I do not know what is.
19. Thomas Davis: Noelle's concern is possible to come up in new business as an informal discussion, but they cannot presently happen as they were removed from general orders. At this point, there could be a decision to act and make these appointments, but they would not be confirmed until Rachel either signed a resolution or if the Senate could reconvene to confirm these
20. Noelle Dana: Is there any way we could suspend constitutional rules?
There is a lot that goes into having a Senate meeting convene, so I would hope that we could make this decision now.

21. Michael Dugan: What is the majority that is required to add an item to the agenda?
22. Thomas Davis: Unanimous consent only applies to resolutions, amendments, orders.
23. Movement to end questioning and move into debate passes.
24. Debate:
 - a) Michael Dugan: I move to make a friendly amendment to make all references of “June 1st” be “June 10th”.
 - b) Karen Kennedy: That request was on my part given the time crunch with the move out efforts and Memorial day weekend. I do not think that much could be done in that time with so many staff and faculty members being involved in the move out process.
 - c) Consent granted from sponsors for friendly amendment.
 - d) Michael Dugan: I do believe the University pandemic response committee is something that is urgent. I apologize for sending out the wrong version, but I would like to propose another friendly amendment about the purpose of the committee.
 - e) Thomas Davis: Correct me if I am wrong, but clause 7 now reads “this committee shall have the purpose of making further recommendations...”
 - f) Michael Dugan: That works, yes.

g) Rachel Ingal: A lot of people have been working on this through different channels, which some people may not have been aware of. I totally understand the intention of this group and how it could benefit students going into the summer. However, I do have some reservations regarding it. Sarah and I were elected into these positions to be advocates for the student body. The beginning of our term has most definitely been unique, but we have been in touch with many constituents and people who have concerns. I would strongly suggest that you and any concerned constituents tune into the Q&A session with Erin Hoffman Harding. Our adviser for student affairs is the head of the Emergency Operating Committee and reports directly to Erin Hoffman Harding. He strongly advised against students that are members of the same groups with the same concerns within the same week contacting them. Administrators and faculty also have heightened stress right now with their workload, personal lives, and handling the new situation we have all found ourselves in. When we are demanding all of this out of administrators, we need to be aware of their heavy workload, shifts in their personal life, and extra stressors. It is paramount that we are judicious about what meetings we are requesting. Time is limited and there is only so much time to cover a lot of ground, so I think Student Government needs to stand

together as a united front. A lot of administrators do not have the background on the structure of student government, which can detract from productivity as a whole. Ultimately, I think it is most important for us to think about the end goal and what we want to achieve. My recommendation would be to modify the proposed committee. You have all been elected by your residence halls, and that is a very important constituency that you are serving. I encourage you all to gather the information from your constituents and then create recommendations together based on the feedback you receive, which could then be used by administration. For the sake of efficiency and clarity, I ask that you let Sarah, Aaron and I do our jobs in approaching administration. Additionally, I chair the CLC, which I can use for these same conversations and concerns.

- h) Aaron Benavides: I want to thank Michael and Noelle for being so in tune with your dorm communities and for bringing those concerns to us. We know how important it is for you to be attune to your dorm community and trying to keep those lines of communication clear. We truly make every effort to advocate for every student, and we are always more than happy to bring any concerns you or your constituents have to the student body.

- i) Noelle Dana: I 100% agree, we should have one voice. It takes all the voices of senators because members would be reaching out to each of the senators. I think it is absolutely crucial to have this committee in order to voice the concerns of the student body. I am a member of the CLC, and I have not received any communication. I know you are busy as the President, which totally makes sense. Senators are a resource, and we could compile all of this information and put it into a form. We only got feedback when we asked step by step questions, which we could do using a committee.
- j) Michael Dugan: Please do not forget about Anisha and all the work she has done. Noelle is really the one that got this all started, but please do not forget about Anisha. Thanks Karen, we really appreciate all the time and hard work you have put into helping us. Executive is the mouthpiece for what the Senate has produced. We do not mean to overstep, but to improve communication and collaborate. The purpose is to avoid duplicate communication by having a really collaborative group of students.
- k) Karen Kennedy: I feel like the description you just gave, Michael, is very different from what is in the resolution, so I just wanted to make people aware of that. The resolution is written in a way that makes it seem like you are addressing all sorts of bodies rather

than compiling information and being a feeder into the Executive branch.

- l) Thomas Davis: You recognize the executive branch as the mouthpiece. I am very confused now of the exact purpose of the committee. It states in clause 7 of the purpose, but I believe in clause 9 it mentions all the University offices and that the committee is to directly communicate with. As to that fact, student government Ad Hoc committees are very similar to what you have set up and involve communication with the student body. These points would then be handed off to the executive branch to communicate those points of grievances, questions, and concern to the administration, as the Constitution calls for. What I would like to focus on, I think what the common goal here is what the constitution puts forward about one voice of the student body represented through the Executive branch. I think the idea of what Rachel brought forward here is important, making sure that we do not overwhelm these bodies. I am proud to see this, but I think the actual text directly contradicts that position.
- m) Aaron Benavides: Rachel, Sarah, and I have had a meeting with just about every department listed in the resolution regarding Covid-19 and how it is impacting students. Every meeting that Rachel, Sarah, and I have had from the beginning we have spoken

to administrators about Covid-19 and how it is impacting students. It has been at the forefront of every meeting and we do not expect it to be going away any time soon as it is impactful for the entire student body. This is certain to be at the forefront of all of our minds through the entirety of the term, and we plan on it being a priority of ours.

- n) Noelle Dana: Can we hear from other senators in the chat to get a general feeling?
- o) Madison Nemeth: I am leaning toward trusting Exec Cab's opinion and confidence in managing this issue.
- p) Noelle Dana: But we have not heard any of this information, so the committee would help with this dispersant of information.
- q) Benjamin Erhardt: I think at this point we already have channels of communication in place that can effectively communicate Senate's (and more importantly, their constituents) concerns. To add to this channel with a new committee given the increase in traffic already seems inefficient. The purpose of the committee should not be downplayed, but I feel that the committee's function can be completed by Senators speaking to admin through CLC (during the coming school) and through Exec (now and in the future). I strongly agree with what Rachel said in regards to a need

to pause, take a step back, and use channels of communication prudently. That's my initial thought.

- r) Patrick Lee: To be perfectly honest, I have to agree with Ben. At first I was in the dark about the administration's response to the student's grievances about the move out process, and I agreed with Noelle and Mike's addressing of these issues. Now, however, that I know from Rachel what is going on to meet the needs of the students in need (such as the 260 international signers of the petition), I am comfortable letting them handle this. You guys have done a really nice job, and I'm looking forward to seeing the results of further meetings and much anticipated Q&A.
- s) Michael Dugan: The clause that a lot of people are having problems with is clause 9, is this correct? Is that the only issue?.
- t) Sarah Galbenski: That would not be the sole issue, no. I would smile on a motion to end debate.

25. Motion to end debate passes and move into vote.

26. Vote does not pass.

VI. New Business

- A. Informal discussion on SO2021-02: An Order Establishing an Independent Financial Account;

- B. [Amendment to SO2021-02: An Order Establishing an Independent Financial Account;](#)
 - C. Informal discussion on [SO2021-03: An Order to Directly Subsidize Move-Out for Low-Income and International Students in the Absence of Adequate University Action to the Same;](#)
- VII. Announcements
- VIII. Adjournment
- A. Debate:
 - 1. Thomas Davis: Prior to adjourning this meeting, I would highly recommend for the Senate to enter recess for the remainder of the summer. We have barely been able to hang onto quorum in this meeting, which does not display the voice of the Senate as well as it should and can leave us in a standstill. We all have different things going on in different parts of the world and are outside the realm of responsibility outlined in the constitution. One may think this is out of precedent, but it is actually quite in line with precedent. In fact, the Senate has never convened in the summer.
 - B. Sarah Galbenski: I would smile upon a motion to move into recess for the summer.
 - C. Thomas Davis: I must follow proper parliamentary procedure. Right now we are motioning for adjournment. At this point, I would strongly urge you Senators to vote no to adjournment so that we can vote on recess for the Summer.

- D. Vote for adjournment does not pass.
- E. Debate of motion to enter a Summer recess for the Senate.
1. Aaron Benavides: I just wanted to address Noelle's concern in the chat; I think it is very valid. That is what we are here for- to be in communication and to be of service to you guys and your concerns. Just because the Senate goes into recess does not mean we will stop working and stop being in communication with administration and you all. I do not want the thought that communication might be severed or work halted dissuade you on this vote as that is not the case.
 2. Ricardo Pozas Garza: I do not think it is wise to take away the option of meeting at this point in time where it is unclear how things may go.
 3. Sarah Galbenski: Thank you Ricardo. I actually have prepared a statement I would like to read which echoes what Thomas said. We could reconvene either at the second week of the fall semester or when Karen and I deem to do so.
 4. Noelle Dana: I think it would be irresponsible to do so given the unknown circumstances and that there are two unaddressed orders on the agenda.
 5. Matthew Bisner: It was my understanding earlier that if the Senate cannot officially meet or cannot meet quorum but needs to meet for an emergency that they can do so but that it would need to be ratified. In this case, Karen and Sarah could then meet and decide if it is something they



would like to hold the Senate for. Is this something that would still be available to us?

6. Thomas Davis: Yes, definitely. The specific phrasing in there to allow Karen and Sarah to meet first to determine if they would like to end the Senate recess. This would most likely happen at the hands of Senate members bringing urgent issues to their attention and their plans. Again, I would like to emphasize my support to enter into recess.
7. [Sarah Galbenski delivers a statement regarding the Summer term and meetings of the Senate](#)
8. Michael Dugan: One thing that does weigh on my mind is the potential for action to occur in which Senators disagree with the Chair on what priorities are. We do have a duty to students despite the unforeseen circumstances we all find ourselves in right now. I think what we need to do going forward as Senators is to keep the option open for meeting. I believe there should be an “or” statement for Karen OR Sarah rather than “and”, so we can have some way preventing any one person from blocking a meeting.
9. Sarah Galbenski: Thank you Michael. I would like to point out that we have had trouble maintaining quorum since the first hour of our meeting. I did not realize this would be the case, but I believe that would be the case at any point during the Summer due to spotty wifi, different time zones, and busy schedules. This, too, should be considered.



10. Thomas Davis: Friendly amendment to change “and” to “or”. It will be easier to vote by general consent.
 - a) Friendly amendment passes with general consent
11. Vote to end debate passes.
12. Vote passes- movement into recess until August 10th or when the Chairwoman or Advisor calls for a meeting, whichever comes first.