

- I. Opening Prayer, Natalie Ortega, *Lewis Hall Senator*
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
  - A. A presentation was given by the Vice President of Student Affairs Erin Hoffman Harding about campus reopening plans and how the University is responding to different social problems on campus. This was followed by a Q&A session. Appointments to the Committee on the Constitution were then approved. SS2021-16, a Resolution to Commit to Anti-racist Action at Notre Dame was debated and passed, committing to the Senate and Administration supporting groups devoted to improving diversity and the University response to it, such as SRI, the University Task Force, and BSA. It was agreed that this would be the first resolution of many to be drawn up with the Student Senate group focused on racial injustices and prevention. It was agreed SO2021-07 about the Covid-19 Student Response Account would be tabled until the next meeting due to time constraints.
    1. Minutes approved
- IV. A Presentation by the Senior Director of Campus Dining, Chris Abayasinghe, and Cheryl Bauer, Director of Sourcing and Sustainability, on Sustainability, Menu Enhancements, and Service Format
  - A. Chris Abayasinghe: Very unprecedented times, especially to start with, but very excited to have students back. Have had to learn on the fly pretty quickly how to resolve physical distancing challenges, lines, dining options and capabilities. Enhancement of dining options since first started-- such as the desserts that they so

kindly brought to share with the student senate! The vegan options additionally have improved in options and in taste

- B. Cheryl Bauer: We know from the past that we desire to be a sustainable campus, so we acquired compostable containers. Unfortunately, to be efficient they wind up breaking down with heat and moisture, and they also do not conserve heat very well, which is a health issue as well as a desirable issue. Along with Dana Plagenz, the Director of Sustainability, we are looking to move to WHAT IS IT CALLED? They are made in Minnesota and have a significantly smaller footprint. They can break down overtime. We do not have compostable facilities in this area of Indiana, so they all end up in the landfill to begin with.
- C. Chris Abayasinghe: If you guys could pass them around and get a feel for them, and let us know what you think. Our goal is to have a smaller footprint while also responding to student concerns of thermal retention and ensuring we provide a product that has as close of a sourcing rating as possible.
- D. Cheryl Bauer: We found out soon before students came back that there would not be in person dining allowed, so we brought bags in so that you would be able to carry your containers where you needed to carry them. In response to student complaints, we are working to decline the quantity of bags on the stands, and next week they will be gone. We know many of you have your own tote bags or have bags from the grocery store to use. In case you do need a bag, we have acquired bags that fit into small bags and can hook on to your backpack. We are selling them at their exact price point so we are not looking to make a profit. Another response to student

feedback we are making is the transition to reusable cutlery. We are currently building cutlery kits for you, and we welcome you to help us do so the next two weeks at Pizza Pi. Each student is being issued two kits so there can be one in your bag at any given time. If you lose them, then you can buy a new set for cheap in the Huddle Mart or dining hall.

- E. Chris Abayasinghe: We do welcome feedback about what you guys think.
- F. Michael Murakami: Will you guys be phasing out the reusable cutlery as well?
- G. Chris Abayasinghe: Yes that is correct.
- H. Michael Dugan: What are your plans for sustainability in terms of the cups in improving sustainability and quality of service?
- I. Chris Abayasinghe: We ran into the same concerns with the cups as with the containers of it breaking down with moisture. Currently with the health code, we cannot have students fill up their own cups. There are now beverage machines outside at South Dining Hall to eliminate the time in which it is sitting, and we are looking to transition this.
- J. Renee Pierson: I just want to thank all of the dining hall staff for all of the efforts they have made to accommodate students. I really appreciate all of the effort.
- K. Niels Caspersen: I work in the dining hall and a lot of times I have heard of a lot of chefs feeling understaffed. I was curious what plans you have in place to support your staff?
- L. Chris Abayasinghe: Last week we did a staffing model for both dining halls where we did a baseline of number of meals per day and number of containers, which is



certainly a change from last year. We understand that there are not enough workers currently to both prepare the food and package the additional containers. We have posted positions today to add to the staff and will begin interviewing.

M. Ricardo Pozas Garza: Thank you so much for being here. Do you guys also have a timeline for these stainless steel utensils as well?

N. Chris Abayasinghe: The week of September 28th is when we will begin distributing the kits, so when we will also begin to phase out plastic utensils. .

O. Anisha Jaipuria: If it would be possible, it would be great for the signs on the screens to match what is being served to avoid confusion and people bumping into one another within the dining hall.

P. Chris Abayasinghe: Yes, we are aware that it is a problem and are working to fix it. Starting this week you can actually go through the line and the staff will fill the container to reduce food waste and container usage.

V. Executive Announcements

A. Student Advisory Group for Campus Reopening 9/14 Meeting Update

1. Sarah Galbenski: It was primarily about the cold weather, end of the semester, break, and start of spring semester. If you have any questions about these please let me know.

B. University Committee on Women Faculty and Students Update

1. Sarah Galbenski: We talked mainly about the new Title IX regulations, and we elected the chair of that group as well. At the next meeting we will be talking about campus climate and the upcoming election.



C. Executive Statement by Rachel Ingal

1. Hi everyone. It's good to see you all today.

Before we begin, after a turn of events, I feel like there is something I need to address. This year, in the Senate and outside of it, you all have come to know Sarah Galbenski. And in knowing her, I'm sure that I don't need to tell you that her kindness, compassion, and goodness shine through in all of her interactions with people. She is truly one of the warmest and nicest people I have ever met, and I am constantly blown away by her intentionality in conversation and selfless nature. I chose her as a running mate because I knew she lives out her faith and consistently works toward social justice. She spent last spring break on a CSC "Act Justly" seminar regarding Racial Justice and the American Civil Rights Movement, traveling through Memphis, Jackson, Selma, and Birmingham and learning about the civil rights movement and its implications on today. On top of her already busy schedule, Sarah has opted to take the one credit class with the Klau Center on Building an Anti-Racist Vocabulary. And she has even hosted racial justice working groups for all of you, which included organizers of the student strike, in order to discuss how the senate can be of most help. Now that Sarah's character has been called into question, I find it very important to speak toward the matter - not just for her personal sake, but for the sake of the entire Student Union and the legitimacy of what we all do together every week.

This year has been challenging. With the coronavirus marking the beginning of our term and characterizing our transition, we have had to be as flexible as possible and try to remain resilient. We love getting the chance to work with you all every week and engage in fruitful dialogue about important issues, but we also dedicate a countless amount of hours behind the scenes. Sarah dedicates the majority of her days and nights to three hour faculty senate meetings, speaking with administrators, getting dinner with new FUELers, visiting Hall Councils, having conversations with leaders of student clubs, and on top of it all, working to ensure that the Senate is an efficient and effective body that can accurately represent the



students. She is diligent about meeting deadlines and communicating with you all in a timely manner, and she is thoughtful about how to balance the multitude of needs and interests that you all bring to the table in order to make the best use of your time.

This week, Sarah received a total of five resolutions - three were carrying over from last week, and two were submitted this week. Of these two additional resolutions, one was submitted past the Sunday night deadline that she so respectfully requested of you in order to set the agenda for the week. She had already scheduled a presentation from a campus administrator in order to keep you all involved in the dialogue on campus issues and amplify your voices to the actors holding the power, like we promised to do, and she also had three resolutions from the week prior on the docket - one that we didn't reach at the last Senate, and two others that had already been on new business. She let the authors of the latter two resolutions know that they would not be able to fit on the agenda this week, out of respect for all of your time and our time capacity, but that she would be happy to have the discussion next week.

In her correspondence on this resolution, she acknowledged that this was “a significant issue” and that she would “welcome the discussion of the order at a future meeting”. By no means did she “deny debate time to a bill she didn't support” or “refuse to hear this piece of legislation”. This mischaracterization of events and portrayal of Sarah as some kind of tyrannical and heartless leader is disturbing to me, and it is simply untrue. Not only am I disappointed at the lack of consideration for the humanity of student leaders when waging these attacks at people who are truly dedicating their time and energy to serving students and espousing to the public their social irresponsibility, but I am frustrated with the way that these words now harm the mandate of the student senate and student union and tarnish its name. I have been grateful to the many senators who have reached out expressing their support today and expressed their interest in collaboration moving forward. In the future, I

would encourage using respectful and dignified means of achieving ends, as it is imperative to our success as a student union and Catholic university.

I now yield my time to Chief of Staff, Aaron Benavides.

2. Statement by Aaron Benavides:

Dear Members of the Senate,

Rarely does the Chief of Staff address the Student Senate in this manner. Nonetheless, today I decided it was necessary to speak to you on the issue which Rachel has just spoken of.

In my role as Chief of Staff, it is my duty to advance the mission of the Student Body President and Vice President and manage and support our Executive Cabinet. Over the course of my term, I have found that it is incumbent on all of us to stand up for the Student Union and its actors who are devoted to bettering Notre Dame.

As someone who has been a part of Student Government for nearly all of my time at Notre Dame, I truly believe that the work that we have been doing this year as a Student Union is some of the most important work that has ever been done. The way we have come together from the different Student Union Organizations to work together has been inspiring. Rachel, Sarah, and I count ourselves blessed to work with great counterparts across the Student Union, especially with you all. We remain committed to this cooperation and collaboration throughout our term.

We recognize that there have been and will be points of disagreement, and we appreciate the opportunities we have had and will continue to share for dialogue and constructive conversation. However, what I will not accept is what I saw published this morning, which was nothing short of a slanderous Letter to the Editor attacking Sarah for performing her duties as Chair of the Senate. The blatant misrepresentation of the facts and situation was in my opinion unbecoming of any member of the Student Union. To completely lie about a situation to create a personal and political attack does not serve any purpose and simply distracts from the essential work we must undertake.

The work we do is hard. Indeed many of us in this room ran or assumed our positions not knowing what our terms would look like. Nevertheless, it is a privilege to serve our fellow students during this time. We must recall the preamble of the Constitution of the Undergraduate Student Union calls us to “achieve the greatest possible contribution to our community...”

Our positions in the Student Union are not about politics or careers. It is about serving the student body. Let’s not get distracted by politics as we pursue social justice and build a better Notre Dame for all.

With that, I yield my time to the Chair.

## VI. General Orders

### A. [SO 2021-07: An Order to Make \\$10,000 Available from the Student Union](#)

[COVID-19 Response Financial Account](#) - read by Aaron Benavides

1. Michael Murakami: Motion to cap meeting at 7:30
  - a) Seconded
  - b) Vote passes
2. Questions:
  - a) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Thanks again for writing this resolution Grace, and I think it will do good for a lot of organizations. I did notice it did not have clubs written specifically in it, do you think the FMB would smile upon this addition?
  - b) Grace Stephenson: Both a yes and a no. I think it is only fair that the student body has to apply retroactively rather than proactively to align with the policies. I do agree that clubs will have been greatly struck by the pandemic, and will do my best to work with clubs to get

the necessary funding they need, but it technically falls within the realm of the CCC.

- c) Ricardo Pozas Garza: We would most likely have to establish a separate fund within the CCC accounts. Would the FMB then entertain the idea of opening up that second account?
- d) Grace Stephenson: I think yes. I also want to remind you all again that we have not read every request and that it is also not certain exactly what FMB would say. It depends on what money is needed and why.
- e) Ricardo Pozas Garza: That makes a lot of sense, thank you Grace. I look forward to working with you in the future.

3. Movement into debate

4. Movement into a vote

- a) Vote passes!

B. [SO 2021-08: An Order to Suspend Late-Comer Elections](#) - read by Tiffany

Pages-Sanchez, proxy for Matthew Bisner

- 1. Questions:
- 2. Movement out of Questioning and into Debate
- 3. Movement out of Debate and into Vote
  - a) Vote passes!

- C. [SO 2021-09: An Order Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the Undergraduate Student Body Replacing the Executive Programming Board with the Executive Committee](#) - Summary read by Aaron Benavides

1. Questions:

- a) Michael Dugan: So you mentioned the SUB directors are on EPB, so what is the logic behind reducing their involvement with this new proposed committee?
- b) Aaron Benavides: My predecessors have all had similar experiences of EPB not being very productive, nothing ever really gets done. We were either meeting too frequently or too little, and rarely at opportune times in the schedule of programming. We started meeting with the members of the Executive Committee at the end of last semester, which seems to accomplish more of what EPB was supposed to. It is our goal to work for cohesion of the student body, which we feel would be done by this committee and serve a greater purpose.
- c) Ricardo Pozas Garza: I believe I am one of the few individuals who has served on both of these groups. Just in one meeting, the Executive Committee accomplished more than in an entire semester of EPB. This is one reason why I completely support this switch.
- d) Mairead Pfaff: The position of the previous SUB members serving on EPB was a little closer to the formation of the events. Even

though there are fewer people, the person from SUB present would be most knowledgeable and in close communication with SUB material.

- e) Benjamin Erhardt: How often would you all meet and would we be able to be kept in the loop on what is discussed?
- f) Aaron Benavides: Katherine will take minutes for these meetings as well, and we would certainly discuss what happened at the meeting in Senate
- g) Renee Pierson: How would it look for having proxies?
- h) Aaron Benavides: Likely a similar process as the Senate where you send another officer from your department.
- i) Sam Cannova: At what point in this process would we propose a friendly amendment?
- j) Thomas Davis: At any time.
- k) Sam Cannova: If noone has questions, I would like to propose a friendly amendment.
- l) Thomas Davis: It might be better to move into debate rather than do it in questioning if noone has questions.
- m) Sam Cannova: I move we go into debate

## 2. Movement into debate

- a) Sam Cannova: I propose a friendly amendment. When this group started meeting informally we did not call it the Executive

Committee. It was called the Guardians of Olympus. Wouldn't it just be the coolest if we received minutes from the Guardians of Olympus? I propose to you my fellow Senators that we call this committee what it was originally called, something fun: The Guardians of Olympus. My friends not let us waste the hours but enjoy the minutes!

- b) Karen Kennedy: It is always a pleasure to hear from Sam Cannova. It is my duty to pass off on any changes to the Constitution. I do support this committee and think it is a great idea, but I cannot support the name.
- c) Thomas Davis: Do not vote for Sam's friendly amendment please. Myself and Matthew Bisner cannot sign off on this amendment. I support its mission and the role of the committee. The Committee on the Constitution was formed to handle matters like this, and the amendment as it is would be is lukewarm. Our goal is to make the constitution better, so I feel this would be a matter best handled by the Committee on the Constitution. The article mentioning EPB that it is replacing is not required to meet until October, which gives us plenty of time to draft up the piece of the constitution creating this group.
- d) Aaron Benavides: I still encourage you all to pass this order. EPB has been on its death bed for at least the four years I have been here and

likely even before that. I really think this group could do so much more good.

- e) Michael Dugan: It does not require the Judicial Council to approve it but to give council on it, which it sounds like has been.
- f) Thomas Davis: Having this Judicial Council experience is valuable in drafting pieces of the Constitution. We just need some time but could have something drafted for next week.
- g) Aaron Benavides: If I ask someone to table it to your committee to have something prepared for next week, would that be possible?
- h) Isabella Garcia: Motion to table it
- i) Isabella Garcia: I withdraw my motion.
- j) Sarah Galbenski: Great is there anything else on your mind Isabella?
- k) Isabella Garcia: I motion to table this order to the Committee on the Constitution to work on.
- l) Motion passes

VII. New Business

VIII. Announcements

- A. Next week is Civic Engagement week
- B. Birds of Prey in Debart 101 tonight and tomorrow. All SUB movies are now free
- C. Acousticafe will be tonight on Library Lawn
- D. Rachel Ingal will be performing at Acousticafe

IX. Adjournment