

- I. Opening Prayer, Theresa Salazar, *Welsh Family Hall Senator*
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
 - A. [SO 2021-20: An Order to Appoint Senators to Serve the Rest of the Term](#) was passed and two new senators were sworn in. [SS 2021-25: A Resolution Advocating the Enduring Importance of Diversity of All Forms in the Academic Colleges at the University of Notre Dame](#) and [SS 2021-26: A Resolution Recommending the Expansion of a Reliable University-Sponsored Bus Service to Chicago Airports](#) were both passed.
 - B. Minutes approved
- IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. Student Union Transition
 1. Incoming student body president and vice president. The three of us are going to meet with them about executive cabinet applications, so now is a great time to discern your role in student government in the near future. I know anyone would be more than happy to discuss their role with you if you would like to get a better idea for what is suitable for you. I want to put that on your radar as you all begin to discern your next steps
 - B. Next Student Advisory Group for Campus Reopening Meeting on March 8
 1. Very happy to dialogue with anyone about questions, comments, and concerns. I am sure there will be information regarding the University as a vaccine center as well.

2. Lainey Teeters: Do you know if there is a certain date they plan to let us know about different campus changes?
3. Sarah Galbenski: I am unsure. The email they sent out last week is technically the one they had promised. They just said it would come out by March 1st, not necessarily on March 1st. I would assume we will get another update once cases continue on the decline. Karen, do you have any thoughts to add?
4. Karen Kennedy: I do not Sarah, except to add that outdoor programming must be either sponsored or cosponsored by a department. Please reach out to us at SAO or to me personally, or with any other relatable office. That is all I know.
5. Sarah Galbenski: Thank Karen! I know Karen and her team have been working hard to be accommodating and creative so thanks for that. I have heard good things about shuffleboard by the Morris Inn.

C. Grab your sweatshirts from the Student Government office!

V. General Orders

A. Presentation by Margaret Morgan, *Director of the Center for Student Support and Care*

1. Because we are talking about mental health resources, I thought *Inside Out* was a good background to use. I am excited to talk about the Center for Student Support and Care. This Center is relatively new- we make up the Care and Wellness consultants and the Sara Bea Accessibility Services, which are not new. What is new is integrating these services into one space. We officially launched last January. You enter through the center, and from there student referrals happen to outreach and support programs, Sara Bea, and care and wellness consultants.

- a) If you are going through a rough time, but you do not know where to go this is a great place to start.
 - b) The outreach and support program is new. We have staff dedicated to students going through vulnerable processes, such as withdrawal, or ASD support.
 - c) We offer more than one one one support, including workshops and group resources
2. How can the center help?
- a) Individual care, accessibility support, workshops (skills, such as emotional regulation and studying), academic coaching (more one on one approach for guidance through school and studies), consultations, and resources (new [website](#) just launched, which is robust with resources and information).
 - b) Through the website is where you can register for an appointment to meet with a care and wellness consultant. You do not have to call a number to get scheduled. We are really committed to keeping this calendar up on the website.
 - c) Workshop schedule is also on the Website. Topics include but are not limited to working memory, mindful study practices, adjustment/monitoring.
3. Questions:
- a) Sarah Galbenski: I will go ahead and voice my question that some of our co-directors brought up. I know some students are having some trouble getting transportation to and from Q and I, and since your

center oversees aspects of the COVID-19 team I was wondering if there are any remedies going on there right now so folks can have easier transportation?

- b) Margaret Morgan: Thank you for that Sarah. In addition to my role with the center, I also work with the COVID-19 response unit. The care and concern team is different from the care and wellness consultants, and they help to check up on how students in Q and I are doing and any resources they might need. Transportation should be provided for everyone, including when they are released. If they are in a location that is really close to campus, we have been asking students if they want to walk to get some fresh air. There was a shuttle created for released students that stops at every location. This is new, and it really should be stopping at locations on loop. The struggle is students who are off-campus getting transportation because it is not provided for them, nor is food.
- c) Ben Erhardt: Thanks for sharing this presentation with us Margaret. All the work you are doing is so important, especially this year. Just in general, how is your group working to reach out to on-campus students and residence halls or off-campus students to let them know about these resources and tools to be utilized? It is in my experience that people are aware but rarely are the specifics on these tools known. What in general is your team doing to be more present in front of students to make these resources available? I think the

mental health stigma can sometimes deter people from actively reaching out for these resources.

- d) Margaret Morgan: I think that is an excellent question, and I would love you all's insight. I know you all are saturated with emails, and one current way we are getting our name out is through the student affairs emails, which should not be all. We work with hall staff at training because we see them as a point of referral. We do posters and signs in the halls about how to use these tools and what they are. We are included in all the marketing that goes out for care and wellness. Again, I think people are saturated with resources. We get most of our students from referrals, being concerned professors, advisors, and the counseling center. What is most effective in your opinions?
- e) Ben Erhardt: Now that I do think about that I have seen and heard about you all from the student affairs emails. I don't think you should necessarily stop doing that, and I would agree referrals will probably continue to be the primary way students will learn about your resources. Maybe directing that message towards faculty, and reiterating that you all are a tool for professors to reach out to. Many professors may feel they do not want to encroach on a student's privacy. Social media is probably the best mode of advertising.
- f) Margaret Morgan: That's great. Thank you, I appreciate it.
- g) Sarah Galbenski: I was super excited to invite Morgan so that you all could learn more about her and the Center so that you could share

this information with your constituents. An exciting initiative in this upcoming week is that the Associate Vice President of Student Services and the head of the emotional wellbeing task force are presenting to the Faculty Senate on the full mental health resources the University has. That way, faculty will be more aware of what resources there are for those who need it.

- h) Eliza Smith: Thanks for joining us. Going back to Sarah's original question about quarantine and isolation, some things I have heard from both fellow students but also from my own personal experience, it seems to be a disconnect on how students are supposed to obtain this information on transportation. They are just notified about testing or being released, rather than how they can get there. Other times, transportation is offered but after the student has to be out, making it obsolete. I don't know if you have any ideas of how that could be improved and transparency improved.
- i) Margaret Morgan: Thanks so much Eliza for that feedback. That is the first I am hearing of this, and something that I would love for students particularly in quarantine is to always know that the care and concern team is there for problems just like that. When students feel like they do not know who to call or what is going on, we are the team to reach out to. It sounds like what happened in the instances you mentioned should not have happened, so I will happily look into that and to see about any patterns or reasons. Please always know to

call that care and concern team, so we can advocate for you in the moment.

- j) Margaret Morgan: Thank you so much for inviting me and if you have any concerns or questions, please reach out to me and I would be happy to answer that.
- k) Sarah Galbenski: I am so glad Margaret could be here with us tonight. I hope you all utilize these resources and share them with your constituents. As she said, it is a relatively new center, so be sure to get the word out about that.

B. [SO 2021-21: An Order to Appoint Senators to Serve the Rest of the Term](#) - read by Thomas Davis

- 1. Tentative Oath of Office, Bridget Arbuckle *Cavanaugh Hall Senator*

C. [SO 2021-22: An Order to Amend the Constitution of the Undergraduate Student Body to Reflect Changes to the Campus Life Council](#) - read by Aaron Benavides

- 1. Questions:

- a) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Please bear with me as I try my best to be as eloquent as possible. I want to applaud you all for the quick turnaround with the bylaws. In the 2020 bylaw revision, the clubs did not have a direct voice in the CLC. I was a little confused by not seeing this role be reinserted into the CLC roles in the revision. Clubs play an essential role in campus life, so it is important that they are given a voice in a group involving campus life. Can you explain this?
- b) Rachel Ingal: Thanks for that question! Basically we were going off revising the 1999 bylaws. As you know there were some issues that

arose that were kind of weird, we were working on some bylaws that had never been officially approved. When we took a look at reenvisioning what we were doing, we were going off the bylaws that were approved. The unique thing about the CLC is that it is commissioned by the Board of Trustees, and there is a very intentional power balance between the university and the students so that neither can outweigh the other. We had to maintain that power balance because we do not want to sway the body one direction or another, but we wanted to diversity the student voices making up the body. As you'll notice, we tried to give representation to student groups like Prism and Diversity Council. In order to do this, we had to make some sacrifices. Unfortunately, we are not just able to continually add students or we would have added a lot of students. In doing that, we added students who were elected by certain constituencies around campus, like class councils. In order to make those changes, we did have to take off SUB and the Judicial Council President as voting members. In that case, we decided to move them to non-voting members. That is why those members changed their status slightly, but ultimately we did not add anyone else as a nonvoting member as opposed to a voting member just because of that power balance.

- c) Ricardo Pozas Garza: I have a number of follow ups, but I do not want to dominate the conversation from someone else.

- d) Sarah Galbenski: Noone has a hand raised right now Ricardo, so go the floor is yours.
- e) Ricardo Pozas Garza: First of all, what I am not completely understanding is I thought you had expressed the power balance itself was in the voting roles. I would have understood if the position had been moved to a non-voting role as opposed to voting members. It would be nice to at least have an opportunity to be at that table and to have a voice, especially after an academic year where clubs have been so drastically impacted by COVID-19. Clubs are direct mirrors of student interests. I think it is more important that their voice be heard than whether or not they vote, but I do not understand why the club voice would not get any representation. I see there is some flexibility in terms of appointees and the list of voting roles, specifically with one appointee being chosen by the Student Body President. Is there no method of yielding your time so somebody may speak on your behalf and then you can vote on behalf of that person? That is something that could still be utilized by clubs without adversely affecting the power balance?
- f) Aaron Benavides: To start off with your first point, when Rachel and I first discussed taking a look at the CLC seats, we had a meeting with the Department of Student Affairs and did a lot of introspection and reflection on how we could amplify student voices on the CLC. When we were motivated to work on these bylaws, we had to go back to the 1999 bylaws since the 2017 bylaws were never approved

or implemented. That is a big reason why the CCC has not existed for the CLC, for we were ultimately unaware that the 2017 bylaws were not actionable. For the second part, Rachel and I have been discussing using that position for not someone in the student union but for a student voice coming from a marginalized community. We really wanted it to be from a student group that is not affiliated with student government, like Fighting Irish Scholars. Having the opportunity to fill that spot strategically, especially based on what the CLC plans to focus on and accomplish during a particular term. For that reason, we did not really specify because we wanted to leave it open to future chairs of the CLC.

- g) Rachel Ingal: Just to clarify Aaron's first point, it was not that we were removing you at all. We just were strictly adding people that were voting members, then the positions listed in the 1999 bylaws we just changed their status to nonvoting. In our term, we are hoping we could just make one of the three Senators my appointee so we could keep it structurally consistent, being that the new bylaws call for just one male and one female Senator.
- h) Sarah Galbenski: Ricardo, do you have another followup?
- i) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Yes, I do! Thank you for explaining further. I think it is important to understand that the revisions of the bylaws should not be limited to what is present in the 1999 bylaws. I think the composition of the CLC should look like what campus life looks like in 2021. I think we can all agree that clubs have a very important

voice within the campus community, and I still do not see the reason to limit us particularly from even the non-voting membership by the 1999 version. I think this is a fabulous move that these marginalized groups are gaining a voice, that is essential. I think allowing other groups to have a voice rather than limiting particularly with concerns to the non-voting role.

- j) Rachel Ingal: The one thing about just yielding speaking time to people is that we did want to build in an extra seat that would have voting power based on the specific issues that would be considered. We did want to give that flexibility to whatever person is chairing the CLC and to prompt student body presidents to think about the CLC and what they hope to accomplish with that body, optimizing its capabilities.
- k) Ben Erhardt: I am a cosponsor on this order, and I appreciate Rachel and Aaron's work on this. I cannot help but hear Ricardo's point on this, so I want to play Devil's Advocate to hear thoughts on what harm would it have on the structure of the CLC to amend the bylaws for the CCC to have a non-voting member role? Ricardo has been able to speak on behalf of clubs throughout this term for clubs, so why can't one of the amendments be to give the CLC a nonvoting role.
- l) Rachel Ingal: I am totally there with you Ben, and Ricardo, by no means do i intend to invalidate your perspective or to say that the CCC has not been valuable to conversations in the past and going

forward. This has just been a conversation that we have been having for a couple weeks. Very respectfully, this wasn't brought up to us until yesterday, and we have been having a number of conversations with other involved student and university groups. We are under a bit of a time crunch, so I would really appreciate if these initial changes that have been the fruit of a lot of work and writing and discussions could be passed so that the CLC could become a more diverse body as soon as possible. Then, it is definitely a conversation we could have about a future amendment involving the CCC, but I think there needs to be a conversation first within the CLC before it ends up being passed through the Senate. I would love to hear how rectors and student affairs roles would feel because even though it would not change the power dynamic vote-wise it would shape the perspective and discussions. Perhaps they would be very open to it, then it could be something we revisit. At this point, this is all the CLC has been informed of and everyone was very in favor. I would really appreciate it if what we have here could be approved and then these conversations could happen down the road.

- m) Ricardo Pozas Garza: These are just a few concluding remarks real quick and then we can move on to debate. First of all, I want to echo what I began with to commend you for all the work your team put into this. Again, I was fully aware of all the weirdness going on with the 1999 bylaws. I know it must have been a lot of work. I think that while this is still a step in the right direction, I think the CLC is still

going to be lacking. I firmly believe once you have a conversation with all those stakeholders that you will find unanimous agreement in saying that clubs play a pivotal role on campus and that they deserve a spot at the table. I know it does not necessarily have to be CCC, even though I think that an officer from CCC would make the most sense, but any person to speak on behalf of student organizations would be quite beneficial- not just for clubs or the CCC, but for the entire student community. I am willing to vote for these bylaws provided we can continue this conversation.

- n) Rachel Ingal: Yes, Ricardo, I would be happy to continue this conversation!
- o) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Motion to end questioning and move into a debate.
 - (1) Seconded
 - (2) Vote passes

2. Debate:

- a) Dan Baudendistel: Motion to end debate and move into a vote.
- b) Thomas Davis: Wait, I have a question. There are some important amendments I would like to ask someone to make for this to compromise in a way to be in line with the Constitutional revisions that ComCon has been working on for the last semester and a half. These would be: Striking sections 3 and 4 and enumerating them as a second point under the first section. This streamlines the various responsibilities being under one clause. I would then strike section 2

and immediately propose a motion to amend that into the Senate bylaws. I would also suggest that all the Student Union branches that this affects exactly all these representatives shall show up to CLC between the four class councils, given that at some point during the year there are only three class councils. If anyone has questions on those motions, I would be happy to answer them. This is a streamlined motion based on the changes I see needed as it stands. I will reserve my opinion on the document itself, but if this is going to happen it should be done so in line and with clarity for the constitution.

- c) Sarah Galbesnki: Does anyone need further clarification in the form of questions?
- d) Ben Erhardt: I would be willing to make the motion Thomas if that is what you wish or smile upon, but I would appreciate it if you could put it in a format for me to repeat.
- e) Thomas Davis: I believe I have suggesting access, and then Sarah can share the screen.
- f) Sarah Galbenski: While he does that, remind me Madison of what vote we need in terms of parliamentary procedure? I believe it is two-thirds?
- g) Madison Nemeth: I believe two-thirds is correct, but Thomas can triple check.
- h) Thomas Davis: Two-thirds is correct.

- i) Sarah Galbenski: I have the document up now. Can I share it
Thomas?
- j) Thomas Davis: Yes, that is fine.
- k) Aaron Benavides: I would also ask for a friendly amendment to look
at the third whereas clause to change SUB Executive Directors to
Director.
- l) Natalie Ortega: Motion to make a friendly amendment to erase the s
in directors.
- m) Sarah Galbenski: Thank you, that is all we need.
- n) Thomas Davis: I am about done here, but I would like someone to
request in new business we discuss how the two positions will be
elected
- o) Aaron Benavides: Technically, it is listed in the Chief of STaff section
that they are a non-voting member, did you want to add that? You
could leave in the Chief of Staff section, but it makes sense to add to
section 1 number 2 as well.
- p) Thomas Davis: I simply just forgot. I will add that now.
- q) Eliza Smith: Motion to approve all changes to the order.
 - (1) Seconded
 - (2) Changes approved
- r) Sarah Galbenski: With those changes approved, I do believe we are
still in debate.

- s) Connor Delaney: I just want to speak in favor of the order, even speaking from a position that “Lost a voting seat” from the fake bylaws. I think it will be great for diversification of the CLC.
- t) Rachel Ingal: Thank you for that Connor! I would really appreciate if you guys would pass this today. As we near the end of our term, we have been thinking a lot about long term structural changes we can make, and I think this would be a really powerful step in representation and to elevate and amplify a lot of new voices on this campus. Obviously, we are open to further discussion. It is ever going to be perfect, but we can keep working on it as we go.
- u) Thomas Davis: Madison brought up a great point. The former points three and four should just be changed to say I hereby remove so that nothing is enumerated twice. Sorry about that.
- v) Sarah Galbenski: Thank you; that is no problem. It is friendly as well.
- w) Ricardo Pozas Garza: I want to speak out on behalf of the order as well. I wish to commend it further. I have some reservations about this being a permanent solution, but I see this as a wonderful step in the right direction. Please vote in favor of this, with the mind that this is not the full nine yards but a large improvement.
- x) Grace Franco: Motion to end debate and move into a vote.
- (1) Seconded
 - (2) Vote passes
- y) Vote:
- (1) 25 in favor, so the order passes

(2) I would also like to commend Rachel and Aaron for all their hard work on getting these bylaws all up to date.

VI. New Business

- A. SS 2021-27: A Resolution Voicing Student Concerns about Notre Dame's Recent Adjustments to Campus Life Policies and Calling the Campus Life Council to Action
- B. SS 2021-28: A Resolution Requesting a Full-Day Observance of MLK Day
- C. SS 2021-29: A Resolution Requesting Benchmarks for COVID-19 Protocols
- D. Presentation from Ricardo on reallocations.

VII. Announcements

- A. Thomas Davis: Please be in contact with your constituents on student union positions. Please make sure you are not identifying your successor, but informing everyone. We will be having a senator info session coming up next week. Information for hall and class council elections are all up on our website.
- B. Mairead Pfaff: Lots of SUB events coming up this weekend-- virtual movie watch and acousticafe.
- C. Blake Johnson: Are off-campus people interested in the senate also supposed to attend this?
 - 1. Thomas Davis: Yes, that is correct. Cannot forget the off-campus folks.
- D. Michael Murakami: Motion to adjourn
 - 1. Seconded
 - 2. passes

VIII. Adjournment