

- I. Opening Prayer
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Nominations for Assistant Student Union Treasurers were approved. Emeritus status was granted to Elizabeth Boyle, Patrick McGuire, Linde Hoffman, and Halena Hadi. Presentation by Thomas Davis on parliamentary procedure. Presentation by Ricardo Pozas Garza on the status of club funding at Notre Dame.
- IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. Thank you for filling out the [Department Membership Form](#)! If you filled it out by April 19, you should be expecting an email from your new department director(s) this week. If you have yet to fill it out, please do so ASAP.
 - B. Please email Sarah by April 27 if you are interested in serving as one of three Senators on the Campus Life Council (CLC). At our April 29 meeting, each interested senator will deliver a short (less than a minute) speech detailing their interest and qualifications before we vote to elect three Senators to the CLC.
 - C. Please email Thomas (tdavis21@nd.edu) if you are interested in serving on the Committee on the Constitution! [Use this form to sign-up!](#)
- V. [State of the Student Union Address](#), Rachel Ingal, *Student Body President*
- VI. Oath of Office, Henry Jackson, *Keenan Hall Senator*
- VII. Nominations
 - A. [Nominations for Student Union Board Executive Board Members](#)
 1. Motion to vote in block

2. Debate:

- a) Michael Dugan: Just because we are nominating individual people for individual positions I think procedurally we should vote on them individually. I know it would save some time otherwise, but I think individual would be best procedurally.
- b) Henry Jackson: Does anyone have a problem about any of the individual nominations, or if the senate as a whole
- c) Noelle Dana: I am inclined to agree with Henry because we had access to the nominations ahead of time.
- d) Michael Dugan: I did have time to read over them in the time beforehand, but I did have a constituent who had questions about the nominee heavily involved in the planning of the SUB concert and this member is Matthew. I would prefer to be able to question that person and be able to voice that concern, and we could then vote on the others in block.
- e) Sarah Galbenski: I would just like to emphasize going further we plan to have all information available the 48 hours in advance. In this particular situation, Thomas and I conferred and decided it would be best to approach this matter at this meeting, but it definitely is a unique circumstance. I definitely understand, but in
- f) Mairead Pfaff: I had a condensed application period because we were not able to send it out beforehand. As a result, all of the decisions

were not made until today, and I was writing the nomination letters until like an hour ago. This was the last meeting everyone could be here and that they could be confirmed. I apologize, sorry about that.

- g) Thomas Davis: I would definitely say Michael's inclination to have the right to hear each member individually is well founded, not only based on the short notice but based on the qualifications for each individual. I would advise you that Michael does raise a good point.
 - h) Michael Murakami: Because the motion was seconded, do we first vote on nominating everyone in block?
 - i) Thomas Davis: That is correct.
 - j) Noelle Dana: Are we voting for them to be heard in block or individually?
 - k) Thomas Davis: We are voting on whether to vote in block.
3. Voting-- close number of votes (16-10); voice vote is called.
4. Voice Vote:
- a) Thomas Davis: Michael raised a good point that we did not close debate before doing the voice vote, so let's now motion to end debate and I will keep this vote as the votes on the floor but people can have a chance to vote differently after debate.
 - b) Motion passes to vote on the nominations in block.
5. Questions:

- a) Michael Dugan: Matthew, you were responsible for planning the SUB concert. Prior to the cancellation of student events due to COVID-19, SUB had still not announced who would be the performer. My constituent wants to know who that was and how much they were going to be paid.
- b) Matthew Luneburg: The performer was going to be RL Grime. I believe we were offering them around \$100,000. It was in budget, our budget was \$140,000 and we came out around \$141,000.
- c) Michael Dugan: Some of my constituents have some questions why the concert is free and why students are allowed to enter the concert who may not be Notre Dame students. We as Notre Dame students pay a certain amount of money each year that goes towards SUB. Will you be checking a Notre Dame ID at the door rather than when picking up the tickets?
- d) Matthew Luneburg: I do not think that decision is solely based on my discretion. We decided to do the concert for free because we were in budget, so we felt it was in everyone's best interest. I think we would have to wait until the concert, but I have a feeling it would have been a similar process to the football games where you show ID and ticket at door.
- e) Anoop Sunkara: Who is RL Grime?

- f) Matthew Luneburg: He is the DJ behind the hit “UCLA”. If you look that up, you would probably find him.
- g) Sam Cannova: I was just really curious where you stand on the whole T Swift/ Kanye debate?
- h) Matthew Luneburg: T Swift. T Swift versus anyone and she would win is my honest answer.

6. Debate:

- a) Michael Dugan: I do really appreciate the nomination of Megan. I went to high school with her and I think SUB is going to be in very good hands.

7. Vote passes and nominations are confirmed

VIII. General Orders

A. Presentation on [Resolutions, Amendments, and Orders](#), Thomas Davis, *Acting Parliamentarian for the Student Senate*

1. “Drafting Awesome Amendments and Really Rad Resolutions”

- a) Jack Mansfield: If you bring a resolution up on the floor does that still have to be sent in to Sarah beforehand?
- b) Thomas Davis: A resolution brought up on the floor, then it was not sent prior to the meeting and is not on the agenda.
- c) Michael Dugan: When you say not on the agenda, do you mean not in “General Order”, not in “New Business”, or both?

- d) Thomas Davis: Both because “New Business” is intended for the next week, but it is technically on the agenda and is fair game to discuss in the Senate. It is really up to the Chairwoman’s discretion.
- e) Karen Kennedy: Be sure to speak with involved parties before working on a resolution-. Most of the time administrators and staff are happy to engage in a conversation and would prefer it before a resolution is already passed on something. It is best to know all the information and know where all parties are at.
- f) Michael Dugan: How do we determine what number to put behind the “SO” or “SX”?
- g) Thomas Davis: Ultimately the parliamentarian’s job is to upkeep the Senate website. It is very important to be in communication with them. If you have something you would like to write up, I will share the template with you. Fill it out with “SO2021-short description”, and I will sort them by number in order that they come to me.
- h) Madison Nemeth: For letters, do we label it “SO” or “SS”?
- i) Thomas Davis: I want to say “SS”, but we have not had experience with this so I want to double check it for you. Technically a letter takes a very specific form of a statement.
- j) Elaine Teeters: Earlier we talked about the difference between friendly amendments and regular amendments. So how do we distinguish between these?

k) Thomas Davis: A friendly amendment is just a general term you can tack onto an amendment that really does not change the intended meaning in any way. It would be something like a spelling error, so the Senate would just agree to make the change.

B. Presentation on [Benchmarking the Notre Dame Student Union](#), Matthew Bisner,
Judicial Council President

1. Matthew Bisner: We are at this turning point. This is not the first time these recommendations have been brought to the table. You guys have the ability to shape the Notre Dame Student Union into what it should be. A big part of this would be a Constitutional rewrite, making it shorter and more direct with more formalized bylaws. In doing so, student government procedures and organization would be better understood by constituents. These approaches have been made for the last ten years, but with no success because of not having enough momentum.
2. Madison Nemeth: If we were to go about doing a whole overhaul on the constitution, would that be done by a singular massive order or a multi-step process?
3. Matthew Bisner: Under “New Business”, you will see there is a Resolution for a Constitutional Convention in which we would get together a group to rewrite the Constitution throughout the Summer.
4. Noelle Dana: I am a transfer student coming from a school with a very different student government structure. When I was a student coming in, it

was really difficult to find who to go to for different concerns and resources.

So, thank you for a great presentation.

5. Elaine Teeters: I have a question about some of the extra branches like HPC and CCC. If we were to draft a new constitution would these be under the current three branches or be separate branches or how would this look?
6. Matthew Bisner: Yes, for sure. I am asking this question as much as you all. HPC involves programming and is ultimately doing work related to the Executive Branch. In essence, the CCC is doing legislative allocation work, so one option would be expanding it and making it the second branch of the legislature. We would really have to analyze what these powers are and what they are analogous to.
7. Benjamin Erhardt: Great presentation, I strongly agree that we could improve the cohesion of student government. My question has to do with the timeline you mentioned and of what to do next. I took a peak at the new business for next week and saw that an overhaul approach would be ongoing until October, which is the formal route. Do you feel that a formal route or an informal route would be best for the flow of current work for this term and if/ when this would be?
8. Matthew Bisner: The formal route is not my top route. I think it has an aggressive timeline, but it is something we should consider. It involves having many conversations and consultations with different organizations and the task of drafting a great Constitution by October is aggressive. In the

ideal world, what we would do is ratify it for the next term, so it would not affect the continuity of this term. It could affect transition, however, for the next term, which we could work on a case by case basis. That is a great question but I do not think the ratification of a Constitution would affect your term.

9. Benjamin Erhardt: Is your preferred method the informal patchwork route then?
10. Matthew Bisner: Ricardo and I had a long conversation about this the other day, and I think the best would be an in between of these two routes where the Senate is laying down timelines and goals for each of those timelines. That way we could accomplish the work that needs to be done and giving it due diligence, while holding ourselves to a high standard of accountability and a reasonable timeline.
11. Michael Dugan: Do the other universities you benchmarked have similar residential structures to Notre Dame? How do you think this affects where Notre Dame students might place this second senatorial body. Which model would be most applicable to Notre Dame.
12. Matthew Bisner: No, none of them did have a residential structure like Notre Dame. Looking at what that bicameral body would be, I am really at a loss at this point. I have considered CCC and other potential possibilities, and I honestly do not know. What I am hoping to get here is some form of consensus or discussion from the Senate to see what would be best.



13. Michael Dugan: Should the two branches be composed of bodies that have fundamentally different membership criteria, is this something you're looking for checks and balances on, or are these two bodies to take a more deliberative action before passing things?
14. Matthew Bisner: I think at the end of the day, the Senate is made up of a widespread number of types of students at different schools. If we wanted to pursue that route, I think it would be a really good way to diversify the Senate and bring different voices and then having the dorm voices be the second legislative body creating a bicameral structure. I am not sure if this is something we would want to do, but it would be fruitful to have general senators, special interest senators, and so on.
15. Ricardo Pozas Garza: I think the Student Body would really benefit from restructuring the constitution and making it less verbose. Based on the conversation we had earlier in the weekend, I think I am much more informed now on how I see this going forward. For all of our benefit, could you share your personal view on the vision you have going forward on what should be done, how so, and whether this should be done on the Senate floor?
16. Matthew Bisner: Hopefully, what we can do as the Student Senate is to discuss here and at the next meeting attempts to talk through hopes and concerns about how to move forward, whether this be utilizing the Student Ethics Commission or a Constitutional Convention. I hope to have a solid

plan by the end of the next meeting of what our plans are going forward, so we can begin working on this.

17. Noelle Dana: If the Constitution were to be redone, who would this need to be run past in terms of administrative bodies and what would this look like?
18. Matthew Bisner: It requires the advice and consent of SAO and our advisors.
19. Curt Gouldin: Great presentation! I am one of the co-chairs for HPC for next year. Do you have any vision of what the bicameral legislation would do and why not keep it unicameral?
20. Matthew Bisner: The goal for bicamerality, just coming from looking at other schools, is to have the Senate be a deliberative body representing the whole student body and then on the other side having a body dealing with financials. We are coming out of a term in which we spent seven to ten Senate meetings discussing club funding. Bicamerality would allow the Senate to focus more on policies and bettering student body life. It should be noted that the power of constitutional amendment would still be power of student body,
21. Curt Gouldin: To clarify, the second body would be focused primarily on financial discussions.
22. Matthew Bisner: That is how I see it right now. Then, in between the two bodies you would have to get supermajority voting going forward, so it would change a lot of the ways in which legislation is done for the Senate.

23. Curt Gouldin: From a more HPC perspective, how would you deal with incorporating voices of the eleven bodies ND currently has? Regardless of method, it is a serious transformation of student government. I know obviously the co-chairs of HPC are invited to each Senate meeting, but we also are not voting members.
24. Matthew Bisner: Regardless of what path we take, the body doing these changes would have to sit down with the heads of each of these branches before making any changes, to move things out of the Constitution, to establish the bylaws, or for a complete overhaul. In that way we would at least be getting the input of each of these bodies in restructuring Student Government. While the patchwork method may work better for people's schedules, it does not emphasize the student body vote so much as the formal route would.
25. Sam Cannova: I think the aspect of having non-voting members be present in Senate meetings is to empower those voices and allow them to be in the loop, more well-informed, and feel a part of the decision making. Reforms can be discussed within each branch and then the Senate can give its okay when these all come together. Maybe we could convene town halls at the right time where leaders and any interested students could come and listen in and air their thoughts.
26. Patrick Lee: I am curious, I like that town hall idea, how do you plan on incorporating, in terms of this overhaul, everyone's voices when it is a ten

member committee ultimately making these big decisions? At the end of the day, it seems like a pretty small group.

27. Matthew Bisner: Great point, I think the exact phrasing is that the Senate may elect no more than seven additional members. The seven additional members would ideally be representing the seven different bodies of the Student Union so that someone from each branch would be present.
28. Madison Nemeth: If we were to go about the patchwork model, would the research and responsibility mainly fall on the Committee on the Constitution and Judicial Council to go about the changes?
29. Matthew Bisner: The Student Ethics commission would be the body consulting one on one with the student union organizations. They would go section by section, article by article, pointing out the ones relevant to those groups. They would then walk through items that do not necessarily need to be there and move these items into the bylaws. They would then consult with the Parliamentarian and Committee on the Constitution to double check the Student Ethics Commission's recommendations. This would then need to be formalized to be brought to the Senate floor and approved.
30. Aaron Benavides: Thank you for your hard work on this Matthew. As someone who has been working with the Student Union since my freshman year, I can attest to the ways I have seen some inefficiencies and appreciate your consideration. I do want to raise some of my concerns regarding the formal process. Given the current pandemic we find ourselves in and the

uncertainties this brings, undergoing discussion of a formal process in the Senate order for next meeting might not be the best option right now. We have no idea what this summer or even the fall semester could turn out to be. We are concerned this could lead to more policy issues falling behind on the Executive branch side because that would be a disservice to the students and the Student Union. Can you further explain what a middle path would look like between formal and informal? Right now, I am definitely in favor of the informal path given that it gives each branch of the Student Union an opportunity to be wholly involved in the process.

31. Matthew Bisner: I agree. The resolution I have under new business for next week has its shortcomings and is not fit to come to the floor because of the rigidity of it and given the current situation. I just wanted to put it out there to the Senate so everyone could see what this would look like. It could be rewritten to say “or designee” to be able to respect the schedules of Sarah and Rachel and the plans they have for implementing other policies while still ensuring voices of the executive branch are being represented. The Student Union Ethics Commission would work alongside the Committee on the Constitution to ensure the drafted constitution contains the spirit of the constitution but also has the voices of student union organizations.. The goal is to make the constitution more purpose driven and much less cluttered. I hope the dual approach of the Committee on the Constitution and the

Student Union Ethics Commission, along with the Senate could be this middle ground approach.

32. Aaron Benavides: Would you want a formal senate order outlining the informal process or what would the specifics of this look like?
33. Matthew Bisner: That would be completely up to the consideration of the Senate. The things I would recommend to be put into consideration at next week's meeting would be the timeline and what this would look like. I do not know because I do not know what the Senate wants necessarily.
34. Elaine Teeters: With the uncertainty of the Fall semester given the pandemic, would these plans be feasible remotely?
35. Matthew Bisner: This resolution was written March 15, 2020, so quite a while ago. It has not been updated to reflect the very real possibility that we could not be coming back in the fall. This means we might not be able to go about some of these formal procedures or might require creative possibilities to work within that framework. The constitutional convention as it is laid out becomes less and less feasible by the day due to these unexpected events.
36. Michael Dugan: In order to have this very broad overhaul, it is not simply about what each branch wants but what the students want. Do we think it is the appropriate time to even consider this patchwork approach if we cannot get student feedback?
37. Matthew Bisner: You are absolutely right, we cannot consult the students in a broad way if we do not come back in the fall. This is actually where the

patchwork approach would help us. We can push off making the big overhaul changes, and focus on internal student union organizations and revising the current constitution. I think organizing the constitution and moving parts to bylaws is a big enough job on its own.

38. Karen Kennedy: I am really grateful for this wonderful conversation you all are having. I have the same question and concern of doing this when the student government could not appropriately engage with the student body. This would be pivotal and exciting work, but I want to be cautious about moving forward. There are so many potential problems dealing with these issues remotely, such as internet glitches. It would be a disservice to the student body to take on these challenges without allowing for all voices to be heard. Like Matthew said, there is a great deal of reform that can be done with the constitution before moving into restructuring.
39. Thomas Davis: What kind of dogs do you have Matthew? In terms of the Committee on the Constitution, it definitely is a great tool that has been underutilized and I think it is a great idea to utilize it. It is the job of the Parliamentarian to prompt these notions of change at the end of each term, but given these unforeseen circumstances I was not able to have the conversations I would have liked to have. Branch leaders present, if there are any reforms or ideas you have for restructuring please be gathering these notes and thinking about them so we can be more prepared and well-informed to make changes once we are all able to be together. This

summer presents an awesome opportunity if you are able to get these reforms going forward. We do not want to let these changes be hindered another year. I again call you guys to consider joining the Committee on the Constitution and making it an impactful year.

C. [SS2021-05: A Resolution Encouraging the Incorporation of Native Culture and Notre Dame's History with Native People in the Moreau FYE Course](#)

1. Read by Kaya Lawrence
2. Questions:
 - a) Michael Dugan: Is there a reason you choose to use the term “native” rather than another descriptor throughout the resolution?
 - b) Kaya Lawrence: As Sarah mentioned, Anna and Lauren played a huge role in crafting this resolution. If I can, I would like to yield my time to Anna.
 - c) Anna Scartz: That is mostly because in a lot of research and current academics you’ll hear all different phrasing. The best way to phrase it is to use the specific tribal name each time, but we did not want to limit this resolution in this way. Hopefully in this course, students will be more open to hearing experiences from both native americans and other indigenous people. The term “native” respects that broadness, while still acknowledging them.

- d) Michael Dugan: You particularly use the term natives to refer to the Potawatame who had resided on Notre Dame's land. Was that for consistency or for another other particular reason?
- e) Anna Scartz: That is mainly for consistency. There have been other tribes to occupy this land throughout the course of history, so it makes reference to that fact.
- f) Michael Dugan: You mentioned there were different tribes residing on this land, but it sounds like we are privileging the Potawatomi over the other tribes that have been on this land?
- g) Anna Scartz: The relationship Notre Dame has with the Potawatomi is unique because they were residing there when Father Sorin founded Notre Dame and had direct interaction with him, who land agreements were formed with. We do not want to limit the conversation, so deemed "native" the most appropriate phrasing to respect all tribal groups.
- h) Michael Murakami: The resolution is to include native history in MFYE. What curriculum is being recommended to be taken out of Moreau?
- i) Kaya Lawrence: I will yield my time to Lauren for that question.
- j) Lauren Klein: In order to get a better idea of what the curriculum would look like, we want to get opinions of students and the Moreau faculty. We have drafted a survey we plan to send out gathering

opinions on this. The curriculum component of this is very versatile, we would be willing to include resources or even a module depending on feedback we receive.

- k) Karen Kennedy: Have you spoken with anyone who works with the Moreau First Year Experience course, like the people who coordinate the course regarding this?
- l) Kaya Lawrence: I did provide Anna and Lauren with resources of people they could talk to since this was really their project they undertook, so I will yield my time to them.
- m) Anna Scartz: We have been trying the most in speaking with Lauren Donahue who has been involved in this process most recently with sustainability, which went through a similar process to have that topic become a part of the curriculum. We have been in communication with her about our progress. We have used connections to communicate with Moreau faculty about these ideas. We have spoken with the organization on campus made up of Native American students who are excited to engage with implementing this curriculum and given their approval.

3. Voting moved to the first item in general orders for the next meeting.

D. Motion to adjourn.

E. Approvals

IX. New Business



- A. Nominations for Judicial Council Vice President of Elections and Vice President of Peer Advocacy
- B. A Vote on Senate Membership to the Campus Life Council (3 Elected Senators + 1 Appointed Off-Campus Senator)
- C. Surplus Discussion, Grace Stephenson, *Student Union Treasurer*
- D. SS2021-06: A Resolution in Recognition of Provost Thomas G. Burish's Service to the University of Notre Dame
- E. [SO2021-01: A Resolution to Convene and Authorize a Constitutional Convention](#)