

- I. Opening Prayer, Patrick Lee, *Stanford Hall Senator*
- II. Roll Call
- III. Approval of Minutes
  - A. SO 2021-10 An Order Amending the Constitution to Prohibit Student Union Investments in and Consumption of Forced Labor was tabled to the Committee on the Constitution. Isabella Garcia was appointed to the Campus Life Council. SS 2021-17: A Resolution to Educate COVID-19 Positive Students Upon Release from Isolation and Provide Post-Discharge Testing was passed to improve consistency and resources for recovered Covid-19 students. Thomas Davis reported the Committee on the Constitution's suggestions for SO2021-09 on the reconfiguration of EPB. SS 2021-18: A Resolution in Support of Upholding the Preponderance of Evidence Standard in Title IX and Other Sex-Based Misconduct Cases was passed. A resolution calling for the resignation of Father Jenkins due to Covid-19 misconduct was not passed.
    1. Minutes passed
- IV. Executive Announcements
  - A. Discussion of adding some sort of break in the Spring semester to support student and faculty mental health.
    1. We would really like to hear your feedback on this and innovative ideas as to how this could be done.
  - B. Faculty Senate Update

1. Motion of no confidence in Father Jenkins was essentially postponed, and they went into Executive session, which I was not included in as a nonvoting member.

C. Board of Trustees Report Update

1. Discussed the University's general response to Covid-19 and bringing students back. A lot of what we talked about had to do with mental health, gathering spaces, additional testing, and so on. A big focus really wound up being mental health, which seemed to be taken very well. Hopefully we will see further improvements going into the Spring semester.

V. General Orders

- A. [SO 2021-09 An Order to Amend the Constitution of the Undergraduate Student Body to Transition the Executive Programming Board from a Student Union Branch to an Article II Board](#) - read by Thomas Davis

1. Questions:
  - a) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Thank you for bringing this to the table. It seems like the intent behind this order has been significantly altered from what it was when first brought to the Senate by Aaron and I. Could you please explain why the intention of this order was shifted so much?
  - b) Thomas Davis: The purpose is to have a group with the intention to collaborate, bounce ideas off one another, and plan programming amongst different branches of student government. It is moved to be under Article 2 for the Chief of Staff, who was already the Chair. I would acknowledge as the presenter of this that it has been

---

substantially altered. You do not have to vote yes, you can strike it down, the cosigners can object and bring back their method.

- c) Henry Jackson: Why do you think it is not necessary to have this as a constitutional requirement?
- d) Thomas Davis: There is no format in which all branches of the student body, with different defined powers, can be constitutionally required to meet together. There is no purpose in raising the number of times for the group to meet because it will not benefit the role of it.
- e) Movement out of questioning.

2. Debate:

- a) Aaron Benavides: I just want to offer my two cents as the primary author on the original order. It is my opinion that this is pretty heavily altered, so I cannot agree with the recommendations on the Committee on the Constitution's suggestions in full. I think it is a reworded version of what the EPB is right now, which as we know has not been fruitful. For that reason, I would smile upon this not being passed. I would be happy to meet with the other cosigners again and rework it to find a middle ground.
- b) Mairead Pfaff: I met with the rest of the SUB leaders, and we essentially came to the same consensus as Aaron. It is essentially a reworking of EPB, so it is a little less productive to be meeting with windows to the people I actually need to be in touch with. The advisor of the EPB Alicia Bates agreed with us. When they meet

currently, it is basically just to run through the calendar rather than collaborating successfully. We as SUB would be happy with the dissolving of the EPB.

- c) Ricardo Pozas Garza: I want to thank Thomas for his work on this. I do think it can be reworked from its current state into something that is productive for the entire student body. I think the Committee on the Constitution has done great work, so I wonder if we could reject these changes now and keep in conversation with the Committee to come to an agreement that still turns EPB into something more productive
- d) [David Haungs delivers Matthew Bisner's statement](#)
- e) Madison Nemeth: Is the main issue with the recommendation the lack of mention of policy or who comprises the committee?
- f) Aaron Benavides: I will speak as the author of the original order as well as the Chair of EPB. I think what the Committee returned is a reworking of EPB, which fails to do what it is supposed to do and fails to benefit the student body. There are very clear issues I think we can all come together on, such as racism, to collaborate as the entire student union. That is at least where I am coming from. I do agree with the Judicial Council's point that the Committee I proposed does not need to be its own article as I had initially set up. I do think there is a middle ground on which we could meet.
- g) Ricardo Pozas Garza: I appreciate the points that people are bringing to the table, and I do agree there is a way to incorporate some of

these revisions into what was originally proposed. I do have my concerns about the efficacy at which it could be reworked, but that is a later problem. With these thoughts in mind, I am moving to reject the revisions proposed by the Committee on the Constitution.

3. Vote on order does not pass.

- a) Sarah Galbenski: The proposal was rejected, but I do agree there is a middle ground we will reach in which elements of both sides are incorporated to make it the best it can be.

B. [SO 2021-11 An Order to Adjust the Spring Semester Schedule](#) - read by David Haungs

1. Questions:

- a) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Should we expect any future orders for this to affect or does this cover everything?
- b) David Haungs: It is intended to be comprehensive, but if something does happen to arise then there would need to be another order. However, this should hopefully be comprehensive enough.
- c) Benjamin Erhardt: I do not mean to be nitpicky, but under point 4 should 2020 be made 2021? This just stood out to me.
- d) David Haungs: Yes that is correct. I would smile upon a friendly amendment to adjust that.
- e) Sarah Gealbenski: Yes most definitely. It is noted.

2. Debate:

- a) Thomas Davis: Pass this. It is great. Even though my name is on it, I did not do anything. David did a fantastic job with this. Just a

reminder, this needs 5/6th vote, so be mindful of this. Last year there were five or six of these because I did not do nearly as good of a job.

b) Ricardo Pozas Garza: Movement out of a debate and into a vote.

3. Vote passes

C. [SS 2021-19 A Resolution Formally Disapproving Rev. John Jenkins' Violations of University Health Policy and Encouraging Further Action](#) - read by Patrick Lee

1. Patrick Lee: I would also like to note that this was written before hearing that Father Jenkins had tested positive, so we do wish him good health and a speedy recovery.
2. Miles Kelley: I appreciate the thoroughness and speed at which this resolution was written. The resolution we voted down last week was very extreme, but this is definitely much less strong. What makes you think this will make a difference?
3. Patrick Lee: We believe the Student Senate's role is to speak on behalf of the student body. The student body has been held to a standard and been doing very well at abiding by university rules in order to keep ourselves and one another safe. I think the resolution had a good point in making clear that actions have consequences, so we would like to maintain that sentiment.
4. Neils Casperson: I know that we really wanted to find a middle ground of writing a resolution that would get attention to invoke change but also wouldn't be so dramatic as to warrant scoffing by administration and losing the respect of administrators. I think we really tried to find that medium in writing this and holding Father Jenkins to the same standard which we are held to.

5. Michael Murakami: Actions should have consequences, but Father Jenkins is in a different position than us... he is in a position of power over us. I thought it was silly initially in writing this to have him go through the same TeamND training that we did given he was a part of creating it. However, we want to have a meeting with him to discuss his actions and to give him our feedback.
6. Benjamin Erhardt: As you will see, the next resolution has to do with the Covid-19 policies and discrepancies within them. They address solutions to this which are more likely to be taken into consideration in conjunction with an expression of dismay towards Father Jenkins actions.
7. Renee Pierson: I also was a cosigner of this resolution, and I wanted to talk about the TeamND policies and why it is important he goes through that. It is clear there is a disconnect between him and his understanding of the protocols. There is no evidence that Father Jenkins had to complete any sort of TeamND or Covid-19 training.
8. Lainey Teeters: In what areas Ben do you have in mind for changing Covid-19 policies?
9. Benjamin Erhardt: To be honest, I have not really taken the time to discern further areas in which I think Covid-19 policies could be improved. I am curious about opportunities for open spaces for groups to gather, but it sounds as if that will be addressed in the next couple weeks.
10. Patrick Lee: Going off of that, this brings us to the table and gives us an opportunity to let the administrators know what we want make these last few months as enjoyable as possible.

11. Michael Murakami: We do not want to suggest something unsafe to be changed, so we want to have a meeting to understand what is safe and what is not and create further change from that.
12. Henry Jackson: Patrick, given recent developments Father Jenkins is under a lot of backlash and others threatening to encourage his resignation, do you think this would push that in that direction despite it not being its intent?
13. Patrick Lee: That is not its intent, but I suppose it could. However, I do not think we can look outside of what is in the resolution and worry about possibilities.
14. Dan Baudendistel: I think Father Jenkins is, all things considered, doing a great job. I think it is pretty clear that he knows what Covid-19 is given that he was at the forefront of bringing us back. I just don't know how we can expect to have a dialogue with him after expressing anger and punishment toward him. I am just not sure how we can do this and then not expect to get in trouble rather than receive grace when not wearing masks within the dorm.
15. Patrick Lee: I hope it is not interpreted as punishment. I am proud to be part of one of the first universities to decide to bring its students back due to the value of being in person, and I think we have done a great job. However, I do not think it could hurt to encourage a review of the Covid-19 policies.

D. Debate:

1. Lainey Teeters: Great job, great resolution. Provides a path to express some of our concerns and frustrations about current Covid-19 restrictions and how this inhibits aspects of the community.



2. Grace Stephenson: Seeking punishment or reconciliation for Father Jenkins does not solve the injustice we are feeling of his immoral act, so it will not necessarily solve anything or lead to any lucrative conversation. Town halls to express these concerns and have a dialogue with administrators would be a great solution to hear out both sides without blaming one another.
3. [David Haungs speaks on behalf of Matthew Bisner](#)
4. Neils Casperson: I think these resolutions are taking different alleyways to approaching the same problem. A lot of what we are suggesting would be in the best interest of the President and lend its hand to mend the bridge between the student body and administration. It would allow Father Jenkins to maintain his image, keep the faith, and encounter self improvement, whereas the resolution from last week was very punishable.
5. Molly Schrock: I think this resolution is very empty, and it assumes he is not aware of his own policies that are listed all over campus. He went off campus and blatantly broke all of these rules, essentially taking a political stand he should not have placed himself in, and sent out a statement with a bunch of excuses empty of any sort of apology. I do not think this resolution is enough.
6. Miles Kelley: Since there is not any sort of policy enforcement that I could find that would be applicable to Father Jenkins, I think this resolution comes as close to holding Father Jenkins accountable as it can within our bounds. I want to express my support of this resolution.
7. Benjamin Erhardt: In the interest of time, I would like to motion to move out of debate and into a vote.

E. Vote passes with 75% yes.

F. [SS 2021-20 A Resolution Encouraging the Further Adjustment of Current](#)

[On-Campus Residence Hall Visitation Policies to Promote Student Well-Being While](#)

[Continuing to Prevent the Spread of COVID-19](#) - read by Benjamin Erhardt

1. Questions:

- a) Madison Nemeth: Are you concerned at all by the enforcement of the policy being unfair across dorms?
- b) Benjamin Erhardt: Rectors are expected to value the wellbeing and safety of students, so I think that is ultimately up to them. I find it hard to believe that something student life has already proposed would be a conflict for rectors, especially given so many rectors have already proposed ideas of this nature.
- c) Lainey Teeters: Would you be willing to add a friendly amendment for it to be based on the Covid situation within the dorm. "At their discretion based off the Covid-19 cases in the dorm"

(1) Benjamin Erhardt: Yes, I would be okay with that.

(2) Michael: Percent due to different sizes?

(3) Sam Cannova: What about "situation" to cover our bases?

(4) Friendly amendment passes.

2. Debate:

- a) Ricardo Pozas Garza: I am fully in favor of this, particularly for promoting the health and wellbeing of students.

- b) Daniel Schermerhorn: I am fully in support of this, especially as a member of Baumer Hall where we are still building community. This would help us to fully integrate into the Notre Dame community.
- c) Madison Nemeth: With this friendly amendment, I am in full support. I just wanted to make sure my earlier question was not swaying anyone, so I thought I would clarify.
- d) Anisha Jaipuria: I want to also express my support, especially as we move into the Winter months.

3. Vote passes unanimously.

VI. New Business

VII. Announcements

- A. Student Advisory Committee is meeting soon-- reach out to Rachel, Sarah, or Aaron
- B. Library Lawn Acousticafe tonight
- C. ISSLP application is due October 11
- D. New Dillon Hall Senator-- welcome!!!

VIII. Adjournment