

- I. Opening Prayer - Andrew Lauerman
- II. Roll Call - If you could use one word to describe the semester, what would it be?
- III. Approval of Minutes - [30 November 2022](#)
- IV. Peter Herrman motions to end the meeting at 6:45pm.
 - A. Connor McCloskey seconds the motion.
 - B. Debate
 1. Paul Stoller: I would motion for the meeting to end at 7pm or 7:15 pm, considering what we are talking about is pretty important.
 2. Sofie Stitt: I agree. Please think carefully about this.
 3. Madison Nemeth: Meetings are usually scheduled to go from 5:30–7pm, so it makes sense to cap it there.
 4. Jake Lowry: Are we unable to go past 7pm?
 5. Sofie Stitt: Technically, Senate meetings go until adjournment, but we have the room until 7pm.
 6. Derick Williams: I motion to make a friendly amendment to strike 6:45 and change it to 7pm.
 - a) The friendly amendment is approved.
 - C. Vote
 1. The motion passes. The meeting will adjourn at 7pm.
- V. Executive Announcements
 - A. [Sofie's Reminders about Decorum](#)

1. The Student Senate does not debate the merits or actions of individual members of our campus community, including Students, Faculty, and Staff.
2. Sofie Stitt: This still stands. You guys have done a great job with this. I am required to interrupt you if you stray from this. Does anyone have any questions? If you do, you can always ask. Remember, we do not debate on people. Of course today is a little different, but we still should not be attacking personal character..

B. Availability Over Winter Break

1. Sofie will be available during Winter Break, except December 17th–December 26th. Feel free to reach out via email ([sstitt@nd.edu](mailto:ssstitt@nd.edu)) with questions or concerns, or to meet. I am happy to be of assistance in any way that I can.

VI. General Orders

A. [Recommendation from the Student Union Ethics Commission](#)

1. Derick Williams: Point of Inquiry, as far as closing the meeting goes, is that technically required?
2. Madison Nemeth: No, which is why you are able to vote on it.
3. Sofie Stitt: We had a discussion before the meeting, and it is precedent for meetings to be closed when discussing disciplinary actions.
4. Madison Nemeth: We are not required to close the meeting. However, the standard code of Parliamentary Procedure, which the Constitution does

require us to follow, also states that meetings regarding disciplinary actions should be closed.

5. Hunter Brooke: I know closing the meeting is to protect the reputation of the defendant, and as the defendant, I am grateful, but I am fine with the meeting being open and would like us to reject the motion.
6. Connor Patrick: As this is new to a lot of people in the room, can I ask why it is recommended that the meeting be closed?
7. Sofie Stitt: This is to protect the privacy of any students involved in issues of this nature.
8. Madison Nemeth: The code of parliamentary procedure outlines that closed meetings should be held when disciplinary actions are being discussed. It is in order to freely discuss confidential and sensitive matters.
9. Jessica Vickery: But it doesn't say "must", it's "should".
10. Hunter Brooke: Again, I am happy to waive this right.
11. Paul Stoller: If it's closed, would non-senators not be allowed to speak?
12. Sofie Stitt: Just people not on the Senate listserv can't be in the room. That would not include our guests. I have no preference, but must present these options to you.
13. Hunter Brooke: I am appreciative, but I am happy to keep the meeting open and make the motion to close the meeting so we can reject it.
14. Jessica Vickery: Do you guys have the power to close the meeting?
15. Sofie Stitt: No, but it's our responsibility to present this option to you.
16. Derick Williams: I move to read the recommendation.

a) Jessica Vickery seconds.

17. Sofe Stitt: This is new to me, so I will be using pretty sanitary language. I am going to read this. The Student Union Ethics Commission is a part of the Judicial Council, of which Madison Nemeth is the chair. Any member of the Student Union may report the issue to the Student Union Ethics Commission. The Student Union Ethics Commission shall then convene to review the allegation and provide a recommendation regarding further action. If a Bill of Impeachment is the recommendation of the Student Union Ethics Commission, it will be brought before the Senate at the next meeting. So, just so everyone is aware, this has already happened. That is why this Bill is here, in front of you all. I will now explain the next process, but are there any questions? A Bill of Impeachment shall cite specific allegation(s) of misconduct. Misconduct shall include disturbance of the peace, incompetent or negligent performance, disregard of the authority of the Student Union, violation of this Constitution or its bylaws, infringement upon the rights of another, willful injury to the good name of the Student Union, hindrance of the Student Union or any of its agents in legitimate endeavors, intentional mismanagement of undergraduate student funds, conspiracy to commit any of the above, or actions that are deemed unbecoming by the Senate. This is important: a majority vote of the members of the Senate on a Bill of Impeachment shall constitute impeachment and shall call for a hearing to be conducted at the next regular meeting of the Senate or within one academic week, whichever is

later. A hearing must be conducted before the vote for removal may be taken. A two-thirds vote of the entire voting membership of the Senate, supporting the allegations of misconduct as stipulated in a Bill of Impeachment, shall result in removal from office. So, the debate and vote today and the vote that will occur today is about if the Bill of impeachment has merit and that the individual should be brought to a hearing. We are not debating about whether the alleged party should be removed. We are talking about: is it worth it for the Senate to pursue a hearing and that would question if Senate would remove this alleged party.

18. Paul Stoller: So this debate now does not include the merit of what was done? What are we allowed to talk about?
19. Sofie Stitt: I will direct you to Madison quite a bit from here on out.
20. Madison Nemeth: I am going to read the letter to you guys, and you can decide based off the letter and evidence if it warrants a discussion about removal from office. This is about whether we want to pursue further consideration, which would happen at the next Senate meeting when we come back after Winter Break.
21. Sofie Stitt: This is very formal, and I appreciate your patience as we navigate this, as this is a first for everyone. Who gets copies of this?
22. Madison Nemeth: Members of the Senate. I will read it first and then pass it out. This is all of the evidence the Student Union Ethics Commission considered during the meeting. It starts with the complaint that was filed

to the Ethics Commission. The alleged party brought their own evidence, which was also reviewed by the Commission.

23. Mo Doyle: Is this given to just voting members or to everyone?
24. Madison Nemeth: Voting and non-voting members. I didn't account for all the Department Directors, so we'll start with voting members first and their proxies.
25. Sofie Stitt: You are not permitted to take these papers out of the room.
26. Madison Nemeth: You can write on them. I will collect the papers at the end of the meeting.
27. Sofie Stitt: I will turn on Christmas music and we can review this.
28. Questioning
 - a) Madison Nemeth: You are not deciding if we should remove Hunter from office today. We would be deciding if we want to move to discuss further to hear more testimonies. You will decide if the recommendation deserves further consideration.
 - b) Trista Brantley: Would the vote just be a simple majority?
 - c) Madison Nemeth: Correct. Today, the threshold is a majority. If you get a majority vote, you will proceed to a hearing.
 - d) Derick William: Point of Inquiry for Madison, who are we allowed to ask questions to? Just you, or also the alleging party?
 - e) Madison Nemeth: Just me. That is not how today's meeting works. Asking questions to the alleging party would happen further down the line.

- f) Sofie Stitt: Once more, I want to reiterate that this is not a hearing. There will only be questions directly to Madison.
- g) Hunter Brooke: My question is about some of the testimony I provided and to make sure this is all clear. Essentially, my question is, was this said during testimony? Starting last year, following the election, I met with Patrick Lee to talk about contacting people to help with senatorial work. I contacted Judicial Council and recontacted Patrick, and he expressed his approval again. I emailed the Co-Directors of FUEL about speaking to the FUELers and reached out multiple times. I texted Sofie Stitt if I could get the FUELers' contact information and was directed to Instagram. I then received an email from the Co-Directors asking me to stop, and so I stopped reaching out immediately. Did I say all of this during my testimony?
- h) Madison Nemeth: That does sound accurate to what was said during the meeting.
- i) Trista Brantley: Can I ask who was at the initial meeting?
- j) Madison Nemeth: How SUEC works? It is made up of "randomly selected" members of the various Student Union organizations. I serve as Chair, and then there is the Parliamentarian, representatives from Class Councils, SUB, CCC, HPC, and Off-Campus Council. We receive an allegation via an online complaint form. When I receive one, I reach out to the alleged

party if they want to move forward or resign from their position. If they choose to move forward, then we set up a hearing. They receive the complaint and hear from substantive witnesses (alleging and/or alleged). SUEC gets the complaint and hears a statement and asks questions. Then, the Commission enters a debate to decide if a violation occurred or not. If not, the meeting is over. If a violation occurred, they decide the remedy. They can choose between sanction, public censure, or recommend a Bill of Impeachment. They decide a remedy, vote on that, and as chair, I issue the recommendation. If there is no sanction, I let the party know. If it is public censure, I write and post it.

- k) Connor Patrick: Follow up question, is that a two-thirds or majority vote?
- l) Madison Nemeth: Decisions of SUEC only require a majority vote.
- m) Connor McCloskey: This is evidence Hunter brought to the meeting. He also mentioned things that don't appear in the packet. Are there things omitted because there were no screenshots of them?
- n) Madison Nemeth: The packet includes what the alleging party submitted and what Hunter chose to submit himself. Anything else he asked about was not hard evidence, but testimony. SUEC Minutes are not publicly available.

- o) Griffin McAndrew: What was the reason behind the Bill of Impeachment? Why not public censure?
- p) Madison Nemeth: The Commission found that he committed the four violations listed in Article 13.
- q) Kevin Wang: Question for Jared, when were the members for ComCon selected?
- r) Jared Schlachet: Roughly mid-September
- s) Kevin Wang: An exact date would be nice.
- t) Sofie Stitt: We'll circle back to that.
- u) Bobby Spence: When SUEC recommends a Bill of Impeachment, is that because you are hoping for an impeachment? Do you have an intent behind that?
- v) Madison Nemeth: That was just the Commission's recommendation.
- w) Sofie Stitt: Is Senate required to go forward with the recommendation?
- x) Madison Nemeth: No.
- y) Jessica Vickey: Within the letter written, what legitimate endeavors hindered the Student Union and its agents? What specific endeavors does that line reference?
- z) Madison Nemeth: You can reference Article 3, Section 3b, Clause 17 on page 6 of the document. This outlines the duties and responsibilities of FUEL Directors and their goals. The

Commission believed that Hunter's actions interfered with the ability to integrate first-year leaders into the Student Union and proper education of first-year leaders in the practices of ethical peer leadership.

- aa) Jessica Vickery: In the evidence brought forward, is there a reason that, in the texts between Jared and Hunter, some are cut off. Could those be used in the decision?
- bb) Madison Nemeth: This is everything as it is submitted to us. If there is a partial message, we can't ask for the full one. The Commission decides based off exactly what is given.
- cc) Mia Moran: I know you said Hunter Brooke violated those four counts, therefore the Ethics Commission warrants a Bill of Impeachment. I am still curious as to the logic behind. In Ruling 2122-01 about endorsements on Instagram this past January, the ruling includes more of their intention and logic in the ruling. Does SUEC believe a Bill of Impeachment was necessary to ensure this never happens again?
- dd) Madison Nemeth: The Commission found that his actions warranted impeachment.
- ee) Mia Moran: Yes, but it doesn't explain why this is warranted.
- ff) Madison Nemeth: That is not the mission of SUEC. The goal is not to create policy through decisions, it decides whether a violation occurred and what they find the remedy should be.

- gg) Mia Moran: Yes, but in this example, SUEC explicitly mentioned how they found the alleged party was aware that their actions were due to negligence and not malice, so their decision was to do a public sanction.
- hh) Sofie Stitt: I am not on the Commission, but point of clarity, some things in the Constitution have guidelines for disciplinary actions.
- ii) Mia Moran: So then the logic would be that the Constitution specifically says that these actions call for impeachment.
- jj) Madison Nemeth: First, I think I'm confused on the question. SUEC interprets what the violation is and what punishment should come from it. The Constitution only says once what the specific punishment would be for a violation. SUEC is not told what the rules are, they make their own decision. The ruling may potentially explain the reasons.
- kk) Mia Moran: I want to know the reasoning behind them choosing that specific sanction.
- ll) Madison Nemeth: SUEC felt it met four of the criteria of what merits a Bill of Impeachment. The Constitution outlines what actions should be taken in that case. Does that make sense?
- mm) Sofie Stitt: I will link the Constitution in General Orders.
- nn) Jared Schlachet: The ComCon members were selected sometime between September 17 and September 21.
- oo) Peter Herrman: How many members are there on SUEC?

- pp) Madison Nemeth: Eight.
- qq) Peter Herrman: How were they chosen?
- rr) Madison Nemeth: They were randomly selected.
- ss) Peter Herrmann: From what organizations?
- tt) Madison Nemeth: SUB, Hall Senators, Freshman Class Council, Sophomore Class Council, Junior Class Council, Senior Class Council, Club Coordination Council, Hall Presidents Council, and Off-Campus Council.
- uu) Sofie Stitt: That is all in the Constitution.
- vv) Peter Herrman: Will we ever know the roster?
- ww) Madison Nemeth: It is on the Judicial Council website.
- xx) Marshall Smith: Do we know the distribution of votes, like how many voted for each of the sanctions? For example, was it 7-2?
- yy) Sofie Stitt: We can circle back to that.
- zz) Derick Williams: We have a long break coming up and I would like to get things settled quickly because I have a resolution on the agenda.
- aaa) Sofie Stitt: I am going to have to reject any sort of motion on that so we can get more questions answered.
- bbb) Connor Patrick: Following up, I am looking at the ruling from January that Mia referenced, there is a whole section that says why sanction was chosen rather than impeachment, basically because there was no bad faith. There is a whole part explaining why. Is

there something in the Constitution that shows that these four violations lead to impeachment? The ruling from January says why the decision was made.

ccc) Madison Nemeth: I guess that's on me for not writing a good enough letter or ruling. Are you asking why the ruling was not public censure?

ddd) Connor Patrick: Not specifically. There are three options, right? I guess for us who don't know, why was impeachment specifically chosen instead of the others?

eee) Madison Nemeth: Because of the four aspects in the impeachment article, they felt a Bill of Impeachment would be necessary.

fff) Connor Patrick: There are lots of Student Government organizations in the Constitution, some are enumerated and some are not. Are there other common positions, like dorm commissioners, that aren't in the Constitution but are still a thing?

ggg) Madison Nemeth: Yes, dorm commissioners are a good example.

hhh) Pablo Oropeza: Yes, those are chosen by the Hall President's volition.

iii) Sofie Stitt: Dorm constitutions are not in the school constitution.

We have 10 minutes to get through to voting.

jjj) Derick Williams: Motion to move out of questioning and into debate.

(1) Jessica Vickery seconds.

(2) The motion passes.

29. Debate

a) James Baird: There are lots of people and guests here that want to speak. Could I yield my time to David Huang?

(1) David Huang: I'll be quick. I was Judicial Council President last year. Hunter mentioned me in his question. I advised him that this was perfectly constitutional last year. As Chair, the President does whatever SUEC says—they can't vote. Frequently, I get inquiries about the Constitution, and because this was easy, I gave him direct advice. The violation is that the position of "Senatorial Aid" is not in the Constitution and that Hunter contacted students who have another position already to apply. Those are both silly and wasteful violations and would destroy everything the Student Union has created. If creating informal positions was an impeachable offense, any Chief of Staff, informal subcommittee of JCouncil, and every dorm commissioner would be in violation. A position doesn't have to be in the Constitution or in bylaws to exist. The other violation was about contacting individuals that

are already in FUEL. Council precedent is clear that you can only have one enumerated but multiple unenumerated positions. Reaching out to them is perfectly fine. This should be laughed out of the room, and you should get back to doing work that matters.

- b) Madison Nemeth: I disagree with that interpretation.
- c) Derick Willaims: Point of Inquiry, is there a potential way to continue in a different room? This is a public meeting, so can we move into the lobby?
- d) Mo Doyle: You can't have a private meeting in a public space.
- e) Derick Williams: Could we go to the Student Government Office?
- f) Rachel Dorfner: The SUB office is open if we want to cram in there.
- g) Jake Lowry: SUEC ruled for a Bill of Impeachment and wanted to send this to Senate. There are multiple opinions. David is smart, but he is one voice.
- h) Sofie Stitt: The club resource center is open. We will go to the third floor. The expectation is that nobody leaves because we have voting numbers figured out. Please keep in accordance with your papers. Because we capped the meeting at 7pm, we will have to stop at 6:55pm for adjournment, unless we extend time beyond.
- i) Connor Patrick: Motion to extend to 7:15pm.

(1) Derick Williams seconds.

(2) The motion fails.

- j) Derick Williams: Point of Inquiry, can I get a count?
- k) Jared Schlachet: It was 13–12–5.
- l) Derick Williams: 12 opposed?
- m) Jared Schlachet: Yes.
- n) Mo Doyle: Capping the meeting at 6:55pm means that you don't have to vote—you can table this.
- o) Sofie Stitt: Here are the options. Because we are in the debate, we can adjourn debate and move to voting, or we continue this same debate in second semester and postpone.
- p) Madison Nemeth: If you still need to discuss, the motion should be to postpone.
- q) Sofie Stitt: Either vote now or postpone.
- r) Mo Doyle: Don't feel rushed to vote.
- s) Griffin McAndrew: Motion to postpone and reconsider next semester.

(1) Jessica Vickery seconds.

(2) Sofie Stitt rejects the motion.

- t) Sofie: Hold on Jessica, there are other hands up. I want to make sure everyone gets a chance to speak before we keep moving.
- u) Connor Patrick: Let's look at the big picture. January will come, and we have a lot of things going on, including Walk the Walk Week. There are lots we should be devoting time towards, and they

are good and noble things. Petitioning starts the week we get back.

Personally, having seen January StuGov life for four years now, it would be prudent to resolve this tonight and get back in January to talk about things that really matter that people are working hard on.

- v) Griffin McAndrew: I want to respond to that. Clearly there is a large amount of interest and time devoted to be here and discuss this. Everyone should try to say their piece in the next 5 minutes.
- w) Sofie Stitt: People hoping to testify about Hunter's standing should not be considered. That is not the discussion tonight.
- x) Mia Moran: Adding to what Connor said, there are other resolutions that should be addressed as soon as possible. We should get this resolved.
- y) Jake Lowry: We have talked about this for an hour, and now we are saying not to worry about it and just make a decision. That would nullify what we've done.
- z) Lauryn Pugh: To reiterate, we are not deciding a removal, but if this Bill of Impeachment warrants a hearing. It is not fair to Hunter to make him wait all break to see if he has a hearing.
- aa) Isabelle Grace: If we need to extend time, that is better than wasting an hour of our time later to go over what's already been said. We all know our decision, probably. Motion to extend the meeting to 7:10pm.

(1) Connor Patrick seconds.

(2) The motion passes.

bb) Creed Leathers: Can I make a motion to vote?

(1) Peter Herrman seconds.

(2) The motion is rejected.

cc) Connor Patrick: Where are we?

dd) Sofie Stitt: We are still in debate, and we have 19 more minutes left in the meeting. If we have not reached a decision yet, we still need to adjourn the meeting, so we really only have 15 minutes left.

ee) Connor Patrick: A debate to move to a hearing?

ff) Kevin Wang: I have been a Senate member for a second term and have never seen something like this come through Senate until today. The fact that SUEC brought this matter to discussion means that this is significant, and we should not leave it to be discussed in January. I am not a voting member, but we should consider the implications in this allegation. Because SUEC recommended impeachment, it should require a thorough debate.

gg) Derick Williams: I respect my elders and those who have seen situations like this before, so I would like to yield my time to Ben Erhardt.

(1) Ben Erhardt: David gave the perspective of a former Judicial Council President, and I want to give one from a former Senator. I was here the last time impeachment was

approved. I have two points to make. One: In that experience, the case had clear evidence of misconduct and wrongdoing warranting a discussion of impeachment. I don't see that here. Based on Hunter's timeline, he made it clear that he has been in compliance the whole time. Two: Do not take this lightly. If you move forward, it will bring bad attention to the Student Union and take up a lot of your time. We have been devoting an hour of time to this and have given this its due time. We wouldn't be here if we didn't care, and moving forward could do more damage to the Student Union and bring more negative attention than anything else Hunter has done. Impeachment should be used in instances of willful violation or misconduct. You are voting to impeach him, which should only happen in a very clear instance. I don't see a willful violation here.

- (2) Madison Nemeth: I was also a member of Senate, and we never had to consider impeachment because the person resigned. We really don't know how comparable the two situations are.
- (3) Joey Kositzke: I am one of the FUEL Co-Directors. To counter, in regards to Hunter being in compliance with the request of FUEL Directors, we requested that other Senators present to the FUELers at our meeting. It was

requested on our end that Sofie Stitt, Trista Brantley, and Connor McCloskey be the ones to present to the FUELers. For the point in the Bill of Impeachment regarding hindrance to my role as FUEL Co-Director, our big focus is to not overwhelm the FUELers, as our Student Union can get very complicated. Having information spread in manners like this undermines a lot of the work that we do and confused a lot of the FUELers. Now lots of maintenance must be done to remedy that situation. Point 3 and 4 brought by the Commission are very important to consider. Educating future leaders is the whole purpose of FUEL, and we want to make sure it is done right and well.

- (4) Rachel Dorfner: I have never been in FUEL, but I was the Director of FLIP and got to see how FUEL is run. Introducing first-years is a process. The FUEL Co-Directors were elected and chosen for a specific reason, and they have a plan. There is a level of respect that needs to be had for them and their process. Going against their wishes should be considered. The idea that we should sweep this under the rug because of other things going on in January is against our responsibility to give this situation our due diligence.

- (5) Trista Brantley: Point of Inquiry about the Constitution, in the article about infringement upon rights, assuming this situation regards this, what is the standing on that?
- (6) Madison Nemeth: The Commission's interpretation was that it wasn't contacting the FUELers that was a violation, but that he contacted them against the wishes of the Co-Directors, whose job it is to decide how FUEL is run. He promised a position that didn't exist and what came with it. That was an infringement on the goals of FUEL.
- (7) Lauryn Pugh: I was on FUEL and in Senate my sophomore year. As someone who is in charge of lots of other people, it is very disrespectful when someone circumvents your wishes. I don't have as much to say on Points 1 and 2 about dorm commissioners, but would encourage you all to think about the ethical implications of undermining other members of the Student Union to advance one's own agenda.
- (8) Tavin Martin: I am a member of Exec Cab and was on FUEL last year and went to nearly every Senate meeting. Two things to note. As Joey touched on, FUEL has four main purposes: integration, explanation, community development, and education. This is where students learn what exactly the Student Union is. It might be easy for us

to understand, but the average student doesn't. There is a legacy of FUELers entering positions across the University. We should consider the ethical leadership practicalities of this, as they learn what is right by what the people older than them do.

(9) Connor McCloskey: To reiterate, this sets a precedent. We can't let Senators go around other bodies of power.

Consider the ethics of what we're doing if we move this forward. We can't sweep this under the rug.

(10) Derick Williams: To me, this looks like an issue of people who can't get along in the sandbox. In a situation like this, when something goes wrong, the first instance would result in a simple email. When Hunter was first told not to do this, he was immediately reported to SUEC. Most people would only impeach someone who repeated something after they were told not to do it. When Hunter was told no, he stopped.

(a) Will Calder: You saw my texts. Hunter approached me about being a Senatorial Aid and was clear that this was an unofficial and unenumerated position. He made it clear this was not an official position being offered.

- (11) Luca Ripani: I am one of the rare Senators that is a Senior because I am a transfer student. I have been in Student Government for four years, plus middle school and high school. People in Student Government aren't paid, we are volunteers. Most Senators do this because it looks good on a resume and don't have interest in the Student Body. It is not so serious that we need to impeach someone. It is not life or death. Hunter is not trying to overthrow the University, and this is not serious enough to consider impeachment.
- (12) AnnahMarie Behn-Link: I am the other Co-Director of FUEL. If you look at Exhibits 6 and 7, we told Hunter we would not have him present during our meeting on Senate. After the third time of correspondence is when he was sent to the Ethics Commission.
- (13) Joey Kositzke: I want to point out that the message sent to FUELers was different from what was sent to Will. There is a different informality portrayed in those texts.
- (14) Sofie Stitt: It is 7:06pm. We can vote to extend the meeting or postpone the debate.
- (15) Patrick Smart: I motion to move to a vote.
- (a) Paul Stoller seconds.

- (b) Derick Williams: Point of Inquiry, what exactly are we voting on?
- (c) There is a motion to extend the meeting 5 minutes, per Sofie Stitt's request.
 - (i) The motion passes.
- (d) Sofie Stitt: If you vote No, that means this does not warrant a hearing. If you vote Yes, then you think this does warrant a hearing.
- (e) Griffin McAndrew: Is there a secret ballot?
- (f) Sofie Stitt: There could be. That would require a motion and a second, and we would conduct the vote via Google Form.
- (g) The motion passes.

30. Voting

- a) The recommendation fails.
- B. [SO2223-14](#): An Order to Suspend the Off-Campus SUB Representative Vacancy Election
- C. [SS2223-11](#): A Resolution to Address Concerns with Class Registration for Students in Notre Dame's ROTC Program

VII. New Business

- A. [SS2223-13](#): A Resolution to Increase LGBTQ+, Racial, and Ethnic Minority Representation in the University Counseling Center Counselors

- B. [SS2223-12](#): A Resolution Calling for the Reaffirmation of the University's Pro-Life Values
 - C. [SO2223-16](#): An Order to Amend Article XV to Expand Required Campaigning Reimbursements
 - D. [SO2223-17](#): An Order to Amend Article XV to Adjust Campaigning Locations
 - E. A Resolution Calling Upon Campus Dining to Make Available Cooking Classes for Students
 - F. [Upcoming Topics & Collaboration](#)
- VIII. Announcements
- IX. Adjournment
- A. The meeting is adjourned. There will be a recess until after Winter Break.