

**Senate Executive Summary**  
November 9, 2005  
Notre Dame Room, LaFortune

**I. OPENING BUSINESS**

- A. Lizzi Shappell called the meeting to order 6:06 p.m.
- B. Rob Lindley led the invocation.
- C. Philippe Collon, Jacques Nguyen, Mariana Montes and Christina Lee were absent.
- D. Christina Lee moved to approve the minutes; Chris Hollon seconded. *The minutes from the March 1, 2006 meeting of the Student Senate were approved at 6:08 p.m.*
- E. Lisa Rauh moved to put item C under New Business before Officer Reports; Brenna Doyle seconded. Brenna explained that Ali Wishon had to leave so that's why they wanted to invert the agenda. *The agenda was so inverted at 6:10 p.m.*
- F. Rob Lindley moved to place all New Business after item C; Chris Hollon seconded. *The agenda was so inverted at 6:11 p.m.*
- G. Katie McHugh moved to put A last on the list and move the academic freedom discussion to the third item under New Business; Brian Klein seconded. *The agenda was so inverted at 6:13 p.m.*

**II. PODIUM**

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

A. SS0506-27 Health Services Hire

- i. Brenna Doyle explained that they are opening a position to hire a new physician. So the Gender Issues Committee wanted to show Senate support for a physician who is well-versed in women's issues, because the health center doesn't have strong representation right now.
- ii. Carol Hendrickson said that she thinks that this is a great resolution. She learned that ND doesn't have any of these services like most universities do.
- iii. Lisa Rauh moved to vote; Christina Lee seconded.
- iv. *SS0506-27 was passed unanimously at 6:15 p.m.*

B. SS0506-26 TCE and Course Information Improvements

- i. Chris Harris yielded the floor to Vijay Ramanan. Vijay was here to talk about a proposal from his committee. They have looked at ways that they can inform students about course selection before registration. The report was handed out last week. For many years, students have wanted a credible and comprehensive source for information about courses. Things like ndtoday and word of mouth have been the common ways. Two years ago, student government requested that TCE's be released. They are used by the University for job status and tenure, so there is a confidentiality issue with that. There is a question of why students might find that information useful. They are pretty reliable. In response to this, last year three students worked with the provost and Faculty

Senate to develop an alternative. They have produced some recommendations on what is best. They brainstormed ideas about what students would want to know and what would be useful. They categorized them by sources, students, registrar, etc. They have done two pilot testing series. He showed a sample of what this might look like in practice. He ran through the set up of the course information form. It covers class style, TA information, enrollment data, student feedback, etc. They tried to not be repetitive and have it be minimally painful for students. The form will show a distribution of responses. Five questions are still under development, but they are still thinking about how to word the questions. Hopefully this information would be available online, and only to students. He said that we can probably think of other items which might be useful, but these things were probably considered. It wasn't meant to identify classes that are easy, but match a student's skills and interests to a class. Success of this system depends on good participation of the students. Otherwise it won't be helpful. He wants Senate's support for this. This is a huge improvement on what we've had in the past.

- ii. Pat Knapp asked who will be administering the surveys. Vijay replied that these questions would be given out with the TCE's. He would like to redesign the TCE document to include these questions. He would also like for students and faculty to work out how to administer this. OIT would then post them online. Jim Grace asked if it will be just for students to look at information. Vijay said that he would like instructors to see their information. But right now, only enrolled students would be able to see the information. Jim then asked what he sees Student Senate doing. Vijay said that he would like us to serve in an educational way. Most students don't know what TCE's are used for, and the communications department could be used to educate students and have them realize that you need to get a high response rate. Liz Brown asked when he hoped to have this started. Vijay said that he can't put a timeline on it. They have taken it to Faculty Senate, and then they will take it to Academic Council to get it approved with OIT. They will develop a web platform over the summer. They could gather data in the fall and spring of next year. Rhea Boyd asked if there would be a question about the discriminatory practices of the professor. Vijay said that the first question asked if the teacher respects student's opinions. Rhea asked if there are any courses identifiers that could be used to aid students looking for diversity issues. Vijay said that would probably best be left to the advising system. They could possibly institute a search engine for key words in a course title. Rob Lindley said that his only concern is that several of his courses have specific course questions on the TCE's. Vijay said that in labs, for example, TAs play a big roll and they have included that on the report. They thought about doing college specific ones, but that gets tough to administer. Brenna Doyle moved to vote; Lisa Rauh seconded.

iii. *Resolution SS0506-26 passed at 6:38 p.m.*

C. SS0506-29 Academic Freedom

- i. Matt Walsh said that this is the product of what his committee considers a middle ground. He thinks it is our responsibility to debate this. This resolution is a product of a lot of things, the discussion in CoMo, Faculty Senate, the Fr. Jenkins discussion and Senate discussions.
- ii. Pat Knapp moved to amend the resolution replacing the final phrase “unless such programming is grossly offensive and serves no discernable education or intellectual purpose” with “even programming which may disgrace, or be perceived to disagree with, certain elements of Catholicism, unless such programming shows no respect for the University’s mission, or show no willingness to enter into academic or intellectual conversation”; Liz Brown seconded. Carol Hendrickson said that she liked this amendment because it addresses the offensive nature of things. Pat Knapp moved to vote; Rob Lindley seconded. *The resolution was so amended at 6:44 p.m.*
- iii. Katie McHugh said that the most important part is the “education geared to a modern society and no intellectual boundaries”. There were questions about what academic freedom means, they included the American Association of University Professors’ definition. It clarifies the open speaker policy and how that would extend to VM or QFF. The mission statement of the University re-emphasizes that. Matt Walsh said that the second page is their attempt to tackle the issue of “alienation” and “balance”. They tried to use language that was not so particular to restraining ourselves. They do mention the VM and QFF, but only once, because they want it to apply to greater University policy. The last two stanzas are trying to encourage administration to see diversity in the wide-range of programming. There is an innate value in controversial events, even though it can offend people and it is a dangerous ground for us to be singling out certain programs. He stressed the need to enter into academic or intellectual conversation on events, this was the language used by the Faculty Senate.
- iv. Dave Baron asked about the third clause, and how Katie knows that it was taken from AAUP. Katie said that it isn’t a specific cite in duLac, but the first line is word for word the same. There is only about one or two sentences that are different, they just inserted ND to make it applicable. Pat Knapp asked if it would be adequate to provide a citation. Dave thought that if you separated the two it would be fine, because you can’t be certain that they took it from there. Steve Tortorello said that it is a good resolution and asked why we are associating with AAUP. Katie said that we are a member and it was just for clarification processes. Steve said that it might be dangerous to take their footnote and apply it to duLac. He thinks that the duLac argument is enough. Suj Pandaya suggested changing the word “Festival” to the appropriate word. Carol Hendrickson thought that by using the word “disallowing” in regards to the event is a bit vague. She liked the

general idea, but doesn't know what it means. Katie said that they don't want to make it too much more specific. Rob Lindley proposed a friendly amendment to change "festival" to "conference". He thought this is a good resolution, but his concern is that the amendment left out some wording. He asked if we are afraid to put "Catholic character" into the resolution at that point. Matt Walsh understood with where he is coming from. The intention is to encapsulate what Rob wanted. There is concern from a lot of people that Catholic character is open to interpretation. He wants to make it as inclusive as possible. They could rework the third clause and make a clear distinction between duLac and the AAUP policy. Chris Harris said that he doesn't support this resolution. He supports Fr. Jenkins and his views. The issue isn't your own personal views. We have to represent our constituents. There is no clear consensus on these issues. This is not the time or place for us to take a stand. It is not our position to take a clear stand on this issue. We have served our constituents well, and have done all that we can. We got the student body's view across to Fr. Jenkins. For student government to take a side is wrong, and there is no middle ground on the issue. The ultimate decision lies with Fr. Jenkins and this is not our place to take a stand. Ben Gunty said that perhaps this resolution is leaning in one direction, but using the mission statement and duLac is leaning the other way. This is exactly what the University is set on, and we are bringing this to a formal light. He thought that this is our opportunity and responsibility to take a stand. It might be redundant to add something about Catholic character in the last clause. Jim Grace said that he would almost prefer looking at resolutions for specific events. A more reactive approach would be better. Many Senators admitted that there was a split on this issue within the dorms. Carol Hendrickson felt that the nature of the debate changed. Originally she thought that the issue was VM and QFF still on campus. She agrees with Fr. Jenkins about having a balance. She doesn't even know what people think about that. The issue has changed. Katie said that almost every resolution that we pass is dealt with by higher bodies. This is an opportunity to say what we think. Sometimes leaders have to lead public opinion, not follow it. We have to take into the information that we have in front of us. Sometimes you don't make decisions because they are easy, but do it because they are right. Katie moved to amend the last statement by inserting, after disallowing, "or limiting the frequency, forum or fundraising of"; Erin Hankins seconded. Brenna thought that fundraising brings in a whole new can of worms. It is a separate issue. Steve said that he would rethink his thoughts on the entire resolution if you put fundraising in. Liz advised against that. It pushes the resolution to a more extreme position. This wouldn't keep it representative of the middle ground. Carol said that it is tough to be general about this. Pat said that this amendment changes the scope of the resolution to the point where it wouldn't have any policy strength.

Fred Thwaites moved to vote on amendment; Drew Beatty seconded. *With a vote of 7 yes, 17 no and one abstention the amendment failed at 7:16 p.m.*

- v. Steve said that he thinks there is fuzzy logic about the high turnout linked to it being a rightful place at the University. Rob said that we have been acting for our constituents since this issue came up. We have been representing our constituents all year. He didn't feel justified taking a stance when he doesn't know what his constituents feel. There was a friendly amendment to change "Queer Film Festival" to "Gay and Lesbian Film: Filmmakers, Narratives and Spectatorships". Christina Lee said that she supports this letter, but moved to send it back to committee; Brian Klein seconded. Pat asked what the timeline for Fr. Jenkins' decision is. Lizzi responded "no se". Brenna said that if we were to pass this, it would it even get to him before that. Steve recommended moving it back to committee, and not worrying about the time crunch. Fred felt that the discussion hasn't covered everything. Matt said that if anyone had any suggestions they should tell him, because they will bring it back to committee. Carol wondered how much would be accomplished by sending it back to committee. Chris Harris said that sending it back to committee shows that there is no consensus and he doesn't think that should change. Nick Guzman wanted to reiterate that not all of the opinions have gotten out yet. Liz Brown moved to end discussion; Steve Tortorello seconded. *With a vote of 14 yes, 11 no, and 1 abstention the letter was sent back to committee at 7:24 p.m.*

D. SS0506-28 Information Distribution

- i. Dan Bowen said that this is basically a response to the gripes from fellow senators. He thought that hall presidents have better ability to disseminate information.
- ii. Pat Knapp asked what the point of the tedious phraseology was. Dan Bowen explained that it is just his writing style. Ben Gunty said that everybody gives stuff to HPC. He likes the ideas of not having to put up posters, but doesn't think that belongs in the Constitution. Suj Pandaya had a problem with some of the wording, like the word "eternity" and "never". He thought that this should not be in the constitution. Dan explained that "eternity" was put in for finality. Dave Baron said that he will sign joke resolutions like mad in the next two weeks, but not amendments. HPC wasn't getting the stall notes up. These are our topics and events, so we have a vested interest: buck up and do it. Chris Hollon said that he doesn't think that it should be in constitution. Brian Klein tabled the amendment (to eternity); Steve Tortorello seconded. *The motion to table the amendment did not pass.*
- iii. Brian Klein moved to vote on the amendment; Archita Patel seconded.
- iv. *Resolution SS0506-28 did not pass at 7:32 p.m.*

E. BOT Topic Approval

- i. Dave Baron said that even though they will be out of office; they are still in charge of reporting to the Board of Trustees. The issue will be student-alumni relations. There is a gap between what students and alumni think, for example on academic freedom, the candle ad, etc. Lizzi Shappell explained that it will have a three part structure: current student culture versus what alumni think, a career section about a possible alumni database, and how we can best use the structures already in place. Dave said that he has spoken with Fr. Poorman and he pointed us in the right direction.
- ii. Carol Hendrickson moved to approve; Libby Hopp seconded. *The BOT topic was approved at 7:36 p.m.*

F. Approval of Student Union Award Nominees

- i. Jim Grace said that the Irish Clover Award is for outstanding service to the student body. The first nominee is Vijay Ramanan. Chris Hollon moved to approve; Fred Thwaites seconded. *Vijay Ramanan was approved as the recipient of the Irish Clover award at 7:37 p.m.*
- ii. The second nominee was Dave Baron. Rob Lindley moved to approve; Drew Beatty seconded. *Dave Baron was approved as the recipient of the Irish Clover award at 7:38 p.m.*
- iii. Christina Lee said that the Frank O'Malley award goes to an outstanding faculty member. Josh Kaplan is the nominee; he is the advisor to undergraduate political science students. Liz Kozlow said that she nominated him because his door is always open and he will talk to you about anything. He has been a great mentor. Brian Klein moved to approve; Chris Hollon seconded. *Joshua Kaplan was approved as the recipient of the Frank O'Malley award at 7:40 p.m.*

**IV. OFFICER REPORTS**

A. Mr. Dave Baron, Student Body President

- i. Dave Baron said that he, Lizzi Shappell, Matt Walsh and Aly Baumgartner met with John Affleck-Graves, Dr. Frances Shavers, and Bob McQuaid to talk about the resolutions about living wage. We are going to get more information about benefits and about how staff advisory councils work.
- ii. He announced that CoR approved Liz Brown as new CEA for next year. They also approved Stephen Friend as the Student Union Treasurer.

B. Ms. Lizzi Shappell, Student Body Vice President

- i. Lizzi Shappell said that they have already mentioned BOT.
- ii. Dave Baron, Chris Harris and she went to FMB to make sure that we will get the full amount for the College Readership Program.

C. Ms. Liz Kozlow, Chief Executive Assistant

- i. Liz Kozlow said that Pulumbo award is due today, and asked everyone to turn it into Judicial Council.
- ii. She couldn't quite announce the next speaker for the Catholic Think Tank Series, but it will be on March 31<sup>st</sup> at 7 p.m.

D. Mr. Philippe Colon, Faculty Senate Liaison

- i. Philippe Collon was absent.

## V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

### A. Committee on Academic Affairs

- i. Chris Harris urged everyone to enjoy the extra library hours this week.
- ii. The week after spring break, his committee will go off-site to high schools to talk to juniors about academics and college.

### B. Committee on Diversity Affairs

- i. Sarah Liu said that a panel discussion will take place on March 23rd on race, classism, and sexuality.

### C. Committee on Gender Issues

- i. Ali Wishon said that she met with Ann Firth about updating the health center's website.
- ii. SAAW is in the works.

### D. Committee on Residence Life

- i. Mark Seiler said that AAW went well.
- ii. The majority of the committee's effort will now go into the college town market research focus groups after spring break.
- iii. Residence hall charities are listed online

### E. Committee on University Affairs

- i. Matt Walsh said that he met with John Haynes about the DPAC and it was an informational meeting. He will meet with an associate provost to talk about that.
- ii. In regards to the commencement speaker selection process, he will be meeting with new class council officers about how to influence the speaker selection process.

### F. Committee on Oversight

- i. Suj Pandaya asked that everyone tell their new senators to start coming to meetings.
- ii. He is still working on the election section with James Leito.

### G. Committee on Community Relations

- i. Nick Guzman said that they met with Bob Jones about details for the legal seminar and it will be great. It will be on March 29<sup>th</sup> at 8 p.m.

### H. Committee on Minority Affairs

- i. Rhea Boyd asked everyone to stay tuned for the Native American letter.
- ii. The Spring Visitation campaign email will be going out soon.
- iii. The focus groups information will be going out.
- iv. A Caesar Chavez panel will be on March 27, from 8-10 p.m. in the library auditorium.
- v. She met with the committee on cultural diversity, and a lot of what came out of the subcommittees are things that we are concerned about.

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

## VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Lizzi Shappell said that applications for student government 06-07 are due on Friday.
- B. Erin Hankins reminded everyone to pick up the Stand Against Hate posters and to talk to their halls about Must Sex TV.
- C. Dan Bowen said that he shall continue to address the concerns of the Senate.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

- A. Rob Lindley moved to adjourn; Steve Tortorello seconded. *The March 8, 2006 meeting of the Student Senate was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.* The next meeting will take place on March 22, 2006 in the Notre Dame Room of LaFortune.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alyce Baumgartner  
Student Body Secretary