

NOTRE DAME STUDENT SENATE

Executive Summary

DATE: 13 NOVEMBER 2013

Notre Dame Room, LaFortune

- I. **Opening Business**
 - a. Nancy Joyce called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.
 - b. MAGGIE ARMSTRONG led the invocation.
 - c. 3 were absent; 0 were late.
 - d. Nancy Joyce entertained any motions to change the 6 NOVEMBER 2013 executive summary. *The 6 NOVEMBER 2013 executive summary was approved at 6:03 p.m.*

- II. **Officer Reports**
 - a. Mr. Alex Coccia, Student Body President
 - i. No Shave November
 1. The grand prize is a dinner with Sargent Tim McCarthy
 - a. As asked by Juan Jose D, how do you win?
 - i. The most money raised
 - b. Ms. Nancy Joyce, Student Body Vice President
 - i. None.
 - c. Mr. Juan Rangel, Chief of Staff
 - i. Absent.

- III. **General Orders**
 - a. Resolution SS 1314-10, as presented by Ms. Carolina Wilson
 - i. This resolution supports the efforts of diversity council. The diversity council passed the resolution DC 1314-01 (as mentioned in Senate minutes 6 November 2013).
 1. Carolina R. thinks as leaders, it is essential that we are different. Even though differences are essential, we should be able to agree on some things. At the root of the efforts of DC, there is something we can all agree on. We want to include those that have felt excluded, and welcome those who have felt unwelcome. She asks that as the senate that we too show that we want ND to be a welcoming place.
 - ii. Toni Schreier motioned to vote, Maggie Armstrong seconded.
 1. Thomas Rogers objected.
 - a. Rohan Andresen asked the secretary if she was getting all of this.
 - b. There was a hand vote to vote on voting.
 - i. The vote was 18 yes 14 no, so the voting did not commence.
 - iii. Rohan A. motioned to open discussion, Melissa Krumdick seconded.
 - iv. Juan Jose D. recalled the retention of faculty of diverse members. He asked if there was information for the total retention rate of professors

at the previous meeting, he would like to know these numbers. He would like to know these numbers before we tell people how to do their job.

1. Maggie Armstrong thinks that this is irrelevant. She did not think that the resolution was 100 percent you will do this. She does not think we are telling anyone how to do their job, just that as a student body that we are looking into these ideas.
 - a. Danny Colston thinks that the language Maggie A. mentioned was not nearly as strong as the language used in the resolution of DC. It was we think that you need to do this now. As much as he could tell, he does not think that they discussed this. Have they talked to faculty senate? With Juan Jose, before we start to make resolutions about how professors should further education we need to understand the perspective.
 - i. Carolina W. does not know the extent of the research done. She believes that DC has done as much work leading up to this that they should have been doing.
 1. Nancy Joyce mentioned that DC has been working on this for about 6 months, and that Executive Cabinet has seen this beforehand and that there was a lot of work done since April since he would have seen it. Also, the faculty and staff: this did not refer to what Juan Jose was talking about. She would like to clarify the language on this.
 - v. Bob Pak asked about cultural enrichment course, the idea he gets here is the opening to diversity. We have these that aren't mandatory, he has taken some Spanish and Chinese courses, but to achieve what Carolina R. wants the class would have to be made new. Many students wont have room for this, and may not want to be in this.
 - vi. Juan Jose D. asked if Carolina R. and Luis L. could please be in here, because he feels that this is unfair to them.
 1. Nancy J. said that this was the purpose of last week. She thinks that the idea behind what Carolina W. is presenting is just supporting the spirit of the DC resolution. By the fact of asking offices to look into issues, it spurs discussions and actions on how to make students more culturally enriched and have all students welcome here. DC doesn't necessarily think that they will get everything that they are asking for. It will be submitted regardless of whether we pass it, because DC has already passed it. DC as a group of student leaders has passed this. If you can get behind the

idea of some sort of inclusive thing in a classroom, that is what we are voting on.

- a. Juan Jose D. is worried about voting on a resolution of things that haven't been planned out. He thinks that some of these might be too strong, like the extra course. Many majors like engineers or double-majors are packed.
 - i. This class would be like a seminar said Nancy.
 1. Juan Jose D. said what if they already took their philosophy? There is still grey area.
 - vii. Michael Masi thinks with the resolve, it does say that the language means we are supporting exactly what DC is saying with the "recommendations"
 - viii. Maggie A. would just like to speak a bit, although everyone has said what she would like to say. We might be giving ourselves a bit too much power if we think that what we pass is going to happen. As student leaders, we have a say in what we would like to happen. However, what will actually happen is up to the Provost. She highly doubts that this course will happen next year. The university probably will not take this so literally. She would envision it as more of a grad program, like with freshman.
 - ix. Carolina W. would say that the resolution supports the recommendations of DC because they have the research, she does not and we do not. If we pass this, it will bring awareness.
 - x. Stephen Scobee would like to change the resolution to say spirit instead of recommendations.
 1. Danny C. thinks that it is very important that we talk about amending it. To his eyes, it looks like a blank check. It does not specify that specific resolution. He understands that there will be interpretations, and since grey areas have been pointed out, he feels uncomfortable passing something because of interpretations than what it actually says. This is not a stable way to go forward. He would like to remand this back to one of the departments or committees to talk about it.
 - xi. Dottie Schlueter said that Kiana last week talked about that these recommendations are from students across campus, and she recognizes that these students have a better opinion than her. It would be good to trust them, and to respect the fact that they worked hard on this. These are just recommendations. She thinks that we are putting too much stress on these recommendations. They are not going to change our class schedules. This is not a WWII peace treaty. This is a statement of cooperation and trust and respect of DC.
 - xii. Kyle McCaffery would like to thank Dottie S, and continue in the same vein. All that we have come up with that we have real debate on is the required cultural course. No one has brought up debate on other parts of DC's resolution such as the diverse faculty retention, or making dietary
-

considerations in the dining hall. Lets try to focus on what we are talking about with the language.

1. Maggie A. agrees that recommendations should be kept in to support DC. If we were to take out the recommendations, it would cause a backslide and show distrust of DC. She worries the about the need to show a solid supportive front.
- xiii. Joe Kelly thinks that most of us agree on the recommendations, and he has talked about the spirit of inclusion statement to his dorm. His dorm members said that this statement would remind them that they are different and make them feel uncomfortable. He does not support the FroshO rector choice of members, because of his dorm's situation mentioned last week.
- xiv. Juan Jose D. to what Kyle M. said, would like to commend what DC has done for all of their hard work. He would not like to support the wording here if there is misinterpretation of the wording. They did put a lot of work into this, however he does not feel that we need to agree with every single point and has passed up an amendment, so according to the parliamentary procedure, we must cease discussion.
1. Change Resolved Clause to "That the student senate supports the efforts and recognizes the hard work of Diversity Council"
 2. It was seconded. The amendment was debated; procedure was explained by Nancy J.
 - a. Michael Lindt feels like this wording only recognizes the work, you worked hard congratulations. If we have an amendment we need to say we agree with something, not necessarily recommendations but support something.
 - b. Kyle M. disagrees with this amendment and would like to debate the issues inside the DC resolution. He thinks that we need to debate more the issues that the senate has with the resolution. If someone feels uncomfortable because the statement of inclusion shows a problem on campus, than let that person feel uncomfortable because if they feel comfortable with that problem that is a larger problem.
 - i. Nancy J. clarified that DC resolution has been passed as it was presented last week regardless.
 1. Kyle M. thinks that we should agree with the recommendations in this resolution that is being read tonight.
 - c. Lisa Wuertz thinks that efforts and hard work is redundant.
 - d. Danny C. would like to respectfully disagree with Nancy J., because we are looking to support the resolution in its entirety. It is worth considering that not all of us agree on

everything in that resolution because of some grey area that was brought up. If we as a body cannot agree on parts of it, than he is unsure as to how we as a body we can vote to support on the whole thing.

3. Stephen Scobee asked to table the vote on this resolution until next week, but to continue discussion on this resolution. Emma Herlihy seconded.
 - a. 3 voted to table the amendment, majority opposed.
4. Discussion continued with the amendment.
 - a. Carolina W. supports the original wording. There is always uncertainty; we will never make a decision to do something or be somewhere and agree with every aspect of it. Even choosing ND, there were aspects that made us feel unsure. Outside of us, would this course attribute be annoying for students? But lets not just think about us; the core issue is what would be good for students. If we can all follow this in ourselves, then she thinks that it gives grounds for us supporting.
 - b. Sarah Price thinks that we are getting caught up between resolution and recommendation. The resolution that we are passing supports the DC resolution, and their recommendations to provide a solid front showing that we support DC. That is why saying hard work is not enough, we should show support and that we will help. We should recognize this is not within the senates power to change the recommendations.
 - c. Rohan A. would like to say that usually he is very hesitant on progress for progress, but this does not fall under this category. This is coming from the part of our campus, 7 percent, that feel uncomfortable for a reason. This would be unfair to a silent part of our constituents. It is our job to represent our consitituents as senators This is coming from our peers who need the most help right now. He supports the word recommendation.
 - d. Juan Jose believes diversity is great for our campus, it allows for us to be exposed to different points of view. DC is doing a very noble job. But by the same token we as a senate cannot give them a free check, that is why the amendment he proposed to vote the resolution in. However he does not feel that we need to agree with every single point. If there are those who agree with DC's points. They can send a letter.
 - i. Juan Jose D. motioned to vote on the amendment. Phillip Krebs seconded.

1. The majority voted against the amendment.
- xv. The original resolution was debated on again.
 1. Toni S. supported Rohan A's point. It is hard to sometimes just get wrapped up in what we think here. We are here to represent our dorm and our dorm's diversity.
 2. Lisa W. motioned to close discussion, Carter Perrin seconded.
 - a. It was voted by the senate to not close discussion.
 - xvi. Stephen S. wanted to table the vote so he could talk to his dorm, Sorin about the resolution.
 - xvii. Maggie A. was curious about the procedure.
 1. Nancy J. clarified the parliamentary procedure.
 2. Maggie A. said she was confused.
 3. Nancy J. said we are now in the part that we are discussing the resolution on the floor, then if we did close the debate, we would proceed to vote.
 - a. You cannot motion to discuss the motion.
 - xviii. Toni S. would like to clarify exactly what the effect of passing this resolution would be.
 1. Nancy J. explained that our resolution would be submitted along with Dc's resolution, and Nancy would write a letter expressing the sentiments named in the last two weeks in the offices mentioned in the DC resolution.
 - a. Toni S asked for clarification if this was giving our opinion?
 - i. Nancy J said yes, and they will act on DC because we are not asking them to act on our resolution.
 - xix. Danny C. said that we are here representing constituents, and that the senators are here to speak not just for the 7 percent, but the whole. You were voted to represent the entirety of your dorm community, so if you have any objections to the DC resolution it must be voiced. Look at this from a broad perspective. If there is a part of this resolution that you do not like, there is a reason for this. If you do not support this in its entirety, then do not vote on it.
 1. Thomas R. would respectfully disagree. Do we have research on what would improve the 7 percent's time here?
 - a. Nancy J. said it is in the DC resolution. Nancy J explained that DC is made up of 30 clubs and the leaders of these clubs meet in DC. Dc when it decided it wanted to propose this resolution in response to Call to Action in 2012, then they went back to their constituency to ask what would make it better and they narrowed it down to these recommendations that are in the current DC resolutions.
 - xx. Maggie A. thinks it is unfair that we are only representing the 7 percent here. She still supports it even though that she feels happy here. She thinks it is possible and likely that the majority of our constituents can

- agree with these recommendations. She can understand why one would want to go back and talk to ones dorm.
- xxi. Rohan A. thinks that this will not do any harm to those who don't feel uncomfortable. What makes him like ND are the community, football, and masses and none of the things here will change that. We want to make as many feel comfortable here.
 - xxii. Sarah Senseman explained that her job is to consider the constituents. The only thing students will hear is that senate supports or not support. They will not think about the technicalities or the details. It is just the 10 words.
 - xxiii. Kyle moved to amend the resolution resolve clause to say "that the student senate supports the efforts and recommendations of DC and that the discussion of the recommendations be continued by the Office of Student Affairs, Auxillary Operations, and the office of Provost so that any grey areas in the recommendations will be clarified"
 - 1. Zach Waterson moved to change grey areas to ambiguities.
 - 2. Juan Jose D. thinks that we need to go back to our dorms to be able to debate this better, and he motioned to table this until the next senate.
 - a. Stephen S. seconded.
 - i. It was voted to not table the discussion.
 - xxiv. Emma H. motioned to vote, Katie McCarty seconded.
 - 1. The amendment was amended.
 - xxv. Kyle motioned to vote, Angel Zambrano seconded.
 - 1. The senate voted on the resolution as amended for discussion, the vote was yes.
 - xxvi. Bob P. would like to know when this DC resolution would be put forward.
 - 1. DC is waiting for us currently, we are unsure what will happen if we do not pass this.
 - xxvii. Sophie Manley asked that Nancy read the resolution as amended.
 - 1. Nancy J. read the resolution as amendment.
 - 2. Kyle M. explained that this would draw attention to the good qualities in the DC recommendations, however we would not want these point blank. We would like continued discussion by all the necessary departments to improve upon this.
 - xxviii. Sophie M. is confused, because none of the recommendations seem ambiguous to her.
 - 1. Kyle M. said that we as a group do not support the language about the required course, and the ambiguity lies in how it would be operated and how soon it would be enacted. Also, in how a spirit of inclusion would be enacted. The ambiguities are there for a reason. DC wanted these resolutions to be in bare form.
-

- xxix. Maggie A. thinks if this is what it takes to get support, great. It is absurd to think that it would be enacted point blank, and by adding this it sounds like we are negating our support.
- xxx. Philip Krebs thinks that it sounds like we are just discussing the ambiguity clause. He motioned to vote.
 - 1. Bob P. seconded.
 - 2. The senate voted by standing.
 - a. The resolution as not passed as amended.

IV. New Business

- a. There was no new business.

V. Announcements

- a. Please take two posters from Sarah S.
 - i. This are for the Town Hall next week, and tomorrow is the feedback campaign #grillthegov.
 - 1. Please have people give us feedback, announced Catherine Kromkowski.
- b. Michael Lindt announced 163 days until the Regatta.
- c. Girls Run the World 5k is this Friday please sign up.
- d. CCC just updated facebook and twitter
 - i. Please add or follow CCC
- e. Monica Daegele clarified to bring people who wouldn't normally go to a sexual assault discussion event.

VI. Adjournment

- a. Without objection, *the 13 NOVEMBER 2013 Senate meeting adjourned at 7:19 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Alexandria Chloe Wellman
Student Union Secretary