

- I. Opening Prayer - Daniel Jung
- II. Roll Call
 - A. Pick One
- III. Approval of Minutes - [January 24th, 2024](#)
- IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. Campus Dining Executives Presentation
 - B. Exec Cab
 1. Civic Engagement Week (2/5/23 - 2/9/23)
 - a) Voter Registration Drive (Duncan Student Center from 5:30 - 7:30 pm on Monday, February 5th)
 - (1) Daniel Jung: Next week we have Civic Engagement week.
It is all about promoting civic engagement and democracy. It is in collaboration with the Office of the President. If you aren't registered to vote, get registered, and tell people in your dorms to get registered.
 - b) Absentee Ballot Workshop (Duncan Student Center from 5:30 - 6:30 pm on Tuesday, February 6th)
 - (1) Daniel Jung: A lot of us are voting in states that aren't Indiana. We come from all over the world. If you interested in learning how to vote in your home state while in Indiana, you can come to this.
- V. General Orders

A. [SO2324-11: An Order to Clarify Membership of the Off-Campus Vice President in the Student Senate](#)

1. Daniel Jung: Right now, there is a disagreement between the Senate Bylaws and the Constitution, so we need to hash that out.
2. Questioning
3. Debate
 - a) Sam Godinez: I got very constitutionally smart this winter break. I've looked at all the bylaws and read all the Constitutions twice. If I can pass this, I will have double the experience of previous parliamentarians, which will look very nice in my application.
4. Vote
 - a) The order is passed.

B. [SO2324-12: An Order to Amend Article XII of the Constitution](#)

1. [Decision from the Committee on the Constitution re: SO2324-12](#)
2. Daniel Jung: This went through Comm Com.
3. Hunter Brooke: It was reviewed by the Committee on the Constution. They voted unanimously to approve it.
4. Questioning
5. Debate
6. Vote
 - a) The order is passed.

C. [SO2324-13: An Order Clarifying the Publication of Senate Documents](#)

1. Daniel Jung: Right now, basically it just says that the Senate must be in charge of publishing Senate documents. Very vague. This would give Hunter and the Parliamentarian the authority to do that.
2. Hunter Brooke: None of these changes are very big to the Constitution. Admittedly, they are just fixing things. But, as general practice, I think it is a good idea to at least know what's being changed and have some idea, especially when dealing with the Constitution, which outlines fiscal policy and huge operational rules for how things work. Try to at least have some understanding. It is very important. I'm not saying I'm going to read it, but try to have understanding. If you don't, then during questioning at least ask "What's this doing?". That would be my recommendation. I don't want to be like the old guy that's like "Do this," but that's my two cents.
3. Questioning
 - a) Sam Godinez: So, who uploads the Senate documents? You or the deputy?
 - b) Hunter Brooke: Currently? I would say 70% me, 30% deputies. I ask the deputies to help me upload something if I have something that demands my attention immediately after Senate or in general.
4. Debate
 - a) Andrew Ryan: I saw in New Business, it talks about establishing deputy parliamentarians as enumerated positions. You said 30% of them are uploading them. Why not include them in this clause?

b) Hunter Brooke: In essence, the order that is putting them in the Constitution is saying they can do anything I ask them to do or fulfill any responsibilities assigned to the Parliamentarian. The way that is written would be interpreted to say they can do this as well. That's how it's been interpreted. The order the putting them into Constitution isn't changing anything from interpretive standpoint, but it is just making it clearer.

5. Vote

a) The order is passed.

D. [SO2324-15: An Order Calling for a Referendum Regarding the Ban of PEVs on Campus](#)

1. Sam Godinez motions to move SO2324-15 from New Business to General Orders.

2. Questioning

a) Clay Chauncey: I know this says this is not expected to change the ban, but have you reached out to admin to see if they would consider the results of this?

b) Sam Godinez: No, but I had a meeting with Hunter and Aidan. My goal is informational purposes. I am not trying to overturn the decision. This is just way to get student feedback on the issue.

c) Daniel Jung: I also want to add that students were involved in this decision. There was a committee formed and I was tasked with assigning students to that committee for their input.

d) James Bradley: In terms on information and motivation, could you clarify what that referendum is for if there is no hope of changing the

decision that was made? What is the purpose of it? What are you hoping to do with it? Who are you looking to send it to? Or, is this just purely you wanting to learn more about it?

- e) Sam Godinez: I would say the fourth option. I am trying to get a wide variety of student feedback from all across the campus because, realistically, there is no consensus whether the student body population agrees or disagrees with it. Having at least that number of say, for example, if 48% agree or 39% disagree, or something of the sort, that could be extremely helpful for reference purposes. It would give us an idea.

3. Debate

- a) Andrew Ryan: I'm curious if anyone has any thoughts on what could be said if this could give students the false impression that this could influence future policy. Even though it says in here that it wouldn't reverse it, but I'm curious if anyone has any thoughts on if this could give a false impression.
- b) James Bradley: I am confused. I remember reading the original report that came out that was an actual ban of PEV. One sense that I did get from it was, regardless of students who were split on it, due process was followed very well. There was a lot of thought and effort put into it that reflected much more than: just do students like their personal vehicles or not? Or are they fun? I think this gives the false impression of if students like them enough, we will bring them back. I just feel like this referendum is not clear on what it is being used for, who it is going to, or what the purpose of it is, other than fact gathering. It inadvertently undermines the due process that was already followed.

- c) Louis Cornett: With all due respect, I think due process was a joke. From the people that I've talked to, it was very selective committee who voted on the PEVs. If people think it will bring PEVs back, they will be really honest with their feedback, so I don't think it matters if it used for fact checking. It's not that big of a deal.
- d) Sam Godinez: It is for informational purposes. If anyone wants to add a motion to add that it is purely for informational purposes, they could do that.
- e) Amelia Forrest motions to add a friendly amendment that adds a question that says "This survey is for informational purposes only and has no direct bearing on university policy" at the end of the question.
- f) Daniel Jung: This needs to be approved by all cosponsors? Are all the cosponsors good with it? Good, this friendly amendment has been approved.
- g) Ryan Lally: We don't say this for other orders when, in fact, the nature is the same. The nature of a Senate order is this student body calling upon university to make a change. Whether or not they choose to make said change is but to them, but we are calling on them to make that change. While this is not directly calling upon them to make the change, I think the reason we are saying we don't want to give students a false hope is because this decision made suddenly and it is a very contentious issue. Students dont feel like their voices were heard. It's not the nature of this that is different than any other student order, it is the situation and issue being discussed, which I think would make student voices being heard on the matter more clearly. It would be a valuable initiative.

- h) Hunter Brooke: Just a point of order. Did you intend to say “This survey is for information purposes...” or “This is for informational purposes...”?
- i) Amelia Forrest: This question. Or Survey. I don’t really care.
- j) Hunter Booke: I did want to raise the point really quickly. I can’t make any motions or recommend anything, but here is a question mark and an extra space. I just make sure because this is going to be sent to everyone that the language and grammar are correct.
- k) Jacob Zybura: I know i missed opportunity for questions. I’m going to propose somethign and if someone wants to answer, I would appreciate it. Is this opt in or does everyone who gets ballot has to answer it. I’m worried if this is opt in, this will be a biased result. All my friends who had scootersr, especially athletes, are upset at the ban. Or the people far away having to ship it back home and spend a significant amount in postage or boxes. And its a hassel.
- l) Sam Godinez: There is option to abstain or be neutral. If one is under the impression “I don’t want to answer” because they don’t care, they can choose to abstain.
- m) Aleah Applin: I feel like this is such a pressing issue. The time we are putting into it isn’t enough, especially with how heavy people feel about it. There could possibly be a change for transportation for athletes. I don’t think its fair they work what is a full time job for their sport and their transportation and what they are used to was cut. I think this isn’t the answer. I also see the struggle of this being an opinion-based survey, like completely what you feel about something. The decision was made for campus and student well being. If people tried to use scooters last

week with the ice, while most of us would have made the decision not to, I know people would still have tried. We saw how people were bruising themselves from falling just walking. I think this could lead to greater harm and students being more upset that they feel their voices are being heard through a survey when we might not even be able to do anything about it.

- n) Hannah Blaskeiewicz: I just want to say that survey did go out. We got plenty of emails about it. I filled out the survey about the EVs. Everyone got it. It was on the weekly blast of emails as a link and there was a form you could go to to actually voice your opinion.
- o) Sam Godinez: Yes, a form was released. But, it only got 586 responses. To my understanding, in comparison to the 14,200 individuals that are students and faculty on campus, I'm not including staff because I couldn't get the data, a lot of those individuals didn't fill out the survey because they didn't see the necessity of it. That's why it didn't have a high response. Now knowing what happened, I think a survey would be better.
- p) Hutner Brooke: The 14,000 number, from a J Council perspective, this would be an email sent only to undergraduate students. So, not 14,000 people.

4. vote

- a) The order is not passed.

VI. New Business

- A. Daniel Jung: We have three things in New Business. Obviously we don't need to go through them today, we do them next week. But, I do want to draw attention to Item A (SO2324-15), which is an order calling for a referendum regarding PEVs

on campus. A referendum is essentially a student poll. If this was moved up from New Business to General Order, the idea would be that this could be added to Student Body election, which is taking place next week. It would essentially say “Who are you voting for?” and then question two would be “What are your thoughts on PEV ban?”. We can keep it in New Business and the alternative would be, if it’s passed, it would be added to the Class Council elections.

- B. Hunter Brooke: If this is not moved up and it goes onto the Class Council ballot, if you guys vote to approve it, the only difference is no seniors would be able to vote because they are not electing a Class Council president, so they would not be able to offer input in this. Just wanted you all to know that.
- C. Sam Godinez: Quick question. What if class councils, what if there is only one ticket?
- D. Hunter Brooke: If only one person is running for a Class Council election, then the Judicial Council will not hold an election. They will ask the Senate to suspend it and those people will automatically assume office. If there is only one person running, there will be no ballot for that to go on for that class.
- E. Dorian Khoshyomn: Don’t Senate and Hall President elections happen at the same time? Couldn’t we add the questions to that election?
- F. Hunter Brooke: For sure, we could finagle around. At that point it would be a question of workload. It might be more difficult on a technical level from a J Council perspective. I’m not sure involved in a lecture. I think it’s probably possible, but it would be a lot trickier.

- G. Daniel Jung: Also I think with HPC elections, aren't some not run through J Council elections?
- H. Hunter Brooke: Yes, fair point. In dorms that opt out of out electoral processes, we can't put that on the ballot. Any dorm that chooses to run things by themselves would not be able to offer insight on this. Obviously, any dorms where we suspend elections as well. So, if you win your Senate by us suspending it by being the only one running, your dorm would not be able to offer insight either.
- I. Andrew Ryan: Does this have to happen with concurrent with an election, or are you just saying that to increase turnout?
- J. Hunter Brooke: I'm hesitant to say it does, but in past referendums, it has always been attached to ballots.
- K. Dorian Khoshyomn: When you say dorms opting out of the general electoral process, is that purely based on precedent? What members of a dorm community have the ability to make that decision as to what process they are going to use?
- L. Hunter Brooke: You guys can offer insight on this as well. From my point of view, every dorm has a hall election coordinator. J Council works with them and corresponds with the other leaders in their hall and they decide whether they want to opt in or opt out of our election processes. That happens every year. It is not reliant on precedent. It is them telling us actively "This year, we want to opt out". It so happens that usually dorms that opt out continue opting out, but it is a decision scientifically made.

- M. Peter Schimpf: It is worth noting, usually have an election and there is often a debate that happens within halls. This could still be included in the discussion of an election. But, it doesn't have to be.
- N. Hunter Brooke: Yes, I'm not saying they don't have an election, but J Council has less direct line of sight to their election and less ability to make sure everything being voted on in an appropriate way
- O. Daniel Jung: I also want to say results of this poll is not going to change anything, it is merely a way to gauge student feedback, thoughts and perspective on this issue.
- P. Sam Godinez: I just want to say, I know its late and I'm completely understanding. But even if you disapprove the referendum, it is best if we consider it now and tough it out because, in the case we approve it, then we could include it.
- Q. [SO2324-16: An Order to Institute the Deputy Student Union Parliamentarian into the Constitution](#)
- R. [SO2324-17: An Order to Raise the Maximum Limit on the Carry Forward Account](#)
1. [Decision from the Committee on the Constitution re: SO2324-17](#)
- VII. Announcements
- A. Daniel Jung: Campus Dining brought cookies and Mexican hot chocolate. Please grab some on your way out.
- B. Lily Condodina: SUB only has Acousticafe this week tomorrow from 8:30-10:30pm in Haggerty. Keep your eyes out for a few new events coming.

- C. Jayden Espinoza: O'niell's signature Spring event, Ms.ND is tomorrow in Washington Hall. Doors open at 7. You can get tickets at the door.
- D. Vinnie Badali: Next Wednesday is Siegfried's annual event, Day of Man. We will all be out there in shirts and shorts raising money for the South Bend Center for the Homeless. There will be a link to donate as well. Spread the word.
- E. Hunter Brooke: Now that we have entered campaign season, please be aware that if you are in this room, you almost certainly cannot endorse anyone. You should absolutely avoid doing so.
- F. Aleah Applin: Freshman Formal is this Friday. If you have freshies in your dorm that haven't gotten a ticket, we are about to reopen it. The freshman class went in an uproar about it, so we are about to send email communications out that there will be more tickets.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting is adjourned.