

-
- I. Opening Prayer - Aidan Rezner
 - II. Roll Call
 - A. Pick One
 - III. Approval of Minutes - [February 7th, 2024](#)
 - A. Justice Walker motions to change the name from “Justice Walker” to Amelia Forrest on page 2.
 - B. Justice Walker motions add the name “Justice Walker” to the unattributed question (item O) on page three.
 - IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. A Friendly Reminder about Senate Decorum
 1. Aidan Rezner: As we have potentially more controversial items enter the Senate floor in the next couple weeks, I wanted to remind everyone that we debate issues of the Senate, not our personal beliefs. If the conversation ever goes into either a personal belief or the morality of the issue, anything of that sort, I will be jumping in and stopping you. We debate issues of the Senate. I don’t want anyone to be hurt as a result of our conversations or anything negative to come of that. I will be very stringent on that policy. I just wanted to let everyone know that as we enter into the conversation. If everyone is ok with that, then I would appreciate it.
 - B. SO2324-16: Procedural Error

1. Aidan Rezner: Last week, we made a mistake. Thank you Sam and others who brought this to our attention. With the order SO2324-16, and order to add the Student Union Deputy Parliamentarian to the Constitution, because that is a Senate order, it requires $\frac{2}{3}$ vote to pass in the Senate. Any order does. A resolution only requires a simple majority. The vote we counted was 17 to 11, we did that quickly. That would not reach the threshold. We were going to recount this week, but in the subsequent days, the author of that resolution, which is completely under his right, has decided to withdraw that motion entirely. So, it wouldn't have passed any way based on our first count, but I just wanted to let you guys know that it did not pass, even though I said it did, my mistake. He has decided to withdraw that, which is totally in his right. Any questions? That order is going to be treated as if it never existed. That is how we are going to proceed with that.

V. General Orders

A. [A Nomination for Student Union Treasurer](#)

1. Questioning
 - a) Aidan Rezner: Mark and Hannah are here to answer any questions.
Mark is the candidate for this position next year.
 - b) Belle Marchetti: Hannah, why did you nominate Mark?
 - c) Hannah Blaskiewicz: Over the past year, Mark was one of two Assistant Student Union Treasurers. In all parts of the process, he has been inquisitive about learning about the role. He has been into

trying to make the office more efficient and he has been totally into helping the office. I thought he would be a great candidate.

- d) Sam Godinez: Quick question, what are you hoping to do as the Student Union Treasurer?
- e) Mark Metryoos: Hannah did an excellent job. I am hoping to maintain the things she has done and ensure that I keep the ship afloat and make sure the assistant Student Union Treasurers get a lot more learning during the period of time I'll have two of them. A huge part will be mentorship in regards to the Constitutional perspective and what it means to be Student Union Treasurer and how we delegate funds and the allocation of such funds. A huge part of why I wanted to take on the role is specific to the Shirt Charity fund. A lot of the work that we do there is in terms of supporting medical expenses for students who need that. I think I will continue the work there as well.

2. Debate

- a) Daniel Jung: I've known Mark for three years. He is a great guy and cares greatly about Notre Dame. I have no doubt he will do an awesome job in this role.
- b) Hannah Blaskiewicz: I've worked with Mark for a year now. I know how passionate he is about Notre Dame and about the Student Union. He came into the role as assistant Student Union

Treasure with the goal of making the university better and, if you approve him, I think he will do just that.

- c) Ava DeCroix: I know he worked with the CCC controller in prepping for winter allocations and he was very knowledgeable about how the club funding process worked. That is a large part of what we work with FMB on, so I know he is very knowledgeable and was great to work with. I think he will be awesome.
- d) Diego Gonzalez: I've only known Mark for very little. Every time he talks about this, he has a lot of knowledge. He will do a great job.

3. Vote

- a) The nomination is approved.

B. [SS2324-10: A Resolution to Urge Protection of Sexual Orientation in the University's Non-Discrimination Clause](#)

1. Questioning

- a) Joseph Tunney: I was doing some research and it says the Office of Institutional Equity oversees the nondiscrimination policy. Did you talk to them about this?
- b) Andrew Ryan: No, I did not.
- c) Joseph Tunney: Was there any reason why you didn't?
- d) Andrew Ryan: I was looking at past research when this was brought up in the Senate in the past in 1988, 2008, and 2012. I wanted to use this as a measure of getting the conversation started

and showing them the student body, at large, is willing to make a statement on something like this. I am trying to open up those doors for conversations after that.

- e) Joseph Tunney: When did the spirit of inclusion, when was that written?
- f) Andrew Ryan: I think it was in the late 90s.
- g) Joseph Tunney: Has that been adjusted?
- h) Andrew Ryan: That was originally written with the intent of talking about sexual orientation, but it never changed the non discrimination clause. My point is that the spirit of inclusion was not included, that was merely a statement they put out. This is actually looking at the non discrimination clause itself.
- i) Joseph Tunney: I'm seeing nothing in here about gender identity. Is that correct?
- j) Andrew Ryan: Yes, it's just focusing on sexual orientation.
- k) Ryan Lally: What are some ways, it says that the university reserves the right, by virtue of this not being in the nondiscrimination clause, to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation. What are some ways in which that is occurring or potentially would occur?
- l) Andrew Ryan: Last year the Observer talked about a student with a bisexual flag in their room and they were mistreated by their roommate for that. Their rector said the university wouldn't be

able to do anything about it because the non discrimination clause doesn't include sexual orientation. That's an example of how that put a hold on someone trying to go to this university.

- m) Sam Godinez: So, you have not met with any administrators on this specific resolution?
- n) Andrew Ryan: That's correct. This is a way to get the foot in the door and get the conversation going and show the student body is aware of the issue and is willing to talk about it.
- o) Jayden Espinoza: Do you have any information on how the students voted in the past?
- p) Andrew Ryan: This was passed three times, once in 1988, 2008, and 2012. It was passed by large margins each time. I don't know the specifics, but it was passed three times.
- q) Louis Cornett: What is the goal, since it has been passed three times and the university hasn't done anything? What is the goal this time around?
- r) Andrew Ryan: The fact that it was last brought up in 2012 and that was over 10 years ago. With that, after it was passed, the university established PRISM ND. They did make strides in the right direction. Since then, this past summer, an LGBTQ alumni group was formed officially by the university. They have made steps in the right direction. This is going to show that it is still at the forefront of people's minds. This is still a relevant issue that they

should tackle. Also, since 2021, the national stance on this issue has shifted in a more favorable direction.

- s) Sam Godinez: Who would this resolution go to? Would it go to a specific office or the university as a whole?
- t) Andrew Ryan: My main intention with this is directed at the university because there is a new president coming and a new chairman of the Board of Trustees. They both have influential power and impact. I'm not sure specifically who this will go to, but I think this is showing the university as a whole that this is impacting the students.
- u) Aidan Rezner: To clarify, it likely would be sent to the Office of Institutional Equity and the Office of the President.

2. Debate

- a) Clay Chauncey: I don't think I have to explain how a vote and opinion on this can be deeply personal. Out of respect, I motion to vote via Google Form.
- b) Hunter Brooke: This means a closed ballot.
- c) Sam Godinez: Are we going directly to vote now?
- d) Aidan Rezner: No, he is making a motion to make this vote a closed ballot vote, so it would be on Google Form.
- e) Clay Chauncey motions to vote via closed ballot.
- f) The motion fails
- g) Aidan Renzer: We will remain in open vote.

-
- h) Sam Godinez: I have to read off a quote from Madison Nemeth, who was a former J Council President. In the 2022/23 year another there was a resolution concerning ASL. “I think resolutions are not supposed to be used to get your foot in the door with administrators. If you come to a meeting with a resolution saying ‘you have to do this,’ they don’t like that. If you talk first, your resolution can be more well written and come with a specific plan. We say this with another resolution. I don’t think passing this resolution is necessary for talking with the administration. It could actually potentially harm the relationship and it may seem like we are forcing them to do something”. That is a quote that is repeated from Madison Nemeth, Judicial Council president, who also authored several resolutions when she was a senator, and the former Parliamentarian. Also, I have to quote Hunter Brooke from last year “I agree with Madison. I think we should meet with administrators and figure things out first”.
- i) Andrew Ryan: It is really important to illustrate that this has been passed 3 times before. That in itself shows that the university clearly is aware of this. There was a petition last year. Clearly, the university is aware of something like this. They know this is on students’ minds. It is simply urging them to do something, it is not telling them to do anything. It is urging them to open up the conversation and talk about it. That is the main intent here.

-
- j) Avery Gahler: In response to Sam's point, I want to urge everyone when we are voting not to vote on the basis of how the senator went about writing it and creating this motion, rather the actual substance behind it. Although each senator has a different route in which they do want to pass resolutions and things like that, I think we need to focus on what this is asking for, rather than how this is being asked.
- k) Amelia Forrest: It is important to consider not necessarily where you particularly stand on this issue but think about the student body at large. I know some students I have talked to had a lot of reservations about coming to somewhere like Notre Dame because they were worried they were not going to be welcome on the basis of sexual orientation because of things like seeing people are not supporting these kinds of things. We represent the students as a whole. It is important we make people feel welcome and accepted. That is a big part of Notre Dame and our community.
- l) Jayden Espinoza: It is important to remember that, historically, the way the Senate has voted. The Senate represents each of our dorm communities and the community at large. It is important to have consistent reflections and updates on how the student body feels. We want to make ND an inclusive place. We need to highlight how we as a student body would or would not align on a topic like this.

-
- m) Mary Grace Walsh: I am the Director of Disability Advocacy for Notre Dame Student Government. I was involved with the ASL initiative Sam is referencing. There is a huge difference between going to the university and a difference in how to approach coming to a group with a resolution and without. Doing it with resolution isn't saying you have to do this, it is saying we have a lot of student support and we can see that there is a way to work together. There is no forcing. I know from working with the administration that they simply won't be forced to do anything. But coming with vast student support, and saying this is something we care about and we want to work with you to make it happen is really powerful. Passing a resolution doesn't force the administration to do anything.. It is not disrespectful. It is not rude. It is saying we have support and there is a reason that this matters. Especially if it's something that the administration doesn't get to talk to students a lot about.
- n) Bridget Schippers: In defense of why it is helpful to bring forward a resolution with administration, even if there has been no recent formal meeting, in my own personal experience with advocacy for the wage change a couple years ago, we were told directly by the VP of Student Affairs that they like to first see there is student support behind an issue. That is what they recommended to use

before those conversations. It is a nice entry way at times and has been recommended by admin in the past.

- o) Kate Jackowski: I am the Director of Community Outreach for Notre Dame Student Government. I echo what Bridget and Mary Grace said. I was a Senator, I was the Welsh Family Senator, last year during the ASL bill. I am very familiar with the conversation that was had about that about the process taken. That was a large sway in why that vote ultimately failed. That was probably the main reason. In this case, there are a lot of distinctions from the ASL bill. That should not be anyone's hold up in voting against this resolution.
- p) Ava DeCroix: I think the focus may considering on where the university's Catholic stance aligns on this issue and that was potentially a reason why this issue was not implemented. It is stated in the resolution itself that this is in place at other Holy Cross recognized instigations. We would do well to remember when we are voting that this is not something that is, it seems from the implementation at least, contrary to how the Holy Cross Order runs academic institutions.
- q) Sam Godinez: There are several avenues to say that something has support and then pass a resolution. Particularly speaking, I was, respectfully, attacked because I did not meet with Professor Mattison before I proposed my Moreau Resolution. Even then,

there were several people who wanted him to talk here. I'm not arguing that the issue is not important. On this issue alone, it should pass. But, I am concerned about the fact that a resolution is a call to action

- r) Greg Gehrig: I am the Director for LGBTQ Advocacy for the Student Government Executive Cabinet. Like what Ava saying, based on benchmarking with other institutions, based on the work that our department has been done with academic courses with other policy and programming initiatives, it definitely is evident that there is a lack of inclusivity, especially of legal policies, based on our benchmarking with other Catholic religious institutions. It is important, especially considering when almost 50% of LGBTQ men experience discrimination. That is important as well. I want to echo what Mary Grace and Kate were saying, too.
- s) Ryan Lally: Great example, Andrew. A lot of this seems to be a grassroots thing. I don't know how efficient going to university will be. It will certainly make a statement that the students support this. Again, Greg mentioned legal policy. I'm not well versed, but I don't know how efficacious a bill would be, even if passed and implemented by the university administration in preventing things.
- t) James Bradley: My instinct is if the largest thing hindering people from voting yes for this is how effecting this will be, just pass it and let's see. Passing it can only tell us where the shortcomings are

and where we need more support and where more work needs to be done. If you are going to vote no because you don't think it will be super effective, you're making it ineffective. You are not allowing this issue to be heard.

u) Lena Dougherty: I am the Director of Title IX and Women's Initiatives. If anyone has information on this that contradicts mine, please let me know. As of right now, the non discrimination clause hosts things such as sex, ethnicity, race, ability. If you know how a Speak Up report works, if I was in a classroom and somebody discriminated against me for my ability or my sex, I would be able to file that Speak Up report and the university would be able to do something about that. If someone made a comment to me that was a discriminatory comment about my sexual orientation and then I file that report, the university, according to du lac, wouldn't be able to do anything on the basis of du lac. That's why it is so important to have sexual orientation in the no discrimination clause, or at least push for it, so it can be included in the non discrimination, just as any other identity would.

v) Max Feist: Sam about being attacked with his resolution earlier. I don't think it's equivalent to this that much with regard to justice and how this bill affects the students. A one credit class is a lot different than a student being able to speak up about discrimination against them. Bridget said that the admin had said in the past that

students' grassroots are encouraging and have been effective. They like to see that. We are the student Senate and we are supposed to represent the students. I think this bill is in favor with students and, this may be anecdotal, but if you think about how much the university preaches, during welcome weekend especially, about being welcoming to all different ethnicities, and kinds of people, they emphasize sexual orientation during welcome weekend too. They put Pride stickers on rectors' and RAs' doors. I think this is a "practice what you preach" sort of thing.

- w) Libby Meister: Going off benchmarking and a couple of other things, this was an Observer article that out of the US's top 50 universities, us and Pepperdine are only two out of all of them to not protect both gender identity and sexual orientation, obviously I know this is just about sexual orientation. Saint Mary's also includes sexual orientation in their non discrimination policy. This has been over ten years. I think it is urgent that we as a student body, if we believe that we support this issue, continue to bring it up to administration. There has not been sufficient change.
- x) Mary Grace Walsh: Just think about what it would look like if the United State Senate were voting on this. I know we are not the United State Senate, but I think it's important to consider the image that we give to students coming to this university and who are at university. You all represent the student body. It is really important

that we at least show that we are welcoming and kind and loving to all those, regardless of sexual orientation. If the United State Senate did not pass something like this, I have friends who would not feel welcome in the US after that.

- y) Andrew Ryan: I wanted to conclude by bringing your attention to talk about university precedent, specifically. In 1988, there was a Notre Dame report done by the Task Force on Marriage, Family and Other Life Commitments. It was commissioned by the university itself. One of the specific things they recommended was that universities explicitly include sexual orientation in its formal non discrimination statements. This shows that this issue has been brought to administration before and they are clearly well aware of it. This is about continuing to remind them this is on students' minds and this is something that is important

3. Vote

- a) The resolution is passed.
- b) Aidan Rezner: Thank you for the respectful conversation that we were able to have. I really appreciate it, from everyone. I thought it was a very productive and fruitful conversation on both sides.

VI. New Business

- A. [SO2324-18: An Order to Clarify and Amend Article XII and XV of the Constitution](#)

-
- B. [SO2324-19: An Order to Amend Article I of the Constitution Regarding GreenDot Training](#)
 - C. [A Nomination for Judicial Council President](#)
 - D. [SO2324-20: An Order to Redistribute Funds in the Student Union Covid-19 Response Financial Account](#)
- VII. Announcements
- A. Lily Condonina: SUB has Bubble Soccer tomorrow. The sign ups are still open on Instagram. We have Acousticafe cafe as usual tomorrow from 8:30 to 9:30. There will be Valentine's cookies and cookie decorations. Also, executive director applications are open until tomorrow
 - B. Rose Nguyen: JPW is this weekend! The JCC event will be from 2 to 4 right before Mass and Dinner. Come play games and win prizes. There will be food. Also, you do not need to stay the whole time, you just need to play one round to win prizes. There will be a prize for each of the 6 rounds.
 - C. Andrew Ryan: I wanted to commend the work of J Council on the election last week. I saw there was an increased turnout. I want to commend work that they did.
 - D. Aidan Rezner: Yes, they did a wonderful job. Koryn is not here, but Hunter and I will pass that along. The process went very smoothly, and if I remember, there were no allegations.
 - E. Hunter Brooke: It went very smoothly.
 - F. Ava DeCroix: Just a heads up. This is not official yet, but Libby and I are working on a club database on the CCC. We are working on a survey, pending SAO

approval, to send the hall councils about how people are finding clubs to join. I would appreciate all of your participation.

- G. Aleah Applin: The Black History Month showcase is on Friday at 7pm in Washington Hall.
- H. Charlie Pehl: There is now a volunteer database on the Student Government website. Tell people in your dorm about it. It is an easy way to find ways to give back to the SB community and volunteer on campus.
- I. Mariana Esparza: Walsh's signature event, Mr. ND, will be on February 22nd at 5 pm. Go to our Instagram page and vote on the candidate you want to win.
- J. Hunter Brooke: J council had a prospective Senator information workshop yesterday. We are getting into the season where people are interested in running for Senate. If people reach out, tell them how great it is. But, you can't endorse anyone.
- K. Aidan Rezner: Ok, Sam. You have two minutes. No personal names.
- L. Sam Godinez: I woke up on Thursday, February 8 to find that someone attacked me by name on YikYak, anonymously. These individuals claimed that I poured out my heart and soul against the ticket that shall not be named for students running for student body president and vice president. Firstly, I was attacked 3 times. Not once, not twice, but three times. In the third one, I was claimed "Sammy G this isn't gonna work in your favor" after there was a repost for a post on someone's campaign. It also said "This isn't gonna look good on Dillon either". I want to testify here for the record to deny, deny, deny any allegations made against me on YikYak. These are all fake news. In fact, I'm going to say

that I didn't even criticize these tickets on YikYak, I criticized them on Fizz, and I criticized all of the tickets. This all started because a lot of people asked me, "Who are you going to vote for, Sammy G" and I wrote "anybody but this". I am just trying to make sure the J Council did not prosecute me because Dillon hall was very interested in who I was going to vote for. I want to clarify that I'm very proud to be mentioned on YikYak. This doesn't come every single day. Deny, deny, deny. One last message to individuals who wrong this comment. One last message. *Plays cat video facing camera*

VIII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting is adjourned.