



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
*University of Notre Dame*

February 26, 2024

Members of the Student Senate,

I would first like to extend my sincerest gratitude to individuals who spoke in support of my nomination of Hunter last Wednesday. I would also like to thank individuals who have reached out to me to voice their concerns regarding Hunter's nomination; I appreciate your respectful and professional engagement. My goal has been, and always will be, to nominate the individual who will best represent the ideals of the Judicial Council and the Student Union, and will work tirelessly to continue to improve the Student Union in honor of our predecessors and for the future of Notre Dame. I am unwavering in my belief that Hunter is the strongest candidate to assume the role of Judicial Council President and that this nomination will allow me to walk away knowing that I have left the Judicial Council and Student Union in the best possible position to succeed.

I would like to acknowledge that I am fully aware that my re-nomination of Hunter has caused some dismay. As I stated previously, I feel strongly that nominating Hunter is in the best interest of the Student Union and that I would be doing a disservice to concede so quickly in the face of pushback. In retrospect, I also believe that there remains a significant amount of misunderstanding relating to numerous arguments used to oppose my nomination for Hunter. I would like to take this opportunity to address some of the points raised during the debate on his nomination and I hope that this clarification and explanation will be taken into consideration when the nomination of Hunter for Judicial Council President is reconsidered.

First, I would like to clarify the responsibilities of the Judicial Council President and how Hunter, undoubtedly, has the most experience that aligns with what will be expected of him. Beyond selecting the rest of the Judicial Council Officers and serving as the chairperson to the Student Union Ethics Commission (SUEC), the Judicial Council President is responsible for overseeing the administration of elections, advising the Judicial Council's Election Committee, overseeing the Peer Advocacy branch of Judicial Council, providing constitutional interpretations, and playing active roles on the Committee on the Constitution, Senate, Campus Life Council, and Financial Management Board. With the sole exception of the Financial Management Board, Hunter has gained experience with each of the groups throughout this term by attending meetings, advising in a similar capacity to myself, and offering assistance and insight to each of these groups. However, beyond the formal responsibilities of the Judicial Council President, knowledge of the internal workings of Judicial Council hearings and all election-related endeavors are the most difficult parts of the job. The expectations of a Judicial Council President are numerous and, to this day, I am continually challenged despite the experience that I have gained throughout this term and in my two



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*University of Notre Dame*

prior terms as Vice President of Elections. Over the course of this term, Hunter has demonstrated a keen understanding of much of the aforementioned responsibilities and has actively participated in ways that have allowed him to learn what it takes to be a Judicial Council President.

Second, I believe that there may be misunderstanding on the SUEC process and what it means to have a Bill of Impeachment sent to the Student Senate for consideration. The SUEC is tasked with reviewing any and all allegations of unethical conduct of any member of the Student Union. When the SUEC convenes, they have the ability to impose a wide range of sanctions that include censure, probation, and a Bill of Impeachment. There are no set criteria for what merits each sanction; thus, each year, a SUEC with new members could rule differently despite cases with similar circumstances. Once the SUEC submits the Bill of Impeachment to the Senate, the Senate is tasked with determining whether the action or behavior warrants impeachment and a hearing for removal from office. In Hunter's case, your predecessors in the Senate decided that the allegations *did not* warrant impeachment nor a hearing for removal from office. Any claims that Hunter was impeached are incorrect, and are made because of a misunderstanding of the SUEC processes. I also firmly believe that Hunter's experience on both sides of the SUEC has provided the Judicial Council with valuable insight that has allowed us to make changes that improve the process for all involved in both the SUEC and Election Committee. I am not concerned that his appearance before the SUEC in the past will inhibit him from carrying out the duties of the SUEC chairperson with integrity; in fact, I believe that he will be all the more equipped to do so.

Third, I believe that the claims that assert Hunter's lack of sound constitutional interpretation assume a malicious intent that cannot be proven. I have the utmost confidence that the interpretations he has provided have been honest and ethical. Regarding the order to insert the role of Deputy Student Union Parliamentarian into the Constitution, Hunter made an honest mistake that many others failed to catch, including myself, Aidan, Matthew, and Madison. We all make mistakes – to say that Hunter cannot provide sound constitutional interpretation based on a mistake that he took responsibility for is to say that, in order for any of us to hold any office, we must be perfect. Similarly, though I was not present at the Committee on the Constitution meeting referenced in the last Senate meeting, I can say that providing a varying constitutional interpretation and willingly engaging in discussion over it is never discouraged by the Judicial Council. I was not told the version of the story that was portrayed in the document sent to select Senators – I was actually told quite the opposite. One of the characteristics that I personally looked for in candidates to fill my Judicial Council team this year was the ability to voice opinions against the majority so that we would be able to engage in meaningful debate for the betterment of the Student Union. To say that an abstract or different constitutional interpretation that was being debated is representative of



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
*University of Notre Dame*

poor constitutional interpretation capabilities discredits the unique importance of diverse perspectives in the Committee on the Constitution proceedings.

To reiterate, the nomination of Hunter for Judicial Council President does not come without significant reflection and consideration of the individual who will best serve the interests of the Student Union and Judicial Council. Throughout his time on the Judicial Council, I have witnessed a tremendous desire to ensure that every individual is afforded the opportunities that they deserve – whether in elections, ethics, or anything else. I have observed his dedication to ensuring that members of the Student Union are in compliance with the Constitution by taking proactive approaches to the extent possible to assist others in fulfilling their duties. Hunter is without equal in his qualifications and experiences and has demonstrated only the best character and ability to uphold the integrity of our institution. I humbly ask that you reconsider the nomination in light of the facts presented in this letter, and I look forward to engaging in thoughtful and respectful discussion over the qualifications of Hunter for the nomination for Judicial Council President.

Respectfully,

Koryn Isa

*Judicial Council President*