

-
- I. Opening Prayer - Aidan Rezner
 - II. Roll Call
 - A. Pick One
 - III. Approval of Minutes - [February 14th, 2024](#)
 - A. Sam Godinez motions to amend the word “unknown” to “cat” on the last page.
 - IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. Presentation from the Office of Sustainability
 - B. [Reply to the Senate Letter Proposed to the Office of the Registrar Regarding Early Morning Classes](#)
 1. Aidan Rezner: Sam wrote a Senate letter to the Office of the Registrar a few weeks ago asking the percentage of students with class before 10am at least twice a week. Daniel will read the letter in response to that request.

Sam, take that information as you will, I know you are working on a Grab & Go resolution. Use that information. That is the purpose of a Senate letter. It shows a unified front from the student body to ask for a piece of information.
 - C. Fr. Mike Schmitz Visit
 1. Basilica of the Sacred Heart Mass: Friday, February 23rd from 5:15 pm - 6:00 pm
 - a) Aidan Rezner: If you want to go, I think it would be best to arrive early. It will be a pretty packed event. If you want a seat, get there early.

2. Keynote Address: Basilica of the Sacred Heart - Saturday, February 24th
from 12:00 pm - 1:00 pm

- a) Aidan Rezner: There will be two opportunities. This will be a talk or keynote address. If you have any questions, ask me. It's free. First come, first serve, but definitely arrive early. If you haven't heard his Podcast, "Bible of the Year," it is awesome. We are very excited about it and happy to bring him to campus.

V. General Orders

A. [A Nomination for Judicial Council President](#)

1. Questioning

- a) Sam Godinez: You mentioned that you've served as Senator and Parliamentarian according to this letter. What has been your experience in this position? What have you done to deserve this position?
- b) Hunter Brooke: Can you repeat that, Sam?
- c) Sam Godinez: You've been in two positions in Student Government enumerated, Senator and Parliamentarian What has been your most meaningful work?
- d) Hunter Brooke: The most meaningful was always when you are able to directly serve other people and see the positive impact from that. A lot of the help I was able to do with elections this year was super impactful for me because you see it first hand. Also a lot of the representation I did for Carroll Hall when I was a Senator. I

was always super happy and liked to go back to hall gov meetings and share what was happening and what was going on. That was always very touching.

- e) Andrew Ryan: Have you made any commitments, formal or information, about who can hold any positions under your leadership?
- f) Hunter Brooke: No. I've been asked and I've explicitly said the Constitution requires that I send out applications out to the Student Body. In accordance with the outlines in that document, I very explicitly said to everyone that applications will be open to the entire Student Body and I have not made any commitments.
- g) Andrew Ryan: One of the responsibilities of the Judicial Council President is to serve as the Chairperson of the Ethics Commission. What has having to appear before the commission in the past taught you about ethical behavior in the Student Union?
- h) Hunter Brooke: A lot, actually. I am very happy to be in a unique position where I've kind of seen multiple angles of how things work. I'd say it has given me a lot of empathy for what it is like to go through difficult processes and the importance of transparency and making sure people understand what is going on, but also ensuring when unethical behavior happens, we are able to hold people accountable. It has been something I've been able to do this

year and advise the Council on doing. I would say it's given me a lot of great experience.

2. Debate

- a) Clay Chauncey: Every voting member who I could find an email for received an email. Feel free to check that. It is a more in depth outline of what I am about to say. First of all, I want to say that I have absolutely nothing against the individual being nominated. He has been nothing but nice to me in every interaction, and I genuinely do think he is a good person. The concerns I am raising come from a place of concern for the Student Union, and I am in no way making a comment or judgment on his character, but on his ability to carry out the duties of the office to which he is nominated. All of the information was gathered from former Judicial Council officers and committee members, former Executive Cabinet officials, and other Student Union officials, all of whom expressed concern with this nomination and recommended a vote against it. First of all, the two main duties of the Student Union Parliamentarian are to chair the Student Union Ethics Commission and the appointing other the Judicial Council officers for things such as Elections, Peer Advocacy, and Parliamentarian. The first problem I have is that the Student Union Parliamentarian chairs the Ethics Commission. I think there is a little bit of conflict of interest considering that the Student Union

Ethics Commission recommended that Hunter be impeached last year. Take that as you will, I'm not here to rehash that allegation, but I do think the whole situation has brought plenty of points that may be problematic. First of all is dishonesty in front of the student Senate. I quoted Hunter's comments during the impeachment hearing last year. He failed to mention that he was told by the FUEL directors that other Senators will be educating FUEL members of Senate activities and he ignored that and in fact reached out with a message which also mentions several enumerated positions within the Student Union Constitution. Speaking of that, I quoted parts of that email, I was a recipient of it. Some of the claims he made during it include having an office and a coalition within the Student Union. We all know that is not true. Claiming that this role in the Senate as "Senatorial Aid," which does not exist, includes learning to write legal documents and winning election campaigns for Senate, Class Council, etc. And that Senatorial Aids will be able to work within Comm Con. Hopefully all of you as Senators know that, even though Senatorial Aids do not exist, they would not be writing legal documents or helping Class Council with elections. He also claimed the ability to renew his aids across positions. Once again, even if that position did exist, I'd see a little bit of conflict with bringing aides to a new Student Government position. There is a direct link to that email

within the document I sent out. There is also misrepresentation of some Senate actions. During the Student Body VP campaign, he referenced fixing Lake Dillon several times and every time he failed to mention that a large part of this being fixed was that it was an accessibility issue which the Department of Disability Advocacy had long been working on. There are, of course, a few instances where I feel the Constitution was poorly interpreted. One of them being a Comm Con meeting last year in which Hunter and two other individuals argued against the reforms by employing an interpretation of the Constitution that was so abstract that it was upsetting for other members of the Committee. One of them, the Judicial Council President at the time, left the room out of frustration and did not return. Since ending debate required unanimous consent, the meeting went on for around 2 hours. Several other members left as well. Additionally, just two weeks ago, you all know, a Senate Order, sponsored by the nominee, failed in a vote. We were incorrectly told that the order passed, and rather than correcting the record to indicate that it failed, the order was pulled from consideration. There are only two viable possibilities I conceived for why that order got passed. Either the nominee did not know that it required a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote threshold, or the nominee ignored that fact. I think either one of them is problematic. It is for these reasons that I believe that this nominee

is not fit for the position of Judicial Council President. In my carefully considered opinion, he has demonstrated a lack of good judgment when it comes to the Student Union Constitution. This position has influence over everything from elections to Senate actions to representation at OCS hearings. Given the information detailed above, I do not feel that I can trust the nominee to act in the best interest of the Student Union.

- b) Andrew Ryan: Due to the personal nature of this vote I motion to vote by closed ballot.
- c) Aidan Rezner: That is a debatable motion, so we can debate on that.
- d) Sam Godinez: I want to talk about the motion.
- e) Aidan Rezner: Sorry, I just want to explain how this will work for everyone. The motion for a closed vote is debatable, so we will have a debate and then someone will have to make a motion to vote on whether we vote on having a closed vote. Does that make sense? It is very complicated. And then a closed vote is a $\frac{2}{3}$. If we have a closed vote, then it will be a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority.
- f) Ava DeCroix: $\frac{2}{3}$ majority to vote to have a closed vote?
- g) Aidan Rezner: Yes. We will work through this. Right now we will debate and I will explain as motions come through.
- h) Sam Godinez: Absolutely not. If you have disagreements with Hunter's nomination, then you should be able to voice them

publicly. I am very appreciative of individuals who have been a voicing publicly, but that means you should also vote publicly. You should be able to say within your own voice that you vote yes, no, or abstain. I think it is only fair that these procedures are followed. I think individuals should not be scared in order to voice their opinions. This is just to make it more reflective and have an open vote.

- i) Ryan Lally: I think you can have the results publicized and have people know who voted for what, but the idea of a closed vote is to not have people feel pressured by other people. People should not feel pressured and should not be afraid to voice their opinions publicly, but you and I both know that is not the case, especially given the order of the votes, raise your hand yes and you see a lot of hands go up and you think you might be one of the few people with your hand going no. I do think that a closed vote ensures people are voting in ways consistent with what we think.
- j) Clay Chauncey: I want to emphasize the gravity of poison we are considering. It is important to note that an individual in the position has influence over all our activities. The fact that people are worried says a lot in and of itself. I think it is fair that people don't want their vote to be known. It is a very valid concern.
- k) Andrew Ryan: The fact that we have to work with this individual moving forward after this nomination regardless of the outcome

and one of these is him advising us on Parliamentarian. A vote either way could impact the relationships moving forward and the vote should be impartial. I don't think that should be hindered based on how we vote on this nomination.

- l) Sam Godinez: Secret ballots, at least in the past, and I think J Council can attest to this, are extremely, extremely rare. I don't think there has ever been a nomination thus far, I don't even remember the last time a secret ballot vote was done. I think this is just going to make it more complicated overall as a whole process to make this a secret ballot. Let's just keep it open.
- m) Joseph Tunney: Hearing that point, I think this may be an unprecedented circumstance. There has never been an instance in which someone who has been recommended to be impeached by the ethics commission would then go back to be the chair of the ethics commission. I don't think that has ever happened before.
- n) Clay Chauncey: On that note, I will say the last time a closed vote was used was considering the porn resolution last year. I think if people not wanting their thoughts on porn to be known was a valid concern, then this is very much a valid concern.
- o) Louis Cornett motions to vote on having a closed vote.
- p) Aidan: This is just a vote on whether we are going to have a closed vote or not. I know it is super confusing. Does everyone understand?

-
- q) The motion is passed.
- r) aidna: We will have a closed vote on this issue. Thank you for bearing with me on this. We are still in debate now on the issue of the Judicial Council President nomination.
- s) Ian Schowe: I just want to say that it is interesting that he's had a lot of positions, but he did not serve on the J Council as an actual member.
- t) Aidan Rezner: The Parliamentarian is a Judicial Council member.
- u) Koryn Isa: I would like to say that Hunter is the single qualified candidate for this position. He has demonstrated over the course of this year that he is more than capable of assuming this role and he is more than capable of carrying out the duties associated with this role and he has the right demeanor to do so also. I think to assume that something that may have occurred but didn't fully result in anything punitive last year is going to dictate how he is going to act moving forward, I think it is unfair to him, I think it is unfair to me, and I think it is unfair to the Student Union. He wasn't impeached. Ultimately, none of us in this room know, I don't think, know exactly what happened. To hold that so closely to this nomination I think is unreasonable. Hunter has demonstrated over this year that he is a person who acts with honesty and good morals, and good ethics. I think to question that today is rather

disrespectful. There is no other candidate I feel is more qualified than Hunter.

v) Peter Schimpf: I've known Hunter for three years. I've worked with him closely with a variety of roles. I have seen over the past three years not only an incredible growth of character but also incredible hard work and dedication. I don't know anyone who is more passionate and dedicated not only about the Constitution, but also to the upholding of the Student Union. I think he has shown, especially as long as I've known him, growth in character and willingness to accept when people disagree with him and to communicate that very calmly and clearly. It can sometimes be contentious and he can communicate very well and effectively, which is an incredible skill to have.

w) Lulu Romero: I will add that I've only gotten to work with Hunter for a short amount of time dealing with transitions and things like that. But, in the two to three weeks where I was completely lost in terms of the Constitution and what my next steps were, Hunter was always ready and willing to step in and answer any questions I had and offer any possible solution or idea in ways he could help not only myself but the entire senior class. I don't think I would have been able to feel as prepared with transitioning into this role without Hunter's help. He is incredibly selfless and incredibly committed to the role. I have seen this in a very short amount of

time. Peter can testify more to this because he has worked with him for longer, but in these past three weeks, he has been very helpful and I think he is more than qualified for this position and he can successfully follow Koryn, especially following working under her leadership.

- x) Joseph Tunney: Can I ask Koryn a clarifying question based on her previous remarks?
- y) Aidan Rezner: Yes.
- z) Joseph Tunney: You said that Hunter was the only qualified candidate at the start and then you said he was the most qualified candidate. Which one of those is the case?
 - aa) Koryn Isa: I would say both.
 - bb) Joseph Tunney: I find it shocking that he's the only qualified candidate for the role.
 - cc) Koryn Isa yields time to Thomas Musgrave.
 - dd) Thomas Musgrave: I am the Judicial Council Vice President of Peer Advocacy. I want to make a few points on Hunter's nomination. To be clear, I fully support him. Number one is the point on his actions in the Ethics Commission. To be very clear, I've been OSC'd twice and been convicted and that has made me a much stronger VP for Peer Advocacy. I know the system and I can help people very, very effectively. To be clear, Hunter, yes, there was the recommendation from the Ethics Commission for

impeachment. The people in your seats decided not to go through with that. I think his understanding of that process makes him a lot stronger in understanding the gravity of it. I think it will make him very effective in that role. The second thing is that, during my time working with Hunter in the role, I found him to be very incredibly both knowledgeable and open to criticism. We challenge him often. It is very clear that we have challenged him on a lot of things. He is so open to having that and having that level of discussion. I think he's grown a lot in the few years that I've known him. I fully endorse him for this position.

ee) Faith Sullivan: I have a clarifying question based on that fact of you saying he is the only candidate. Does that mean you are unwilling to nominate someone else should his selection not happen?

ff) Koryn Isa: If this nomination doesn't pass today, I will be sending in a nomination next week for Hunter.

gg) Aleah Applin: I think Koryn does a very good job at what she does and JC operated very well this year. With her experience, it would be unwise of us not to listen to her strong recommendation. I appreciate you doing such a good job at articulating your points and concerns. I think that it would be unjust for us to not recognize that people grow, people change, and people also make mistakes. The ND Constitution itself is not perfect and I think Senate is a

great representation of that because we change things all of the time. Sometimes we do make mistakes when interpreting it. We make mistakes in writing things. I think Hunter has shown that he is willing for change and growth. I don't think he will be a power hungry person who won't listen to people's concerns. FYCC was very confused on a lot of things about the Constitution and Hunter has personally sat and had meetings with us individually. He has a lot on his plate as Parliamentarian. He truly gives the time and attention to each organization that needs it.

hh) Daniel Jung: The first time I met Hunter was about a year ago when I was running against him. That is not really a position where you are inclined to like someone. But, over the past year working with him I have enjoyed seeing his growth and seeing his knowledge of the Constitution. He really does feel deeply about Notre Dame and I think he is the most qualified candidate for this job. I don't think it is particularly fair to hold something against him from a year and a half ago when he was exonerated of it in the Senate. I also think, as Parliamentarian, he has done a fantastic job. You all have seen his care and guidance of the Student Union/

ii) Jayden Espinoza: I want to understand how much of a choice we have in this. If Hunter were to not receive this today, you would nominate him again next week? Let's say he were to lose that

again, would you keep nominating him? Do we actually have a choice in this at all.

- jj) Aidan Rezner: For clarification, you guys could deny the nomination, but once it is approved, it is approved, but you could continually deny the nomination if that's your prerogative. Eventually that would have to be a further conversation. I can't speak to what would happen in the future if that were the scenario, but for clarification purposes that is how it would go.
- kk) Jayden Espinoza: So, he can continue to be nominated as many times, regardless of how we vote. If it is hypothetically continually no, it could also hypothetically be continued that he is nominated.
- ll) Aidan Rezner: Correct, but the nomination needs to happen before March 15. It would be problematic if there was no nomination and approval before that date. There would be timeline coming into play there. If you are asking if continual nominations would perhaps never have an end, it has never happened, but hypothetically yes. Koryn, is that your understanding as well?
- mm) Koryn Isa: yes.
- nn) Aidan Rezner: I think the reason Koryn has expressly articulated that she thinks Hunter is the sole, best candidate for this position and that is what she would renominate.

oo) Jayden Espinoza: I want to make sure I understand. That means, regardless of how we vote, he will most likely be the person to assume this position.

pp) Aidan Rezner: That is out of my purview. The Senate has to approve it. I can't speak to that.

qq) Hannah Blaskiewicz: I've worked with Koryn for over a year now. She is an effective leader as Judicial Council President. Speaking as someone who also has to appoint your successor, there is no one except for the person in a role who understands how the person who assumes your role is going to do. You know what that job entails. Koryn, As Judicial Council President, has thought about this thoroughly and has to think about the future of her part of the Student Union. She has thought about this and I trust her judgment and I think you should trust her judgment too.

rr) Koryn Isa cedes her time to Ryn Weiss.

ss) Ryn Weiss: I am the Vice President of Elections for the Judicial Council. Aleah mentioned that we had a very seamless election process this year and that was due in large part to Hunter's existence in Judicial Council and his term. I hadn't met him before this term. I can say he is a wealth of knowledge and he is willing to debate you on things and willing to talk about difficult processes. I think our elections would not be as clean as they have been so far

this year without his presence in Judicial Council. I endorse him as a candidate.

- tt) Max Feist: First point. I don't think it's disrespectful to have a little friction and question Hunter as a candidate. I don't think it is disrespectful and I think Hunter would be in favor. At the beginning of the year, he mentioned how a lot of Senate is thoughtlessly passing resolutions or nominations. I think it is Constitutionally a good thing and democratically a good thing that we are having friction here. Also, all experiences I have had with Hunter have been good. The only negative experiences that have been brought up so far have all been hearsay, I've never witnessed them first hand. I'm on Comm Con with Hunter and I was in Senate with him last year. My Comm Con interview with him was interesting and he just knows so much about the Constitution and he wasn't even in the role of Parliamentarian for a long time at that point. You all underestimate the amount of knowledge he has on the Constitution. He knows it like the back of his hand. I've been in Stu Gov for two years and he will reference things I didn't even know existed. He is really passionate about it too. He is not just this boring person with a lot of knowledge. He is passionate about what he wants to improve on the Constitution and Student Government in general.

uu) Thomas Kluck: I don't think anyone in the Senate denies his knowledge. We see it every Wednesday how he is just spitting up there. I personally question Hunter's agenda. Clay had the link to this email that was sent to Clay about this senatorial aid. Reading this changed my perspective. The wording is grandiose and offers this role that doesn't exist. I also want to remind everyone that on February 7th, we had an order to institute the Deputy Student Union Parliamentarian which is another instance of Hunter desiring aids under him. Those two point to the fact that there is a pattern more than just one instance. One was unconstitutional, the other is not, but I find it counterintuitive to have someone lead the Ethics Commission that would be sent to the Ethics Commission. It boils down to me that discrepancy.

vv) Bridge Scippert: I've only met Hunter in the past year since serving as Co-Chair of HPC. Within that time he has always been very prompt and on top of things with us. He has proactively reached out about things otherwise we wouldn't have realized that needed to be done or that were not even necessary, but it ended up helping us better our organization because he gave advice and we were able to decide whether we wanted to follow it. If the question is his character, within the past year there have been instances where he reached out to HPC just to discuss and know our opinions on things when he had no requirement to do so. He has

reached out for our feedback when there was no need for him to do that. I think if his only purpose was some ulterior motive or some power thing, he wouldn't be taking those extra steps.

ww) Ryan Murray: I am Hunter's successor and Senator of Carroll Hall and he is one of toughest acts to follow. Every member of Carroll lets me know and tells me every hall council how I'm doing such an awful job and that Hunter was just that good. The passion he brings to every position that he has, from what I've seen, is great. He sets the example of everyone going for it too. His dedication to university is something that other people can't compare with. The next people in line being nominated would not be prepared. People would keep wanting Hunter. When he was being impeached, I was seeing that from Hunter's side, I went to that meeting as a member of the public. I shouldn't say too much, but he dealt with that maturely. A lot of others have said he deals with friction and disagreement very well. I think there's no better way. He's one of the best people to judge things on Judicial Council.

xx) Ava DeCroix cedes her time to Anna Teerlink.

yy) Anna Teerlink: I am the incoming CCC president for the 2024/2025 year. I am also the current CCC Division chair for the Special Interest Division. As you all heard in the nomination letter, Hunter currently serves as a representative on the CCC. Over this

past year, I have served as his direct supervisor on the CCC.

Within this capacity, I can personally contest the exceptional professionalism and genuine care for the student wellbeing that Hunter brings to every single action he carries out. This past year, he has been meticulous in adherence to our internal policy. Without fail, the Hunter Brooke I observed is diligent, measured, considerate, honest, and endlessly willing to share his vast wealth of knowledge as an aid to his fellow student. In light of these attributes, and in light of his work ethic, I, as his current superior, am wholeheartedly competent in his intellectual and moral capabilities to serve as Judicial Council president.

zz) Ryan Lally: Thank you for providing your insight and experience in why he would be a great fit. I appreciate all of your perspectives. It is a two pronged approach. First is his experience and qualification. No one is questioning that Hunter knows the Constitution, bylaws, and legislative process of Student Government. The other aspect is the personal side. I don't want to testify to that right now but the things brought up and people saying this would make him great as a Judicial Council President would be his willingness to accept criticism, his willingness to work with people, his vision for the future and a vision of where he is going to take things from here. I find it concerning the prospect of having his nomination repeated over and over again. I find it

concerning and unpragmatic to say that you are going to continually nominate him. I understand that you believe he is the best one for the job and apparently you believe he is the only one for the job. However, these virtues of being open to change and working with people who are opposing you, I would like that to be shown.

aaa) Clay Chauncey: A lot of the qualifications people are citing are great. I agree. Good intentions, proactive. I fully believe all those things about Hunter. I also don't think there is a single person at this school that doesn't exhibit those attributes in high amounts. To say those are his qualifications and he is the only one qualified is absurd, especially when you consider that the Student Union Constitution is a 40-page document. Give me 24 hours and I could probably cite it word for word. I don't think these qualifications that make him the only qualified candidate are so rare and so sought after that there is nobody else that could possibly do the role.

bbb) Sam Godinez: Koryn Isa is one of most respected individuals in Student Government. Under her tenure and under the whole Judicial Council, as well, voting turnout increased by 20%. That is not something that just happens overall. Even though it is cliché to repeat, if Koryn says this is the best nominee or the only nominee, then this is the only nominee. Also, I want to respond to the

argument of the Constitution that you can read it in 24 hours. As someone who has read the Constitution, that is not possible. I'm telling you right now, it is not possible to continually read that Constitution and know it. The fact that Hunter does and has done so as a student in a top 20 university and has all of these attributes and focuses so much on Student Government makes him exceptionally qualified. In terms of the ethics behind from previous years. We all make mistakes. We have all sent bad email and have done things that we would have preferred to approach in a different way. He has shown actual remorse and improvement to actually be better. It is not fair to judge him based on an event that happened two years ago, in which a majority of us were not even present. We have to take into consideration what was the decision from the Senate and the whole Senate decided it did not have merit. We should not judge his nomination based on that. In response to some of the documents, apparently there was misrepresentation of the Lake Dillon things. As someone with a good relationship with administrators from the Office of Facilities Designs and Operations, I can tell you they all said it was Derrick and Hunter. The department advanced it, but only after Derrick and Hunter presented, but it was mostly them. I also read in the Observer that it was mostly them. In terms of the Senate order that apparently he got the threshold wrong, so did the deputies, Koryn, and Aidan.

People make mistakes. It is that we are so accustomed to resolutions that that's what we all thought. The moment I briefly said, hey I don't think you got the threshold right, he immediately noticed that it was a Senate order.

ccc) Maeve Milker: It's so cool to see how far everyone has come being Senators. When everyone was being voted in in April, no one was saying anything. It is cool that people are forming their own opinions. I can only speak to my personal experience. Hunter talked about it when he was asked what was most impactful for him. This past election could, you all know, all of us in this room, at least the Senators, have gone through an election cycle. It is stressful. He was beyond helpful and encouraging. Between our ticket and the other two tickets, there was a lot of good camaraderie, hugs, exchange, and things like that. So much of that came from the tone set by Ryn, Koryn, and especially Hunter. I feel like we all respected his opinions a lot of a person who has gone through the Student Body election cycle. Also, I know Koryn, she's in my section in McGlenn, and I respect her as a person. I'm not best friends with Hunter or Koryn. I don't know either of them that well, but the level of professionalism and dedication. We've all heard things about Hunter. I'm not going to sit here and say I've never heard anything negative about Hunter Brooke in my life. I've heard things. I don't know him too well as

a human being or as a person outside of the Student Government context, but within the Student Government context, I can't think of anyone else who would do as good of a job. Besides what I think, I respect what Koryn thinks with her level of experience.

ddd) Aidan Rezner: We have brought up a lot of great points. I appreciate the conversation. If anyone has anything new to add or anything other insight, I think now would be the time. All of us have expressed our piece, so if anything has anything new to add.

eee) Lily Condodina: On behalf of SUB, I didn't have a huge knowledge of the Constitution or Bylaws before coming into my position. Hunter was extremely helpful. Regarding the comment about everyone at this school being hardworking and willing to do roles. As a leader in the Student Union, it is a huge role to take on and you need a specific person for it. Someone with the knowledge and willingness to do it. I trust Koryn and her judgment to appoint her successor.

fff) Jayden Espinoza: I don't appreciate how this conversation has turned from a conversation about someone's ability to fulfill a role based on the description of the role and then resulting documents that we received. It has become a conversation on this person being so good at their job, it would be respectful to not follow what they say. As we have agreed within the Senate, there is a benefit to us having conversations and disagreements. This continual coming up

of Koryn doing such a good job, so we should follow what she says, is not honoring the true depth of what the Senate is. We should be deciding based on the dialogue. Regardless of what someone has to say, we all should be allowed to express our thoughts. We should not constantly becoming back to the idea that this other person said this thing. I understand that she is the person in the capacity and she has worked intimately with Hunter, as well as an influx of people who have showed up today in support of that. This constant coming back to the personal has gotten us away from what we should be focusing on, which is qualification, which is on work history, etc. It is not just I know this person, this person is this type of person, so we should be following that. That has become inappropriate

ggg) Koryn Isa: We started off saying we understand that Hunter has the qualifications. Then the discussion changed to his character. Then I heard that we are now saying that everyone is a hard worker and everyone is a lot of things at Notre Dame, so we need to find a person with the requirements for the position. My consideration of Hunter for this role has been a combination of both. What he has shown he is capable of doing from a purely qualifications standpoint is high. With the expectation of a couple of meetings a week, he is at everything I am currently at. He has miles of more qualifications than I had when I assumed this role. I

served as VP of Elections for two terms, so I had not been to Senate of Comm Con or CLC or a ton of the other things that Hunter is at weekly. The knowledge that he gained from being in those meetings and having served as Parliamentarian for a year does make him qualified to assume the role of Judicial Council President. To his character, Aleah said it very well. People change. I am not going to say whether or not I think he did or did not make a mistake in the past. He had made mistakes in his life, just like the rest of us. To forget that we are all capable and will be making mistakes and that it is about our ability to overcome them and how we respond in the face of obstacles and adversity is what is important. Over the past year, Hunter has given me no reason to be concerned about how he will lead the Judicial Council and the Student Union in the future and will do so ethically and with the best intentions in mind. I appreciate that we are taking this nomination seriously. The position is important and it is a lot of work. Who is in position matters. I appreciate that we are having a serious conversation about the qualifications of Hunter. I think he is the qualified candidate for this position and I hope you approve his nomination.

hhh) Andrew Ryan: I would like to simply share a potential conflict of interest about a fellow Senator who has made previous repeated comments about desiring to serve as Parliamentarian in the future

and they are the one fighting adamantly for this nomination. I ask that you keep that in mind.

iii) Sam Godinez: You're right. I want the position of Parliamentarian, I'm not going to lie. I will apply for it when it becomes available. But, every time, and Koryn can attest to this, that I have asked who are you thinking of this position, he has always said he's going to send up our form to everyone. He follows the rules. He has never told me anything in private. I'm being very honest here. Take my word for it. Hopefully you fo. Realistically, I've never heard of him saying he wants to promise a position. Even in the election cycle, he said that he was not going to promise a position for anyone when running for Student Body Vice President because he did not want to get disqualified. He likes to follow the rules in that regard.

jjj) Aidan Rezner: Thank you for the conversation. I appreciate it. I am impartial. I am the Chairperson of the Senate. My experience with Hunter, I hope that you vote on the qualifications of the position, as opposed to the character or the character growth of the individual. I think that the conversation divulged to that. In my experience, Hunter has been nothing but helpful and I would like to say thank you for the conversation. I appreciate it. I hope this is voted on the qualifications of this position and not on someone's

ability to grow or not grow because I do think Hunter has grown from that experience and that has been shown to me

kkk) Louis Cornett: I don't think a point of debate should not be that he is not promising elected positions to people because that is what he is supposed to do. All of this is great that he is doing this, but that is the bare minimum.

3. Vote

a) Aidan Rezner: I will send this over the list serve. Please only access it if you are a voting member of the Senate. The Deputy Student Union Parliamentarian and myself will review the votes. We will not announce it at this meeting because I want to be very meticulous about this and make sure all of the votes are valid. I will send it out. It will be over Google Form over email. I will get it to you ASAP. I want to make sure every vote is counted and valid. I am going to refrain from a preliminary announcement because I want to make sure all votes are valid. It is a majority vote. I will get this out as soon as possible and I will not delay it. I do not want to say something and have it not be true.

4. Ryan Murray motions to include the document shared by Clay Chauncey in the meeting minutes.

5. Clay Chauncey: I have a point of debate. That is not a public document. It was emailed directly to some people in this room.

6. Aidan Rezner: Because that document was explicitly read from and is part of the meeting minutes, that motion is allowable by the Constitution because it was read. This requires a vote by majority.

7. The motion is passed.

8. A copy of the shared document was created for record purposes and is linked below.

- a) [Copy of Document “On the Judicial Council President Nomination”](#)

B. [SO2324-20: An Order to Redistribute Funds in the Student Union Covid-19 Response Financial Account](#)

1. Sam Godinez seeks to suspend all parliamentary procedure and move straight to a vote.
2. The motion fails.
3. Justin Aguiar motions to postpone SO2324-20 to next week.
4. The motion passes.

VI. New Business

- A. [SS2324-11: A Resolution to Update the NDH Wall](#)

VII. Announcements

- A. Lily: Legends Acousticafe this week!

VIII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting is adjourned.