

-
- I. Opening Prayer - Aidan Rezner
 - II. Roll Call
 - A. Pick One
 - III. Approval of Minutes - [February 21, 2024](#)
 - A. Sam Godinez: Point of order. Last Senate meeting, there was a lot of discussion because Clay deleted the original document. These were not typed in the minutes. Is there a reason why?
 - B. Aidan Rezner: What do you mean by that?
 - C. Sam Godinez: There was a discussion because Clay deleted the document.
 - D. Aidan Rezner: I believe that was after the meeting.
 - E. Isabella Tardio: Clay sent me a copy of the document which I included in the minutes. I made a copy of that document and own the document, so it is not deleted.
 - F. Sam Godinez: In the minutes, there is no mention that the document was deleted. It was said during the meeting.
 - G. Hunter Brooke: Did anyone say explicitly during the meeting?
 - H. Aidan Rezner: Also, did I call on that person? I don't believe I did, therefore it is not included in the official minutes.
 - I. Sam Godinez: I will just wait for the recording to come out.
 - IV. Executive Announcements
 - A. Sustainastyle Eco-Chic Thrift Shop: Friday, March 1st from 11:30-3:30 pm in Duncan Room W134

1. Aidan Rezner: This is a sustainable thrift store. I believe all of the items are between 1 and 5 dollars. There are a bunch of different brands, including Nike, Reebok, and Free People. So, there will be a lot of awesome clothing. It will be credit card purchases only. Stop by. It is a thrift store and will be supporting sustainability so clothes are not wasted and thrown away.

B. Aidan Rezner: Thank you to all of the people here. Lots of proxies. Never seen a senate meeting so lively. Because so many people, if we could keep the side chatter to a minimum so we can hear everyone and all voices to be heard. There are a lot of people here. I appreciate it so we can move forward agenda items as smoothly as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

V. General Orders

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

1. Questioning

a) Hunter Brooke: Thank you, Hannah. For the sake of anyone who might not have understood the language within that legislation, can you explain, briefly, a quick history of the Covid account and what this is doing to it.

b) Hannah Blaskiewicz: As we all know during Covid19, the university closed. So, there was a bunch of money that couldn't have been used because people weren't here. Student Senate and FMB decided to set aside funds that weren't used during that year

to a separate account where people could apply for that money for Covid related expenses or things that affected the way they could run because they weren't able to run enough money because no one was on campus. Also, the Student Senate and FMB worried about a potential drop in shirt sales. By setting aside this money, it was a way to ensure if anything happened fiscally, the Student Union would remain healthy. People have been applying to fund when we came back to school in 2021 and 2022. None were applied in 2023 and now 2024. FMB came to the decision where, if no one was applying to this fund and campus has returned back to normal, then there is a need for these funds to be redistributed. Past Student Union Treasures recommended that the funds be rolled back into the Student Union Endowment. However, there is a surplus currently in the carry forward accounting, which will go into the Student Union endowment, meaning there are already funds going into the endowment. After many conversations with people in SAO and FMB and other student leaders, we came to the decision that the best option is to roll funds into the Shirt Charity Endowment, which is one of the endowments that benefits students here.

- c) Ryan Murray: Were other options that were seriously considered, other than The Shirt?

-
- d) Hannah Blaskiewicz: There were other options. One of them was the Student Union endowment. There are three endowments that affect ND students that this money could have gone to, including the Student Enrichment Endowment, Student Union Endowment, and Shirt Charity Endowment. Those were the main three. This ensures the most equitable endowment of funds, rather than giving it to certain organizations and splitting it up that way.
- e) Amelia Forrest: Why did you pick the Shirt Endowment?
- f) Hannah Blaskiewicz: Part of it was that The Shirt, if you remember from my presentation, is a huge part of what ND is. Not just in the sense of it contributes fiscally to the Student Union, but at the same time it is the heart of ND. From a personal anecdote, when we played Ohio State, some of the student leaders came from Ohio State, and me along with Ava, the CCC President, and Ryan, the President of the Shirt Charity Fund, talked to our Ohio State counterparts. They were so impressed by the project and the charity fund and what we do here. The shirt really is the heart of ND. One of the things FMB does is allocate money from The Shirt Charity Fund and look over The Shirt Charity applications. That was a big reason why we thought about that.
- g) Belle Marchetti: Can you explain what The Shirt Charity applications are? I didn't know much about it before I was in FMB.

-
- h) Hannah Blaskiewicz: To apply to The Shirt Charity Fund, the two criteria are: an extraordinary medical situation and a situation where the student has a financial necessity for the money. Applications then go to FMB. FMB looks at those applications. To make sure they are unbiased, they are blocked out for any identifying information of the student and then judged on those two criteria.
- i) Aidan Rezner: The Shirt Charity Fund, in addition to providing charitable and philanthropic support, the proceeds from The Shirt also do help fund the Student Union, as well. This is doing two fold.
- j) Hannah Blaskiewicz: This goes to The Shirt Charity Endowment, so it only goes to the Shirt. The proceeds from The Shirt go to the Student Union and endowment.
- k) Aidan Rezner: I see, my fault. This one goes specifically to The Shirt, but proceeds from The Shirt, being the heart of ND, also helps fund the Student Union.

2. Debate

- a) Max Feist: It seems that Hannah's co-signature request email passed my eyes, but I fully support this. For the record, I fully support this. It is great. Thank you to FMB. This is great. You are doing great work.

- b) Hannah Blaskiewicz: I just want to say that this has been a couple years in the making. When talking about it in FMB and working with other student leaders, we think this is the best option. It is a privilege to know what we do. The Shirt charity and endowment are a big part of ND. I would be pretty thankful if you all approved this.
- c) Ava DeCroix: I want to echo, as someone else in the role as CCC President involved with fiscal policy and the Student Union, that I fully support this.. I also thought I co-signed this, but I am in support. Hannahh did a great job.

3. Vote

- a) The order is passed.

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

1. [Addendum Letter to the Nomination from the Current Judicial Council President](#)
2. Aidan Rezner: Just as an explanation as to why this is in General Orders, and not New Business, the nomination letter is unchanged. The addendum is new, but, by rules, this goes in General Orders, not New Business. We have heard this nomination before. The addendum is new, but the letter itself is unchanged.
3. Hunter Brooke: Thank you, Aidan. I wanted to take a second to pull the curtain back: to share a bit about what Student Government has meant to me, the experiences that have shaped me, and my continued desire to work

to improve the Student Union. In highschool, I did a lot of service work—like most of us, I’m guessing—but we didn’t have Student Government, so when I was headed to Notre Dame and looking for opportunities to continue serving the people around me, I stumbled on Notre Dame’s Student Government. I remember finding a copy of the Constitution and thinking oh my gosh, a real-life Constitution. I found a recording of Rachel Ingal delivering the State of the Union, and I think nearly fell out of my chair. I remember telling my parents, “I’d absolutely love to get involved in this.” But I get to campus still askin’, “how can I have a positive impact?” And, of course, me being me, I said, “well, the best person to ask, probably, must be the Student Body President.” So, as a first-year with maybe two weeks under my belt, I emailed Alan, and I asked him about impact and he said, “Well, Hunter, I’d start with FUEL.” I had no idea what FUEL meant, but I distinctly remember sitting in the corner of South and watching him draw out a map of the Student Union and thinking, “holy cow, this is a lot.” But after finally discovering FUEL was an acronym I applied and got in. I was so excited to be involved. And at about that time, I started feeling a bit of disconnect between the Student Union and the student body and I thought, “hey, if we could just better connect with students, it’d totally reshape the way Student Government serves as a force for good.” So as any nuts, type-A first year with crazy energy would do, I conscripted two of my friends and stood for a few hours outside South, basically accosting people with a 25-question survey

to see how much they understood about the Student Union. The results were what you'd expect—unfortunate—and that experience and time in FUEL really pushed me to get involved with a few members of the Senate who I would eventually really look up to and hope I could work with even further. So FUEL was a great experience, but I was really eager for more direct impact—and Nolan, the Carroll Hall Senator at the time, said, “Hunter, you should run for Senate.” It sounded awesome—a way to directly serve my friends and the people in my dorm, and also hopefully show people that Student Government could really have a positive impact. So I got elected and really tried to view everything I did through the lens of, “how can I best support my dorm, and, really, the greater ND community.” And so I worked on things I thought were important to people. Things like lowering the costs of RecSports classes. ROTC class scheduling. Lots of Campus Dining work—I had a ton of people in my dorm ask me about campus dining prices, so I worked a lot on that. And I'd really try to keep people updated on my meetings, on the legislation I was writing—anything that Senate was hearing—and eventually, people would ask, unprompted, “how'd the meeting with Luigi go?” And that was always touching because it showed me that people had really started to care about the job, and really believed that I could support them and that I was pushing for them. I really tried hard for my friends, and I saw the results of my work in their support for me; and that was definitely one of the most touching parts of my Student Government career. I hope I've

helped the men of Carroll begin to see the importance of Senate in bringing about real, tangible change. But if I had to define that year in a word, it'd probably be over-enthusiastic—I was kinda like a little puppy that just got out to play and was running around and peeing on the floor, and eventually nipping at people by accident. Obviously, one of the nips was the FUEL incident. I remember when I was in FUEL, I thought the Senate was super cool, and I jumped at opportunities to work with other Senators. So when I actually became a Senator myself, I thought it would be awesome to have FUELers actually working with me, getting involved with the Senate, and seeing what that work was like. And I'd spoken with Patrick, the Student Body President at the time, and he'd said he thought it was a great idea; and I'd spoken with the Judicial Council President as well; he told me he saw no issues with the idea, Constitutionally. But when I eventually did reach out to a few FUELers, it became clear very quickly that I hadn't been communicative enough, and I clearly hadn't gotten enough permission, and several people felt like I was trying to undercut their authority. I realized this after one of the FUEL Co-Directors emailed, making me aware of concerns, and I responded to her the same day saying: "It's clear I've created some distress, and I'm sorry for any upset I've caused. This was not my intention; I had hoped to provide younger students with additional opportunities if they so wished. Thank you for the concern; moving forward I'll refrain from further communication as you have requested." Like an excited puppy, my

intention was not malicious—I’ve never had malicious intentions—I was overly excited and allowed myself to get so caught up in that excitement that I didn’t do enough to manage the importance of communication and working with others. Overall though, I think the ethics process that blossomed from that incident, while stressful and hard, was a strong learning experience. I learned that, no matter how excited I was about something and the good I thought would stem from my work, I needed to follow the process, to communicate, to double-check and triple-check things, and to establish clear expectations with my fellow leaders. But, I also learned the ability to take a deep breath. I learned a great deal of empathy. And I learned how to handle really difficult and emotionally upsetting situations with grace. Most of all, it probably taught me the value in kindness and compassion for another human being. And these lessons have only endured as I continued in the Student Union, gaining experience running in a major election and then subsequently serving the Judicial Council. And the experience I’ve gained in the Judicial Council has just been enormous, and I’ve had the absolute pleasure of learning from our advisors, and Koryn, Thomas, Ryn, Matthew and Madison, as well as past Judicial Leaders. And I’d say that the experience I’ve gained over the past three years is so valuable to now hopefully transitioning to leading these processes. I’ve testified in front of, defended in front of, and also advised the Ethics Commission; and also testified, defended, and advised the Election Committee as well. I can’t say that every experience

I've had has been fun, but I can say that I've seen every possible angle of our system of justice, and of the way in which the Judicial Council can and should work. I've developed an immense appreciation for democracy, transparency, honesty, hard work, and the ability to have a backbone. In the great length of time that has passed, I feel as though I've transitioned from being that young puppy to an older, wiser, more patient, and better behaved Golden Retriever. Through time and experience, I have gained a more level head, and a more responsible and even outlook. I was not perfect—and I still am not perfect: I recently made a mistake with a voting threshold—but I'm very honored to say that I believe I've come very far, and I've learned a lot, and I feel confident that I'll be able to usher the Judicial Council into another year of ethicality, honesty, kindness, and excellence.

4. Questioning

- a) Andrew Ryan: I have a clarifying question about the mistake you mentioned about the voting threshold. I noticed on the Senate website that Orders 15 and 17 are posted, which failed and passed, respectively. Do you plan to include Senate Order 16 as well on the Senate website, given that that did fail.
- b) Hunter Brooke: Historically, Senate orders that have been withdrawn have not been included. Since we had a procedural defect, the plan was to send it for a revote, but I said I won't waste the Senate's time and withdrew it. If people feel it would be

valuable to have it on the Senate website as something that failed, I would have no issue with doing that.

- c) Amelia Forrest: I was not here last week when we did questioning. I've heard a lot from different people about a meeting that happened last year that was amongst the Committee on the Constitution or J Council where there was a lot of strife. I wanted to hear from you about that.
- d) Hunter Brooke: Sure. I was at the meeting, fortunately. Hopefully I can provide some commentary. For anyone who is not sure the meeting she was talking about, it was referenced in the letter as a meeting for the Committee on the Constitution where the Judicial Council President stormed out and, after that, the meeting lasted in debate for 2 hours because unanimous consent was needed to end debate. From my memory, what ended up happening was the Judicial Council President left early. I don't think, from my memory, there were any aggressive or insane differences of Constitutional opinion. Admittedly, she must have felt that her leaving early came across as a bit curt was just because, in the Senate meeting after that meeting, she came up to me and apologized to me for leaving early. But after she left, the meeting ended pretty quickly because unanimous consent is never, has never, and will never be needed to end debate. Debate is ended by majority vote. I would say thinking anyone would stick around for

a 2+ hour meeting for a procedural defect is a bit funny. I

personally think people would probably just leave if that were the real world. To my memory, somebody left early, we had some debate, it ended pretty quickly after she left, we closed the meeting. At the next senate meeting, she actually apologized for leaving early.

- e) Amelia Forrest: Did her leaving mean then you could not do unanimous consent?
- f) Hunter Brooke: No, not at all. Unanimous consent is not necessary to end debate. Like how things work in the Senate, when we motion to move out of debate and into a vote, it is a majority vote. Unanimous consent is not required in the Committee on the Constitution or in the Senate to leave debate.
- g) Aidan Rezner: Is your question why people feel they needed unanimous consent?
- h) Amelia Forrest: I want a clarification.
- i) Aidan Rezner: From my understanding, the question is why did this meeting last so long? When the Judicial Council President left, why was there confusion?
- j) Hunter Brook: It didn't last long, I don't know what to tell you. From my memory, it was not a very long meeting. If it was so long, people would have left. Unanimous consent was not needed

to end debate, so it was not an issue. To my memory, that is not what happened.

- k) Mary Grace Walsh: I remember the issue with the senatorial aide positions. I was pretty involved. I was close friends with Anna Marie at that time, one of the FUEL directors at that time. I just want to clarify. From my memory, you said this went to Patrick and he did not have any concerns, constitutionally.
- l) Hunter Brooke: Is that your question?
- m) Mary Grace Walsh: From how I understood your remarks, you said you had talked to someone previously who said there were no constitutional issues with this. Was that person someone who is qualified to say that? Why didn't you double check that? Or, why did you not communicate with FUEL directors, knowing you were going to reach out to all of the FUELers, not just some of them?
- n) Hunter Brooke: Not communicating with the FUEL directors enough was a mistake on my part. Wholly and totally, as I said, one of the things I learned from that process was the value in communicating. Honestly, it was a mistake. If I were to do that again, which I would not, I would obviously be much more proactive and clear in my communication and expectations in what other people are and are not comfortable with. The people who I got advice, constitutionally, from were the Judicial Council President at the time. I thought he was pretty qualified to offer

Constitutional input. I didn't know who to double check the J Council President on, from a constitutional perspective. To my memory, from a purely constitutional angle, I don't think I double checked it with anyone else.

- o) Mary Grace Walsh: I'm confused as to how you can currently claim you have the best knowledge of the constitution, but this was something you didn't catch yourself. What has changed about your understanding of the constitution from then to now.
- p) Hunter Brooke: A lot. That was a long time ago and I was a young Senator. Immediately, time, for sure. Everyone learns as time progresses. Working with many other people who have worked with the Constitution and seeing their own interpretations of things and judicial philosophies. Being exposed to those viewpoints has given me a much more refined and thoughtful ability to interpret the constitution. Going through that process, as I said, it was not easy by any measure, but it was a very valuable learning experience. It taught me a lot as well. I am an extremely different person than who I was early last term in the Senate.
- q) Jayden Espinoza: I just want to understand correctly what you said about not being at that meeting. I want to make sure I understand correctly. You originally said the meeting/debate went on for two hours and ended shortly after, but then you said it was a quick meeting and you did not understand why someone would leave

early. I want to clarify. Was it a quick meeting or was it a two hour long meeting that then ended after the person had left?

- r) Hunter Brooke: I cannot say I remember with total confidence the exact length of the meeting. I was informed that it was claimed that after the Judicial Council President left the room out of frustration and did not return, debate required unanimous consent to end, and since it required unanimous consent to end, the meeting lasted for around two hours. From my memory, that did not happen. As I said, from a purely procedural perspective, unanimous consent is not needed to end debate. Straight up, that doesn't make sense. From a common sense perspective, I've never seen a meeting of the Committee on the Constitution last longer than an hour and a half, hour and 15. If it was going on for 2+ hours, as was suggested, because of procedural hold up, people would just have left, rather than stick around for no reason.
- s) Clay Chauncey: Do you feel that you serving in this position would benefit the student body?
- t) Hunter Brooke: I believe that I have a lot that I can do to serve others and help other people within the student union and, indirectly, the student body. The Judicial Council does not have the most direct impact with students, but by uplifting other student leaders and ensuring we have clean, transparent, and accountable elections. Indirectly, I would say so.

-
- u) Clay Chauncey: You mentioned uplifting student leaders. Do you think the fact that a majority of student leaders voted against your nomination contradicts that point?
- v) Hunter Brooke: I don't know. I suppose. We will see what happens today.
- w) Max Feist: You said you consulted the Judicial Council President and referred to them as him. Did you mean Parliamentarian, because of Madison, or did you mean Student Body President for Patrick.
- x) Hunter Brooke: I meant David Haungs who was the J Council President at the time when I asked the J Council President. I asked David when he was in office before April 1st when Madison assumed the position.
- y) Lauren Whitlatch: My question is, because I am very new to all of this, people are saying the supposed J Council meeting went on for two hours, but you, from your memory, it was very quick and not like that. Why has that rumor been saying it was general knowledge when you said it never was?
- z) Hunter Brooke: I can only say from my perspective, I wouldn't say it was general knowledge, I did not hear that was a thought since last Wednesday. I was surprised to hear that people figured that out. I don't know what other people have heard, but the claims I've heard about that meeting, as to my memory and as to basic

parliamentary procedure, are incorrect. I don't know why people have that thought. I can't read other peoples' minds.

aa) Justice Walker: I was a part of the Committee on the Constitution last year. Just so I can ensure that I was at this meeting, do you remember which day this was and which order was being debated?

bb) Hunter Brooke: I definitely do not. If you want, I can look back on that. But, off the topic of my head, I cannot cite that exact day of the meeting.

cc) Andrew Ryan: While serving as Parliamentarian, have you ever shared any legislation or orders with senators to potentially pass with their name on the top of it?

dd) Hunter Brooke: When you say share, do you mean writing and then now you put your name?

ee) Andrew Ryan: Any type that you wrote and then passed on.

ff) Hunter Brooke: What I've done a lot, as an example, is a few senators have had an idea, like this First Year Class Council GreeNDot extension deadline, it's on the agenda as New Business, as an example. I don't think my name is at the top of that one. But multiple people had been writing very similar pieces of legislation, so I helped group them together and helped with some grammar and editing things. Because I felt that they had been the originator of it, they could put their names on top. Personally, I don't care all too where my name goes on the legislature.

gg) Andrew Ryan: To clarify, I'm referring to the university award you emailed me about on April 28th. I then went back on this same email, recently, and saw a different Senator's name on the top with your name no longer on it. I'm curious if there was any type of sharing of that legislation for then someone else to pass with their name on top of it.

hh) Hunter Brooke: Was it the Tony Pollatto Award? I cannot speak to that. After I became Parliamentarian, I had nothing to do with it. Initially, I wrote it. When I did write it, my name was on top of it. But, after I became Parliamentarian, we felt that it was too much of a substance issue and not something I should be pursuing, which I think is a fair point. Since then, what has happened after that, I could not say.

ii) Andrew Ryan: Would you say someone took that from you?

jj) Hunter Brooke: I wouldn't say took it.

kk) Andrew Ryan: But you didn't give express permission?

ll) Hunter Brooke: No.

mm) Andrew Ryan: Therefore, would they be taking your work?

nn) Hunter Brooke: I don't know. I don't know what has happened, necessarily. If I had more detail.

oo) Sam Godinez: In Clay's document, it said there was a misrepresentation of Senate where you were taking credit, solely,

for Lake Dillon. Could you speak about that and if you solely take credit for it?

pp) Hunter Brooke: I never am eager to take sole credit for anything.

That included. I think making sure that credit is shared and recognized is important for us as individuals but also for the sake of the Student Union. I don't think students and the Observer take us very seriously when we try to spend our time taking credit for things instead of solving issues. The only thing I can really say to that topic is I feel I did a lot of work to resolving infrastructure issues, including Lake Dillon and others. Derick is here and he worked on that as well, so perhaps he can speak to that as well after. I did put a lot of work into it and I think I did help.

qq) Mary Grace Walsh: What happens if your nomination does not pass by March 15th?

rr) Hunter Brooke: Honestly, off the top of my head, I could not tell you. If you wanted to send that question to J Council in an email, we would get back to you.

ss) Mary Grace Walsh: Does anyone in this room know the answer to that?

tt) Koryn Isa: I had not made any decisions or thought much about what would happen if it didn't pass today. I know a nomination has to be in by March 15th.

uu) Mary Grace Walsh: What happens if it's not?

-
- vv) Koryn Isa: I would probably or could be sent to the Ethics Commission.
- ww) Mary Grace Walsh: If a nomination is submitted but a nomination fails, what happens if nothing is passed by March 15th?
- xx) Hunter Brooke: We as a Judicial Council always try to have measured conversation over constitutional things like that. Therefore, we are bad at answering questions on the spot and immediately. So, that's why I said if you wanted to email, that way we could all talk about it and get back to you with a correct, final answer that has come after a lot of conversation. That's why we are hesitant to say this is exactly what will happen.
- yy) Mary Grace Walsh: That's fair, but it is you guys that would be making the decision on what happens, along with other members of Judicial Council?
- zz) Aidan Rezner: Judicial Council is the interpreter of the Constitution, but the Constitution would be the one making the decision as to what would be done in that case and an interpretation of the Constitution.
- aaa) Koryn Isa: I would also say that the Student Union Ethics Commission could have a say in it if I were to be sent to the Ethics Commission.

-
- bbb) Hunter Brooke: A clearer way to say it would be that the Judicial Council tends to interpret the Constitution, where the Ethics Commission tends to enforce the Constitution.
- ccc) Mary Grace Walsh: I wasn't trying to ask about ethics. I genuinely don't know the answers. It seems no one knows the answer, so I am trying to get clarification on that. If this is something that would be more appropriate to email the Judicial Council about, I can absolutely do that.
- ddd) Andrew Ryan: For Koryn, you talk about how you have unwavering confidence in Hunter. I'm curious were there any other individuals that you considered for this position that you could speak to?
- eee) Koryn Isa: I did consider other individuals for this position. I don't want to talk about them if they don't feel comfortable. I can say Hunter has the most experience that parallels the responsibilities of Judicial Council President. As I said in my letter, elections are incredibly hard, but also a lot of the other behind the scenes work that we do as a group that is not always super apparent to the Student Union or the Student Body is also very hard. Developing a knowledge base on the Constitution to even know where things are or where I can even begin to think about these concepts is difficult. I did consider other candidates

and they may share if they would like to, but I will not share about them. I think Hunter's qualifications are the most in line.

fff) Aidan Rezner: They may share in debate if they would like to.

ggg) Jayden Espinoza: For Koryn. You said you don't have any plans if this doesn't pass again, but last week you said you would continue to nominate Hunter if it didn't pass again. Is it that you don't have a plan if this fails again, or is the assumption that if this fails again, you would then again nominate Hunter.

hhh) Koryn Isa: I believe last week I said if the nomination didn't pass last week, that I would resubmit it for this week. But, this week, i do not have plans. I have not made a decision whether I would resubmit or not if it doesn't pass this week.

5. Debate

a) Aidan Rezner: As the chairperson, I would like to say, as we go into this debate, I hope this debate is not a rehashing of what we talked about last week. That would not be very productive for conversation. We know what we talked about last week. If anyone has any new insights or ideas to share, it would be beneficial at this time. Additionally, parliamentary procedure requires me to interrupt if there are matters of personal belief of character concerns. If it is related to fit of the nomination, that is ok and permissible. That is what we are talking about. Fitness of the nomination and ability to lead the Judicial Council. If we talk

about matters of personal belief, I am not saying any of you did that, in fact I thought it was a productive conversation last week, but if it does divulge into that, I will have to interrupt just by mandation of parliamentary procedure.

- b) Koryn Isa yields time to Thomas Musgrave.
- c) Thomas Musgrave: I want to first talk about Andrew's point. I did apply for the position, but everything I am going to say here applies with that. I want to be clear that I did not know that Hunter was applying or not when I said I was interested. I believe that he is a stronger candidate than me and would make a stronger Judicial Council President than me. To reintroduce myself, I serve as the VP of Peer Advocacy for Judicial Council. As someone who is a bit of an outsider., I appreciate all of the consideration and debate that you are engaging in. I want to reiterate as someone who worked with Hunter extensively in Judicial Council, I want to attest that he is undoubtedly the best candidate, strongest candidate. There were some things said in the last meeting that all Notre Dame students were bright and hardworking enough to hold a position like this and that the constitution can be easily memorized or recitable. This characterization unfairly simplifies the requirement of this job. Not only does it require a knowledge of the Constitution which, as someone who was proxied as Parliamentarian in August while Hunter was still being nominated,

I can attest, it is a difficult document to understand. I was terrified up there. It also requires a researched knowledge of historical election precedent, a breadth of student experience in the student union and the ability to weigh different interpretations of election rules and constitutional provisions. All of these things are particularly important because the Judicial Council is transitioning to a new advisor next year. We are very excited to have Cody, but it is vital that the incoming president has a strong understanding of the history of our constitution and the depth of knowledge on past precedent. Hunter's knowledge and commitment to Judicial Council and his knowledge on all of these things is unquestionable. A story I like to tell from October was an email I received from Hunter on a Saturday night after a home football game with a detailed six page, single spaced memorandum on the history of election reform within the student union between 1988 and 2012. Frankly, I don't think any other possible candidate for this position has demonstrated even close to this level of diligence and commitment to the student union and Judicial Council, and this is only one example. I would have never taken the time to do that. I myself had qualms about Hunter becoming Parliamentarian. I've seen all the evidence you guys have. But, it is important to note that, within his capacity in the Judicial Council, Hunter has been nothing but diligent, supportive, and receptive to criticism. Wryn,

Koryn, and I disagree with him all of the time. He has demonstrated the ability to weigh multiple perspectives on issues to make fair, reasoned, and ethical decisions, which is the most key trait for a Judicial Council President. I urge you all to put aside any personal qualms and vote yes based on his proven diligence to Judicial Council and unquestionable passion to the Student Union.

- d) Yara Obeidi yields time to Jessica Vickery.
- e) Jessica Vickery: I was a Senator last year for Ryan Hall. Thank you, Yara, for ceding your time. My experience with working with Hunter, I want to echo what Thomas said. He is very easy to work with and is able to share opinions and be an objective manner of saying what is right for the Student Union. I wasn't here at the previous Senate meeting last week about the different things that went on last year. Last year, I was Senator during the time of the impeachment and all the other things that passed during that time. Since then in my conversations with Hunter, an outsider looking in, he has shown immense growth from that time. During questioning when it was asked how has he changed from last year to now, think about how much everyone can change within a year and how much he is able to learn, especially as parliamentarian. I want to emphasize that I think he has come a long way, learned a lot, and is the best person for this job. As he said earlier about being an enthusiastic puppy, he loves this. He is not just doing it to

do it for future jobs, resume, things like that. He is doing it because he cares about Notre Dame and he wants to put in the effort and do something with his year as Judicial Council President. That's what I feel.

- f) Clay Chauncey: I have a point of order. Look at the Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure, which is our rules. The section titled Qualifications of nominees. Qualifications for each office should be stated in the bylaws or other document of authority as designated by the bylaws, such as the policy established by the constitution. no member who lacks the qualifications specified in the bylaws or document of authority can be a candidate for or be elected to an office. A Nomination of an unqualified member must be ruled out of order. Seeing that our constitutions state that nominations for Judicial Council President have to pass through the Senate and it has already failed, I would argue that this person is unqualified and I think this entire nomination should be considered out of order.
- g) Aidan Rezner: Thank you for that point.
- h) Clay Chauncey: That is a point of order, so it needs a response. It is not a debate point.
- i) Aidan Rezner: I don't see it that way. The way that I interpreted it as failing in the beginning, I don't have the parliamentary book. Thank you for reading it, but I don't have the parliamentary book

in front of me. The ruling i made was I think there was a response to some of the claims made that were valid and reasonable based on other information. I thought it was reasonable to bring to the floor again. Of course, I take those comments seriously. I also think the nature of the vote plays into it. It was a very slim margin and a lot of abstains, meaning if this had been in a different direction, we would be in a different spot right now. I do see this as a valid point of consideration again. That's how I would respond to that. Rest assure this was taken in extreme consideration. Because of the nature of some of the claims made and the responses that I felt were responsible responses to the claims this week, in regards to the addendum letter that was written, I think that provided some validity in it being heard again. Thank you for bringing that up. I appreciate it.

- j) Ryan Lally: This is by no means a conviction. I see trouble in the potential future of this, as Mary Grace was getting at. If this were to be rejected again and we do not have a passed nomination by march 15th, Koryn mentioned it would go to the Ethics commissions of which Hunter is a member and of which Koryn is chair. This is not an attack on personal character, but it seems like a potential conflict of interest. As for an avenue to circumvent this, could you help me understand what will happen to avoid a conflict of interest if that happens.

-
- k) Koryn Isa: I would say if the nomination is not passed by March 15, someone could refer me to the Ethics Commission for not fulfilling my duties as Judicial Council President. An allegation can be submitted to any of the commissioners, so it doesn't have to come to me. The commissioners can decide to organize themselves. I would have to refuse myself and they would select or appoint an acting chairperson. While I would venture to assume Hunter would refuse himself, the commissioners could vote to have him refused.
- l) Justin Aguiar cedes time to Derick Williams.
- m) Derick Williams: It's been a while since I've been here and I forgot how tense this room can be some time. I'm glad I can be here and thank Justin for his time. I appreciate all of the points that have been brought up. I've worked with Hunter a lot, just as Jessica here. I thought it important to provide my input and thought process on the debate I've read. I won't extoll more of Hunter's qualifications. I'm sure that you've heard enough on what has to be said. I read the minutes, so I think that is appropriate. What I would like to share is my input on having seen Hunter go from his time on FUEL through Senate through the impeachment process to running with him for student body office to him serving as parliamentarian. What defines Hunter and a lot of what he does, seeing him for a professional side and also on a personal side, is

this idea of shared community, which is why we are all here, why we are all passionate about Student Government, and why we love our lady's university is this idea of shared community. It is something Hunter has always tried to live out in the work that he does. That is part of which why he invited me to work so closely with him to work on senate resolutions together but also to invite other people to be together and work in a collaborate format to bring people like Jess and other Senators and other people across Student Government to try to put together solid resolutions that we feel like can make as difference. That explains why Hunter would want to do something such as advise younger members of Student Government to be involved in a process like that because it is exciting and you want people to be involved, especially younger people. Opportunities like that can seem exciting in the moment and, in retrospect you realize the mistakes that you made. Hunter has owned up to that. It is something I appreciate seeing in Him. We have all changed. I think about how I've changed over the past year and I think about how different of a person Hunter and I are. We've been through Senate together and speaking on his behalf during the impeachment process and saying yes to running on a student body campaign knowing I was running with someone who had been through difficult moments like that. But I felt confident, excited, and supported to chat with him because I knew that he had

learned from those experiences and become a different person.

Those same qualities are where he is at now. That is what will lead him in how he acts, decides, and votes and works and would fulfill this function as Judicial Council President, which is what the debates should be now that we have talked through the qualifications. How does this man, if selected to be in this role, act? Is the act in a malicious content or does he work in a format of shared community where he united people to make Student Government a better place. I think that is what he will do, that later half. It makes me proud, regardless of how this decision goes, if he gets it or not, it makes me very proud of Hunter to know how far we came through all of these things and we got to the moment we are and that his time in Student Government is one he has learned from and one he should be proud of, as well.

- n) Charlie Pehl: I had no idea about any of these issues last week when they were brought up. It was very complex and I was surprised, so last week I was very much a neutral observer because I was shocked that Hunter, who works so closely with us and seems so good at his job, had done things that seemed so questionable. At the end of the meeting, I did not know what to think because a lot of questions were left unanswered and this weird meeting that had been brought up, which I was skeptical of. I has No idea what these things were, so I ended up abstaining

because I had no idea. I felt there were a lot of unanswered questions about Hunter's past and things that he had done that were questionable. This meeting through our questioning phase and through Hunter's speech that a lot of these issues that have been brought up, their base seems questionable to me whether or not they happened as reported or that they were really that big of a deal. Also, Hunter, it is very clear through his speech and through what everyone else has spoken about him has grown a lot. I'm sure everyone else in this room has. I think you have to be a be very skeptical person to look at that and still think they are all making it up. As someone who was very split last week and really didn't know what to think about all of this, I think today's meeting and what the questioning phase showed us and what everyone else has said shows very clearly that Hunter is not some malicious guy or power hungry guy, or that he will be very corrupt. It is clear that he has grown a lot and was very eager. It is important to see that, especially after some questions were left unanswered last week.

- o) Andrew Ryan motions to limit debate to two minutes per speaker.
- p) Justice Walker: Earlier I shared I was at the Committee on the Constitution meeting in question. Admittedly, I was a freshman and had no idea about the Constitution and I wasn't super involved in Student Government besides the meetings once a week. I will share that I did find the agenda and we had seven transition

documents to approve that day. So it was naturally expected to be an already really long meeting and additionally we had two orders to amend the Constitution dealing with endorsements and refusals. I also believe this was during the time when people were running for president, including Hunter. I think tensions were relatively high, which might have to do with some of the rumors that spread after this meeting, just to shed some light on what that meeting was.

- q) Jayden Espinoza: My only thing here is, as Hunter had phrased it like being a puppy and getting excited. Hunter was very excited at the opportunities that Student Union has. As someone who also did FUEL with him freshman year, I remember a situation where we, as FUELers, were told we could not email the President or Vice President and that we would have to contact FUEL directors and they would be the person to link us to the two people. When a vacancy was filled for the now Director of LGBTQ initiatives, as someone who was delegated to that committee, Hunter seemed very excited at the opportunity to have the position for some reason. We had just very recently become FUELers. He directly went over that and emailed both Maddy and Allen. To me, that is a one off. I get that sometimes you are excited at an opportunity and you are going to go take it, or be inquiring about it. But then hearing that that was repeated again in terms of neglecting these

very clear rules that we have in terms of communication and parliamentary procedure, it brings up the question of, if everyone is saying he has changed so much, but this has happened in the past two years and Most recently with his resolution brought forth that was miscounted. I totally understand that mistakes happen, but if this is coinciding with he's excited and looking forward to something, it is hard to understand that that wouldn't happen again.

- r) Max Feist: Point of response. Considering there's been whole discussions and big points made on how hunter has changed, it seems to be a non sequitur to critique his past actions and say his past actions reflect his current self when we already made the point that he has changed and everyone that has interacted with him in Student Government has said he is a great kid.
- s) Thomas Kluck: We've heard so many qualifications. They are all fantastic and wonderful. I want to speak on the qualifications of the Student Senate. We made a decision last week and I trust that decision and that judgment. I don't think I was a dumb person last week and I don't think I am much smarter this week. We made a decision and if our judgment was respected, we would not be having this conversation again and we probably would be out of this room already. So, I'm going to trust my judgment from last week and trust I was pretty smart last week, or not dub, and I am going to vote the same.

-
- t) Ryan Murray: On making mistakes in the past, I see that as a by volume thing. Hunter does a lot. Every meeting we have a bunch of resolutions where he's the owner of the document. If he is going to keep screwing up, that is the price of making decisions. All of us can think of some example where we keep making decisions and, eventually, we screw up. At some point, we are making decisions. That is what Hunter brings to the table where he is actively trying to do something. I'd rather have someone who keeps trying and doing things, and occasionally screws up, than someone who does very few things with no mistakes. We need someone who can keep getting things done. The Student Body is not one person. There are lots of people who can critique his decisions and that he can respond to. Each mistake he has made in the past, he has responded to and adjusted. He started Communicating more after FUEL incidents. He owns up to his mistakes, learns from those, and adapts from those while keeping his momentum. The last point of what the decision was last week, we have to admit that it was a contentious decision. It was a 15 to 14 vote with 9 abstaining. That is a very narrow margin that is worth revisiting.
- u) James Bradley: To echo that last point. Just to the point that the Senate has already made a decision and we need to respect it. It was a very close vote with 9 abstains. I don't think that means case closed, we have completely decide. I was skeptical of the idea of

the candidate being submitted again without any changes, but upon seeing the vote, it was clear the Senate was divided and a substantial number of Senators did not know how to vote and they voted to abstain. That in itself warrants a second vote. I'm seeing a general trend. I'm trying to keep an open mind through last week and this week. The general trend this week is, through questioning period and debate now, we heard Hutner and Koryn and Thomas and other people answer questions and every time they give an answer to dispel some of the criticisms against Hunter. It seems that the people who are continuing to support voting no try to focus on an even more minute detail on something that happened two years ago. I don't like the record. I don't like some of the things that have come up. The picture that is becoming clear to me is that Hunter is an overqualified candidate who made mistakes in the past. As a senate, we are spending a lot of time focusing on things that continue to get downgraded on the scope of the job that he would actually do.

- v) Daniel Jung: To things. It is not fair to compare last meeting to this meeting. They are extremely different meetings. This meeting has been much more clear and we know what questions we need to ask. We have done a really good job at trying to demystify some of the concerns that were raised last week. I see these as two separate meetings and I think bringing it to a vote a second time is valid.

Second thing. I don't work super closely with Hunter, but I think it is important and significant that some of his strongest advocates are those that work extremely close with him. That is a stronger testament to his character and qualifications.

- w) Clay Chauncey cedes time to Griffin McAndrew.
- x) Griffin McAndrew: I was the Parliamentarian at the beginning of the term, prior to my resignation for other things, personal and family reasons. I returned in January and thought I might be able to offer insight here. I would like to start by offering another personal account of Hunter's past mistakes. We were Senators together last year before the election and before all of that. Prior to impeachment, I worked closely with him on a number of issues, including food robots, flex points, the whole shabang. Prior to that meeting, there was a strategy meeting. I see a number of people who were at that meeting in this room, where we got briefed on the charges against him. Going into that meeting, I was 100% on his side. I was in support of him the whole way. Coming out of that meeting, it definitely changed. The evidence against him, I think, now, was enough to vote to continue investigating. It became cleaner through the evidence that he did not give us a whole picture of what had happened. I came out of that meeting feeling like a total idiot. I felt tricked and taken advantage of. From then on, our relationship deteriorated. That was one of the larger factors

in why I ran for student body and one of the larger factors in why I ran for Parliamentarian. Hunter betrayed my trust in a lot of ways during that meeting and I do not think he is right for this job.

- y) Mary Grace Walsh: I am the Director of Disability Advocacy. I don't have a vote in this, I'm just chatting. I think there are some things that haven't been brought up that, if I were voting, I would take into consideration. One of which is, at the end of this, there will be a Judicial Council President. Koryn is going to graduate, she is not going to be on J Council anymore. You really do have a choice. There are other qualified candidates besides Hunter. I am struggling to understand how someone who has appeared before the Ethics Commission, regardless of whether they have changed or not, I think that we can all understand that people make mistakes and people grow, but this wasn't a mistake. Maybe it was, I'm not going to speak on whether he intended to make this error. But, from being involved in this issue, all of the FUELers were contacted without anyone contacting the FUEL Director. He went over the head of the FUEL directors, he emailed people essentially promising a position or asking them to apply for positions that didn't exist, was brought to the Ethics Commission for this, rightfully so, as Griffin said, and he wasn't impeached, that is a helpful clarification, but the Judicial Council President is someone who nominates people for others positions and to put someone in a

position, like Judicial Council President, who has a known history of appearing before the Ethics Commission with unethical allegations feels like a no brainer to not elect him. You guys have other options is what I'm trying to say.

- z) Aleah Applin: I think it's been made clear that there are other options and other people Koryn could have chosen from. The fact that one of her most qualified people came to Senate today and said Hunter is the best person for the job should not go neglected nor should Koryn's opinion. It's healthy to have debate, but these are two of the most qualified people to say, and someone who's going to be here who is a viable candidate or option is literally saying do not put me in this position, put Hunter, he is going to be the best one. Also, last week a lot of people got caught up and upset that Koryn said she would nominate Hunter again and that made them very frustrated and it came into their voting. As we have someone who abstained and didn't know what was going on, I think a lot of people's opinions have changed and that is a good thing that they are changing. It is not getting caught up in the other people. Right now, we are focusing on Hunter solely. We are focusing on is Hunter the best person for the job? Is he going to do the job well? Is he qualified for the job? That's the person we are focusing on. We are focusing on so many other factors when it comes to voting. Koryn's decision is not Hunter's decision. We

need to focus on can Hunter do this job really well? Can he lead Judicial Council? I think a lot of people here have proven that he can.

aa) Thomas Kluck: To respond to Aleah's claim, we also did have someone who worked closely with Hunter say the opposite and give the opposite recommendation. I want to talk again, directly to the Senate. I grew up with an older and younger brother and I was often "big brothered" by my other brother. I don't like to see that happen and I feel like that is what is getting done to the Senate. We are being shoved into a corner. We don't have an option. We don't have a choice. I'll never stand to being "big brothered" in any regard. I think this jeopardizes the legitimacy of the role of Senate. If our decision last week doesn't matter, and if we make the same one this week, it is not going to matter, until the very next week, it is going to happen again. I feel like we are getting put into a corner. Our power, our agency, the agency we have been trusted with is being jeopardized. I feel uncomfortable with setting this precedent.

bb) Lena Dougherty yields time to Griffin McAndrew.

cc) Griffin McAndrew: I know you are hearing from me again, but I want to tell another story. This is not specifically about Hunter, this isn't his fault, but I think it demonstrates that J Council needs a strong leader. I don't think Hunter is capable of that. Shortly after I

resigned, I got a text from Hunter in late September asking me for a copy of the Constitution. Evidently, what had happened was, no one in J Council had a copy of the Constitution after I resigned, so I was given the impression by Hunter. I had to send him an edited copy of the Constitution that I had been working on prior to my resignation in order to lay out ethics reform initiatives. While it isn't his fault that the Constitution was lost when the J Council central drive was deleted, I think it demonstrates that Judicial Council needs a strong leader that is able to take care of business, that is able to make sure that things don't get lost. The person in charge of J Council holds a great deal of responsibility for everything else in the student union. I'm not sure I trust Hunter to do that.

dd) Amelia Forrest: I feel like we are going over and over again. It is already after 7.

6. Vote

a) The nomination is approved.

C. [SO2324-21: An Order to Suspend Hall Elections](#)

D. [SO2324-22: An Order to Suspend Class Council Elections](#)

1. Andrew Ryan motions to move up SO2324-21 and SO2324-22 from New Business to General Orders and to vote in block.

2. Question

-
- a) Sam Godinez motions to make a friendly amendment to change the wording from 23/24 to 24/25.
 - b) Ava DeCroix: Point of clarification, 23/24 election means occurring in 23/24 election and 24/25 term.
 - c) Aidan Rezner: Just to clarify, last year, the same wording was used as is used this year. If the same wording is used, it will be confusing because it doesn't match up.
 - d) The motion is passed.
3. Debate
 4. Vote
 - a) The orders are passed.

VI. New Business

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

1. Sam Godinez: Since there are a lot of visitors here who probably want to think of something else, not the resolution, I motion to postpone it to next week.
2. Sam Godinez motions to postpone SS2324-11 to next week.
3. The motion passes.

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

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

-
1. [Memorandum from the Committee on the Constitution Regarding SO2324-18a and SO2324-18c](#)
 - D. [SO2324-19: An Order to Amend Article I of the Constitution Regarding GreenDot Training](#)
 1. [Memorandum from the Committee on the Constitution Regarding SO2324-19](#)
 - E. [SO2324-23: An Order to Amend Article I of the Constitution](#)
 - F. [SO2324-24: An Order to Amend Article XIII of the Constitution](#)
 - G. [Student Union Annual Award Nominations: Frank O'Malley Undergraduate Teaching Award](#)
 - H. [Student Union Annual Award Nominations: Irish Clover Award](#)
 - I. [Student Union Annual Award Nominations: Nancy J. Walsh Irish Clover Award Nominations](#)
- VII. Announcements
- A. Lily Condodina: Acousticafe this week. There will be a Leap Day event tomorrow. You can stuff a flush, we have little rabbits and frogs. There will be a limited amount.
 - B. Lena Dougherty: The Women Owned Business Market will be from 3-7 in Dahnke Ballroom on Monday. We have a few vendors with arts and crafts, jewelry, and clothing.
 - C. Amelia Forrest: BP's Sig event is a meal auction from 3-7 in Haggerty Cafe on March 1st. There will be a silent auction for items that you can bid on. All proceeds go to Meals on Wheels.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting is adjourned.