

-
- I. Opening Prayer - Aidan Rezner
 - II. Roll Call
 - A. Pick One
 - B. Aidan Rezner: Two quick things. One, if you are proxying for someone currently in Senate and you are a new Senator, I know there are a few of you here, you can vote. But, if you are just here as a new Senator, once again, a reminder that you cannot vote on any of the measures. But, if you are proxying, you are more than welcome to also have speaking privileges.
 - C. Diego Gonzalez: I am proxying for Matthew Dunn, but Matthew Dunn was going to proxy for Thomas Kluck.
 - D. Aidan Rezner: Is Matthew Dunn a new Senator?
 - E. Diego Gonzalez: Matthew Dunn is a new Senator.
 - F. Aidan Rezner: And you were going to proxy for him as a new Senator?
 - G. Diego Gonzalez: He was going to proxy for Thomas Kluck.
 - H. Aidan Rezner: But he is not here?
 - I. Diego Gonzalez: Neither Thomas Kluck or Matthew Dunn is here.
 - J. Aidan Rezner: We will just operate as if there is no proxy, then. That's probably the best way to do it there. Secondly, 'm going to try to stand throughout this whole thing, but I had surgery over break. Everything is fine, but I am still recovering. So, if I sit, I will do my best to stand through the whole thing, but I just wanted to give you guys a quick heads up on that.
 - III. Approval of Minutes - [March 6, 2024](#)

-
- A. Andrew Ryan: Point of inquiry. There was a conversation that took place after debate and before the vote. It wasn't recognized, but it is in the minutes. On page 13. I was wondering because it was not in debate.
 - B. Aidan Rezner: I see what you are saying. I think my acknowledgment of it would allow it to be in because it was a question towards my end. That's the reason why we decided to include it.
 - C. Sam Godinez motions to amend page 6 from "some are" to "Zahm is".
 - D. The motion is approved.
- IV. Executive Announcements
- A. [Back the Bend Sign-ups \(3/23/24\)](#) - 9 am-1 pm (Bus Loading @ Stepan Center)
 - 1. Aidan Rezner: We currently have 500 signs up but have capacity for 700. If you are interested in getting involved in the community, it is from 9 to 1. There is free breakfast, t-shirt, and lunch. There are a variety of projects from gardening and mulching to painting and planning an Easter egg hunt, so there are a lot of diverse ways to fit your needs and what you are interested in. If you are free and available this Saturday morning, you can still sign up and we would absolutely love to have you. If you have questions feel free to ask me or Daniel about it. The buses will be at Stephan and will begin loading at 9 am and get back at 1 pm.
 - B. PrideFest
 - 1. LGBTQ+ Acousticafe (8:30-10:30 pm on Thursday) @ Library Lawn
 - 2. PrideFest Library Lawn Celebration (12-4 pm on Friday)

-
3. Aidan Rezner: We will have food trucks and a photo booth. You are more than welcome to stop by

C. Lent Grotto Gathering - Wednesday, March 20th from 7:30-8:15 pm

1. Aidan Rezner: Father Griggs, who is the rector of Keough hall, will be delivering some remarks and will be doing some prayer. All are welcome to join.

D. The Color Purple Film Viewing and Discussion - Friday, March 22nd from 5:30-8:30 pm in Debartolo Performing Arts Center

1. Aidan Rezner: The new one that just came out. It is a totally free viewing. We will have a short panel discussion about how the movie relates to the book and what it means to broader society. If you are interested in seeing the movie, haven't seen it, or want to see it, it is a free ticket. That will be in DPac in, I forget the name of the theater, but it is in the theater in DPac.

V. General Orders

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

1. [Addendum to SS2324-11](#)

- a) Aidan Rezner: Quick note. Daniel, after much discussion, decided not to sign this in hopes of further conversation. The way that that will work is when this is brought back to the Senate, in order for it to pass, officially now, it requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote by convention of the Constitution. What is listed here is strictly the way it is written, but there is an addendum which the Senate Advisor has asked to be

read today. If not, we will go by normal conception. This appears exactly the same as we saw it was last week.

2. Questioning

- a) Sam Godinez: I would like to propose a friendly amendment.
- b) Aidan Rezner: Do all of the cosponsors listed and do you have the document of the friendly amendment?
- c) Sam Godinez: I shared it with you. Do you want me to share it with everybody?
- d) Aidan Rezner: That would be helpful.
- e) Sam Godinez: I can just share it with you again.
- f) Aidan Rezner: Or you can just make the updates to the document itself. Do it the same way you do it when you sent it to me because I think it would be helpful to see what is being removed and what is being added.
- g) Sam Godinez: Sure. This will take a couple minutes. I am sorry. OK. I'm done.
- h) Aidan Rezner: All of the cosponsors of the resolution, so Sam, Maria, myself, Maeve, Clay, Lindy, Kaitlyn, Dorian, Jacob, Ryan, Bella, and Andrew, are you all ok with this change? Can you just raise your hands for me? Ok, I appreciate it. I also am in favor of this. The friendly amendment will be based. For further explanation as to what this does, it says that if a residence hall remains a swing dorm and still houses undergraduate students, its

dorm name will still be included on the NDH wall in the path moving forward. At the point that it stops housing undergraduate students altogether, then it will be considered for removal. Can be considered for removal. Before that it would not be considered for removal as long as it continues to house undergraduate students.

You can remove the highlights and remove the red as well.

3. Debate

4. Vote

a) The resolution is passed.

B. [SS2324-12: A Resolution Calling On Sustainable Investment Strategies](#)

1. Questioning

a) Andrew Ryan: On page 3 of the resolution, you state that the investment portfolio does include investments in fossil fuel companies. How do you know that?

b) Lizzie Stifel: The Investment office has confirmed to Student Government leaders that there are investments in fossil fuel companies when we met with them in the recent years. We know within the last academic year that there are investments but they're aren't able to disclose with the actual investments are due to proprietary purposes. We do know about 4%.

c) Joseph Tunney: Have you met with the ND Investment office? If so, how did those meetings go and what did they say?

-
- d) Lizzie Stifel: We asked this year. We met with them last year. We haven't met with them this year. We met with the head of the Office of Investment last year. They gave us a different option this year. We are still working on finding time for that.
- e) Sam Godinez: The resolution calls for five years. Why not 10 or 15?
- f) Lizzie Stifel: The main purpose of this is to start strict and then open it up a little bit. We want to keep in line with the international goals of reducing greenhouse emissions by 2030, which is kind of crazy, in the next five years. Also, there is no reason to wait to divest in something that morally contradicts our values, especially the Catholic values. If the Notre Dame Investment Office does decide that ten years is best, that is fine. Five years is just a goal for us and I don't see a reason to wait for that now. I do think it is in our best moral interest and potentially our best financial interests, especially as more high school students begin to make decisions based on how a school responds to climate change. Five years is a goal. We are not strict on that, but we are calling on the school to aim for that.
- g) Louis Cornett: So, you haven't met with anyone this year? I know you mentioned you weren't able to see the investment, but you believe just because they said they invest in fossil fuels that you

have enough information to write this resolution saying that even what they are investing in now is too much.

- h) Lizzie Stifel: To be clear, this year we met with the Office of Sustainability and Campus Ministry to pass this through them. They also are in the understanding, granted they talk with the Office of Investment more than we do, that there are investments in fossil fuels. I don't think within a year that much would have changed. We still think 4% is a significant investment.
- i) Louis Cornett: To be clear, you heard from someone?
- j) Lizzie Stifel: We talked with them last year. So, coming from Student Government leaders last year, directly from the head of the Office of Investment.
- k) Justice Walker: If the school was divested from fossil fuels, they likely would have made it public knowledge because it is a big deal to do it, as most these Catholic universities have made a point to state that they would be divesting from fossil fuels.
- l) Clay Chauncey: Based on the language of resolve statement, it seems like you are calling on them to create a plan within the next five years. So, the actual divestment itself is not being asked to happen within the next five years?
- m) Lizzie Stifel: I can't speak to the actual pieces of divestment, I am not in investments. We are giving that over to them. What we want to do is see public action and some sort of commitment. Once it is

out there publicly, there is more pressure on them to actually commit to the divestment. It is not just students, it is the entire Notre Dame community. We want something public. That is what we are asking for.

- n) Alex Mitchell: During your meeting that last, with the Investment Office, was there discussion regarding a time table and possible alternatives with regards to these investments.
- o) Lizzie Stifel cedes time to Annika Barron.
- p) Annika Barron: The members of the Department of Sustainability last year when they met with them, I was not in the meeting, but my understanding is that, because it was the first official meeting with Student Government and the Office of Investment, it was more of a fact finding, asking questions. They did not discuss divestment plans and a plan, specifically. It was about collecting information and establishing that relationship. But, when we reached out to them this year and weren't able to meet with them, we were disappointed by that. That is why we took this next step into the resolution.
- q) Andrew Ryan: Would you say them not meeting with you this year is them ignoring you, them not wanting to do anything, or was it a scheduling thing?

-
- r) Lizzie Stifel: Probably the first two. We got to meet with them last year and they weren't as excited about meeting with us this year. We don't know the reasoning.
- s) Andrew Ryan: Do you think this resolution would make them more willing to meet with you?
- t) Lizzie Stifel: I hope so. I think showing student support is a great way of starting that conversation. It is not just the department, it is not just a few of us, it is the student body. I think as support tapers off, we had a resolution the year before, which led us to meeting the next year, and then nothing happened in between. I think this is a great way to reestablish that the student body cares.
- u) Sam Godinez: I apologize for sounding aggressive. SS2122-05 from last year passed and it's almost the exact same language, like 90% of it is basically saying that the university will stop investments from fossil fuel companies. You are saying that you met with administrators last year, not this year. In your words, it was more of a fact finding meeting. What are the possibilities that this can even be established?
- v) Lizzie Stifel: The biggest purpose of this is to show renewed commitment over the years. Also, a lot has changed in the past two years. The USCCB released next investment guidelines, Laudato Deum was released and increased urgency, and ND also released their 10 year strategic plan with sustainability as a highlight. A lot

of these things are now in play that were not in play two years ago.

We want to show our ongoing support and reinspire this conversation, especially with Father Bob, who is going to be coming into office soon because he deeply cares about sustainability. I actually spoke on a Laudato Deum panel with him in the fall. So, bringing this back to the conversation, as these things are changing, this is an important and, especially with Laudato Deum coming out a few years ago, calling on people like us to make these changes.

- w) Sam Godinez: Going off on the question by Andrew, if this is to initiate a conversation, who will be initiating that conversation?
You are a senior and your term is up in two weeks or so.
- x) Lizzie Stifel: The next leader of the Department of Sustainability.
We are working quite closely with the Office of Sustainability and Campus Ministry. As we continue our relationship with them and the Office of Sustainability, this will be passed through with the next leader as well as those offices hopefully.
- y) Andrew Ryan: The 4% figure that you cited in the endowment that was for the fossil fuel industry, was that from the Investment Office directly last year.
- z) Aidan Rezner: Yes.
- aa) Lizzie Stifel: I think it is also cited online.
- bb) Andrew Ryan: They said it last year though?

cc) Lizzie Stifel cedes time to Annika Barron.

dd) Annika Barron: Last year, I was not in the meeting, but last year they said less than 5%. I think in the past five years it has been online, 4%.

ee) Lizzie Stifel: At least Father Jenkins is quoted saying that and he probably knows more than us.

ff) Andrew Ryan: Another concern is, with that 4%, that is about \$800 million in the endowment. What would you say about transaction costs and things like that? Other costs that could potentially hurt things like financial aid or things like that if this took place?

gg) Lizzie Stifel cedes time to Annika Barron

hh) Annika Barron: This is something we thought a lot about. The studies that have been done on both companies and universities that have divested in the past has found that there has been no negative impact to endowments. Like we said, we are not telling the Investment Office how they should make this transition over the next five years because they know a lot better than we do the best way to deal with some of those transaction fees. Historically, schools that have done this have not seen a negative impact. Actually, a lot of people in the finance world have said that transitioning away from fossil fuels is wholly a good thing as the whole energy sector starts to transition. So, it is probably going to happen sometime.

ii) Lizzie Stifel: Those are backed in literature reviews and actual research.

2. Debate

a) Louis Cornett: First, I would like to thank all the authors and everyone for the work put into this. There are a few things I would like to say. I wrote this before so there might be a few changes, so bear with me. This resolution does not in any significant way take into account the current and past investments of the University Notre Dame. This absence includes how the university has progressed in investments focused on ESG in the past and present. The document includes very few discussions of anyone of significance at the University of Notre Dame related to investing, which includes, but is not limited to, the Presidential's Office, Board of Trustees, or the Investment Office. This resolution completely disregards how the endowment and the future of Notre Dame financials would be impacted by a switch away from fossil fuels, if any, not even a disregard, but also a lack of knowledge. Whereas the resolution disregarded investments by fossil fuel companies into lower carbon futures, including \$15 billion by Exxon Mobile over the next five years, as well as the many benefits these companies provide to their millions of workers. There has been no indication as to why the university currently invests its money as it does and this resolution seems to be an

attack on the mission statement of the Investment Office, which states “by earning superior risk and adjusted returns, we support the university’s teaching, research, and service mission, providing students and faculty the resources they need to achieve success in their chosen fields”. These integral financial processes provide students with the resources necessary to be successful and the Investment Office has done a tremendous job supporting this, as demonstrated by the outstanding track record of the Notre Dame Endowment and Investment Fund. There has not been the proper discussion to pass the resolution, there has not been the proper research, and although, this may not be from the lack of effort from the authors, I believe there is still an issue to be talked about and I encourage the authors to revisit it and meet with more representatives before such a substantial resolution is passed. Because of my passion for this issue and what I believe is my duty as a University of Notre Dame elected official, I believe I will have no alternative than to resign as Senator for Alumni Hall if this resolution passes. In addition, I would like to say it has been an honor and pleasure serving with you all. Thank you.

- b) Amelia Forrest: I was one of the people who got to work closely on this resolution. I want to mention a few points that we did not get to talk about in questioning. A lot of what this resolution is about is Notre Dame’s moral obligation as a Catholic university to

be pursuing investment strategies that better the future of vulnerable people across the world and that match with Catholic Social Teaching. Notre Dame refuses to invest in a lot of categories that might be good financial returns because of the university's moral bankings on that. For example, Notre Dame doesn't invest in companies that do embryonic stem cell research because the university is committed to life. There are a lot of companies that do that kind of thing and Notre Dame won't invest in them. Even though that could be a good financial investment, because of our morals, the university refuses to. I think not investing in fossil fuel companies is important to show consistency across our morals. Otherwise we don't have anything to stand on by saying we won't invest in these categories that the USCCB tells us not to, but these ones we don't really care about. That's just some thought

- c) Justice Walker: Additionally, responding to that fact that it might have a negative impact on our endowment. On the first page in the last whereas statement, there is a study done that these four universities didn't have a negative impact on their endowment, so there has been research that there isn't a negative impact on endowment.
- d) Joseph Tunney: I'm worried about a potential loss of funding outside of the risk adjusted returns of potential benefactors who

have built their fortune in the oil industry. I can point to three halls, specifically O’Niell, Duncan and Welsh Fam, who were built all or in part from oil money. I would love to hear some opinions on that and the potential loss of funding that would result from benefactors feeling alienated or left behind by this university.

- e) James Bradley: That’s a fair point, but that is also in the past. Two things. One, the Student Senate passing this is not going to immediately drop donations or vastly change the economic future of the university. I feel that a lot of the negative reaction of this bill is vastly over exaggerating the immediate impact that passing something like this would have. This is about the moral responsibility of the university. The way that I view this resolution is a collection of student leaders at the university standing up for what they believe to be the right path forward for the university in line with the moral responsibility that we have to invest in a future for our planet, our world, and our community. I think a lot of the concerns are valid and the would be if passing this vastly changed the economic future of the university. But, it is clearly not what we are debating here. This decision comes down to the future that we would like to see the University of Notre Dame support and create. This resolution clearly encapsulates a future I think the university is right to invest in.

-
- f) Jayden Espinoza: We all need to maintain an understanding that by signing this, that does not mean tomorrow every investment is going to be pulled out and we are going to see massive changes. What is being asked is that we are maintaining competitiveness and understanding what currently is set by world and national standards for sustainability and what is going to be done and what has been proved to work at other universities. I personally feel like the bill is very reminiscent of our LGBTQ initiative that we passed earlier this year. Even though there was not a guarantee that the university would accept it and change their beliefs around it, we understood that there was a necessity as the Student Senate to honor not only the current students, but the morals of the university, and where we would like to see the university go. There is not by any means this being signed and affected tomorrow. This is about us as students being able to say that we understand that a sustainable future is one that is necessary for the livelihood of our planter and university as well as putting a statement out there who prospective Notre Dame students who at times like this are considering whether they will be at a university like here or another place. It is important to have messages like this going out that say we stand for a sustainable future and we understand that we are not in the capacity to say how it will be done. This resolution explicitly does not say how this will be done, it passes it

off to the appropriate authorities to do that. No one here is putting anything up to the Investment Office and saying this needs to happen at xyz time. It is saying that we need to begin establishing concrete plans to make sure that we are remaining competitive and understand the national and worldwide standards.

g) Molly Swartz: What stood out to me was that Scott Malpass was in charge of the Investment Office for 30 years. He grew it from \$400M to what it is today, \$18B. He did that by standing by the idea of our goals, yes to make money, but of that to provide financial aid and support the Church's mission. By growing the endowment from \$400M to \$18B, he stayed true to that, so I'm sure he passed up other investment opportunities that could have been big because they did not support the Church's mission. He is no longer in that position as of the last couple years, but I'm sure their office will at some point support this decision because they have always stood by that mission. I think this would just put it more on their table. Like you said, it doesn't mean it's changing tomorrow, but I wouldn't be surprised if this is a conversation their office is already thinking about.

h) Sam Godinez: I know nothing about climate change. I was completely neutral on this, but Louis raised a lot of good concerns, which were the potential loss of money or that this isn't very well researched. Is there a possibility to get more information on this?

Maybe postpone it and then get more info and then bring it back another week.

i) Aidan Rezner: If you would like to make that motion that is available. You can make a motion to postpone if you want.

j) Amelia Forrest: I want to address Joseph and Sam's comments. I will respond to Sam first about gathering more information.

Because of what the Investment Office does, most of what they are investing in is proprietary information, that information is not public and they can't give specific information. They would not tell us how much or what they are investing in. I know Lizzie and the rest of the Department of Sustainability have made extensive efforts to meet with people and try to get this information, so I'm not sure how postponing a week would greatly increase the amount of information we have about this topic. To Joseph's point about donors, it is important that donors who donate to Notre Dame are donating primarily hopefully because they believe in Notre Dame's Catholic mission. They have made their money off of oil and they still may be inclined to donate. If they are so turned off by us divesting from fossil fuels and no longer want to donate, we are lucky at Notre Dame that the university is not at risk of shutting down because of lack of funding. I think the need to stick to our Catholic identity and morals is more important than renovating a new dorm sooner than it might get renovated.

-
- k) Louis Cornett: If you are talking about morals here, you have to go 100%. We are arguing over what we don't even know to be 4%, so if we are saying, morally, that we have to be invested in non-fossil fuel companies, then the argument raised is can we even accept donations from people who made their money in fossil fuels. Where do you draw the line in morals? You can't. If you go by that logic, do we get rid of O'Neill Family Hall Music? Because that is the same thing. If we are talking about morals, people who made their money in fossil fuels are not a donation that Notre Dame would want, based on that logic. If we are going to play the moral card, let's play it 100%.
- l) James Bradley: Respectfully, that is misrepresenting the issue. The idea about the moral question is not vilifying the fossil fuel industry or people who have made their money through that industry. The moral question is about the responsibility we have to our future and the next generations' future. The future of the planet not being corrupted by global warming or climate change. The question isn't do we have a problem with those donors? No, because this resolution is not vilifying the industry they made their money through. It is acknowledging that we want to have a sustainable future that is a future that is in clean renewable energy sources. This resolution is not saying we condemn everyone or we condemn all of the people who work in those industries. All of the

concerns brought up about the fossil fuel industry, I don't see anything that vilifies it. The moral question isn't about what's morally wrong with it, it's about what we do with a choice. Notre Dame, thankfully, is in a position where we are not shutting our doors tomorrow. We are not worried about where the money is coming to keep the lights on. Part of the privilege in financial security is an ability to seriously consider resolutions for change like this. We are in a unique position where we can actually actually have these conversations and talk about a future where we don't invest in fossil fuels any longer. I think that is misrepresenting the question.

- m) Max Feist: He covered everything. I just want to say that just because there is a bill proposed that is moral and taking a step in the right direction doesn't mean you can snowball and say unless we are going all out or you are not doing all of these things, then there is no point in doing it. There is a point in doing this. It is not "100%" but it is still a step in the right direction. You can't just snowball it and disregard it.
- n) Jayden Espinoza: I want to echo that going 100% in this situation is understanding that we are trying to set a commitment to a sustainable future. Anything over that is more than 100%. All this bill is asking is that we set a standard that we will abide by that is more competitive and understanding of what the world is in need

of. Also, I think it is important to understand that if we are really concerned about the people who donated, I think it was O’Niell, Duncan, and Welsh Fam, that we are so concerned with them, a dorm, on average, is a \$20 million one time gift. In total that is \$60 million out of an almost \$19 billion endowment. This by no means is changing what our endowment looks like. It is also not addressing gifts that people are making, it is addressing what we are investing in. It is important that we separate those two that this is not saying if someone who makes their money in oil wants to donate to Notre Dame that we are going to lock them behind a safe and say don’t come near the university. It is saying, where we will be putting our money is not these places.

3. Vote

- a) The resolution is passed.

C. [SO2324-25: An Order to Establish a Legislative Formatting Code](#)

1. Questioning

- a) Max Feist motions to postpone SO2324-25 to next week.
- b) Sam Godinez: I highly argue against this because there are four items already in the agenda. If we postpone it right now, it will make next week's meeting a lot longer.
- c) Clay Chauncey: One of the items in New Business is definitely getting moved up. The other one is adding a period to the

Constitution, so I don't mind voting on that today, either. I don't think this will prolong next weeks meeting.

d) The motion is passed

D. [A Nomination for the Assistant Student Union Treasurers](#)

1. Aidan Rezner: On behalf of Mark, I ask that these be moved up because his assistants are here today.
2. Clay Chauncey motions to move A Nomination for the Assistant Union Treasurers from New Business to General Orders.
3. Questioning
4. Debate
5. Vote

a) The nominations are approved.

E. [SO2324-27: An Order to Add a Period to the Constitution](#)

1. Clay Chauncey motions to move SO2324-27 from New Business to General Orders.
2. Questioning
 - a) Aidan Rezner: Andrew, can you please give a one sentence synopsis of what you are doing?
 - b) Andrew Ryan: When I passed the order last week, I forgot a period at the end and that means in constitution there was an incomplete sentence, so this is completing the sentence.

-
- c) Joseph Tunney: Wouldn't a more appropriate thing for you to do instead of correcting this error would be to resign your Senate position?
 - d) Andrew Ryan: That was considered, however this was determined to be the best option.
 - e) Alex Mitchell: What effect will this have on ink expenditures?
 - f) Andrew Ryan: I was in consultation with the Investment Office.
 - g) Matthew Amante: Can you explain the disastrous consequences of this not passing?
 - h) Andrew Ryan: It is just inconsistent with the rest of the Constitution. It would be the only incomplete sentence in there, so I just wanted to complete it.

3. Debate

- a) Sam Godinez: I am completely against this. I would like to do a friendly amendment to, instead of a period, a semicolon.
- b) Andrew Ryan: No.
- c) Hunter Brooke: J council has reviewed this very thoroughly and we are in support of this important change.

4. Vote

- a) The order is passed.

VI. New Business

- A. [SS2324-13: A Resolution to Update the Hall Flags on The Track In the Smith Center](#)

B. [SO2324-26: An Order to Suspend a Hall Vacancy Election](#)

VII. Announcements

- A. Sam Godinez: Please sign this petition to bring back the large paper cups to South Dining Hall. I am hoping to introduce a resolution next year.
- B. Hunter Brooke: Only South?
- C. Sam Godinez: Oh, and North. South is better, that's all. Please sign this. I need a lot of signatures on this. Not just the 200 required, I want 500. Also, if anyone wants to help out, I will be standing outside of South Dining Hall one of these days, and North as well, just harassing people and telling them to sign my petition. If anyone wants to join me, please do so.
- D. Aidan Rezner: If anyone has any dietary restrictions to any foods, email me because I may bring something to our last meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. The meeting is adjourned.