



73rd Student Senate
Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Committee Agenda
September 3rd, 2021 | Zoom Meeting ID: 909 196 4098

Call to Order: 6:01pm

Members Present: Chair Linsky, Vice-Chair Tackett, Parliamentarian Rowan, Senators: Randall, Little, Nemeth

Members Tardy: None

Members Absent: None

Guests:

Approval of the Minutes:

- Rowan: **So moved**
- Tackett : **So Seconded**

Announcements:

- Rowan: Thank you chair Randall for all the formatting of the Resolutions.
- Randall: For the resolutions when you present them, you can find the ones I formatted in the google docs folder. Everything you need is there.
- Tackett: Let's keep talking points concise for meetings purposes. Also, please do not keep repeating the same point over and over again.
- Linsky: I and Vice-Chair Tackett have a Sweepings Committee coming up. I might not have the time to present all the resolutions in the committees. So please, let's divy up the time.

Student Comments:

-

Committee Business:

-

Old Business:

-
- **Rule 14: Censor**
- Linsky: Let's give some context. This entire debate we had about it was about censures. There is currently a supreme court case that is summing up our two sides of the



argument. Should our censoring be a ceremonial thing, should it have teeth, is it a form of speech or an official act of punishment other than speech?

- Tackett: Before we go into our debates, I think Chair Little should look at this rule without being persuaded by our opinions.
- Little: I will read over 14. After reading it, it doesn't seem awful to me. I do not like 14.4C. That does not seem clearly defined. The idea of what makes a complaint acceptable or not.
- Randall: How do you feel about the idea of censors
- Linsky: Heres my side, a censor right now is nothing but a statement of dissatisfaction. They could do something completely wrong on the senate floor, and nothing would happen.
- Randall: We did learn in summer senate that the Rules and Procedures violations are included in the
- Rowan: If someone moves for a censor, there is an immediate vote, and it must pass by $\frac{2}{3}$. Then, it goes to the Rules Committee to decide the correct punishment. There are several options for punishment.
- Linsky: I like that
- Randall: I like that, but I think we need to give context and talk about it before the vote.
- Tackett: I agree. If someone says a slur for example on the floor, that doesn't need any context. However, if we have something happen like the beginning of the 73rd, we need to have context.
- Rowan: We do not want the senate to go in a trial mind tho.
- Tackett: Lets just do technical non-debatable.
- Linsky: I agree, I think that is a great overall censor solution.
- Rowan: I think the non-debatable is a good idea that can cover that. I will screen share the rule re-write that I just pitched.
- Linsky: I do not think the senator that is getting censored should be kicked out. It could be removing their due process.
- Randall: I do not want people to be in the chamber if they are not in decorum.
- Linsky: I am starting to think the only way to not be debatable is to go straight to a vote.
- Randall: We need context, if the event that happened in January were to happen again, we would have no idea what is going on.
- Rowan: We could add all the due-process to happen in the rules committee once passed. However, I think the best option would be to have a questioning period.
- Randall: I think maybe censors should come in the form of a resolution when it is started.
- Rowan: We need some immediacy.
- Tackett: What is stopping me from just asking for points of information?
- Randall: You can but there needs to be an obligatory statement for why.
- Rowan: I think we can do it with a requirement for an opening statement for the petitioner of the censor. They can just petition "this is what happened".



- Linsky: I like adding that part in, however, we need need to make the language say “In the motion, the senator making the motion must state the reason for the motion concisely”
 - Randall: What is the reason for 14.1?
 - Linsky: Just cut it. It’s redundant. We already know that the rules need to be followed, and this document says so many times over.
 - Rowan: No, it does have a necessary purpose. It is there because it serves a naming purpose for the rule. Looking at this new rule, we were able to cut it by 167 words.
 - Randall: I think there is a grammatical issue in 14.3.E.
 - Rowan: I will make it more readable.
 - Linsky: Let’s read over the finished product one more time to see if there are any issues. After reading it, I see no issues.
 - Randall: I think we need a vote requirement for the Rules vote.
 - Rowan: let’s make it 2/3rds just like the other vote.
 - Randall: I think we need a rule that says that “Pro temp shall draft all charges of impeachment that arise from the proceedings within the Rules Committee”. If not, the burden for the impeachment charges that result from the censor process would not exist.
 - Rowan: I agree.
 - Randall: I think we also need to get rid of the header in rule 14.
 - Linsky: Seeing that
 - **Vote on the Passage of Rule 14:**
 - **Yes:** Randall, Rowan, Little, Nemeth, Linsky, Tackett.
 - **No:** None
 - Tackett: The motion passes.
 - Linsky: Seeing that, we are done. We just need to see these bills through.
 - Rowan: We also need to discuss a possible vice-chair for Rules and Jacalyn feels that we need to keep the “Calendar” language. We can deal with that next week
-
- Linsky: Recap of what we did, we passed all of the resolutions in this committee. We only did not do Rule 14. Once we deal with Rule 14, we will go over Senator Randalls budget bill
 - Randall: I would like to actually go over these budget bills first.
 - Linsky: Sounds good

New Business:

- **Joining Budget and Finance Committee’s with Senator Randalls Proposals**
- Randall: During the summer, we decided that the budget and finance committee needs to merge into one. I came up with two different bills from the ideas we talked about. The first one is to make the budget a special standing committee. It takes one member from each standing committee and 6 members from Finance for that special meeting. The second option is to just get rid of the budget committee entirely. This would give the



finance committee more things to do. I would love to hear opinions about this. The only thing I have not dealt with is special projects. I do not like how that is set up.

- Tackett: I like the special standing committee idea.
- Linsky: I like the second option better. It is simpler, and it allows the finance committee to look over the budget over time
- Little: I like that idea as well, it is simpler. What will happen with the budget committee once we get rid of it? Will we only have 4 standing committees?
- Randall: Yes, it'll be 4 standing committees until we can come up with a 5th one.
- Nemeth: I agree with Linsky.
- Rowan: I seemed to like the special committee at first, but it does seem like the finance committee option alone will be better.
- Linsky: I also feel the gravity of the budget is too important to be a special standing committee. I did not realize that until I heard everyone talk about it.
- Randall: I will note, the president said this might be too much of a burden for the finance committee to take on at one time. The big difference with this option would mean that there could be delegated responsibilities for the committee.
- Tackett:
- Linsky: I see another problem, the budget week is always crammed in right before the deadline. Having just one week is not enough. It could be a budget month for example. We need to give it more time so committee members can tackle the budget. Having members take in the budget across that extended period of time would create a more experienced budget committee with a better understanding of the process and more time to pay attention to detail throughout the process.
- Tackett: I would be okay with the second option if we were able to extend the budget week to something like a month for example. I would want a set of committee members focusing on the budget as their primary focus.
- Randall: I like that, but we can't have it be the only focus.
- Rowan: The October deadline is a soft deadline. I do however agree that we need to extend to the budget process.
- Linsky: With sweepings, we have a month to allocate the one million dollars. Why is the budget only a week?
- Little: If we go with the second option, will the chair have the option to open a subcommittee? We did this in the judiciary
- Randall: We discussed sub-committees. It is not included in this bill because we do not want to cause an unnecessary burden.
- Little: I like the flexibility of that. There will be some semesters where it will not be needed.
- Rowan: I was pushing the sub-committee. We also came up with the idea of sub-committees for different parts of the budget so the presentations and allocations will be split up amongst the sub-committees.
- Little: Won't that be an issue with the small size of the committee? We would need a larger committee.



- Randall: That is the plan.
- Rowan: We are seeing an increase in the size of the senate.
- Randall: I appreciate the feedback. I think I will go back and make sure there is no limitation to budget only being a week. If it is, I will change it.
- Rowan: I think the chairs should have to bring in the president to be able to appoint a special committee. There is a lot of independence with the chairs so they don't get burdened with all the extra duties.
- Linsky: The buck does have to stop somewhere. In this case with the budget, as all committees in senate, the buck should stop with the president.
- Rowan: Everything I am reading about the budget, there is nothing limiting "Budget Week". It just needs to be at least a week.
- Tackett: I will talk to chair Gonzolez about a budget week to start extending it so it is not such a burden. We will report back on how the logistics of that look.
- Randall: We also need to make sure that the people in sweepings know this is emergency funding.
- Tackett: I think we should also do the budget first and then work in sweepings.
- Rowan: I think it would be important to do a statutory change.
- Rowan: I **move to adjourn**

Unfinished Business:

- None

Final Announcements:

- None

Date and Time of Next Meeting:

Adjourned: 7:36 pm

Video Recordings:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qw7O1F8VluxrpYeUBd8WNqejpExPzrGE/view?usp=sharing>

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1enG9C8t6fxiZ5loy9BFhKyBzHoFtH69h/view?usp=sharing>