



**73<sup>rd</sup> Student Senate  
Rules & Calendar Committee  
Date: October 13th, 2021**

**Call to Order:** 5:06PM

**Members Present:** Pro-Tempore Wang, Chair(s) Randall, T. Murray, Roy, Gonzalez

**Members Tardy:** Chair(s) Nasworthy, Little

**Members Excused Absent:** Chair(s) B. Murray

**Members Absent:** Senator(s)

**Guests:** Parliamentarian Rowan

**Announcements:**

- President Pro Tempore - Land Acknowledgement
- Judiciary - X
- Finance - Passed CR 26 RTAC and CR 27 amended PAC. Need more RTAC members, actually becoming a problem
- IA - Met Monday and amended RoP, legislative round table, start bureau review
- Budget - kept bill 57 tabled, talked about RoP and budget week, first hearings are Friday, please come
- SLAA - X
- RTAC - X
- PAC - Heard 4 requests, one was tabled for more info and the other three are CR 27
- Guests - X

**Committee Business:**

- **Bill 51** - Sponsored by Senator Randall (P) - To amend the Student Body Statutes to eliminate the Budget Committee in its entirety and restructure its current duties to the purview of the Finance Committee.
- **Resolution 65** - Sponsored by Senator Randall (P) - To amend the Rules of Procedure to eliminate the Budget Committee in its entirety and restructure its current duties to the purview of the Finance Committee.
- **Resolution 73** - Sponsored by Senators Tsouroukdissian, Preshia (P) - Giving Senators the option to transfer sponsors and preventing legislation from sitting in committee for prolonged periods of time.
- **Suspension Hearings:** Senators Bouchard, Thorpe

**Old Business:**

- **Bill 51** - Sponsored by Senator Randall (P) - To amend the Student Body Statutes to eliminate the Budget Committee in its entirety and restructure its current duties to the purview of the Finance Committee.

○ Round Table:

- Little: Point of Information: since the last time we went over this has the sponsor talked to anyone new, any developments
- Randall: Yes, talked to Little, Tacket, T. Murray, things have been crazy not had the chance to meet with Gonzalez. Development, put more thought into it. More insight into how people are feeling about this. Have a few options if this doesn't work out. Still stand behind this.
- Gonzalez: Can you talk about those options?
- Randall: Would withdraw this right now and change budget from a standing committee to a special standing committee.
- Wang: If the idea is that budget just does not have enough to do right now, what can we add?
- Randall: Could audit those who receive a&s fees, but that is under the purview of the finance committee. Would be hesitant to do that, but that was an option that was discussed.
- Gonzalez: According to finance code, supposed to be shared between budget and finance
- Randall: Mid-year investigations but not investigations in general
- Gonzalez: This is based off budget in a covid world, not doing what it is supposed to be doing in a normal time. Budget does have powers to investigate and throughout the budget week process, doing work that is supposed to be done year long with reaching out to organizations.
- Little: **POI**: Can the sponsor outline the differences between the bill now and the special standing committee idea?
- Randall: The biggest thing is laying out structure for the ew special standing committee, puts 50% of members from finance and one member from the other committees. Transfers between accounts would be handled by the finance committee. Those sorts of requests go through budget to ensure fiscal responsibility, finance can easily take on that responsibility.
- Gonzalez: My understanding is that every budget member that the sponsor has talked to has disagreed with this and that is telling
- Little: Would vote yes on this in its current form. Not the biggest fan of the special standing committee idea. Makes more sense to combine the two and would like to hear other opinions.
- Randall: **POC**: sweepings and central reserves are special standing committees and people from committees are elected to serve on the special committees. Talked to a variety of budget people and there was not always total disagreement.
- Gonzalez: Former chairs of budget disagree with this
- Randall: Then that would be news to me
- T. Murray: With sweepings this year, engagement was an issue, I had to volunteer for IA because no one else wanted to do it.
- Gonzalez: I want to echo that, pleading that this does not work. Been a part of five funding boards, know the ins and outs, just not going to work.
- Little: Do not know what that this will address the quorum issues, my mind is more on the engagement issue and making sure that people care if they are in the special committee. Agree with the sweepings point. Still on the fence of the engagement thing. Need people to care that the budget is good and the budget is thorough.

- T. Murray: **POI**: how many people requested to be in budget in committee preferences recently?
  - Wang: I do not have that exact information.
  - T. Murray: Point of Information: Would you say it is in the bottom two?
  - Wang: Maybe, not sure
  - Little: Has anyone spoken to people to see if people are generally not excited about budget in finance, would combining them increase interest or engagement. Would this incentivise them to join finance.
  - Gonzalez: Wouldn't that mean that more people would want to join budget because it is easy
  - Wang: What makes people want to join a committee then?
  - T. Murray: People might just not be interested in money
  - Little: People might feel like they don't know enough about the process to be a good contributor to budget and finance.
  - T. Murray: how do we feel about giving this to the senate at least and out of rules and if it passes, seeing how it goes until spring inauguration and reassessing.
  - Randall: One year sunset where if this doesn't work, this would be repealed if the senate votes that this doesn't work
  - Little: Who would then vote on this? Senate?
  - Randall:
  - Gonzalez: **Point of Parliamentary Inquiry**: is there precedence about this with bills? Anything of this magnitude?
  - Wang: I do believe there is precedence. If not, I know it has been talked about in potential bills.
  - Parliamentarian Rowan: No, but have had conversations about this and most of the time sunset provisions haven't been used, perfectly okay to have this, in the proviso, basically say, if a bill not passed in a year to approved this, it is automatically repealed.
  - Gonzalez: **POI**: would bill 51 need just a majority to pass this bill?
  - Randall: It's an omnibus so  $\frac{2}{3}$
  - Gonzalez: don't like sunset language so no
  - Little: I think it would be fine, might be unnecessary, we could just pass a repeal bill
  - Rowan: If you want to repeal it, you do not have to wait for that year with the sunset, you could just repeal the sunset if you like it, if you do not like the new thing you can just have a repeal bill.
  - Little: Agree with what Chair Murray said earlier so it would be good to hear it on the senate floor, should be heard by the full senate, maybe hearing some other thoughts
  - Wang: Just worried that other senators might not know what is going on
  - Little: Fair point
  - Wang: We could table this until the end of the meeting or another week
  - Randall: If we table it could we guarantee that this will be voted on before the end of the session?
  - Consensus: yes
- **TABLED**

- **Resolution 65** - Sponsored by Senator Randall (P) - To amend the Rules of Procedure to eliminate the Budget Committee in its entirety and restructure its current duties to the purview of the Finance Committee.
  - **TABLED**
  
- **Resolution 73 – Sponsored by Senators Tsouroukdissian, Preshia (P)** - Giving Senators the option to transfer sponsors and preventing legislation from sitting in committee for prolonged periods of time.
  - Opening Statement:
    - Randall: \*reserves time for closing\*
  - Round Table:
    - Nasworthy: **POI:** what is this amendment?
    - Randall: A number of changes have been made and improve accountability. On wednesday, a lot of senators expressed frustration, going back to the drawing board, standing committees just cannot cut legislation. It can in this situation be removed from the committee's agenda, it would then go to rules, and this defines how rules would make that decision, brings in rules as a third party, made it 4 meetings so the committee has the ability to shift its schedule to hear the legislation. If the timing isn't right, we want the committee to move the time around to make sure that something works, and only if that cannot happen, the withdrawal from agenda and giving rules would go into effect. Clearly defines adding a new primary sponsor. Inputs the precedence of something that the current and one of the previous Senate Presidents did with if a sponsor leaves senate, the Senate President can give the measure to a new sponsor instead of killing the measure.
    - Randall: **POC:** this was Tsouroukdissian's first legislation so that is why the whole chapter is included.
    - Gonzalez: We already made a decision last week, about something very similar, also with the debate in senate last week it was made clear by the sponsor that this was targeting resolution 18. Appreciate that this is being made into something that is less personal. Have seen this turn into something unfortunate and do not see it turning back.
    - Little: The best course of action if people still think this is important it should be resubmitted and leaving the stricken out 10.19 shows that this has sort of already stirred the pot and it would be better to start fresh and not deal with the negativity with this.
    - Roy: Inclined to agree, seeing the discussion on the floor, the sponsor did not seem like he no longer believed in the resolution. These changes look very good, but if it becomes the same thing with bringing up arguments about other things that is.
    - T. Murray: I agree with the point that the content of the previous bill was
    - Randall: **POC:** Would be open to striking the whereases.
    - Little: We should probably just kill this and start fresh so it does not bring up the situation we had last week
    - **Gonzalez moves to call the questions; Nasworthy seconds**
  - Closing Statement: 5:00 remaining
    - Randall: Last senate was rough, if the potential amendments were to come again in a new resolution, would the committee want to hear on something that is truly clean?
  - Vote:

- Gonzalez: No
  - Little: No
  - T. Murray: No
  - Nasworthy: No
  - Randall: Abs
  - Roy: No
- **RESULT: DOES NOT PASS**
- 

**New Business:**

- **Candidate for Undergrad Seat 3 - Emily Fruchtnicht**
  - **TABLED**
- **Suspension Hearing - Senator Bouchard**
  - Total of 9 absences since 4/14
  - Opening Statement:
    - Wang: Accumulated 9 absences,
  - **Little moves to enter roundtable; Nasworthy**
  - Roundtable:
    - Little: **POI:** What committee?
    - Wang: Finance
    - Nasworthy: Commitment is probably not there
    - Little: 9 absences since April is every single Senate meeting. Missing that many meetings, did the senator give any excuses about absences
    - Wang: No excuses were given ahead of time
  - **Gonzalez moves to call the question; Randall seconds**
  - Vote:
    - Gonzalez: Yes
    - Little: Yes
    - T. Murray: abs
    - Nasworthy: Yes
    - Randall: Yes
    - Roy: Yes
  - **Senator is forwarded for impeachment with a vote of 5 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention**
- **Suspension Hearing - Senator Thorpe**
  - Total of 11.5 absences since January 27 2021
  - Opening Statement:
    - Wang: Fall senator, do not know if these are split by senate or by committee.
  - Questioning:
    - Nasworthy: How many absences were excused
    - Wang: None
    - Randall: One, but he told me five minutes before that he had work
    - Nasworthy: Was he a summer senator?
    - Wang: No
  - **Little moves to enter roundtable discussion; Gonzalez seconds**
  - Roundtable:

- Little: Senator came before us for the deputy treasurer position in the summer and was not confirmed, he said he cares a lot about senate, but absences shows otherwise. Will vote to impeach.
  - Nasworthy: Only having one “excused” and just not showing up it shows not much professionalism
  - Randall: When he gave me the excuse for that one finance meeting. My response was “not cool”.
- **Randall moves to call the question; Gonzalez seconds**
- Vote:
  - Gonzalez: Yes
  - Little: Yes
  - T. Murray: Yes
  - Nasworthy: Yes
  - Randall: Yes
  - Roy: Yes
- **Senator is forwarded for impeachment with a vote of 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.**

**Vote for absence allocation for Preshia:**

- Gonzalez moves to allow one more absence; Little seconds. T. Murray objects. Gonzalez withdraws.
  - T. Murray: My only problem is that if he misses tonight then he’s done, I’m okay with one, I just wanted to talk about it.
- **Nasworthy moves to allow one more absence; Gonzalez seconds.**

**Vote for absence allocation for Reeves:**

- Randall: Let’s give him two or three, like the idea of a tight leash
- Little: agree, on my committee, agree that the number considering being a spring senator is high, not very communicative on groupme, hard to get a hold of him, has shown up to both committee meetings since he was unsususpended.
- **Nasworthy moves to allow three more absences; Gonzalez seconds**

**Unfinished Business: X**

**Committee Legislative Roundtable: X**

**Closing Announcements:**

Nasworthy: RTAC still needs people

Roy: there is an election happening so keep an eye out

Gonzalez: the budget schedule is in the rules chat, hope you can come

**Date and Time of Next Meeting: TBD**

**Adjourned: 6:34 PM**

*Renee Wang*

---

**Signature of President Pro Tempore**