



**74th Student Senate
Judiciary Committee
10/18/22 | 945 852 05606**

Call to Order: 6:03 p.m.

Members Present: Chair Kariher, Vice Chair Maglin, Senator(s) Tucker, Rivers, Boisvert, Casiple

Members Tardy: None

Members Absent: None

Guests: Chair Diaz, Senator Folwell, Senator Schindler, Samantha Strickland, Jenna Kruse

Land Acknowledgement: The Student Government of Florida State University acknowledges that it is located on land that is the ancestral and traditional territory of the Apalachee Nation, the Miccosukee Tribe of Florida, the Muscogee Creek Nation, and the Seminole Tribe of Florida. We pay respect to their Elders past and present and extend that respect to their descendants and to all Indigenous people. We recognize this land remains scarred by the histories and ongoing legacies of settler colonial violence, dispossession, and removal. In spite of all this, and with tremendous resilience, these Indigenous Nations have remained deeply connected to this territory, to their families, to their communities, and to their cultural ways of life. We recognize the ongoing relationships of care that these Indigenous Nations maintain with this land and extend our gratitude as we live and work as humble and respectful guests upon their territory. We encourage all to learn about and educate others on the contemporary work of the Indigenous Nations whose land we are on and to endeavor to support Indigenous sovereignty in all the ways that we can.

Announcements:

- None

Committee Business:

- **Bill 77 Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P) Anderson, Bettley, Carter, Diaz, Fermin, Long, Rivers, Rock, St. Hilaire (Co)** - This bill shall represent the budgetary allocations for Sweepings during the 2022-2023 fiscal year. Pursuant to Statute 412.1D, the first reading of this bill shall consist of the estimated amount in the budget to be allocated by Sweepings for the 2022-2023 fiscal year.
- **Bill 83 – Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P) Suarez, Tucker (Co)** - This bill clarifies that the times FSU SGA elections are open shall be during Eastern Time.
- **Bill 82 – Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P) Suarez (Co)** - This bill makes it so that instead of being slated and voted on as a group, Campus Recreation and Union Board candidates are given individual seats that will be voted upon separately.

- **Bill 81 – Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Anand, Crocker, Kariher, McMahon, Rivers, Roogow, Schindler, Vollick (Co)** - Formally granting the Student Body President and Agency and Bureau leadership the right to forward candidates for different positions from those that candidates applied for.
- **Bill 79 Sponsored by Senator Schindler (P) Anderson, Malone (Co)** - This Bill will simplify and fix issues within the Senate disciplinary process.
- **Bill 84 – Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Hunter (Co)** - Granting the Senate President the right to call special Senate sessions without the need for a petition.

Old Business:

- None

New Business:

- **Bill 77 - Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P)**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Senator Folwell (P):
 - General Questioning:
 - None
 - **Senator Tucker moves to enter roundtable discussion, Senator Rivers seconds**
 - Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Rivers: I want to start off by saying that I do have an amendment I will be making on this. I want to add proviso language to the AASU and affirm to them that they are not allowed to use the money that we give them via Sweeping on office supplies. They gave us a list of a bunch of things—most of which were office supplies—and I don't think Sweepings is the best place to go for office supplies. I'd like them to use their money on something more substantial. I'd like to go into the discrepancies regarding the IRHC. So, I sat in on the Sweepings hearing and there were a bunch of things that the committee did not find appealing about their request. A lot of stuff had to do with statues and confirmations. A lot of it had to do with the validity of what they were asking the money for. In the end we ended up zero-funding them. They obviously were upset about this, and Sweepings has been in contact with them for the past one or two days. I know that we as a Senate felt very sure about our decision to zero-fund them, but one of our senators came up with the idea to give them some money from Senate Projects to show them good will and give them some money to work with. It has come to my attention that they are not accepting of this. They said apparently that it's Sweepings or it's nothing. I think we found a happy medium to give them some money, but I'm going to stop and let Chair Folwell correct me.
 - Chair Folwell **POC** – I don't have the email directly, but it's not like they said, "it's Sweepings or it's nothing". It was more like I explained to them the situation and what Senate Projects could do, but also how hard it may be to convince the Sweepings committee. They said that they were still interested in fighting for Sweepings' money. They were very grateful for the Senate Projects money.
 - Senator Tucker **POI** - I would like Senator Rivers, Senator Folwell, and Chair Diaz to go into detail as why they zero-funded the IRHC.

- Chair Folwell: I, as the Chair, remain completely neutral. My opinion kind of differed from those in the committee, so I'll let them explain.
- Senator Rivers: An issue that we had was the individuals who came and asked for money on behalf of the IRHC were not senate-confirmed. That was a big issue we had and for fairness' sake, they're not following a certain precedent of rules that must be followed, so we didn't fund them. They were not the only entity who did not follow proper statutes or rules and those other entities, were also zero-funded. IRHC were not the only individuals who were zero-funded during Sweepings' hearings. Any entity that did not follow proper statutes were zero-funded and IRHC happened to be one of those entities.
- Chair Diaz: At the Sweepings committee meeting on Friday night, it was a very long meeting. There were very few people on that call. So, I will say it was a very small group of people that made that decision and I wish we had more voices there. As Chair of Internal Affairs, I deal a lot with agencies and bureaus, and it is true that the people who requested the money were not senate-confirmed. One of the things I brought up was if we did give them the funds, we didn't know necessarily if they would be able to use the money because they are not senate-confirmed. We don't know if they have access to NoleCentral or access to SGA funds. If we did give it to them and they couldn't access it, it would not have been a responsible allocation of A&S money. If this committee does want to fund them, I do have an amendment prepared to do so.
- Senator Tucker: I **move** to allow a non-senator to speak and that would be Samantha Strickland.
 - **Senator Casiple seconds**
- Senator Rivers: I will start out by saying that as a member of Sweepings and Judiciary, we spent dozens of hours fine-tuning this bill and I personally do not have an appetite to amend this Sweeping allocation.
- Senator Tucker **POI** to Samantha Strickland – Would you mind stating how you feel about the decision made in Sweepings committee?
 - Samantha Strickland: Yes, I'm also with Jenna Kruse, our ADF, and she'd like to express how she feels. First and foremost, you said that we didn't comply with statute 907.5 A3, I am the director and I was on the board last year as the assistant director and SGA reaches out to us to get confirmed. We weren't reached out to until September 9th and I was elected to my position in April of 2022. Furthermore, there is no legislation displayed on the website saying you cannot receive Sweepings funds without senate-confirmation. Jenna would like to speak on our behalf as well. Statute 205.3 says that no officer employee will willfully misrepresent themselves while acting in an official capacity. We were never "willfully" misrepresenting ourselves—willfully meaning intentionally—because we were not reached out to by senate while we were confirmed within the IRHC. We were not doing this intentionally and like I said, there was no legislation online. Furthermore, we are a bureau, and we are directly tailoring to the

freshman living on campus. All of our merchandise has SGA marketing and I feel like this is impacting our ability to be a bureau of SGA based on our treatment.

- Senator Rivers: I understand your frustration and where you're coming from. But I also implore you to understand where we're coming from. Yes, there is not anything that says it on the website that you can get this, that, and the third, but it is our job to ensure that we uphold student body statutes. We are the ones who study these statutes, and we are the ones who have to uphold and abide by these statutes. But, going further, it seems like IRHC has their own interpersonal thing, however, you also said that you were also reached out by senate for senate confirmations. What I'm hearing is that you did have the knowledge that senate confirmation is something you have to be a part of. I understand your position, but I also understand my position in that if did not allow it for other entities, I cannot allow it for you guys no matter who you are. Unfortunately, my hands are tied which is why I was so excited to hear about Senate Projects.
- Chair Kariher **POI** to Samantha Strickland – Do you have any plans to get confirmed by the Senate?
 - Samantha Strickland: Yes. We have been in the process of doing so. Our applications were sent prior to our Sweepings hearing. Myself, the Assistant Director of Finance, and the Associate Director.
- Chair Kariher **POI** to Samantha Strickland – Are you planning on presenting to Budget?
 - Samantha Strickland: Yes. Our Assistant Director of Finance, Jenna Cruz, is.
- Chair Diaz **POI** to Samantha Strickland – Who exactly reached out to you about being senate-confirmed?
 - Samantha Strickland: Jaclyn Butts.
- Chair Diaz **POI** to Samantha Strickland – Are you financially certified?
 - Samantha Strickland: Yes. Both of us.
- Chair Diaz **POI** – Do you guys have access to your funds through NoleCentral or another platform?
 - Samantha Strickland: Yes.
- Senator Tucker: You know, the former senator hit most of the points I was going to ask. I don't know the sentiments of the committee, but the proposition to use Senate Projects to fund them would probably be the best way. I'd like to see them get funded however we have to maintain a level of fairness. If you have any amendments to this bill, we should wait until Wednesday when this is in front of the Senate.
- Senator Rivers: Yeah, I wanted to add a few other things. First of all, if we were to go the Senate Projects route, they would most likely receive that money before they received the Sweepings money. Also, we weren't going to fund them a lot of money to begin with because a lot of their requests we were not okay with. The same amount of money that they would get from Sweepings they would get from Senate Projects.
- Chair Kariher **POI** to Chair Diaz – In your proposed amendment, where are you taking money from?
 - Chair Diaz: In my proposed amendment—and I can explain each decision—I removed \$1000 from the food pantry because we

overfunded them anyways and removed \$1000 from Pride Student Union because they said they were okay with losing \$2000 so I cut them by \$1000. I removed \$1185 from RTAC and about \$1000 from the Rise Office and giving IRHC \$4000 for some merchandise that they were asking for.

- Senator Casiple **POI** – How much money did IRHC request, and would it just be for merchandising?
 - Chair Folwell: They requested \$5000.
- Senator Tucker **moves** to allow a non-senator to speak (Jenna Kruse, Treasurer of IRHC)
 - **Senator Rivers seconds.**
- Chair Diaz **POI** to Jenna Kruse – Can you clarify a bit on the Senate Projects bill and if you're in favor or not?
 - Jenna Kruse: We're not adverse to working with you guys on that and we're very grateful that you are willing to do that. Our qualm comes in with the reasoning behind not giving us Sweepings funds because of the statutes previously mentioned. Honestly, the decision process isn't sitting well and as an SGA bureau, we really do want to have a positive relationship with you all. We're very thankful for all of the funding opportunities you have given us, but the statutes that were mentioned took me aback. One of the statutes mentioned was about fraud in student government and we love to work with you all in the future, but the Sweepings disqualification is quite confusing to me frankly.
- Chair Folwell **POC** – For Chair Diaz's amendment, we cannot fund more than we are currently funding in the category of Food and Awards. We are to the dollar amount of the maximum. If we want to fund the IRHC anything within these categories, we would have to take away from someone else.
- Senator Rivers: I want to say a few things. At the end of the day, the students who were elected from the different committees into the Sweepings committee have final say on what gets funded. As someone who sat in the committee, I 100% stand by what we funded and what did we didn't fund. I will say, yes, Senate and the Legislative Branch wants to have a good relationship with all the entities that are connected with us. But I will advise that in certain ways, it is a one-way street. At the end of the day, we have the final say. While I do stand by the Sweepings decision, I stand by the decision to in good faith, give IRHC some money from Senate Projects. If they were to get money this way, they would get money faster than from Sweepings. They wouldn't see the Sweepings money until the spring semester.
- Senator Tucker: I don't think there's going to be any major changes here tonight. What I suggest is that we approve this bill, let it get sent to the senate floor, and we can hash out these important things. It might be a good use of everyone's time if we invite Kruse and Strickland there and we can have some discussions there.
- Chair Kariher: Jenna and Samantha, tomorrow at 7:30 p.m. we meet at Senate and it will be in the Student Union. You are both welcome to come. We are not the final stop for this, so I recommend both of you go.
- Chair Diaz: I know I sent an email that sounded a bit testy, but the reason why we mentioned that specific statute about misrepresentation is

because while it may not be a malicious way, if someone is not senate-confirmed then from our perspective—which is kind of like a legal perspective—they do not hold that office. Why is why someone putting on a Sweepings' application that they are the Treasurer of some entity is misrepresentative. It really is not meant to be a mean or malicious thing and I second everything that folks said about wanting to have productive relationships with entities. If anyone is interested in seeing the Sweepings request from the IRHC it was roughly \$20000 and I can pull it up if you guys want to.

- **Senator Rivers moves to call the question; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**
- Closing Statement:
 - Chair Folwell (P): Okay folks, I appreciate you all hearing this and you will probably be hearing this again tomorrow. When I undertook the job as Sweepings' chair, I told my committee that I would maintain neutrality through all of it, which is why I am letting everyone else decided what to do. I would like to thank you all for making an effort to make the Sweepings' bill as effective and as efficient as possible while still taking into account all entities involved. It is important and I thank you all. I thank the IRHC delegates for being here right now and I hope to see you in Senate tomorrow. It's Sweepings and we need to get it passed tomorrow regardless and I hope we can come to a conclusion tomorrow. **Waives with 30s**
- Vote:
 - Yes: 4; Senator(s) Tucker, Rivers, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
- **RESULT: BILL 77 PASSES**

- **Bill 83 - Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P)**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Senator Folwell (P): This is a simple change. It changes what it says in the election code to clarify that elections will start and end in Eastern time. Last year, we had to wait a very long time because the Panama City campus was an hour behind us which means that they had an extra hour to vote. Now I've talked to President Tyler Tice of the student government council who says that most of the elections there end at 5:00 p.m. anyways. So, changing this won't affect them that much. I asked the Supervisor of Elections how many votes come from the Panama City campus, and I cannot remember off the top of my head, but I want to say it was 120 or something. I think this streamlines the process and makes it easier for the Supervisor of Elections to get the election results faster without really affecting anybody negatively. Thank you. **Yields with 2:00.**
 - General Questioning:
 - None
 - **Vice Chair Maglin moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Casiple seconds**
 - Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Casiple **POI** to the sponsor – So, this would only apply for next election cycle correct?

- Senator Folwell (P): Yes, statutorily, there is a period of time before elections where changes don't apply to the next election, but also even if we pass this tomorrow, this election will already be over.
 - Senator Casiple **POI** to the sponsor – Have you inquired about the technical logistics of making the polls close at 7:00 p.m. to the webmaster?
 - Senator Folwell (P): I haven't inquired on the specifically. This was something specifically requested by SoE Greenwood and as far as I'm concerned, he is pretty in the know about how technical election stuff goes. There have been some issues where he doesn't get a response, but he is pretty in the know so I don't think he would announce this if there was a technical challenge. In years past, it ended at the same time regardless of time zone in both Panama City and here. It was basically already in effect, but it wasn't because they changed it last Spring election. So, if I'm correct, this has already happened before so I don't think this should be a technical error.
 - Senator Rivers: I think this bill makes a lot of sense and I was going to move to call the question, but it seems like other people want to talk so I'll let them.
 - Senator Tucker: Well, if that's how you feel then there's hardly any reason for me to talk. This is one of those things that's like "why the hell wasn't this written this way in the first place?". So, I think this is pretty easy.
 - **Vice Chair Maglin moves to call the question; Senator Casiple seconds**
 - Closing Statement:
 - Senator Folwell (P): **WAIVES 2:00.**
 - Vote:
 - Yes: Tucker, Rivers, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
 - **RESULT: BILL 83 PASSES**
- **Bill 82 - Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P)**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Senator Folwell (P): This basically makes so that Campus Rec and Union Board seats are elected in the same way that Senate seat. I talked to the Chair of the Campus Rec board and the Chair of the Union Board, and they are both on board. I have heard a lot of support for this bill, and this is something that SoE Greenwood states would be ideal. **Yields with 2:20**
 - General Questioning:
 - None
 - **Senator Rivers moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Tucker seconds**
 - Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Tucker: Yeah so, I go to look at this a few days ago with the sponsor and it's one that I definitely don't oppose it, but one that I'll have to think about. I have no idea how I feel about it, but I do think it needs to be sent to the Senate floor. I'd like to see if you guys think there's

something to point out but otherwise I think if it doesn't conflict with statutes, it should be brought to the Senate floor.

- Senator Casiple: I agree with the former senator in the sense that I would like more input than just our small committee. But, one of my concerns is that the point of the seat system is that people get a good number of representatives from their college, right? So you're in campus rec or union board and there's a chance where three people sign up for seat one but no one decides to sign up for seat eight. So, if that happens, we have an empty Campus Recreation board—and there's a really off chance that would happen—but we would be down a seat in the Campus Rec board so we would have to go through senate confirmations to fill those seats to make sure that the seat is filled. I think keeping the seats as they are is fine, but I definitely want to hear your guys' opinion.
- Senator Rivers **moves** to call the question
 - **Vice Chair Maglin objects**
- Vice Chair Maglin **POI** to the sponsor – I just think that I am just a little bit confused by this bill and by the differing opinions going around. Can you, in detail, explain what this bill will change.
 - Senator Folwell (P): So, currently, the way that Campus Rec and Union Board are elected, is however many people sign up, everyone is in the same election and the eight or twelve people who get the most votes get elected. There's a lot of intricacies that make the political experience a little bit different, but I was planning on talking about that on the senate floor. I can go into that now if you want.
- Chair Kariher **POI** to the sponsor – Does this go to Rules?
 - Senator Folwell (P): I didn't see it referred to Rules, but I can check.

○ **Senator Rivers moves to call the question; Senator Casiple seconds**

○ Closing Statement:

- Senator Folwell (P): I want to use my closing to respond to a former senator's concerns. I know that some of this happens, but at least for senate seats if two people sign up for seat one and nobody signs up for another seat, the SoE has the authority to change the seat for one of them, so both are automatically elected. I assume that if three people were to sign up for one seat and nobody signed up for another, I believe a change can occur. If not, I am willing to write another bill. I'm pretty sure that that concern will not be a big deal. I think it will make elections more elections more competitive and makes everyone more accountable—which I can go into more detail about on the floor. **Waives 1:00.**

○ Vote:

- Yes: 4; Senator(s) Tucker, Casiple, Rivers, Vice Chair Maglin
- No:
- Abstain: 0

○ **RESULT: BILL 82 PASSES**

- **Bill 79 - Sponsored by Senator Schindler (P)**

○ Opening Statement:

- Senator Schindler (P): Thank you for having me in Judiciary. I wrote this bill to simplify the censure process in Senate. Currently the process

requires four seconds from senators, and then goes into debate, then goes to 2/3rds vote, then goes to rules, then can go to judiciary but there are other outcomes. This makes it so it goes straight from the senate vote to judiciary for the impeachment hearing.

○ General Questioning:

- Senator Tucker: Does this go from Rules to Judiciary?
 - Senator Schindler: It would go to rules and then they can decide what the punishment is, but they can forward a senator to judiciary for impeachment.
- Vice Chair Maglin: So, the candidate would go to immediately into impeachment proceedings?
 - Senator Schindler: Yes.

○ **Senator Tucker moves to enter round-table discussion; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**

○ Round-Table Discussion:

- Senator Tucker **POI** to the sponsor: What is your reasoning for going straight to impeachment?
 - Senator Schindler (P): I feel like if there is 2/3rds consensus then they should be forwarded to impeachment to be accountable for their action. The verbal warning is too lax of an outcome.
- Senator Tucker: I won't be voting yes. There needs to be more room given to the rules. There is a wide number of reasons to be censured like just breaking procedure
- Senator Rivers: I just we could all get along. I will be voting no, because I see a piece of targeted legislation, and this is going to help somebody do something malicious. I wonder why they are trying to get rid of all these steps and why are we trying to turn senate into learning lab but if I don't like you then you get impeachment. This discourages discussion and takes power away from the Rules Committee.
- Senator Tucker **POI** – to the sponsor: Why do you want to move this from rules to judiciary?
 - Senator Schindler (P): If there is a large violation that constitutes a censure then it should go to judiciary.
- Vice Chair Maglin: I am going to be voting no because what if there is a senator that gets censured from one action at one meeting and there could be a lot of extraneous circumstances that cause that 2/3rds vote. There could have been a lack of understanding about the rules and rules could take some time to reflect and then if an impeachment is needed then the rules committee then they can do that.
- Senator Tucker **moves** to call the question, Casiple seconds
 - **Senator Rivers objects.**
- Senator Rivers: A senator can submit articles of impeachment if they find something egregious. Senate needs to be a place where you can talk to people and learn.

○ **Vice Chair Maglin moves to call the question, Senator Tucker seconds**

○ Closing Statement:

- Senator Schindler (P): I do believe that 2/3rd vote of the senate then they should be sent to judiciary to have a hearing regarding the incident.

○ Vote:

- Yes: 0
- No: Senator(s) Tucker, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin

- Abstain: 0
 - **RESULT: BILL 77 DOES NOT PASS**
- **Bill 81 - Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P)**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Chair Diaz (P): This is a bill I worked on over the summer and consulted the Chief of Staff with. Over the summer someone forwarded a candidate that applied for president of class council, and they were forwarded for vice president. This bill gives the executive branch more leeway if they feel that a candidate is more qualified for a position they did not apply for. If I apply for HLSU director and the e-board for HLSU does not want, you to be director then they can forward me for secretary. However, the agency and candidate must consent to the change, and then there must be a notice on their application when they are forwarded to the senate.
 - General Questioning:
 - None
 - **Senator Tucker moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Casiple seconds**
 - Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Casiple **POI** – As it is currently written the SBP will have final say over the position?
 - Chair Diaz (P): This requires the consent of the agency and the candidate. The executive branch already has this power, but now it requires the agency and candidate consent
 - Senator Tucker: This should have been. In statutes to begin with, and the sponsor made this even cleaner, and this has my support.
 - Vice Chair Maglin **POI** – Does this mean they will have to go through the confirmation process again?
 - Chair Diaz (P) – This requires the consent of the head of the entity so it would probably just look like email correspondence.
 - VC Maglin **POI** – If the person that is the executive director, they would have to consent to someone replacing their job?
 - Chair Diaz (P) – This happens when e-boards are changing so when the director is being replaced when the new administration comes in. This does not give the authority of the SBP to kick someone out.
 - **Senator Rivers moves to call the question; Senator Casiple seconds**
 - Closing Statement:
 - Chair Diaz (P) – I think this will streamline things, and this is a power the executive branch already has, and they exercise this power. But this protects candidates from having their validity questioned.
 - Vote:
 - Yes: Senator(s) Tucker, Rivers, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
 - **RESULT: BILL 81 PASSES**

- **Bill 84 - Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P)**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Chair Diaz (P): Three times within the last calendar year we have had to do special sessions of the Senate. All three cases we had to do petitions and it had to be accepted by the senate president for special sessions to happen. This bill would give the Senate President the power to call special at their discretion. This bill would do that. I would like judiciary's advice about the wording of it. I feel like it is a little unclear. We can protest an unfair special session by denying quorum.
 - General Questioning:
 - None
 - **Senator Rivers moves to enter roundtable discussion, Senator Tucker seconds**
 - Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Rivers: Under current statutes the people must consent, but I feel like we should add a clause if the SP is calling a meeting, then attendance should not be counted, because senators should not be penalized if they were not consulted about it.
 - Senator Tucker: I was going to say the same thing, if someone would like to make that amendment.
 - Senator Rivers **moves to amend.**
 - Amendment: "Section A. If a special session is called by the Student Senate President, an absence shall not negatively impact a senator's attendance record."
 - **Senator Casiple objects; Amendment withdrawn.**
 - Senator Casiple: I feel like there wouldn't be an inclination to go to a special session if there is not a penalty for attendance.
 - Senator Rivers: I don't know why they would call a special session, but what if they called a session on Friday at 9:00 PM and I have plans to go out on the town, but I wouldn't be excused but I also shouldn't be penalized.
 - Vice Chair Maglin: I think if you have an excused schedule conflict then it wouldn't affect your attendance. I have class in the evenings sometimes, so I would like an attendance clause added.
 - Vice Chair Maglin **moves** to amend.
 - Amendment: "at their discretion" after "twenty-four (24) hour notice"
 - **Senator Rivers seconds: Sponsor finds it friendly.**
 - **Amendment is adopted.**
 - Senator Rivers: I liked my previous amendment because if I wake up on Tuesday and they say we are meeting Friday at 10:00 PM. I love my Friday nights and I usually go out Friday nights, but I shouldn't take a hit on my attendance.
 - Senator Rivers **moves** to amend
 - Amendment: "If a special session is called by the Student Senate President, an absence shall not negatively impact a senator's attendance record."
 - **Senator Casiple seconds; Sponsor finds it friendly.**
 - **Amendment adopted.**
 - **Senator Rivers moves to call the question; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**
 - Closing Statement:

- Chair Diaz: I am excited to see Chair Kariher's amendment, but this is a straightforward bill and I thank y'all for your time.
- Vote:
 - Yes: 4; Senator(s) Tucker, Rivers, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
- **RESULT: BILL 84 PASSES**

Unfinished Business:

- None

Closing Announcements:

- Chair Kariher: I did want to give a quick update about the Investigative Board. We do have a couple of weeks left, so I am going to save my Resolution. I have gotten a few updates about some of the information that was misconstrued and so if you guys have any questions, you are welcome to come to me or Chair Diaz. Great meeting guys, this was awesome, and we really got through it. I appreciate everyone's efficiency and while making sure we really look at everything.
- Vice Chair Maglin: First of all, great meeting just as Chair Kariher said. I always love when we have a lot on our calendar, so we get to hash out things like a real Judiciary committee. Anyways, I was flipping through statutes earlier and it is my job as Vice Chair to deal with the excused absences at whatnot. So, if you need to miss a meeting or will be late, please let me know. I am dropping my number in the chat if you don't already have it to make sure that I am fulfilling my duties as Vice Chair.
- Senator Rivers: I just want to say that I love Judiciary and that I really do wish we could get along in Senate. It really disheartens me when we can't get along on a personal level which affects the work that we do in the senate chambers.
- Senator Tucker: I just ask that at least Senator Rivers and Senator Casiple if you want to as well please stay on this meeting after it is adjourned.

Next Meeting: 10/25/2022 at 6:00 p.m.

Adjourned: 7:34 p.m.



Signature of Chair Kariher