



**74<sup>th</sup> Student Senate  
Judiciary Committee  
September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2022 | 6:00 P.M. | 923 7307 8067**

**Zoom Meeting Recording:** [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Fo2l\\_6PBdQfnwz4iAZpFWU-yVKukk9xP/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Fo2l_6PBdQfnwz4iAZpFWU-yVKukk9xP/view?usp=sharing)

**Call to Order:** 6:03 p.m.

**Members Present:** Chair Kariher, Vice Chair Maglin, Senator Rivers, Senator Tucker, Senator Boisvert, Senator Casiple, Senator Drackley

**Members Tardy:** Senator Schindler (excused)

**Members Absent:** Senator Fermin

**Guests:** Senator Folwell, Bruce Suarez (SrCC President), Candidate Jorge Lago

**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. Despite 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:**

- Chair Kariher: I don't have any announcements, just that I'm excited for today's meeting.
- Vice Chair Maglin: Same, I'm just excited for our first Judiciary meeting this semester.

**Committee Business:**

- Constitutional Amendment 3: Diaz (P); Drackley, Folwell, Tucker (Co)
  - Lowering the Constitutional threshold to fill vacated non-elected offices in the Student Government from a 2/3 to majority vote of the Student Senate.
- Bill 60: Diaz (P)
  - Amending the nomenclature of the Rules and Student Life committees in Statutes to align with the current Senate Rules of Procedure and the current practices of the Student Senate.
- Bill 72: Folwell (P); Casiple, Carter, Diaz, Drackley, Rider, Suarez (Co)

- This bill addresses several issues in Chapter 302, regarding the Class Councils. Among these issues includes references to incorrect statutes, general legislative vagueness, conflation of an “officer” of the Class Councils and a “member-at-large” of the Class Councils, the application process timeline not adequately reflecting how applications have been handled, forcing a President of a Class Council wishing to resign to hand in a resignation to themselves, and general typos.
- Bill 73: Rivers (P)
  - Defining what a Complete, Incomplete, and Fraudulent Final Expense Statement is.
- Hear from Supreme Court Associate Justice candidate – Jorge Lago (7:00 P.M.)

**Old Business:**

- None

**New Business:**

- **Candidate for Confirmation: Jorge Lago, Supreme Court Associate Justice**
  - Opening Statement:
    - Candidate Lago: Hi my name is Jorge Lago, I’m a second-year law student. I heard great things about what the Supreme court does at this school, and I knew that it was something that I wanted to do my second year of law school. I appreciate you guys taking the time to come here and take part in this confirmation. I’m a little bit unsure of what to expect but I appreciate you guys being here. As far as my opening statement, all I want to say is that I’m looking forward to helping the students of this great school to solve their disputes in the most civilized and organized way possible. That’s all I got for me. **Yields with 2:10.**
  - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
    - None
    - **Senator Schindler moves to enter roundtable, Senator Tucker seconds.**
  - Round-table Discussion:
    - Senator Tucker: In the olden days before I retired from committee chairing, I first got into contact with the candidate, and they were by far the most communicative. Out of all the candidates, in the brief conversations we had, you could tell that the candidate is someone of intelligence.
    - Senator Folwell: Can you explain you just explain your jurisprudential philosophy a little bit and how you think that might relate to student government?
      - Candidate Lago: I think I’m not going to be one of those people that says ‘the statutes say exactly this, so I’m going to do exactly this’. At the same time, I’m not going to say I don’t care what the statute says if I think it’s right. I think statutes are there for judges to guide themselves off of and I think they’re an important baseline. But I don’t think that every situation can be solved from what’s written on a page word for word and I think I’m going to do my best to mix what is written on those statutes as well as to what

was argued when the statute was passing. Also, trying to apply the best response to the situations presented based on the essence of the statutes.

- Senator Tucker: **POI** for the candidate: Say the court has reached a solid consensus but you really disagree with it. How confident are you in voicing those disagreements?
  - Candidate Lago: Just because everyone else agrees with something doesn't mean that I'm going to sit there and not voice my opinion. That's the way I've lived my life and I think I'd do the same thing in court.
- Senator Tucker: That's a really important trait when you look for judges to have a semblance of independence.
- Senator Rivers: **POI** to the candidate: Have you had any communication with the current justices?
  - Candidate Lago: Yeah, I've had brief conversation with Mr. Linksy, and I've had brief conversation with the other justices. I've gotten very brief overviews of what the role is going to consist of and the general gist of how this goes.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** for candidate: I know this can be a time commitment, so I want to know how committed you are to this role?
  - Candidate Lago: Yeah, I mean absolutely it's a good question. I think I'm very committed to this and I'm not the type of person to do anything half-heartedly. If I'm completely honest, if I thought that I couldn't handle it or that I wouldn't be able to for any reason, I wouldn't be here. But I'm fully committed to it and fully prepared for it.
- Senator Tucker: I think the candidate has answered our questions very well and I really like this candidate.
- Chair Kariher: what has been the most formative moment that has led you to be here?
  - Candidate Lago: I would say that it's more encompassing than just one moment. I grew up somewhere where a lot of people would tend to solve their problems in not very, you know, educated or civilized ways. I've always thought there was a better way to solve disputes or conflict and from a young age, I've always idolized that way of thinking. I've always wanted to be part of that system and I think this is a good step to get there.
- Senator Folwell: What law do you want to practice?
  - Candidate Lago: I'm torn between personal injury and criminal law.
- Senator Tucker: Looking through his application and there's a few things that stood out to me. The biggest thing that sticks out to me is balance. There are values such as compassion and determination in there that I think is important.
- **Senator Tucker moves to call the question, Senator Casiple seconds. No objections.**
- Closing Statement:
  - Candidate Lago: Thank you all for being here. Those questions are great and show how dedicated you guys are to working in your field. I look forward to working with you guys and I thank you for your time. **Waives with 1:40.**

- Vote:
  - Yes: 6, Senator(s) Tucker, Casiple, Boisvert, Schindler, Rivers, Vice Chair Maglin
  - No: 0
  - Abstain: 0
- **RESULT: CANDIDATE LAGO PASSES**

- **Bill 60 - Sponsored by Senator Diaz, Senator Tucker (P)**
  - Opening Statement:
    - Tucker (P): So, as you can see it doesn't say the entire thing in the bill in front of us. Fortunately, it's a super simple thing. Sam talked to me about it three days ago when he found out he probably wasn't going to be able to make it at this time. So, I looked over it and because we changed our Rules and Procedures this summer, it doesn't align with statutes. All this does is align our current Rules and Procedures and update it in statutes. Mostly it's all just kind of pointless grammatical and phrasing type stuff like that in statutes. It's not changing any rules that are already there.
    - **Senator Tucker yields with 1:55**
  - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
    - None
  - **Senator Casiple moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Boisvert second**
  - Round-Table Discussion:
    - None
  - **Senator Boisvert moves to pass by unanimous consent. No objections.**
  - Closing Statement:
    - Tucker (P): I don't really need to say anything, but Sam will be able to better explain this on Wednesday. Feel free to ask him any questions.
  - Vote:
    - Yes: 6, Senator(s) Tucker, Rivers, Boisvert, Casiple, Drackley, Vice Chair Maglin
    - No:
    - Abstain:
  - **RESULT: BILL 60 PASSES BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

- **Bill 72 – Sponsored by Senator Folwell (P); Casiple, Carter, Diaz, Drackley, Rider, Suarez (Co)**
  - Opening Statement:
    - Folwell (P): Hi everyone, I hope you're all well, I know a lot of you were here this summer, so it's good to see all of you again and for those who weren't here during the summer I do look forward to a productive semester. So basically, this bill is a second iteration of one that I introduced over the summer, and it's had a few changes in the past month or so to address some concerns that were brought up. This bill addresses several fundamental issues with the statutes surrounding the class councils. Some of these issues include terminology and consistently incorrect statutes and what is frankly, absolutely ludicrous timeline for the appointment of the sophomore and junior class councils. I can go into more about that if you guys ask, but I do know I have a limited opening in judiciary. I've worked extensively with the officers of the class councils, and they are all on board with this bill. It is necessary to allow them to do some of the projects they want to work on this year, and it will allow the class councils to be more easily managed and increase their long-term viability. I hate to say it like this but as they are, the statutes are horribly flawed and I hope that this bill will solve some of the most prominent issues there, As I mentioned, I have all the officers of the class councils on board with this, and I look forward to any questions you may have. Thank you for listening and I do hope that you will vote in favor. I yield my time. **Yields with 1:40**
  - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
    - Senator Rivers: Is it the intent of this bill to umbrella the members at large to "officers of the class councils"
      - Folwell: No
    - Senator Rivers: Is this bill doing that?
      - Folwell: No, it is not.
  - **Senator Rivers moves to enter roundtable discussion, Senator Tucker seconds**
  - Round-Table Discussion:
    - Senator Tucker: **POI** for Senator Rivers – What is the difference between members at large and officer of the council?
      - Rivers: I'm going off the definition from the Office of Involvement that an officer is a president, vice president, treasurer, and secretary or whatever equivalent of those are. A member at large is not one of those roles.
    - Senator Rivers: If you were in the summer senate, you'd know that a previous form of the bill failed in this committee. However, the sponsor did change some things and brought it back to us however I still have some things that I would want to change. One thing is the timeline for JuCC receiving applications. If you go to 302.4 B, it says that applications must be publicly released by the outgoing senior class council no later than two weeks after the spring general election. It goes on to say the newly elected senior class council shall receive all completed applications by

their inauguration as well as any new applications. I do not support this because as the outgoing senior class council, they cannot release applications because at this point, they would not be in their roles anymore. It should be the current senior class council who is constructing applications, making the questions, and fine-tuning the applications. It should not be the duty of the outgoing senior class council to deal with this because it is just not typically how things are done in any organization on campus. I will be making an amendment to that section specifically.

- Senator Tucker: **POI** to Senator Rivers: How can we correct this issue?
  - Senator Rivers: For me, what I see is after the new SrCC has been elected, after they have been inaugurated after the spring general election, you give them two weeks' time to send out the applications. It should be the duty of those in those roles to make the applications rather than those who are no longer in the roles.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to the Sponsor: Are you agreeable to the changes brought up by the previous senator?
  - Senator Folwell: If it's striking "outgoing SrCC" then yes, I'm friendly. If the amendment the previous senator is speaking of is a little more broad it may be trickier to get me on board.
- **Senator Rivers moves to amend.**
  - Senator Rivers: Strike "by the outgoing SrCC no later than two weeks after Spring General Election" and amend to "within fourteen (14) business after the Spring Student Government Election" and we can work from there.
  - **Senator Tucker seconds amendment**
  - **Sponsor does find it friendly; amendment is adopted.**
- Senator Boisvert: **POI** for the Sponsor: Is there a situation in which the inauguration happens within those fourteen business days and then it's kind of left ambiguous as to whose job it is to nominate the JuCC?
  - Senator Folwell: I don't think we'll ever have an inauguration that fast. This amendment should've fixed that. We'd have to make an identical change to the SoCC portion.
- Senator Rivers: What this is doing so that after the newly elected SrCC has been inducted into their roles, it gives them the opportunity to release the applications to the JrCC.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to the Sponsor: Can you clarify why you don't believe the previous statements are correct?
  - Senator Folwell: I do not believe that to be true after reading the student election codes. If he's trying to do this so that the new class councils have to do that, it would just push back the confirmation process even further. We need to change the addition I have under that. I misunderstood what the amendment was supposed to do.
- Senator Rivers: First of all, it's looking like this bill is going to get chopped up. I'd recommend that the sponsor withdraw the bill and resubmit with changes. Let me be clear, the applications would open after inauguration and the newly elected SrCC would oversee this.
- Senator Tucker: And I think with the previous editor said, I think it's pretty fair to give them a little bit of a buffer zone. Now, you know, obviously, it is

going to push back the confirmation process, but sometimes it's better I feel like to do things right than rushed. And I think that just having those 14 extra days. I think that gives them an appropriate amount of time to figure out where to go do before they open those applications, I think that's pretty fair.

- Senator Rivers: It doesn't really matter how long after they're in their positions, it takes for them to open up the application because the gag is that people are going to have to go to summer senate any way to get confirmed, regardless of anything.
- Senator Boisvert: **POI** to the sponsor: Can you explain, kind of in depth, how the application process timeline is structured for this because I think I'm very lost as to what applications are received to the reviewed by and who this bill is supposed to be giving that power to confirm?
  - Senator Folwell: My understanding of it is the spring election happens, right. And once that spring collection is done, there are five days for the application to open for sophomore and junior class councils. When you go back on the class councils' Instagram page, you can see that this must have been the supposed interpretation, because almost consistently five days after the spring general election, the applications have opened.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to anyone: Did we ever get the other class councils confirmed this summer?
  - Senator Folwell: we got the President and Vice Presidents of the junior and sophomore class councils confirmed and the treasurer and Secretary are not subject to send a confirmation, so yes, we did.
- **Senator Tucker moves to allow a non-senator to speak. No objections.**
- Senator Rivers: Alright so this bill is obviously getting on my nerves and I'm sure it's getting on some of your nerves. So, I'm going to go ahead and make amendments that I see fit.
- **Senator Rivers moves to amend.**
  - Senator Rivers: Can you change "election" to "inauguration"? Also, strike "The newly...as they come in." and reintroduce the last line that's struck out.
  - **Senator Tucker seconds. Senator Boisvert objects.**
  - **Amendment Sponsor into opening statement:** Senator Rivers – What this is doing is that after the inauguration, the new people who have been elected are fully in their positions. After that date, we give them 14 business days for them to put out applications for So and JrCCs. I brought the deadline part to be nice to them.  
**Yields with 2:02**
  - **Senator Tucker moves to end roundtable on the amendment. Senator Boisvert seconds.**
  - Senator Casiple: I agree with the changes that were made but maybe we change the amount of business days to ten business days so that it's not a full three weeks.
  - Senator Tucker: My thoughts exactly. I do think business could just be regular days and that it wouldn't be problematic.
  - Senator Folwell: I'm texting the SrCC president and he's on board. We're on board with this amendment.

- Senator Tucker: **POI** to Senator Folwell: can the SrCC speak right now?
- Senator Folwell: No idea.
- **Senator Boisvert moves to call the question on the amendment, Senator Schindler seconds. Senator Tucker objects. Motion withdrawn.**
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to Bruce Suarez: Do you find this amendment friendly?
  - Bruce Suarez: Thanks for having me. Yeah, I'm currently with the senior class councils and we're all on board with it.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to the Bruce Suarez: Are you agreeable to the first amendment in yellow?
- Bruce Suarez: Yes, I'm agreeable to that.
- **Senator Tucker moves to call the question. Senator Boisvert seconds. No objections.**
- Closing Statement for amendment: Rivers – I know there was talk about changing business days and I think that's fine, but I just wanted to make sure people had time to do it. **Waives rest of time.**
- Vote:
- Yes: 7, Senators Tucker, Rivers, Casiple, Schindler, Drackely, Boisvert, Vice Chair Maglin
- No: 0
- Abstain: 0
- Back in roundtable:
- Senator Tucker: I move to amend.
  - Senator Tucker: Strike out the "business" from "fourteen business days".
  - **Amendment found friendly by the sponsor.**
- Senator Rivers: I move to amend.
  - Senator Rivers: Let's change the JrCC and SoCC to say that they have 14 days to release applications for those councils.
  - **Senator Tucker seconds. No objections.**
  - **Amendment found friendly by the sponsor.**
- **Senator Rivers calls question for Bill 72, Senator Boisvert seconds. Senator Tucker objects.**
  - **Withdrawn.**
- Senator Tucker: I move to amend.
  - Senator Tucker: Can you add my name to the primary?
- Senator Rivers: I will commend the sponsor for resubmitting this bill and I'm proud to see where it is.
- **Senator Rivers moves to call question on Bill 72, Senator Tucker seconds. No objections.**
- Closing statement:
  - Folwell (P): I wanted to thank you all, especially the person who made the bulk of the amendments there. You know you're a great ally and I'm glad we could come to an agreement on this. I really appreciate you taking the time to create some of the amendments, and I appreciate your efforts. That being said, I'm still struggling to compose myself after that impersonation thing, so I thank you all for bearing with me. I wave the rest of my time. **Waives with 44s.**

- Vote:
  - Yes: 5, Senators Rivers, Boisvert, Casiple, Schindler, Maglin,
  - No:
  - Abstain: 1, Senator Tucker
- 
- **RESULT: BILL 72 PASSES**

- **Resolution or Bill 73 - Sponsored by Senator Rivers (P)**
  - Opening Statement:
    - Rivers (P): Alright so first thing's first, the purpose of this bill just needs to be replaced with the correct one on the calendar. But yeah, basically what this is that it's just very plainly stating for the elections commission and the FSU Supreme Court exactly what details a complete Final Expense Statement is for the election season. That was a problem with the spring election because the court was just like, we're not very sure what to really go off of. So, these are very fine-tuned definitions of these things. This is one of the things that the SoE Greenwood wrote up and I took what I liked from it and made a few changes that fit for all parties involved. And with that I yield. **Yields with 1:41.**
  - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
    - None
  - **Vice Chair Maglin moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Casiple seconds**
  - Round-Table Discussion:
    - Senator Casiple: **POI** for the Sponsor: Regarding the referenced statutes that are struck out, are those guidelines non-existent anymore? Or if this passes, would those statutes have to be struck out?
      - Senator Rivers: So, for those sections it did not work the way I'm specifying it. The problem last election season was that these statutes were too vague and what's on this bill is very clean cut. It's right here, in your face.
    - Senator Tucker: After looking at this, it's a good thing but it needs an amendment. So, I move to amend.
      - Senator Tucker: If you could strike out the Purpose portion and replace it with "Defining what a Complete, Incomplete, and Fraudulent Final Expense Statement is"
      - **Senator Casiple seconds; No objections**
      - **Sponsor finds it friendly.**
    - Senator Tucker: The bill looks good, and I'm going to give you all a second to look over it.
  - **Senator Tucker moves to call the question; Senator Casiple seconds**
  - Closing Statement:
    - Rivers (P): What I was saying is that this is something that is clearly defining for the election commissions and the FSU Supreme Court just in case they have to review anything related to Final Expense Statements they know what to go off of. With **Waives with 1:03.**
  - Vote:
    - Yes: 5, Senator(s) Tucker, Rivers, Schindler, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin
    - No: 0
    - Abstain: 0
  - **RESULT: BILL 73 PASSES**

- **Constitutional Amendment 3 – Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P); Drackley, Folwell, Tucker (Co)**
  - Opening Statement:
    - Chair Diaz (P): This is a constitutional amendment, and I suggest that you read the current text of it and how it's currently written, because it's honestly, a little bit confusing. I believe the current interpretation is that if a position is vacant within the student government, it's two thirds vote to approve that confirmation. And I don't really like that. I don't think it necessarily makes sense because let's say if there was a situation where the HLSU director position became open. If the position is vacant, it's two thirds but if there's a current office holder majority. So, you have a situation where it's the same candidate for the same position, getting two different standards of treatment, based on circumstances, outside of their control. And I know it's three minutes I'm a little bit short on time, I want to reserve time for my closing but, again, completely open to answering any questions that you all have. **Yield with 1:52**
  - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
    - None
  - **Senator Tucker moves to enter roundtable discussion, Senator Rivers seconds**
  - Round-Table Discussion:
    - Senator Casiple: **POI** to the Sponsor: Can you repeat the scenario you brought up?
      - Chair Diaz: Yeah, so let's say an agency, any position and I say, I'm just giving an example the HLSU-- that's my agency-- if that director position became vacant, and somebody was forwarded for that position, in order for them to be confirmed It would be a two thirds vote of the Senate. If it's not vacant, meaning there's a current officeholder, it's a majority vote. So, it's two different situations for the same candidate for the same office. The only difference is the circumstances surrounding the need for a new person to be forwarded to me, it just doesn't make sense. It doesn't seem fair, and honestly it's a little bit confusing and it just doesn't need to be the way that it is, in my opinion, it should be a majority vote for every position in SGA, except for the exceptions that are in the amendment.
    - Chair Kariher: **POI** for the Sponsor: Under current constitutional law, you can replace, or you can forward somebody for a position that's already filled?
      - Chair Diaz: Yes, so technically the, the way that it like for the agency statutes, for example, those agency leaders don't leave office until confirmation of their successor. It's a very specific statute says that you can stay until installation of your successor.
    - Senator Rivers: So, I actually disagree with the sponsor about this change. I think if you have a vacant position, especially in the middle of the school year, I feel like it should be the goal of the senate to make sure the best candidate is put forward for that. I think the best way to do that is

to have two thirds of the Senate vote. I get what you're saying about the difference between the two different scenarios, but that's my opinion.

- Senator Tucker: I agree with the former senator. Though you still have that disconnect there I feel like if we want to make sure that the best possible person is getting in, we should just make it two thirds for everything.
- Senator Rivers: Yeah, that's where my head's at and I think it should be left as it is.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to the sponsor: I guess we can make it a yes or no thing. Do you believe that-- obviously, we believe that it should be an equal amount of voting, regardless of the, of the situation-- but do you believe that it could be more beneficial to have the two thirds instead?
  - Chair Diaz: I'm not prepared to endorse 2/3 for everything because that's not the purpose of this amendment. that's not like the purpose of this amendment I think the purpose of this is just to make it more fair and less confusing, like simpler to follow. It was super confusing, having to like reference the constitution like okay but if this is vacant, like is this position they can't like if it's not big, but it was such a mess.
- Senator Tucker: No matter what, there needs to be a constitutional amendment where these are equalized.
- Vice Chair Maglin: **POI** to the Sponsor: I'm just confused as to what is currently a majority vote in SGA?
  - Chair Diaz: Majority votes are positions in SGA that currently have an office holder in them that are not elected. Wait. Yeah, that are nonelected. So are all agency cabinet members. All that is majority vote, which I'm fine with, because that's how like the us senate does it that's how the state legislature does it. Every legislature in this country uses majority vote for like everything. So that's why I introduced the amendment that I did.
- Senator Rivers: Yeah, I just wanted to address something that previously to say because I do understand how it can be very confusing, but I just want to reiterate that, you know, we started in leadership positions current company responsibility and leadership was easy then everyone would do it.
- Senator Tucker: **POI** to the Sponsor: can you please explain how we would be capable of making certain positions two thirds if we want to under this new amendment.
  - Chair Diaz: Yeah, I wrote into the actual constitutional amendment that if senate wanted to make any position subject to two thirds, you can do that via a bill.
- Senator Casiple: Were there any concerns in IA?
  - Chair Diaz: I'll be completely honest with you, like it did pass IA, but like, not one question, not one point of debate, just, it was very quick. So, like realistically they just want to get through all of our business so unfortunately, we didn't have a lot of debate.
- Senator Tucker: Yeah, the thing about Judiciary is that we're always going to be a lot more stringent.
- Senator Rivers: Are we going to vote on this or?

- Senator Tucker: Yeah, you know, I really love trying to make this thing, equal, but even with having the clause that we can change the statutes, I feel like that just adds a lot more work, and maybe isn't. I think all the positions coming in they do need to be stringent. Think about all you guys were elected you know how hard of a process that is and how much work that goes into. So, I think we do need to have strict, you know, requirements for positions within SGA after looking at this some more.
- Senator Schindler: Yeah, so I just want to say I think this bill is actually perfect as is. As the sponsor said before, many other forms of government and other student governments operate under this system and being not a Supreme Court justice or an elected position requires two thirds vote. I guess those being higher positions, it does protect that and then any associate positions can be held by a majority vote I think that's very sufficient.
- Senator Rivers: We're a college campus and while we're modeled after real governmental agencies, we are our own thing and sometimes that is a good and you can't just look at what everyone else is doing and say 'oh yeah, this is going to work for me', you need to look at what's going on here-- what's going on on-campus, what are the situations on campus, and what do we want to try to do on campus-- and go from there so that's why for me personally I don't like majority vote at all. I think, especially like for the vacant position you need to be like, I don't know you need to be more stringent you just can't I'm not saying you're just letting anybody in, but you need to be very sure that what's going on is right and that you have enough people voting.
- Senator Schindler: I somewhat disagree. We all went through the election process, or at least most of us did, and in our case, were elected so majority vote. I believe this completely represents the opinion of the student body because it's the reason we were elected.
- Senator Rivers: I don't believe that it represents the whole student body. If you have 80 people, and 41 people are voting yes and 39 people vote no, I don't think that's a very clear indication that those people want something because, obviously, it was one vote off from being a tie. So, that's not a clear representation of the voice of the people. That's the voice of half the people, plus one. Let's say you have a hundred people and 49 vote no and 50 vote yes. What about those 49 people and the body they were representing?
- Senator Tucker: In the time I've spent in student government, it is more often than not people are going to vote yes for the heck of it. A lot of the time people aren't going to put the effort in, so I think we can combat that by making it stricter with the two third vote.
- Senator Schindler: On that note I do completely agree we do need to look at this from a logical point of view and that would be making this a majority vote. If that's something you disagree with, we should raise the bar to make at least 70% of the vote to count for senators then, because obviously 50% of doesn't cut it.
- Senator Tucker: The difference is that these candidates aren't elected by the student body they're often appointed by the Student Body President, so there needs to be more oversight. Often times I would agree with you, but with these elected positions, it's not the people putting these people in office, so we need to be stringent to make sure we're getting the very best

possible person because there may be times in which the Student Body President may appoint their friend and that's why we need to have these guidelines.

- **Senator Rivers moves to call the question; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**
- Closing Statement:
  - Chair Diaz (P): I'm hearing a lot of, like, Mitch McConnell type talk about why we need the filibuster and why majority is not enough, which is fine. Now that being said, I think I heard a lot of folks agree with the idea that the constitution as it's written with respect to that provision is somewhat poorly written. It's confusing it's unnecessary. This is just one potential proposal for trying to fix that. Again, a majority vote is using every legislature, almost that every level of government, even in several different countries on things much more important than confirmations things like budgets things like vote of no confidence. A lot of those things are more important than confirmations and they aren't majority because sometimes it's hard for democracy to get more than a majority vote on anything. We can see the effects of that in the U.S. senate right now. That being said, I appreciate all the debate—Judiciary has always been a great committee. But you know if this fails, which it sounds like it will, I probably won't be touching this again if somebody wants to make it two thirds for everything you're welcome to. **Waives with 32s.**
- Vote:
  - Yes: 1, Senator Schindler
  - No: 4, Senator(s) Casiple, Tucker, Rivers, Vice Chair Maglin
  - Abstain: 0
- **RESULT: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 3 DOES NOT PASS**

#### **Unfinished Business:**

- None

#### **Closing Announcements:**

- Chair Kariher: Look out in the chat for availability for our next meeting.
- Senator Rivers: I want to talk in regard to the incident that occurred earlier in this meeting with a person coming in and posing as one of the senators and saying, a racial slur in the group chat. I just want it to be known that the incident has been reported to the university via report and it has been reported to the university via a zoom recording system. I will be emailing Jacqueline and I we will be emailing Dr. Williams, and I may also be emailing Dr. Hect about this because it's going to be my goal to get down to the bottom of that and find who that person was, no matter how we have to do—even if we have to start tracking IP addresses and things like that. I will be hunting that person down and ensuring that if they are a student at Florida State University that they are brought in front of the Student Board of Conduct to answer for their actions this evening.
- Senator Tucker: Congrats to you, Cole, on your first meeting you did great as well as everyone. Now after failing this past constitutional amendment, we do have a problem in front of us. And I believe it's our responsibility. Since the problem was not solved, we must find a way. So, I'm going to start looking at proposing a new amendment

constitutional amendment and I think that's something that anyone else would like to join on, they should. So, shoot me a text if we all want to work on it together.

**Next Meeting:** TBA

**Adjourned:** 8:15 p.m.



---

**Signature of Chair Kariher**



---

**Signature of Vice-Chair Maglin**