



**72nd Student Senate
Judiciary Committee
Date: March 30th, 2020**

Call to Order: 8:05 p.m.

Members Present: Chair Leckie, Vice Chair Slimak, Senator(s) Adamyk, Parker, Gerts, Ready, Sojos, Weber

Members Tardy: Senator(s)

Members Excused Absent: Senator(s) Ascanio and Absten

Members Absent: Senator(s) Recht, Silvia

Guests: Vice Chair Villacorta, Senator Chabot, Senator-Elect Ashley Gonzalez, Chair Daraldik, Vice Chair Porter, President Denton, Senator Levin, Chair Gnamam, Chair Baxter, Senator Donnelly

Announcements:

- Chair - Please follow the guidelines I sent out to do this zoom meeting. I hope
- Vice Chair - I hope everyone is staying safe and taking care of themselves through these times, please reach out and utilize the resources available. We can get through this together
- Members - Gerts: I am looking forward to continuing working with in Judiciary! Excited to be back
- Guests - X

Committee Business:

- **Bill 26** - Sponsored by Senator Adamyk - to amend Student Body Statutes Chapter 504 in regards to qualifications for the Student Defender position. This bill will allow any student enrolled at Florida State who has completed at least 60 credit hours to be eligible for the position, given approval and forwarding by the appropriate parties.
- **Bill 31** - Sponsored by Senator Levin - to define major legislation. [REMANDED BACK TO JUDICIARY]
- **Bill 35** - Sponsored by Senator Levin - to outline legislative procedure related to holy days. [REMANDED BACK TO JUDICIARY]
- **Resolution 36** - Sponsored by Senator Villacorta - to increase the oversight role of the Internal Affairs Committee
- **Bill 62** - Sponsored by Senators Villacorta and Gnamam - to remove unconstitutional powers from Student Body Statutes. [REMANDED BACK TO JUDICIARY]
- **Bill 69** - Sponsored by Senator Porter - to revise the timeline for voting on senate awards in the spring semester

Old Business:

- **Bill 26** - Sponsored by Senator Adamyk - to amend Student Body Statutes Chapter 504 in regards to qualifications for the Student Defender position. This bill will allow any student enrolled at Florida State who has completed at least 60 credit hours to be eligible for the position, given approval and forwarding by the appropriate parties.
 - Opening Statement
 - Adamyk: Thank you judiciary, we have finally been able to get the meeting with student affairs the week before all of this hit. The main change we made is changing the name to student advisor. (2:09 to closing)
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - X: none
 - Senator Gerts moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Weber seconds
 - Round Table
 - Weber moves to amend as sponsor requested
 - Gerts seconds
 - Sponsor finds it friendly
 - Gerts: are there any changes beyond the change of name within this bill
 - Adamyk: the only other thing is opening up this position to all students rather than just L2 law students
 - Gerts: I like this bill, this allows us to provide a position that will give an opportunity to all students to be part of the judicial branch, rather than just law students. This also gives to the judicial branch, supporting their roles more, along with the personal development
 - Weber: The 2Ls used to be payed within this position, will this remain in this system?
 - Adamyk: I do not believe that they get paid anymore, rather they recieve hours.
 - Ready: compliments to sponsor, as i know how long this has been in the works, and how much effort he put in to ensure that this bill was done correctly. I yield in full support
 - Senator Sojos moves to call the question
 - Senator Gerts seconds
 - Vote
 - Gerdt - Yes
 - Parker - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
 - Weber - Yes
 - **Bill RESULT 6-0-0 Pass**
 -
- **Bill 31** - Sponsored by Senator Levin - to define major legislation. [REMANDED BACK TO JUDICIARY]
 - Opening Statement
 - Levin: Hope everyone is doing well, this will be adding chapter 420.1 and 420.2. This will create a definition of major legislation, and discuss the scheduling of major legislation. This was discussed in the fall, and we have been making the edits sense. A lot of senators have put time into this, so thank you to all (1:10 yielded to closing)

- Technical, Non-Detableable
 - X:
- Senator Sojos moves to enter Round Table Discussion
- Senator Weber seconds
- Round Table
 - Gerts: clerical question, am I a cosponsor of this?
 - Gerts moves to amend bill as sponsor has provided as well as adding myself as a cosponsor
 - Sojos seconds
 - Sponsor finds it friendly
 - Gerts: I am in support of this legislation, this will increase inclusivity within student government. I appreciate that we have worked on this to ensure that this is how we want it to be overall, and taking the time that it deserves. I am glad that SGA and Senate is working to be accepting and inclusive of all
 - Ready: This bill will help with major legislation, ensuring that all students have a voice within what we do. It is integral to ensure that we are representing and including all students on campus
 - Sojos: I like that this does not limit what major legislation is defined as, rather senators are able to make the request to the senate president
 - Weber: Im glad this is finally coming through, as it is an important part of representing our campus and students
- Senator Gerts moves to call the question
- Senator Sojos seconds
- Vote
 - Gerds - Yes
 - Parker - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
 - Weber - Yes
- **Bill RESULT 6-0-0 Pass**
-
- **Bill 35** - Sponsored by Senator Levin - to outline legislative procedure related to holy days. [REMANDED BACK TO JUDICIARY]
 - **BILL WITHDRAWN**
- **Resolution 36** - Sponsored by Senator Villacorta and Chabot - to increase the oversight role of the Internal Affairs Committee
 - Opening Statement
 - X: Putting some proposed amendments in the zoom chat, came up with amendments that can ease concerns, hopefully narrows this down, we want to reaffirm this process, allows us to conduct oversight without going into formal investigation, fact finding opportunity, using what we found as portion of their investigation, put in limits in reasons for calling for review (0:01)
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - X:
 - Senator Sojos moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Weber seconds
 - Round Table

- Weber: Under C1, do you have a standard of proof before we call an investigation? Or are we relying on hearsay?
- Villacorta: we are trying to leave it as vague as it could be, as this is an informal process. This allows for the information to be heard depending on circumstance
- Weber: Could I investigate another senator?
- Villacota: sure, they are a major office. Ideally this could be just a conversation, but it could be more formal as an investigation
- Sojos: I don't really like this, IA would be able to investigate more into a person, then present to the senate, then the judiciary then again investigate and go into impeachment. This will be a lot longer
- Ready: this is already under 406, this will create another burden in which the committee would have to undergo. This is already in place for the judiciary. This is an investigation that would then lead to another investigation, just extending this process. What new information would be found from this? If we want an informal conversation, we should be able to do that as senators. Being in writing makes this formal
- Villacorta: this would be in Rules, it wouldn't be an investigation, rather a review such as a bureau review. We are hesitant to call an investigation, where hopefully this would be an informal process. This would allow for an investigation to be based off of the review. This gives established evidence and understanding of what is happening.
- Chabot: Having this within IA creates a platform for the information to be recorded within. Because there is a review does not mean there has to be an investigation.
- Ready: If we currently have issues calling investigations, we should address that rather than just adding another step. At the end of the day things will end up in 406 with an investigation. I do not understand why IA does not have the confidence to do this already as a committee vote to launch an investigation. If we are accusing someone of a potential issue, we want to ensure a stable and formal process which all parties can rely on. These lax rules could be abused moving forward. If there are issues within the positions, we should have a conversation and investigation. This is redundant, 406 has been within our powers for years. This does nothing but a precursor for an
- Slimak: Previously we discussed how these more casual conversations are mainly the job of the Student Body Vice President. Checking in with agencies, projects, and major positions. Have you spoken to Stephanie Lee yet?
- Villacota: No, I have a big issues consulting the executive branch talking with legislative issues.
- Chabot: We should have the same power of oversight as executive branch
- Weber: I agree with Kelvin: If we are only informally talking as a senator, we are just too afraid to investigate them. This is close to the rules and callender rules with impeachment, which has shown to greatly slow the process of impeachment. This is trying to circumvent the powers of subpoena, I believe this is going to create major conflict between all aspects of student government. This bill's goal can already be established, yield against

- Sojos: When first discussed, if someone did not show up to review than it could be used against them in investigation. Why are we using something within Senate rules against non senators.
 - Villacota: Sojos is blatantly wrong, Wrect mentioned this could be seen as suspicious. Please quote minutes correctly by citing them. It's not that hard
 - This solves an issue to not start an investigation based on political issues. This allows for being seen as a political issue, and prevents investigations to be called on political accounts.
 - Chabot: We will consult with Vice President Lee, but this just establishes the ability of IA to start a review
 - Gerts: I fail to see any purpose in this. There is nothing coercing me to show up, so I wouldn't. This has no teeth that require it to have formalized rules. More could be accomplished by having IA's internal rules include a request to students to come talk. This just spells out clearly a formal manner that eliminates a separate process. This already occurs as senators asking questions. This adds a lengthy formalized process that does most the job of investigation. This expands IAs power, trying to take over investigations while ignoring suppenas. Which overall makes this process pointless, as it is ignoring the main reason for the process. This becomes dubious when around other senators, which is difficult to understand
 - Parker: I agree with a few senators and their comments, at the bottom line, if we are going to do something with our name stamped on it, it needs to be standard and professional. We already have something that does this process, we should be able to see, support, and respect this
 - Ready: one last point, this isn't an annualized review. Beausos go through review because it is an annual basis. Positions are not annual. This is singling out individuals, which is an investigation. If some are reviewed and others are not, there is an unconstitutional manner occurring. This bill does not see through enough of these issues to even be constitutional
 - Weber: This process is dubious. This resolution will only hurt the process that it is apparently trying to help. This will increase polarized issues within the senate. This will create more conflict, and taking up too much time with our limited time
 - Baxter: I can see this from the perspective outside of IA. I am in favor of this, as IA has a very specific role within Senate. Our last thought is other senators, this is not an investigation. This is not informal, this is a process we are laying out. We are able to understand people and positions who are not fulfilling the roles that we have forwarded people for. We don't need resolutions to single out people, rather we want to have conversations to help support students. This will ensure that all postings are doing the best that they can within their roles.
 - Gerts: I appreciate your comments Chair Baxter, I worry that this runs into unconstitutional grounds. It is the job of the senate to review and affirm the positions that the executive branch oversees. It is only our job to remove them if an impeachment process is needed. This could very easily be abused, especially within political situations. Before we do this we need to ensure that all parties are spoken to, and that this is done correctly. I could not support this piece of legislation
- Senator Weber moves to call the question

- Senator Sojos seconds
- Closing: thanks for debating this time
- Vote
 - Gerdtz - No
 - Parker - No
 - Ready - No
 - Slimak - No
 - Sojos - No
 - Weber - No
- **Bill RESULT 0-6-0 Fails**

New Business:

- **Bill 62** - Sponsored by Senators Villacorta and Gnanam - to remove unconstitutional powers from Student Body Statutes. [REMANDED BACK TO JUDICIARY]
 - **Waiting for Supreme court advisory opinion**
- **Bill 69** - Sponsored by Senator Porter - to revise the timeline for voting on senate awards in the spring semester
 - Opening Statement
 - Porter: Thank you all for hearing me tonight, this will simply change the date for voting on awards. Currently voting has to take place two weeks before inauguration, when we do not typically know when this would be. This moves the date the week after the spring election as we have done in years past (2:06 to closing)
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - X: none
 - Senator Gerts moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Slimak seconds
 - Round Table
 - Gerts: I don't like ridiculous problems, I do like simple solutions. I like this bill, as it gives us known dates. Yield in full support
 - Ready: I like this bill, as this is set in stone. Libo is so hard and unfair, as this will help set our dates and times. Yield in full support
 - Senator Gerts moves to call the question
 - Senator Ready seconds
 - Closing: thank you all for deliberation. This simply sets the voting date in stone.
 - Vote
 - Gerdtz - Yes
 - Parker - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
 - Weber - Yes
 - **Bill RESULT 6-0-0 Pass**

Unfinished Business: Articles of Impeachment discussion

- We are either recommending or not recommending to the senate if the Senators should be forwarded to the Supreme Court for impeachment or not, a simple majority vote of the judiciary to pass, and $\frac{2}{3}$ of senate to pass to supreme court.
- This is just about absences, no other offences

Committee Legislative Round Table: None

Final Announcements:

Leckie: Hopefully we all learned a bit and will help make senate go smoothly

Slimak: Thank you all again for a great judiciary meeting, once again I am so proud in our ability to adapt and overcome these situations. Tomorrow (Tuesday 3/31) the Student Alumni Association will be hosting a virtual speaker series! Members of the Young Alumni Council will be speaking through zoom tomorrow at 6 pm. Please tune in! Links will be on the SAA instagram page, please reach out to me with any questions!

Gerts: Thank you all for a great night of work and making me feel not socially distant. Thank you for allowing my bird Suzie as a guest. I look forward to doing this work together. I ask that we take these impeachment hearings very seriously, it is important and a solemn duty. We are making a decision of the mark on the senators and positions, please treat them with as much respect as possible.

Chabot: I know i have been having a hard time social distancing, I am always available to chat and talk if you ever need anything. We are all in this together

Weber: We made history tonight! First virtual judiciary. We are also making history with impeachment on absences next week, and we do not take this too harshly.

Gnanam: I just wanted to share and show my new chickens. Have fun social distancing, its been great for my GPA

Porter: I am also in Tallahassee, come to finance tomorrow, through zoom. I hope everyone is taking care of themselves.

Date and Time of Next Meeting: Monday, April 6th 2020 at 8:00 at <https://fsu.zoom.us/j/587929923>

Adjourned: 9:24 p.m.

Griffin Leckie

Signature of Chair