



**74th Student Senate
Internal Affairs Committee
February 14th, 2022 at 6:30pm | <https://fsu.zoom.us/j/2340400302>**

Zoom Recording:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RVvjUG7xNtb7a83QXeVPkbV4CN4sbgi/view?usp=sharing>

Call to Order: 6:32

Members Present: Chair Russell, Vice Chair Diaz, Senators Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Hautrive, Lessard, Downing, Murray, Drackley

Members Tardy:

Members Absent: Senators Fox (E), Barberis (E), Suarez (U)

Guests: COGS Speaker Gaurav Harshe, Senator Wang

Land Acknowledgement – Chair Russell

- 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:

- **Chair Russell:** We are doing bureau review next week. I will email bureau directors back this week as I have not heard back with any responses. Hopefully they will appear so we can review them. We have Rudolph Adonis tonight for Senate Clerk, our candidate for Student Council for Accessibility and Advocacy did not respond to our emails – hopefully he will show up as it's his fourth week not being here. Our candidate for Attorney General, Corey Adamyk, cannot show up until 7pm, so if we get through our candidate (Adonis) before he can come, we will recess so Adamyk can be heard.
- **Vice Chair Diaz:** Once again, I urge all of you to review the Senate minutes from July 21, 2021. I put them in the GroupMe, as one of our candidates up for confirmation tonight was discussed on the Senate floor. I think it's important to understand the

circumstances around why he was not confirmed for that position as context for the discussion we are going to have tonight. I understand that the debate tonight may become controversial, but it is important that while we represent our constituents and do our jobs of providing advice and consent or checks and balances, that we remain respectful of all of our candidates and ourselves. I think that Senate deserves no less than our full respect.

- **Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson:** Happy Valentine's Day! Please be objective tonight. I know that emotions surrounding these discussions can become quite strong. I think there is a way to be both empathetic as well as objective. I hope people have read those minutes as Vice Chair Diaz said. Try to put yourselves in the shoes of the communities that have been outspoken to do our job properly tonight. I don't want anyone getting sued this time. That's the last thing that should happen to any of us. I personally do not want to be sitting over at the College of Law until 2am on any night of the week, so let's do our job properly. Once again, let's be empathetic and objective.
- **Senator Lessard:** Also wanting to echo the sentiments of the previous speakers. I think about five of us were members of the 73rd Senate when this all went down in summer. This particular candidate was forwarded to the Senate twice before for the position. His confirmation hearing on the night of the 21st was honestly the most controversial of the discussions – definitely something to review. I know my big thing is, there were 3 applicants for this position – why forward the same person again? I will definitely be asking him that tonight. Just keeping it as apolitical as possible. You can ask about his voting record without making it seem like a political attack. We all read that memo on Viewpoint Neutrality. Really keeping that in mind tonight is going to be the only way to make this as objective of a conversation and debate as possible. Definitely keep that in mind, it is going to get a little bit heated, and honestly, if he passes tonight, I do expect it to get heated on the Senate floor on Wednesday as well. Just keep that in mind. If you need to, take a break, take a moment. Turn off your camera and walk away. He was a controversial candidate in the 73rd Senate and I don't believe that is going to change here as well.
- **Senator Murray:** On another note, I had a meeting with Dr. Williams today about the Center for Participant Education. We don't believe that it needs to necessarily be totally nixed from statutes per se, given the way bureau review would probably have lended itself, given that it has been inactive for a long time. But as their liaison, I plan on revitalizing it in a way – I think there's a really great place for it to come back. I think it definitely did tackle some issues that certain communities face that I think there is a need for on this campus. Sort of like progressive education – alternative education, from the sort of stuff that you learn everywhere of campus, sort of the establishment. So a couple of things I think are priorities of mine include respecting the history – it was established in the 70s and suspended at some point, which is a long time. Also to revitalize it to make sure that moving forward, it is doing what needs to be done to seize the opportunities and its potential. Also to recruit a board so if anybody's interested in it, it would be really great to have people on a team who are excited by this and to understand the value of the things that can be done – the things that should be done, and the new things that could be undertaken by it. Not to ramble, but it would basically be, moving forward, I think there's a lot of great potential for it to sort of be an opportunity for people to come and learn about just basically everything. So students, teachers, staff, people in the community could come and put on events sort of like classes to help educate people on certain things. So for example, if you were interested in playing the flute, you could come put on – I think about that. If you were so passionate about the, let's say, movie *ET*, you could come teach a class about *ET*. So that'd be very cool. Another thing that could happen would be queer art in Russia. Looking through the

course catalog from 2019, there was a class that was Intro to Dumpster Diving, which is exactly what it sounds like, but there was also a class on Feminism in Palestine. So that is something I think is really, really cool, and has kept our minority communities – or nonestablishment communities – have been lacking since it's been gone and I think there's really great potential for it to come back. If you have any questions about that, I'm very passionate about it and would love to talk to you about it if you'd like to come on board. We'd also take statute revision for it also.

- **Chair Russell:** Do you know if anyone involved with CPE has access to their email that is posted on the website?
- **Senator Murray:** I cannot say for sure. When I sent two emails to them for bureau review, no one answered, so I can't imagine anyone does.
- **Chair Russell:** I'm in the same position with the Office of Student Sustainability. It's pretty much going the same way that Senator Murray was saying. I would like to see it revitalized, as people have not wanted to be on its e-board in a while.

Committee Business:

- **Candidate for 74th Student Senate Clerk** – Rodolph Adonis
- **Candidate for Veterans Student Union, Assistant Director** – Haley Olsen
- **Candidate for Attorney General** – Corey Adamyk

Old Business:

- **Candidate for Student Council for Accessibility Advocacy, Committee Member**
– Roberto Ortiz

New Business:

- **Candidate for Confirmation: Rodolph Adonis – 74th Student Senate Clerk**
 - Opening Statement:
 - I am a major in Criminology and a minor in Political Science. I did two years in TCC before transferring to FSU this last fall. I was involved in Black Men Achievers, was a student athlete and a peer advisor. I was able to work closely with advisors to provide resources to upcoming freshmen, so I have an idea as to how to help students, which is the reason I want to be in the SGA – to provide me the opportunity to stay engaged with students and to be a voice for them and to help them understand that there is someone on the inside looking out for them that they can rely on. One of my goals, if I have the opportunity, is to create an environment at FSU where students feel welcomed and feel like they have somebody that is looking out for them. I want them to be able to talk to me to help them get their problems resolved.
 - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Are you currently financially certified?
 - Yes.
 - General Round of Questioning:
 - Senator Lessard: Are you involved in any other organizations on campus at this time?
 - I have been trying to get involved since last semester, and I currently serve as Vice President of the Legal Empowerment Brigades.

- Senator Fronczak: You mention in your application how you value teamwork as a leadership style. How do you feel communication plays into your use of teamwork?
 - I would say when it comes to communication, it's basically about understanding that everyone has different values and perspectives than you. When it comes to teamwork, it's basically listening to hear what your colleague has to say so we can work as a team to actually work on the bigger picture.
- Senator Murray: Being Senate Clerk is about urgency, organization, and everyone in Senate relying on this position to have all of our documents in the right place and to have Canvas updated. I wanted to know about your organizational and time management skills.
 - Being a peer advisor allows me to understand that time management is something big when it comes to managing work and school. When it comes to that, I understand the difference between school, different organizations, and athletic commitments. At TCC, I had to focus on prioritizing all of my time.
- Senator Murray: What do you do for yourself to relax when times get stressful?
 - To destress, I have a book called *Think and Grow* that I like to read, along with other books I read to get things off my mind.
- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: With this being a new position, are you ready to take it on and are you able to outline the expectations of the position?
 - I understand this is a new position. The position entails managing the calendars and passing out ballots and legislation when it comes to chamber meetings. At TCC, I had to organize some meetings, listening to things that had to be done, taking notes, and be prepared to go to the dean to explain what I got from it. [sic]
- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: There has been some forms of tension between the Student Senate and members of administration. What plans do you have to make the environment more positive and amicable?
 - I want to make sure that both sides' points of view get heard.
- Closing Statement:
 - Thank you for taking the time to listen to what I had to say.
- **Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Murray seconds**
- Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: I think he is genuine and brings some good energy to Senate. We kind of need the position to be filled as there was only one applicant. I really like his vibes, his answers were short and sweet, and I think he is a good fit. I know he will kill this position. I will be voting yes.
 - Senator Lessard: I agree. The fact that he applied for a Senate seat shows an extra level of dedication that is admirable. You don't know what you're getting yourself into when you enter Student Senate at FSU, especially as a transfer student. The TCC Student Senate runs entirely different, so I understand the dedication it takes to apply to a position within FSU's Student Government. I hold him to a bit of a higher standard in that regard as he gets the chance to see the inner workings of SGA before he decided to run for a Business seat. Despite him not knowing he had an opening statement, he did really well and I think he did a great job.

- Senator Fronczak: I agree. I think he is very personable, and I appreciate how he spoke about his peer mentorship in his application and interview . It seems like whatever he gets involved with, he gets passionate and spends the time needed to excel in that position, and I think that's something very great,
 - Senator Murray: I was just kind of wanting a little bit more given this is a very difficult position to fill and knowing the way people are in terms of stepping up to the plate. I think that will definitely be done, but I have very slight pause and wanted to hear if anyone had similar feelings, but I am voting yes.
 - **Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson moves to call the question; Senator Fronczak seconds**
 - Vote:
 - Yes: 7 – Senators Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Hautrive, Lessard, Downing, Murray, Vice Chair Diaz
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
 - No Response: Drackley
- **RESULT: CANDIDATE RODOLPH ADONIS PASSES**

Senator Lessard moves to enter roundtable discussion; Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds

- Senator Lessard: With bureau review next week, I think it is a good time to discuss forwarding interview questions. I think it would be very pertinent to include information on how interviews are conducted. We can always put information regarding opening statements and interview length so that candidates like the one we just heard can be more prepared if this information was on the website.
- Chair Russell: That information is included in our Rules of Procedure, but people don't really know to look for that. That could be included on the emails that we send out, or email Ben Young to include that on the website.
- Vice Chair Diaz: I think similar to what Chair Russell said, I think it would be useful to include that information in emails to candidates whenever they need to appear before a committee. It would be ideal for committee chairs to include information on their specific committee procedures to candidates coming before them, and I think writing legislation to force that in Statutes could be useful.
- Senator Lessard: With our candidate Adonis, for example, he was slightly unprepared only because he was not aware that he would get opening and closing statements. I think he came in expecting typical interview questions like a job interview, and not the ability to tell us who they are. I think that having that type of information on the website or in his email would help make him more prepared and honestly less nervous about the process.
- Senator Fronczak: What is typically included in emails to candidates?
- Chair Russell: When I send emails, I typically include Zoom links, the time of the meeting, a congratulations message and a request that candidates let us know if they can't make it to their scheduled interview time. I can communicate that information way better and am willing to help candidates be more prepared, which is an error on my part. I may also include a link to our Rules of Procedure so everyone feels prepared and no one feels inadequate at our meetings.

- Vice Chair Diaz: Do we think it is worth it to introduce a bill mandating what committee chairs should be including in their emails to candidates?
- Chair Russell: Sure.
- Senator Lessard: I do think it's worth the time, because Rules runs their meetings slightly differently. We can also make committee chairs include the link to possible interview questions on the SGA page, which are not easy to find. I still expect a lot of Senate committees to want to continue meeting on Zooms, so I expect this model to continue past COVID, so including things like Zoom links, links to interview questions and what that entails, is important.
- Senator Murray: In my opinion, that should be a Senate Rules of Procedure change rather than changing statutes so it doesn't need approval from the Student Body President and Dr. Hecht.
- Senator Lessard: It is more of a Senate committee issue, rather than a statutes issue.
- Chair Russell: I just texted candidate Adamyk to see when exactly he could be available to join us. Continuing on to our conversation, I think this kind of change could help with continuity moving forward onto future chairs.
- Vice Chair Diaz: I may have missed it, but did we get a response from the Veterans Student Union candidate?
- Chair Russell: Yes, she could not come because of classes, but can come next week when the meeting goes back to being at 7:30pm.
- Senator Murray: I believe in the 73rd Senate, we passed a resolution removing the rule that chairs keep a journal to give to their next chair to prepare them. Since we have discussed transition documents last Wednesday, it would be good to pass a resolution requiring that chairs keep transition documents and provides transparency as to the conduct of committee chairs.
- Senator Lessard: I agree, I think a change like that could have helped with Consent Resolution 9 for example. Had Chair Rider been able to get a hold of the RTAC email sooner instead of sending them all at once, I think we would not have been as shocked by the large size of the resolution.
- Senator Murray: Do we feel prepared to handle a controversial candidate or should we wait another week?
- Chair Russell: I would personally like to table this nomination to stress that everyone reads the minutes and be prepared because this candidate has already been forwarded and has been viewed as controversial. He has said that he will be ready by 7:30, so that is up to you if you would like that.
- Senator Lessard: Because this candidate is controversial, I am wanting to deal with this kind of nomination sooner rather than later, if he can be here in the next 15-ish minutes. This will likely be a long Senate meeting on the floor either way if he is passed by the committee. Senator Murray makes a good point that we would be hearing the candidate on SGA Election Day if he is passed next week in Senate. That meeting will be chaotic enough, and I don't want to be hearing a controversial candidate on Election Day.
- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: I think we should go ahead and get it done tonight. I hope you have done your research by now, as that is the expectation of our committee. Are you really going to read minutes if you haven't done so already? I don't want to do this on Election Day either with the whole Senate, as there are other things going on. People are going to leave the meeting, and we know how Election Days normally happen in Senate. I say we just get it done.
- Senator Murray: Be mindful about viewpoint neutrality, because there are certain words that can be used that can be not neutral. Let's just make sure we be mindful of that, and that happens when we're characterizing a candidate as – a certain way. To say that, um,

yeah, so be neutral. And there are certain adjectives about candidates that we've been using that may not be neutral. So just be mindful of viewpoint neutrality. [sic]

- Senator Hautrive: When I was in summer Senate this past summer, I heard this candidate before. He had great answers and sounded like a great candidate for the job. I didn't find out anything that really happened that would diminish his character until we hit the actual Senate meeting. But I wouldn't take it to heart, any of us, I would just try to be objective about everything and remember at the end of the day to take it with a grain of salt. It's Monday, it's Valentine's Day, let's try to be happy.

**Vice Chair Diaz moves to recess until 7:30pm; Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.
INTERNAL AFFAIRS IS RECESSED UNTIL 7:30**

Chair Russell calls meeting to order at 7:30pm.

Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson moves to exit committee roundtable; Senator Fronczak seconds.

- **Candidate for Confirmation: Corey Adamyk – Attorney General**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Fantastic. Thank you very much, Chair Russel, and thank you all for hearing me tonight. I want to apologize, first off, for being late. Like I said, I had class and I was going to plan on leaving early, but we had a guest speaker and I figured it might be rude to try to leave early. But I'm here now. So hello everyone, my name is Corey Adamyk. For those of you that I know, it's good to see you; for those I don't, it's good to meet you. I am a masters student in the Latin American Politics and Policy program. I graduated from Florida State in the spring with majors in political science and history, and also with a certificate in U.S. Intelligence studies. I have served in student government in the past. I was in the Senate, where you all are for two years in undergrad, and then served on a campaign for student government for two months, and for the past semester and a month now or so, I've served on the Elections Commission with several other members of the Student Body and am before you here tonight as the Executive Branch's nominee for the position of Attorney General. I hope to answer any questions that you may have and I hope that I am able to win your support.
 - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Are you aware of report.fsu.edu?
 - Candidate Adamyk: I'm sorry, did you say report.fsu.edu?
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Yes.
 - Candidate Adamyk: Yes.
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Do you know how long this position has been vacant for?
 - I would presume since the current Student Body President took office.
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Has there been any need for this position during the time of this current Administration?
 - I couldn't tell you about the inner workings of this Administration.
 - General Round of Questioning:

- Senator Lessard: You were previously forwarded and denied this position by the 73rd Senate twice. What has changed since then and why should we change our position?
 - Well, actually I was only forwarded once before for this position. In regards to that, I believe there were a few concerns raised in my last hearing: that I was not an active student because I had not enrolled in classes yet, which of course is a moot point. But that being said, I also feel that there were a lot of – everything happened really fast last time and I feel like some people might have misunderstood some things or had reservations, which I can totally understand, but I am hoping to clear those all up today because the Executive Branch has given me their trust in forwarding me again.
- Senator Lessard: Are there any experiences or individuals in your life that you think help you represent and sympathize with marginalized communities on campus?
 - Of course. There are plenty of experiences – I feel like we all experience different communities every day. In regards to one specific community, when I was in Senate, I worked with the Jewish community when they were going through hard times here on campus two summers ago, and I tried to help them feel more at home because I want everyone at FSU to feel more at home. So I tried to work with them and made sure they had a voice in student government while I could in the Senate. Aside from that, you're speaking of personal experiences with marginalized communities. I feel like one of the most marginalized communities we can think of is the disabled community. And I just have to say, personally speaking, I had a brother growing up who was disabled. He was born with Trisomy 18. It's similar to – it's Edwards' Syndrome – it's similar to down syndrome. And we had to – my family had to adjust to – living with someone like that. We had to adjust our lives around a world that's not necessarily oriented towards disabled members of our community. So of course I have experiences with marginalized communities, and every time I am given the chance to have another experience with another member of any sort of community, I try to treasure that as much as possible and try to learn as much from possible as I can from that. [sic]
- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: You bring up Proverbs 31 and how it tells us to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves for the rights of all who are destitute. I would appreciate if you could provide an example of how you have done so during your time while here at Florida State, for marginalized communities on campus besides the one already provided.
 - Well, I feel like the one already provided is an example of a marginalized community. But aside from that, when I was in the Student Senate, I worked with marginalized communities all the time. I was proud to organize efforts during my time in Senate to sponsor resolutions honoring things like Black History Month and Women's History Month, and I wanted to make sure that different communities were getting the recognition they deserved in the Student Senate.

- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: A project that you hope to advocate for is “members of the Black community, Asian-American community, Latino community, Jewish community, LGBTQ+ community and so forth are to feel welcome here at Florida State.” How do you plan on using this role to do so with the power that is limited to just this role?
 - I totally agree that this role is somewhat limited. It’s more of a reactive role than a proactive role in some points. But one of the things I do want to do is try to work with all of the agencies, all of the different bureaus, and ensure that they, first of all, know that they have a voice and that they have backing in any instances – or anything they may pursue. They can count on my support and count on my backing. When push comes to shove, I’ll have their back as Attorney General as per statutes. I think I answered your question.
- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: So you talked about a reporting system implementation through student government. I’d love to hear why you feel it’s more effective to do that through student government rather than using the report.fsu.edu service that already exists and goes through administration, who actually has power to handle these sorts of sensitive situations and has more training in handling them.
 - I 100% love report.fsu.edu – well I don’t love it – I love that it’s a resource that people can utilize and I obviously am not trying to take away from that. In fact, you bring up a good point in that one of the alternative actions that I can do is to promote that and make sure people know about that because I think not everyone does know about that. But sometimes people might not necessarily be comfortable with going through report.fsu.edu or through University administration or the faculty themselves. Sometimes people like to talk to their peers and things like that And obviously I’m not trying to take on the most serious offenses, you know. The offenses that are at the top of the list of things you never do. I’m not trying to do that, and I don’t think the Attorney General really has the power to do that. That’s definitely something that the (FSU) administration should handle. But for the smaller things – the things that some people might notice. Or if something happens that maybe irks you, but it’s not something that’s necessarily a crime or something that is not prohibited by statutes but is something you want to draw attention to, that’s definitely something that a reporting mechanism through the Attorney General’s office could bring. That way, it’s something that we know is an issue. Because it’s hard to correct – it’s hard to address and correct an issue when you don’t know it exists. That’s where we get into these instances where things start to boil over and then everything just goes out of control. But when you’re able to address it head-on when it’s still a minor issue or you’re able to address it when it’s affecting people, but not everyone, so maybe not everyone might care about it, as bad as that may sound, but you’re able to bring it to attention so everyone can hear about it.
- Vice Chair Diaz: I understand that you might not be in the position to answer this question as it is about an active case and this isn’t a judicial

body, so again, if it's not your prerogative to answer, feel free to not. But is your lawsuit against former Senator Jonathan Marcus still active?

- I don't sit on the court, so I don't know their inner workings. That being said, as far as I know, the arguments have been argued and the only thing that we've been waiting on for a few months is the opinion, whenever that gets released. As to the contents of the case, all of the briefs have been submitted and everything like that has been settled. As far as I'm concerned, it's closed.
- Vice Chair Diaz: Can you explain for us why you filed that lawsuit or could you detail the nature of that lawsuit and what it was about?
 - I brought that lawsuit because there are certain things that I believe are the purview of the student government, and there are some things I believe are not the purview of the student government. And I wanted to make sure that even if not for myself, that candidates in the future could have a fair chance at moving forward, wherever that may be, that candidates may have a fair chance of being vetted for the positions that they're applying for, and that candidates – that we're staying within the boundaries of the law, really, and that we're not bringing personal attritions or beliefs into confirmations of the student government, which is supposed to be a non-opinion – neutral – basically.
- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: **POO:** I do not believe, through Statutes or parliamentary procedure, that we are able to discuss this case as it has not been decided yet.
 - Candidate Adamyk: My apologies.
- Senator Fronczak: In your application, you discuss how you are not a law students yourself, but aren't afraid to call upon the help of peers in order to get the information you need. Do you have an example of a time you called upon the help of peers to get you what you need in order to excel in your position?
 - One of the most obvious examples I can think of right now is what was just brought up. The typical lawyer advice is to not represent yourself in court, so that's exactly what I did. I went out and got some help from a law student and I made sure that they were able to represent me fairly. That being said, I'm sure there are plenty of other instances as well where I have reached out – one of them being in student government. And actually in all of those resolutions I talked about: for Women's History, for Breast Cancer Awareness Month, I reached to – for Black History – I reached out to people, obviously, that those issues affect. I reached out to them, made sure they were involved. I asked them to provide input on the issues, and really that came up when any bills or resolutions would either cross my path or I brought them up. One of the things Dr. Acosta, the old Student Government Advisor, always mentioned was that if you are drafting a bill or a resolution, always talk to the people it's affecting. Because one of the things people hate is something happening – Student Government taking action and getting notification a week or two weeks after it happens, and seeing, "hey, this has changed now, so everything that you've been doing is completely different." I know I'm not a big fan of that personally, so I always try to keep that in account

also when other people are also having to deal with that. So really anything involving Student Government, you have to realize that you're not the expert on most things ("you" in the general sense). The best leaders, the best leaders which we all are as campus leaders, they try to reach out to their communities, they try to reach out to people that they know do bring that expertise so that they can have the best overall plan of action.

- Senator Downing: Going back to your application and what you spoke on earlier about your reporting system, you said that the one you would want to create would be for instances where people may not want to speak up to actual University officials. What would be different from that program that you create that would make that environment and reporting system a lot more accessible and a lot more appealing to those that do need to report something? What is your goal with that?
 - It harkens back to what I was discussing in the last issue about the reporting thing. One of the things I feel draws back students from reporting these things is that they do not feel comfortable talking to "the grownups" and the adults, the administrators. The Dean of Students, the Dean of Student Affairs, those sorts of things. People don't always feel open to discussing things with people. They feel much more comfortable discussing things with people who are more akin to them – people who are their peers. I should emphasize again that I am not trying to take away the big cases from reporting. All I was trying to do was to allow a system that people can report the small instances – and when I say small, I realize that everything is relative, so something that may be small to me may not be small to you. But I mean the non, super-criminal instances – I'm trying to create a system where they can report those and then we can gather all of them so that next time there's an issue with antisemitism on campus, for example, we can go back and look at the entire list of every other antisemitic act that's happened here so we can know what's happening here and have a fuller picture. It's sort of like the idea of intelligence sharing. So after 9/11, Congress passed a bill that created an intelligence sharing apparatus. Before 9/11, we had the CIA that was doing things, the FBI that was doing things, and different organizations doing different things. They didn't necessarily communicate with one another and did not have the full picture. There were people cut out of the loop, and the idea behind this is we're trying to create that loop. We're trying to create a long-lasting community so that when all of us are gone, we can remember this instance that occurred, because its occurrence did matter, and we want people to remember it. And we want people to be able to address it so it doesn't happen again. And it's hard to do that when everyone who was around when that happened is gone. So this is I suppose an archive effort, making sure that history isn't lost.
- Senator Drackley: You stated that statutes are in need of revision. Would you be able to explain in more details which specific statutes you think need revisions and why?

- One of the things we always hear from everyone without fail, every time, even before I got into Senate, is that the statutes are poorly written. And that's no fault of our own, it's the fault of things getting changed, and there's five mentions of one thing in statutes that are spread across three different chapters and people don't recognize that. So one of the things you have to do is try to – one of the mechanisms for solving this is, I believe, there is a panel of law students that can be assembled to sort of go through this and recommend changes. The problem with that is that law students don't really want to do that. They have other things that they want to focus on. So one of the things I would want to do is, given all of the experience that I have as the Attorney General, is to work with all of you to revamp statutes to fix things that are in need of fixing. One thing that is definitely in need of fixing is the Elections Code. I can't name specific instances off the top of my head, but I can tell you this comes to fruition every time we have a case where "oh, this is one interpretation, or no, this is another interpretation," so one of the things we want to do is try to limit the – get rid of – the vagueness. We want to try to decrease the vagueness in statutes. We want to make it to mean what we actually mean it to mean, if that makes sense. We want to try to fix it, make sure it's well-written, and as Attorney General, I would be happy to work with every single one of you to – if you have an idea for a bill, send me an email and I'll give you my opinion on it too, and we'll try to work together and that's a standing invitation to you whether I get this position or not. You might not care about my opinion and I'm perfectly okay with that, but I'm happy to provide it. And I think that's one of the points of being in student government, is we all have to be willing to give our opinion and we all have to be willing to give our interpretation, and I definitely want to try to fix statutes because the person who can fix statutes – that's the \$10 million person who can make all the difference. We talk about making a difference; the person that can fix statutes and get rid of all of the small issues and get rid of the "legal" issues that we face here - that's really the person that's going to matter, and I want to try to help all of you to become that person in a little way.
- Senator Lessard: You said earlier that you don't believe everything is the purview of the student government. What do you believe is the purview of the student government when it comes to candidates?
 - If everyone is okay with me answering this, I feel like the purview of the student government is to make sure a candidate is financially certified, committed to the cause that they are applying for, and a student is a (registered) student, and I feel like the certain qualifications that we are supposed to address are outlined in Student Statutes, and while I'm happy to answer any and all questions, I would just say that when you start getting into the subjective issues, that creates an issue because I am willing to bet that none of us on this call agree with anyone else on this call about 100% of everything. And my question is, then, where do you draw the line? So by sticking to the objective standard, the one that is impossible to measure on a subjectivity scale, that's the

only way you can truly pick a candidate – or fairly pick a candidate in my opinion, to make sure we all get a chance to participate in this experiment that is student government.

- Senator Lessard: Would you say that if a student has prior experience within student government, whether it be work as a student senator, so their voting record, or work in the executive cabinet, so any initiatives or goals they had set, would you say that that work and analyzing that work, is the purview of the student government when considering a candidate for future positions?
 - Candidate Adamyk: I think I see the point that you're getting at, senator, and I want to be careful not to address the merits of the case like was previously mentioned. With all due respect, I'm going to not answer the question because like was mentioned before, statutes don't really want us to address the case.
 - Senator Lessard: I actually wasn't asking about the case in particular, I was asking in the general sense.
 - Candidate Adamyk: Ok, well, generally speaking, as long as a student is acting in good will – a student is acting in a way that isn't misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance – because those are the only qualifications for being impeached or not being able to hold office – then I would say that's what you should look at.
 - Senator Lessard: So a student's lack of voting on issues or a student's lack of achieving initiatives or goals is something we should consider when considering a candidate for a future position?
 - Candidate Adamyk: I would say no, you might be misunderstanding my statement a little bit. What I'm trying to say is misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance – that means abusing your office for personal gain, that means not showing up to vote at all, which has happened before, and that means doing it for the wrong reasons. And I think, like I said, we want to stay on the objective scale because that's the only way we can be absolutely fair to everyone.
- Senator Murray: You said in your application that you wanted to make the Office of Attorney General (AG) a friend to the Student Government again. I would like to know how you plan to do that or what that looks like to you.
 - The last AG that we had sort of took an assertive role against the Senate you could say. I'm not sure who in here was in the Senate at that time. One of the things I wanted to try to do is make sure that the Senate understands that the AG and the Executive Branch – we're all friends and we're all trying to accomplish the same things. We're trying to make the Student Body better and we're trying to make sure everyone has a good experience. One of the issues we run into is what exactly does that mean. We all have a different idea of what it means to make the Student Body better, and of course, we have to – the best way we can do that, I suppose, is by collaborating and trying to make sure people understand why we're doing what we're doing, and we try to work with one another and we try to make sure everyone is included like I said. And so like I also previously stated, one of the things I

want to do is work with all of you is to help you out with statute drafting. If you have any issues for any statutes, I want to be there to help all of you. And as AG, it's my job to defend statutes, so I don't get to write them – that's your job. So whatever statute you want to write, if it's passed into law and signed into law, I'll defend it until the day I die. That's me job as AG. Really, what I do is up to you all, and that's the way I look at it and that's the way I want to try to make people understand that the AG is a friend to the Student Body and to the student government.

- Senator Murray: You mentioned that you wanted to “establish a strong infrastructure in the office of AG so that future AGs feel less burdened.” I wanted to know a little bit about that burden that you're seeing and how you think it's a burden, why you think it's a burden, and how you plan to address that burden with this infrastructure.
 - I want to say first of all that I don't think it's a burden because if I thought it was a burden, I wouldn't be applying for it. But one of the issues that I've discovered when talking with both the last AG, the AG before him, and the AG before her, is that people apply for it and they have no idea what they're actually getting into. But me, I've seen the sort of things it entails and I know that it can be difficult at times, especially for law students, which is the problem - which is probably why this position is still vacant to this day. And so one of the things I want to do is try to make it easier for people and part of that is rewriting some parts of the AG's statute. When I was in the Senate, I was one of the people that sponsored the bill that put this language in statute. But I will admit we had some shortfalls. We started the process, but we didn't exactly finish it. And so I want to try to finish that by sort of making lower positions that are more defined so that people have a better idea of what they're getting into. And also sort of making clear what the definitive roles are. So that might be, for example, making a solicitor general, which is a person that actually argues in front of the court, not the AG, usually. So that way the AG when they're – because there's a lot of work behind the scenes that has to be done because the AG when they're drafting briefs or arguments, they're doing all that work, they're doing all that research, and then they also are helping all of you in student government, they're also dealing with elections around election time, they're also arguing cases in front of the court, so I want to try to make sure that we're able to provide a better infrastructure, and that means maybe creating a few lower positions that people can take on, instead of putting all of the burden on one person.
- Senator Lessard: Going back to one of my previous questions, this time with an example of what I mean. Do you believe a senator's work, such as, we had resolutions introduced in the 73rd Senate that produced harmful language against a student population in particular. Do you believe that if the person who sponsors that legislation were to reapply for an SGA position, that we should or should not take that action into consideration when it comes to their position as they have in the past sponsored legislation that was deemed harmful to the Jewish population?

- Candidate Adamyk: I am really concerned that this person introduced language if that's harmful as you say. Would you mind providing me a specific example so that I can better address the question – make sure I'm actually addressing the issue?
- Senator Lessard: There were two in particular that I'm thinking about. One regarding BDS - the resolution regarding the BDS stuff going on in Israel, and the other urging FSU to unadopt the IHRA definition of antisemitism in particular.
- Candidate Adamyk: Well, if that's the case, I will say I'm a little biased, because I was the one that helped lead the effort to adopt the IHRA definition. In regards to BDS, though, that's a simple open and shut explanation. That's against state law anyways. So like I said, my job is to enforce the law. Obviously I'm not going to be arresting anyone, that's not my job. But my job is to make sure that the Student Senate is staying within the boundaries of student statutes and the state law. And when push comes to shove, I think the best way to try to avoid the conflict, because that's my #1 job here, is to try to make sure that everyone is able to sit down at a table and talk things out. They're able to amenablely come to a resolution that at least if it doesn't benefit everyone, at least people don't come away feeling disenfranchised. Because that's part of the problem with SGA. Because you get people that – an action is taken and then people feel like they're no longer heard. And so I don't want that to happen. I really don't want that to happen. So, as AG, there's only so much I can do, but in that instance, I suppose I would reach out to either the sponsor of the bill and any senators leading the pushback against the bill, and I would encourage them try to talk to one another. Outside of Senate, maybe meet at, um, Bagelicious? Is that still on – no – Einstein Brothers, on campus. You know, get a bagel, and discuss it. Discuss the issue. Discuss the actual issue at hand. Try to see if there is a way that we can come to an amenable resolution, and if not, then we can pursue it in the student government – that's the whole point of student government. It's not really government if everyone agrees with one another. So eventually, you just gotta pros-and-cons of the thing, but in this case, BDS, it's against state law, so simple as that.
- Senator Lessard: I kind of don't feel that answered my question, purely because my question was more, do you think we should take those actions into consideration when considering them for *future* student government positions. Like should we take the fact that they were hurtful to a particular marginalized group on campus when awarding them a position that does give them the ability to represent the Student Body as a whole?
 - My apologies. I got lost in my explanation and didn't answer your question. I would say in that instance, it's really – that's a difficult question. I think people are going to agree and disagree on what we should do, but I think purely trying to remain objective – I know as bad as it may sound, but we have to weigh their objective accomplishments, their objective feats. And so if you're talking

about harm to a community, I would question why that person was ever forwarded in the first place.

- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: A huge issue with your forwarding in the meeting over the summer was how certain communities felt when it came to previous actions taken by you. I would personally, and I feel like it would help the rest of the committee, love to hear what you've done and whether these seven months, six months, like half a year. What specific actions have been taken that you feel like have bettered those relations, kind of addressed the issues brought up in that previous Senate meeting.
 - Of course. Thank you for your question, senator. I figured this might come up. And, you know, I am not going into the details of the meeting because we've heard that hashed out time and time again. All I will say is I am sorry for the impact that it had. I am sorry for the way that vote made people feel, because that's not how I intend. That's not how I intend things to happen. Now on that case, that being said, things I have done to try to help marginalized communities. Well first of all, I helped elect the – our current Student Body President, Nastassia Janvier, who is a woman of color, and I think she's done an excellent job representing all of us on the Board of Trustees level. And representing all of us around the community. In addition to that, in the real world, I have donated to minority candidates to try to increase their say in actual government, I have – I am willing to talk with anyone and everyone all the time about issues that affect them. And in terms of policy, I am always trying to pursue methods that create better outcomes for individuals, regardless of what background they come from.
- Senator Murray: **POO**: In regards to the memorandum from the Office of the FSU General Counsel, it reads in there that “the government must abstain from regulating speech and the specific motivating ideology of the opinion or perspective of the speaker as the rationale for restriction.” That's a direct quote. So I don't believe that we legally, by the Constitution of the United States, can use a rationale of someone's opinion, even with honestly, with BDS, the definition of antisemitism, I believe we might potentially be violating the Constitution of the United States by restricting someone from getting into an office based on those grounds. And I think this relates to this candidate also. So I would like for that to be thought of by the committee.
- Chair Russell: Yes, please refrain – objective in your questioning, just as we do with any other candidate. As Senator Murray brought up, we do not want to break the United States Constitution. Please treat this candidate with the same exact respect and fairness that you treat anyone else with. That – I think we should move away from questions that are going into political ideologies and things that Senator Murray just brought up, just for the sake of fairness, respect, and not violating the Constitution.
- Vice Chair Diaz: Chair Russell, Candidate Adamyk, Chair Russell, if you could stop me if this question violates the terms that you just put out, feel free, I would feel free to withdraw that question if you feel it does. Many students that we all represent would wonder how we can trust you as AG to defend the rights and interests of these communities, given that action that we referred to, you voting to keep somebody in office who infamously

attacked such communities. I don't believe that's an ideological question, I think it's a question about voting record, and it's important to be asked.

- Chair Russell: I will entertain this question because when we are in Senate, the voting record is public, that is accessible to all students, people, anything – that's fine.
- Candidate Adamyk: So if I could just address your question from the standpoint of "what would you do to make sure that everyone is being represented," that seems to be the crux of your question, and that seems to be viewpoint neutral in my opinion. Is that correct?
- Vice Chair Diaz: I would just – what would you say to those people that have reservations about your candidacy because of that action that you took on that individual, keeping them in office?
- Candidate Adamyk: I would say that while I might not necessarily agree with their reservations, I can understand their reservations. That being said, I don't want there to be any reservations. If you've ever worked with me in student government, you know that apart from one very unfortunate instance, there has never been any issue with anyone because of any specific background they may have or ideology they may have, or protected class they may have. Because, really, I actually enjoy speaking to new people, especially people that disagree with me. Because, 1, if I disagree with them and we're able to talk about it, it gives me the chance to sharpen my iron. You know, to sharpen my argument, or change my argument. And furthermore, I mean, I've made it fairly clear that I'm always willing to meet with anyone and everyone if they have any questions or concerns. That being said, like I've already mentioned, my job is not to decide who I represent, it's to uphold the rule of law. So part of it, also, is to represent the Executive Branch. So if it's any member of the Executive Branch, like I said, I will do my damndest, to represent you in court, pardon my language. I will do what I can, I will give my utmost, to represent them in court. That being said, I hope we don't get to court, but like I said, the role of the AG is mostly an insurance policy. And it'd be a real shame for someone to need that insurance policy, and then you get the big company that says "well, actually, your issue isn't covered by this insurance policy." That's not my job. My job is to make sure they are represented. And so I can't address enough their concerns. I understand their concerns, I really do. With that being said, I will always represent them. I will always stand up for them. I – if they need me, I'll be there.
- Vice Chair Diaz: As far as I understand how the statutes work, this position is in line to become vacant upon the Inauguration of the next Administration. With all of the plans that you mentioned having for the Office of AG, how do you plan to implement them in about the two months' time we'll have before the next Administration is inaugurated?
 - Well, I will try my hardest. When I originally applied for this position, I had a lot more time to work with. That being said, I realize that I don't have as much time now. So I will get done what I can get done. What I can't get done, I will try to make sure that the next person is able to get done. That's really as much as any

of us can say for any position that we're in. I will not waste any moment of my time, since I do have a limited amount of time. But I can't put a timeline on everything I'll get done with deadlines, but I will get done what I can.

- Senator Drackley: As we have an election coming up for a new executive administration, if approved for AG, you could possibly only be in this position for roughly 2 months, if the new Administration proceeds to appoint a new AG. If this is the case, do you have anything on your mind of what you hope to accomplish in these roughly 2 months?
 - Sure, like I just said, all of everything that I talked about at this meeting is what I hope to accomplish. I can't tell you what I will be able to get done or what I won't be able to get done, only time will tell, given my workload, my classload, but that being said, I'll give as much time to this position as any of you would give to your current position. It's very clear that the Executive Branch wants an AG, if only so much as the AG is supposed to, [per statutes], serve as sort of a legal advisor for the Student Body President, so I feel like any prolonged absence in this position is only a detriment to them and the ability for them to serve. I think I answered your question, but I also lost my train of thought, so let me know if you need...
- Senator Lessard: I know you were previously forwarded to this position over the summer. Obviously you didn't get it at the time. When did you reapply for the position?
 - In January.
- Senator Lessard: What was the roadblock in you reapplying for the position come the fall semester, where you would have at least almost as much time as you would have had had you been confirmed over the summer?
 - I wouldn't consider it necessarily a roadblock, but in the fall semester, I committed to the Elections Commission, so I was serving there. There was a fall election, and I didn't want to up and leave them when they might need me. I served that out and there is still a spring election, but now there's a lot more people involved. So I feel comfortable, if I get this position, to leave from them because now they have a full board and now they also have alternates, whereas in the fall, I made a commitment to them and didn't want to just abandon them halfway through.
- **Senator Murray moves to enter round-table discussion, Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds; Senator Lessard objects. Senator Murray withdraws motion.**
 - Senator Lessard: I've read statutes, but there are so many that committing them to memory is next to impossible. I don't believe the Elections Commission is considered a major office, so what was preventing you from possibly doing both?
 - Candidate Adamyk: Well, you're right, it's not a major office, but it would seem kind of fishy for the AG to also sit on the Elections Commission.
 - Senator Lessard: So you essentially view it as a conflict of interest?
 - Candidate Adamyk: Yes.

- Senator Murray: **POC**: The Office is AG is a major position.
 - Senator Lessard: **POPP**: I was asking if his Elections Commission position was a major office, and if that is what was preventing him, not that. – I know AG is, I wasn't sure about Election Commission.
- **Senator Lessard moves to enter round-table discussion; Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.**
- Closing Statement:
 - Thank you very much, Chair Russell. I want to thank you all for your questions. I hope I was able to accurately address all of your concerns 100%. If not, feel free to send me an email or message me or messenger pigeon me or whatever. I would be happy to answer your questions, I always love talking about student government, it's like my drug. It gets my hyped and so I'm always happy to speak with any of you about any questions you may have, whether that be about the election coming up, whether that be about statutes, whether that be about life, I'm not sure how well I can answer that question, but I will do my best if you ask. And thank you all for staying late on the call. Like I said, I did have class and it went over, I had planned on being here earlier, but I appreciate all of your active questions and I appreciate you all actually looking at my application. I feel like sometimes it seems like people don't do that. But I appreciate all of your involvement.
- Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Being one of I think two people, or three people on this call that were here over the summer, I took major note to look at the responses and see if they are similar. If you're applying for a position again, I would like to see some growth, I would like to see some change in behaviors, attitudes, actions, responses, because that's kind of why we would want to reapply. We want to show that you've grown to kind of show that you don't go against the issues there were before. I wasn't seeing a change. The candidate did not seem to direct a lot of the answers when asked to give examples, evidence. It wasn't all there, it was kind of beating around the bush. And one of the few times when an example was given, talking about antisemitism, talking about the whole reporting system that they wanted to enact and how like "minor forms of discrimination" would be reported there. Firstly, I don't think there's any "minor" form. of discrimination. The candidate kind of talked about that themselves, and how what might seem minor to one person might not be to another. We are all still students getting an education. We are not qualified to handle any sort of discrimination charges. That's not who we are. Last time I checked, no one on this call has a law degree. No one in here is a social worker, no one here is qualified to handle that sort of accusation, that sort of procedure. The bureaucracy behind that is just too much too much for any student to handle, especially considering the candidate is not a law student themselves and admitted that. And then the other goals which I wouldn't say are fully tangible in the timespan given, are not something that I think can get accomplished within the next less-than two months. I'm just not seeing any major change that would make me want to change the way that I want to vote just solely based on this application. Also, the candidate did say "let's look at antisemitism for that reporting system" as if it wasn't a major [issue] based of that further argument, that just wasn't sitting well with me. Whenever I asked about

reaching out to communities on campus that felt uncomfortable, there was no example of, since the prior meeting, reaching out to those communities on campus. The candidate gave big global examples of donating to candidates for real political parties and stuff like that. No matter who these donations were to, or which policies were supported, I asked for on-campus examples, and there were no on-campus examples provided. We, as the Student Government Association, are not the regular government. We have no power over the rest of the world or the state. We have the power over the Student Body here. So I wanted to see some sort of action taken to help support students on campus and the candidate provided none. All of these added up are just not making seem as though, for this time being in this Administration, the candidate is the best fit. If the candidate wanted to come back along when the next Administration comes along, if they would like to extend that sort of invitation and go through that whole interview process again, that is a more fitting time I feel, considering they would have the entire Administration and the entire term to get all of this work done. But to have less than two months to try to enact these goals that I do not feel are tangible in this timespan, or really fit the position, I am going to be voting no, and I do – I know I say “highly urge everyone” literally every vote – but this time, I legitimately highly urge with every single ounce of my being, for the rest of us to vote no. Objectively, this candidate has not changed. I do not feel they have the time to complete the three goals they gave us. So thank you.

- Senator Lessard: I actually had the minutes from the meeting on the 21st of July up throughout his interview. Not only because I wanted to see if there had been any growth and change from the answers given at that meeting, because I believe if you're coming back for a position in which you forwarded and denied previously, that growth is important. Because you were denied for a reason last time. Whether or not, on a personal note, I felt that reason was justified or otherwise, the Senate as a whole voted no for a reason last time and there needs to be growth. I'm not seeing that. I actually made a point to note down and ask similar questions to what were asked at the meeting on the 21st to hopefully really gauge and see that growth. And it just wasn't the answers or examples – were not given at least in a manner that I felt were encompassing of a true example to questions being asked. [sic] Yes, there was like the overarching, broad examples given, but I was really looking for specific examples. Like “hey, this particular individual, this particular situation.” Something that was unique. Something that wasn't necessarily an overbroadening spectrum. And I will agree with the Senator before me – he has two months. Maybe, if something happens and Inauguration gets stretched out, two-and-a-half months as the AG. And I believe that the goals that he gave us are not tangible for the timeframe in which he has to complete them. Tangibility when it comes to goals is very important and I just don't feel that they are tangible at this time. I would encourage him to apply during the next Administration. I think that having more time to complete these goals is important. My other real reservation here really comes down to the answers just felt the same. He's had seven months of growth, and I'm guesstimating here, about seven-ish months of time to grow and reflect and think about it, and

I feel the same. The last thing that really kind of is a hesitation is just waiting – I totally sympathize with the Elections Commission point that he made and how he had committed to the Elections Commission in the fall. However, elections were over mid-October, maybe end of October to the best of my knowledge when it came to fall elections. To wait two months past that, maybe two-and-a-half months after that to apply to a position that you're so passionate about – I'm not a huge fan of that because if even four months, well actually, he would have had a solid five-and-a-half months had we seen him before winter holidays. And I would not have concerns about the goals at that point because he would have a solid almost half-a-year to complete them. So I'm kind of hesitant from a – his answers seem the same as they were last time, where all of these concerns were brought up. And then, the matter of the fact that there just isn't enough time to tangibly achieve the goals that he has presented to us today.

- Vice Chair Diaz: First of all, I apologize if I look tired or am looking off to the side here, I have two monitors. I'm taking minutes, it's a little bit hard with a meeting like this. But of course, I am a newer senator, I wasn't here over summer Senate. But I do feel like it is a little bit – I'm going to use the word disrespectful – I don't know if that's quite the word. It's dismissive of the due diligence and of the work done by the 73rd Senate to kind of throw away, so to speak, a lot the work they did in questioning their candidate and in the decision they made, especially considering what the previous two speakers, senators, said before, that it doesn't seem like a whole lot changed from now and then. I think we are at the end of the day, the representatives of the Student Body. It is our job to provide that advice and consent, or in this case, to provide for checks and balances, and while I urge you all to vote your conscience, I would also urge that you ask yourself whether or not this is a vote that the decision that you make is a decision that you can defend, it's a decision that you're proud of, and it's a decision that you believe the people that voted you in here would support you taking. For me, I think I've concluded that the answer to both of those questions are probably no. I was originally going to abstain because I believe I had a case in the Elections Commission that was upcoming for the candidate, but that's no longer the case, for the record. So I feel comfortable in taking a position on this at this point.
- Senator Murray: Unfortunately, I wholeheartedly disagree with everything that was just said just by the way. I just want to ask, are we serious that if this candidate were to apply and have more time, like after, when the next Administration is inaugurated, are you really sure that you're going to be more supportive of him then? I personally do not think so whatsoever, at all. I don't think that is the intention of – I think the intention of Senate is to not have this person be in Senate – be confirmed by Senate at all. Also, this candidate was denied in the 73rd for a reason and that went to court. So to hold this candidate to a standard of having to change from that decision is kind of crazy to me, when this went to court and is kind of not decided, as the opinion has not been written. So that doesn't make sense to me at all either. Also, based on the viewpoint neutrality statement, one could argue that it violates the Constitution to use this person's voting record – this person's ideologies – this person's – the way this person operates based on their opinions – to deny this person of this office based

on those things. It violated the First Amendment, you're regulating someone's speech in my opinion. I want to say that when people apply to Senate to fill vacant seats, a lot of the time, people have run in an election and lost, or even applied and lost. And a lot of the time, that is framed as the person is "committed, the person's driven." So it's kind of shocking to me that – I'm going to stop using words like that – but I just think it's interesting that there seems to be a change in circumstances that that is now being used as a reason to stop. Like it was mentioned, it's disrespectful to the 73rd Senate to confirm this candidate now. And as someone who served in the 73rd summer Senate and was the vice chair of IA at that time, who was in that confirmation hearing for IA and for the Senate and sat through hours of that meeting, I don't get how it's disrespectful to the work when this is the 74th Senate. We're not even considering in the summer having leaves of absences, had temporary summer senators, half of the Senate was switched out in the fall election. If we have 80 people, then 40 people are new people, just about. So it's a completely different situation and I don't get why we would want changes in an answer when what would need to be changed per se, would be to violate the Constitution, to take those into consideration of not liking that. Also with the issue about not having enough time in the rest of this term, I absolutely think these goals are tangible, I will personally sponsor the bill to create a better structure and more delegated structure of the office of AG, regardless of if this candidate is confirmed or not. The timeline issue is not a valid concern in my opinion because the legislative process takes maybe two weeks. I am going to sponsor that bill. I would love to talk to the candidate about that bill because that's important anyway. I don't think it makes any sense to say that your goals aren't tangible with the legislative process is literally – it's simple and probably everyone here has done it. Also I just wanted to make sure that we are being self-reflective and thinking to ourselves if everyone in this committee can say they are 100% absolutely applying the same standard to this candidate as we have to every other candidate that has come through this committee. I personally do not think so. Again, to go off what the candidate said in the questioning about what is qualifying you for office, what qualifies you – or what would disqualify you – your reason to vote no, would be misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance. Misfeasance means you're doing your job poorly, unintentionally, like if you are scheduling IA on Mondays when forwarding letters come out on Fridays, for example. Malfeasance would be to do that but on purpose, to be intentional about that and to know you're doing something wrong and doing it anyway. And then nonfeasance would be to not do it – to not schedule IA. So yeah, I don't think this candidate falls into misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance, and I think some of the concerns and a lot of the questions were pointed to this person's opinion – to this person's rights, and that sorts of thing, and so I would not like to violate the U.S. Constitution tonight. And besides that, this candidate in my opinion is very, very knowledgeable and very, very experienced in our Student Government Association, and I think there is plenty of time and I look forward to doing some of those things, and I don't have very much to say besides that.

- Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Once again, I do want to remind everyone that no one here has a law degree. Whereas a personal opinion is heard,

it doesn't stand much ground here. Secondly, I do personally stand by everything I have said and that I have asked. I have only asked, and many of us here tonight, have focused just on the objectives because that is what was stressed in the beginning of this meeting. Those three things: misfeasance, malfeasance, all of that – that's for impeaching a candidate. That's if you no longer think they are no longer fit to serve, it does not mean there are not other reasons why would not want to put someone in a position. One of the first things you have to focus on when putting someone in a position is the Student Government mission, and I'm going to accurately say that in this moment, I do not feel the candidate fits that. There are two parts of being in student government, and it's just like regular government as well. And actions taken in the past do have ground. I do not want to sit here and try to misconstrue, and I'm not appreciating other senators misconstruing the words to make it seem as though we are breaking laws when we are not. We were objective tonight, we pointed out actions taken, we asked for evidence, and we based it off of the application. That's what we did tonight. Whenever we had the feeling, if there were certain people that felt they were having issues with following expectations or legal grounds, it was pointed out to the rest of the committee. If there were issues, they were addressed in that moment, but everything else we asked fell in line. On the topic of tangibility as well, I do also want to point out now that previous senators have spoken, the goals given in this application were not tangible in the fact that they were also very vague. I asked the candidate about this reporting system. Once again, that was one of the three, four main goals they explained in this application, and personally there is no use for that. And I will stand by that grounds and the fact that we already have report.fsu.edu. We have the venue to allow people, and the route for people to take this in the manner that they should, administration. Going to one student, that's like if I have an issue and I want to go to Chair Russell and try to tell Chair Russell to handle something. Chair Russell has no grounds to do so. We go strictly based off of administration. They are the ones with the power, they are the ones who are allowed to have that sort of control over the student population. That's one of the goals. The rest of the goals, the wording was very vague. I can give examples. Like the "establishment of a strong infrastructure in the Office of AG that will allow future AGs to feel less burdened while in office." What sort of infrastructure? Whenever I asked about that, there was just not much evidence given. We were not given any tangible form of infrastructure. "Mobilizing the office's resources to conduct community review and reports of different sectors of campus life so that everyday students can have their experiences heard." Reviews, all of that, hearing from our student population – that's what I got from that. Allowing the student population to speak on what's going on. We have multiple venues for that as well. You can report to SGA, you can go straight to a senator. You can go through all these other methods. What makes that different from what already exists? So once again, beyond the timeline tangibility, the vagueness and the existence of other examples of these goals – what do we have beyond that? What are we working based off of? So I do stand strong in my opinions. If the candidate does want to apply again with the next Administration, work with that Administration to see what they want to see on campus for this position and try to make

these goals less vague and move down routes that don't already exist and kind of innovate this position, I stand by that. Once again, I will not stand for any intimidating language to try to make it seem as though we are doing something we are not tonight. We all did a fantastic job of asking the candidates questions that were objective. So I will still stand by my no vote, and I do urge the rest of you to recognize the fact that I brought up very valid points, no evidence was given to discredit my points. That is a solid reason to vote no, so don't feel the need to be intimidated into not voting no because you feel as though someone with no legal grounds has told you that you've broken the law.

- Vice Chair Diaz: I would like to in some ways echo that, but to also urge for a little bit of calming the temperature. If not for a voting record, as this individual did serve in Student Senate, what are we, then, to base our vote tonight on? This has nothing to do with the candidate's political affiliation. I do not know what this candidate's ideology is or what political party he might affiliate with. And this has nothing to do with the First Amendment, this has to do with what the candidate voted on when he was in Student Senate. And I feel as though, of course, that vote has not changed since July the 21st, and I still think that those concerns are real. I don't see the urgency for filling the position of AG at this moment, when I feel as though there is very little that can be done in the office. I just don't – I don't feel comfortable overriding the will of the 73rd Senate tonight or this Wednesday. And for that reason, I am voting no, but I do also urge you all to vote your conscience.
- Senator Lessard: Our voting records is public. The voting record of every single serving senator in this room is public record. Some of us, unfortunately myself not included, are up for reelection coming this spring election. And while I don't believe the Student Body is going to go through and look at your voting record, I do believe that if they were to and decide that because you voted no, or voted yes to a particular piece of legislation that they found wrong or harmful to themselves. If they chose not to vote for you for your student government position, whether that be an executive slate, a class council seat, Union Board, Senate, anything of that nature, I believe that is well within their right. Our voting records are public for a reason. We use them to hold each other accountable for decisions that we have made as student senators and as student government leaders. If people are hurt by those decisions, then they don't – then they should vote their conscience and not give you a position within the student government office. Actual U.S. senators are held accountable for their voting records. Candidates on the other side use them all the time as reasons to potentially vote down a candidate. For even the full U.S. Senate. Our voting records are public for a reason. If people decide to use them as reasons to vote no, that is their right, their public record for a reason. I just think that this candidate was voted no on prior – we have this candidate's voting record, we have – I don't know who say in on the 2020 Student Senate meeting in which things were initially brought up, but there were 7 hours – 7 hours – of student comment during the 2020 summer Senate at various meetings because of an individual who hurt large communities on campus. And if people voted in a way in regards to that candidate that hurt students on campus and students want to say "hey, this decision that you made was hurtful,"

that is their right as our voting record is public. No one is entitled to a student government based on how long they've been here, no one is entitled to a student government position because they know people within any branch of the student government. We earn our positions because we were given them by the students. We are entrusted by the Student Body at FSU to represent them well, and to represent them in every aspect of our lives. If any student on campus feels we cannot do that, I actually urge them to vote us out of office.

- Senator Murray: Regardless of if we're disagreeing, thank you to everyone for saying stuff. Obviously vote however you want, but for the sake of minutes and letting other senators hear every side and know what we're thinking and to be kind of informative about the argument, thank you for stating your case, and I just want to state my final case right now. And that is just that, again, I do want to touch on the viewpoint neutrality thing. I don't have a law degree, neither does anyone else on this committee, nor in Senate, I don't believe. But, the Office of the General Counsel of FSU has 10 attorneys, and that is where the viewpoint neutrality statement came from. The Office of the Florida State University General Counsel. So 10 attorneys who have law degrees gave that viewpoint neutrality statement, just for context. And my next point is with the things about tangible goals, again, I don't really get that argument. The job of the AG is not to have tangible goals that you're trying to institute, new for the first time. The job of the AG is to represent the Student Body. To be judging so harshly based on the goals put in an application – I don't think that's so pertinent to this office. I think that's a bonus. I think it's great that the candidate has any goals. I think the most important goal for a candidate for AG would be to execute the office that is stated. Not so much – I mean it would be really great to have all these tangible goals – but that is not the most important thing. And I think there were questions about “what basis then should we decide our votes on?” We should decide it based on the candidate's experience objectively representing the Student Body, and I believe that has happened and that it will happen. I believe the candidate is experienced. I believe the candidate will objectively represent the Student Body, and I am done talking for the night.
- Senator Lessard: One thing I think is being failed to mention in regards to this viewpoint neutrality statement from the Office of General Counsel, is that it is actually in direct accordance to funding. It has nothing to do with elected or appointed student government positions. It has everything to do with the allocations of activity and service fees and what we fund as student senators on campus. In my opinion, to use that here is taking it out of context, as this was given from the Office of General Counsel in regards to funding. We are all awarded our student government positions by the students on the FSU campus. If at any point, they don't agree with something that we're doing, even if it is just a personal opinion, it is their right as our constituents to vote us out of our positions, just as it is our jobs as senators to ensure that the people we are appointing to different student leadership positions on campus, whether it be exec branch or bureaus, or filling vacant student government positions, that we feel that these students are going to adequately represent the entirety of the Student Body. And with the vague answer given today by these

candidates, I haven't seen that yet. I am happy to have him reapply and come back and prove me wrong. I will admit it when I'm wrong. But I am not seeing that right now, and I think that is something we have to consider. Viewpoint neutrality, from the Office of General Counsel, was directly related to the allocations of activity and service fees, as those are paid for all students. It is in the title of the memo: "Legal Opinion Regarding Allocation of Funds to Student Organizations and Viewpoint Neutrality." We, just like all of us can be impeached by our fellow student senators, any exec position, any agency exec position can be impeached by the students who voted to put that student in that leadership position. AG is voted for by the students through us, and the students voted us in the position to vote and appoint the AG, and it is our duty as students senators to ensure that we feel that this candidate is going to adequately represent all students and I'm just not seeing that today. I'm not saying that he won't. If he came back with more well-rounded answers, more descriptive examples, I just didn't see that today.

- **Senator Hautrive moves to call the question; Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds**
- Vote:
 - Yes: 2 – Senators Hautrive, Murray
 - No: 5 – Senators Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Lessard, Drackley, Vice Chair Diaz
 - Abstain: 1 – Senator Downing
- **RESULT: CANDIDATE COREY ADAMYK DOES NOT PASS**

Unfinished Business:

- **Candidate for Student Council for Accessibility Advocacy, Committee Member**
– Roberto Ortiz
- **Candidate for Veterans Student Union, Assistant Director** – Haley Olsen

Closing Announcements:

- **Chair Russell:** I have spoken with Vice Chair Diaz about the possibility of getting legislation started about rescinding an applicant's application if they fail to show up for x amount of meetings. I am going to discuss that with Chief of Staff Slimak and Secretary England about that, and all the people involved, and I would love to get all of you feedback on it as it would be a committee bill. Please be here and attentive for bureau review. If anyone shares their presentations before the meeting, I will put it in our Google Drive and let you guys know. Thank you for liking my messages and letting me know you've seen them.
- **Vice Chair Diaz:** I know that this was a contentious meeting and that there were a lot of opinions that needed to be expressed. I understand that we're representing our constituents on this very important decision, but wow are these minutes going to take me a while. I would just say for the future, if we could have more brevity – I was going to put it in the chat, but I feel like it is disrespectful to say so, as this was a very important matter, and I feel like these minutes have to be very accurate as this could – again issues that Senator Murray brought up – that this could potentially go into some legal gray area, that these minutes have to be accurate. Therefore, I didn't want to impede upon that by telling you guys to calm down and be brief, but I would appreciate that in the future. Thank you for your debate as always.

- **Senator Murray:** I wanted to make it clear that I respect everyone in this committee very much; you're all my friends and literally we just did politics tonight. I think that probably, I would hope that Jacalyn would say that this is also healthy debate, so I definitely like it. I am very glad to see that there are senators in Senate who are fiercely advocating for their constituents. That is something I would kill to see for everyone. I appreciate that despite disagreements, you can fiercely advocate for your communities and what you believe is right. Besides that, Center for Participant Education – there are some big steps coming very soon, and I'd love to hear from any and all of you if you're interested in being involved in any of that.
- **Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson:** Though we disagreed, I don't believe we broke any laws, so we should be good and stayed objective. I mean if I get sued – I don't think I will – but like, I do appreciate the fact that everyone read minutes and read the applications. This seems like the first time in IA that everyone had questions and everyone had opinions. Kudos to us for doing that, I feel like that should be expected. If we do get sued, I stand in solidarity with whatever happens, even if it's just myself getting sued.

Next Meeting: February 21st, 2022 at 7:30pm

Adjourned: 9:04pm

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Katie Russell". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. It is positioned above a horizontal line that spans the width of the page.

Signature of Chair Katie Russell