



73rd Student Senate
Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Committee Agenda
DATE | Zoom Meeting ID: 909 196 4098

Call to Order: 6:12

Members Present: Linsky, Tackett, Rowan

Members Tardy:

Members Absent: Randall, Soto

Guests: None

Approval of the Minutes:

- Rowan: **So moved**
- Tackett: **So Seconded**

Announcements:

- None

Student Comments:

- None

Committee Business:

- Rowan: Without Randall here I think we should move on to the less controversial rules like 9 or 10
- Linsky: I would like Randall to be here for 9, let's look over 10. I will read it over. After reading, I feel like this is creating a hierarchy where Robert's Rules of Order is subordinate to the Statutes and Senate Rules.
- Rowan: We can change it to something saying Robert's Rules will be applicable when the issue is not addressed by statutes and Rules.
- Tackett: I agree, that makes the most sense.
- Linsky: I will cross out "in which they are not applicable" and replace it with "wherein they do not conflict with the Student Body Constitution, Statutes, or these Senate Rules of Procedure".
- Linsky: I do not have a problem with 10.2, let's move on to 11.
- Rowan: We should change 11.1D to say "forwarded" instead of "named to candidacy"
- Linsky: I agree. I think we should also just scratch 11.2. There is no need to restate what was just said. In 10.3, we can cross out the "Senate Program Assistant" title and we should cross out "distributed to the senate" because it was stated already in the same sentence.



- Rowan: I agree that makes sense
- Linsky: We should also cross out the last half of 10.5, we don't do that and we are in violation of it constantly. It is haphazard.
- Rowan: I agree
- Linsky: Looking at 10.6, what is "people-first" language.
- Rowan: I do not know, it does not make sense
- Tackett: Does it mean, "First-person"?
- Linsky: I do not think so.
- Rowan: Looking at 10.8, former senators did not put statements of intent on their amendments, and that caused issues at the supreme court.
- Linsky: I think we should just add this rule to 10.6, and we no longer need 10.8 since more than constitutional amendments should have a statement of intent.
- Rowan: There are several grammatical mistakes in 10.9 we need to look over. We should strike "Committee amendments" and put "of reference" in its place.
- Linsky: Moving on to 11.10, let's read it.
- Rowan: We need to change the language "recommend approval or rejection".
- Linsky: Yes, technically someone can call a point of order and everything the committee does for approval does not have standing.
- Rowan: I believe Senator Gonzalez changed this rule, I will look it up. It says in Resolution 94 of the 72nd Senate "whether to confirm or deny them".
- Linsky: Okay that's good, looking at 10.10B, we should strike the word "Slander".
- Tackett: Hasn't this been an issue before? Should we just strike the word "slander" throughout the whole document?
- Linsky: Yes I agree, this is not the place to judge slander that is left up to the courts.
- Rowan: The rule also doesn't have anything about opening statements.
- Linsky: You are right, so let's add that language in there. I believe we do 5 minutes for the opening statement?
- Rowan: Yes it is. I will also add that the "time remaining from this opening statement" will go to their closing statement.
- Linsky: After that, it looks like 11.10 A and B is fine. Let's move to 11.11
- Rowan: There is a debate about whether primary sponsors can withdraw and need a motion. So that is why I added "without a motion"
- Linsky: Yes that makes sense. Primary sponsors should be able to withdraw at any time. Let's look at 11.12
- Rowan: Just a note, these numbers are off because we struck 11.2, we need to fix that.
- Tackett: My minutes reflect the amendments by one number off for Rule 11.
- Linsky: For 11.12, I think this rule only applies to amendments on the Senate floor, since we do it more casually in committee. I am okay with leaving it as is since it is still in compliance with the rule.
- Rowan: I agree. Looking at 11.12, I do not think we need the language "title or number of the measure to be amended".
- Linsky: Moving on to subsection A, let's change "shall" with "may"
- Senator Randall remotely from Naples commenting on the google doc: With 10.10 A, I think the period of "pro/con debate" should be indefinite



- Linsky: I agree with Randall and will make the change. My computer is crashing we will take a break and meet back in 10 minutes
- Linsky: Looking back at 10.5, Randall wants to strike “Senate accounts”.
- Rowan: I am okay with that.
- Linsky: I will also reword 10.9 to say “designated by the president”
- Rowan: Randall wants to have only a “pro” debate. I disagree
- Linsky: I think I agree with Randall, it is awkward
- Rowan: It is still important to have it
- Linsky: We will leave it for next week when Randall is back. Let’s look at 10.12.
- Rowan: I want to add the word “and Germaine” into the senate rules and procedure since it is only in Roberts Rules. We had that issue with the JSU bill.
- Linsky: In 10.12 C, I do not think amendments need a majority vote to pass. When they are found favorable it is just added.
- Rowan: We should add “Unless otherwise defined by the constitution or Student Body Statutes” because of the sweepings bill and budget bill votes.
- Linsky: 10.12 D is worded weird.
- Rowan: Robert's Rules calls this type of amendment a tertiary amendment. So I think we strike all of it and reword it all together.
- Linsky: If Robert's Rules of Order accounts for this, then we don't need it at all.
- Rowan: A good rule for Roberts, we should only include them if they are really important
- Linsky: I agree. Looking at 10.12. E, I want to strike the last sentence since we just dealt with that in C.
- Rowan: I agree. I think we should just strike subsection F. I have not seen a situation where that rule has been needed
- Linsky: I agree. Let’s move to 10.13
- Rowan: We do not go to committee caucus unless we are electing chairs. We should cut that entire section and leave it as “ $\frac{2}{3}$ vote”.
- Linsky: 10.14 E seems restrictive
- Rowan: We had an issue with a motion to reconsider where parliamentarian Alvarez ruled to have a motion of reconsideration, the only people who could move to reconsider were those who voted against the original motion.
- Tackett: I think it is fine, there is not many motions to reconsider anyway
- Linsky: Okay I am okay with that for now, moving on to 10.15.
- Rowan: We need to add that only one statement of dissent may be made by “one senator”. We have been in violation of that.
- Linsky: We need to get rid of the “senate program assistant” language. But who will we send it to?
- Rowan: It can't be the president because it can affect them
- Linsky: Lets just leave it blank for now. Looking at 10.16, I do not want to touch this.
- Rowan: We should make sure that it is only prepared and passed the week before “Sine Die”. We had an issue with the list of students being pulled early
- Linsky: I do not want to mess with it.
- Rowan: We shouldnt be allowed to wave the rule, because we could leave students out.



- Linsky: I do not want to touch it still
- Rowan: We could add, "this rule shall not be waived"
- Tackett: Let's wait to see what Randall thinks. I do not think it should have the ability to be waived but we will talk about it when we see him.
- Linsky: Okay, we made it through three pages. Should we call it early?
- Rowan: I want to talk about some of my issues with Rule 6 first to warn yall. I think the Attorney General should be heard by the Judiciary committee.
- Linsky: Rules are not binding to the other branches. The only way it would work is if it is in statute. Does that position come through the senate per SBS statutes?
- Rowan: Yes.
- Linsky: Does the statute designate the committee wherein the AG is to be heard?
- Rowan: No.
- Linsky: Okay never mind we can probably do that. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.
- Tackett: **So moved**
- Rowan: **So seconded**
-
-

Old Business:

- None

New Business:

-

Unfinished Business:

- None

Final Announcements:

- None

Date and Time of Next Meeting: 6/24 at 6:00 pm

Adjourned: 7:52 PM

Matthew E. Linsky