



73rd Student Senate
Rules of Procedure Ad Hoc Committee
6:00pm on July 8th, 2021 | Zoom Meeting ID: 909 196 4098

Call to Order: 6:11

Members Present: Linsky, Rowan, Nemeth, England

Members Tardy: Randall

Members Absent: Tackett (excused), Lessard

Guests: Trevor Murray, Brooke Murray, Franceska Edouard

Approval of the Minutes:

- Rowan: so moved
- Randall: so seconded

Announcements:

- None.

Public Comments:

- None.

Old Business:

Organization of the Committees Discussion

- Linsky: Last meeting we discussed combining Finance and Budget. I don't have strong feelings about it because I'm not sure what a new standing committee would be. We shouldn't be changing things just to make an impact.
- Randall: I went ahead and looked at different SGAs. No one separates Finance and Budget like we do. However, having been in the Finance committee, I think they're more than well equipped to handle the budget. They know the rules that govern the budget.

They should be combined in my opinion, but this is a completely different conversation from adding another committee

- Rowan: I agree with all of that. I've put together a list of the committees of every university SGA I could find. Keeping an eye on what they're doing could give us ideas
- Linsky: My concern about consolidating Budget and Finance would be putting too much responsibility on one chair
- Randall: Finance has only been handling consent resolutions, so I think having concrete legislation each week could be good for them
- Rowan: I want to note that FAU's Boca Raton campus has a Budget Ad Hoc committee that's set up like how we do Sweepings and Central Reserves. They pull people from each standing committee and give them the responsibility of the budget
- Randall: I still think they should handle the transfer and allocation bills. Finance people are qualified to handle the budget. We could even make a sub-committee. We need to give them a bigger workload
- Linsky: I've been thinking about the differences between the two. Budget is all about compliance with statutes. It's Budget's responsibility to set the framework on an annual basis, but it's Finance's responsibility to sub-allocate the student activity fees once that framework has been set
- Randall: Does it denote that they have to be separate?
- Linsky: No
- Randall: I don't think every SGA sends their stuff through that type of committee
- England: I talked about this with the former Treasurer. Budget doesn't meet a lot of the time. Judiciary members, for example, really get into the heart of SGA and have a lot of work each week, but members of the Budget committee aren't given the opportunity to get as involved. That's not an issue, but we should give people the opportunity to be as engaged as possible. In my opinion, we shouldn't have to replace it either. Instead of making a new 5th committee, we should just making the standing committees bigger so more people have a say. The committees would benefit by having more members. More work will be done and the work will be a higher quality
- Linsky: I don't think that there are any constitutional constraints on having less than 5 committees, but we do have to change statute 411.1
- Rowan: We have to accept the fact that we have to make statutory revisions

- Linsky: I wouldn't want the change in the organization of the committees to be on our first submission of the changes to the rules. We should do it, but it should be a follow up. I would like to interview the former Budget and Finance chairs to get their opinions as well. Let's continue to table this discussion for now. We'll return to it after the first pass of the rules
- Rowan: I disagree with England's point. I think committees are meant to be small
- Linsky: Wouldn't it eliminate problems on the floor if we had more people discussing in committee? However, if you make the committees too big, it could lower participation
- Rowan: Max in committee is 20, so we'd have 16-17 senators per committee if we broke it down to 4 committees
- Randall: Right now most committees only have 8. If we put 8 from budget into other committees, it wouldn't be 16-17
- Rowan: We'll have more in Fall. Judiciary had 11 last fall, so it would be about 13
- Linsky: Do we really need to create something vestigial? Another committee has to serve an important function. Let's table this. We need to discuss how consolidation is going to look later

New Business:

New Rule Nine Discussion

- Linsky: How does everyone feel about having a part 1 and 2 of the Rules of Procedure?
- Rowan: I don't understand it and it's unnecessary
- Randall: I agree
- Linsky: Let's talk about Rule Nine: The Adoption of the Rules
- Rowan: The idea that I had here is that of all the governing documents, the Rules of Procedure needs to be the most fluid. At the start of each Senate, we typically adopt the rules of the previous Senate. Rather than doing that, we should do a look at the rules once a year, otherwise Senate is going to keep hitting potholes. It can be a quick look. It doesn't have to be as in-depth as what we're doing here
- Linsky: I'm not sold on this. We don't even know if we're going to be successful yet, so why should we make this a permanent thing? And if we do a good job, it shouldn't have to be. We can come back to this when we're done with our work. The nature of an ad hoc is that we can create one on the fly

- Randall: I hate this rule. This specific ad hoc was created to fix the mess 71 and 72 created. Our job is to fix this now. Why should people submit legislation throughout the year if they know we're already required to do this once per year?
- England: I agree. It's dangerous to force an ad hoc. The beauty of an ad hoc is that they can be created on an as-needed basis. This rule would hinder a Senator's ability to write legislation on their own. It would also cut out work from the Judiciary committee. I like the continuity of always having the Parliamentarian involved, but the rest isn't necessary. Don't force work where it's not needed. Rules aren't perfect, they're a living document
- Linsky: However, continuous education of the Senate on the Rules of Procedure would be valuable, but I still don't think it's necessary
- Rowan: I understand what you're saying, so I'm good with striking this rule. I was just trying to change the issues we've been having in a way that wasn't changing the Senate culture because I know how hard that can be
- Randall: I see what you're saying, but we shouldn't assume people aren't going to do their jobs. It's their jobs to improve legislation. If the legislation is bad, it's my argument that the Rules and Calendar committee should be the ones to fix it
- Linsky: We're deleting the new rule 9

Rule 9 Discussion

- grammar changes

Rule 10 Discussion

- **RECESS FROM 6:55-7:00pm**
- England: Is a motion a measure?
- Rowan: No because the rule is called Submission and Consideration of Measures
- Randall: Would 10.1d be "forwarded" instead of "nominated"
- Linsky: Forwarded. We need to change c too then. Technically if we're saying resolutions are any measure that are not a bill or a constitutional amendment, then confirmations, nominations, and statements of dissent are also resolutions.
- Rowan: USF has different types: statutory bills, fiscal bills, procedural bills, resolutions, and confirmations, so would it be helpful if we separate rule changes from resolutions?

- Randall: We already have 3 types of resolutions: rules of procedure resolutions, resolutions for recognition, and consent resolutions
- Rowan: Maybe we should adopt the nomenclature then
- Linsky: I agree. It's more specific than saying anything that's not a bill or constitutional amendment. Where's the types of resolutions listed in our Rules of Procedure?
- Rowan: They're not
- Linsky: Then we should define those
- Randall: I think they did that to make it clear who signs what and what goes where. I don't hate the idea of making assumptions based on the word
- Linsky: I don't like the idea of a procedural bill which requires the signature of the Student Body President
- Rowan: USF doesn't require the President to sign off on it. It specifically says that
- Randall: Then we should define what we mean by bills and resolutions, but the reason they want it to be so broad is because we can't predict what a Senator is going to say
- Rowan: If we want to separate this out, the idea of a resolution should be the "opinion of the senate"
- Randall: It's more than that
- Rowan: We don't have to use that nomenclature
- Randall: I like the idea of a specific word denoting who is signing the legislation. It's important to define it
- Linsky: It's consent, procedural, and regular resolution right?
- Rowan: Yes
- Linsky: Then let's do a section for resolution and 2 sub-sections
- Rowan: Or we could make them their own separate letter. Either way, we should separate them out. It'll make Senate business more logical. It'll also help a lot when updating the website because the resolutions will be more organized
- Linsky: Are there any other types of resolutions?
- Rowan: Not to my knowledge. The legislative agenda is technically a resolution, but it's still the Senate stating that these are the things we find important. So I'm ok with keeping resolution as "the opinion of the senate" and having consent and procedural be their own

letters rather than sub-sections. If we pass a consent resolution does it have to go to Student Body President?

- Randall: No
- Linsky: I think a good way to delineate is that constitutional amendments, bills, resolutions are all measures filed and considered by senators. Confirmations are just considered
- Rowan: No because Senate Officers are submitted by the Senate President. The forwarding letter goes to the Senate President. If you want to make an abstract argument, you could say the Senate President is indirectly sponsoring that
- Randall: I disagree, but your point about Senate Officers is well taken
- Linsky: I take it back. It overcomplicates things
- England: Just to clarify, a forwarding letter is just a memorandum
- Linsky: We've been going pretty theoretical for a while. Do we have a preferred nomenclature yet?
- Randall: We have to be as broad as possible
- Linsky: I still like how c is worded
- Rowan: The status quo works, I was just looking for ways to improve
- Linsky: We have limited time, so let's move on
- Rowan: Statement of dissent isn't a "majority decision." Lets change that
- Randall: I don't want to hear about new resolutions via packet
- Linsky: Some people do. Let's leave "packets" in 10.2
- Randall: No. It should be sent via email that day. You should never be looking at something for the first time at the meeting. In what cases would you want to give someone a packet of every resolution and bill?
- Linsky: If you don't trust that they check their email and want to give them an opportunity to read it. I don't want to get hung up on this, but let's leave this for Senators to decide
- Rowan: It doesn't hurt to keep it in there
- Randall: 10.3, what does that mean?
- Rowan: Proviso language
- Linsky: Will everyone understand what "proviso of the bill" means
- Rowan: Enough people will

- Linsky: Budget
- Rowan: That's the one area you'd use proviso language
- Randall: What about that in 10.3? Any bills that are being restrictive
- Linsky: All bills are restrictive in nature. You've got to have "student government funds" in there
- Rowan: It's in there entirely for the Budget bill and the Sweepings bill
- Randall: I need 10.4 explained to me
- Rowan: We don't follow this rule
- Randall: Is a money transfer bill an appropriations bill?
- Linsky: Yes
- Randall: So Budget, Sweepings, and Central Reserves are appropriations bills?
- Linsky: Yes
- Rowan: I'd avoid saying all Finance bills because PAC and RTAC are different
- Linsky: Should we cut the last 2 sentences of 10.4?
- Randall: We need to define what appropriations bills are
- Linsky: No. It's fairly basic
- Rowan: Do we even need this rule? Are we ever in compliance with it?
- Linsky: Good question
- Randall: I've submitted probably 3-4 money transfer bills in the past 3 months, so I think it's essential. This needs to be in here
- Linsky: Statutes talks about appropriations twice. It says all appropriations from Senate Projects must be preceded by a resolution. So this is actually incorrect and isn't in compliance with statutes
- Randall: What's the statute #?
- Linsky: 803.9
- Rowan: I see what it's saying. A resolution has to go through first just to accept the reasoning. I think that's dumb, but that's a separate conversation
- Linsky: I'm fine not touching 10.4 any further than we have. It's reasonable

- Randall: We should keep it because of 10.1b, but I hate that we don't define appropriations bill
- Linsky: It doesn't need it. In a practical sense, if you submit an appropriations bill and don't say what the money is going to be used for the bill won't pass
- Randall: Is this even different from 10.5?
- Linsky: No because you could get around that. There's no damage in keeping it. If they don't tell you what the money is used for, it's not going to pass anyway
- Randall: Have we been including a statement of legislative intent?
- Rowan: Legislative intent is the purpose and description section of the bill
- Randall: Can we note that then?
- Linsky: I'm fine with that, makes it more descriptive. Moving on
- Randall: The end of 10.8 is already implied. Let's delete
- Linsky: Fine with me
- Randall: For 10.9, do we say "confirmed or denied" talking about committee
- Rowan: No because the committee forwards or rejects
- Linsky: Full Senate confirms or denies
- Randall: We need to fix this then
- Rowan: At USF, everything below cabinet and directors does not go to full Senate for confirmation. The committee decided whether to confirm or deny
- Randall: We'll use "forward or deny" to be consistent with language
- England: What if the Senate President wants an indefinite time limit for questioning?
- Rowan: At some point a Senator can make the motion. The period of questioning is determined by when the Senator makes the motion and if that motion passes
- England: What if the Senate President says they only want 5 minutes of questioning?
- Rowan: I think we should remove that bit on the Senate President's discretion then
- England: Making an allotted time for questioning is dangerous. You clarify that following questioning, Senators can move to forward the candidates individually or enter pro/con debate. If people think questioning is going on for too long, they can debate on the motion to forward or debate

- Rowan: We need to clarify that it should only be Senators asking questions because we've had issues with that. The same way that we say non-senators can't debate
- England: Instead of saying "an indefinite period of time," you can just remove it. You don't have to specify
- Randall: That's fine
- Rowan: What if we say "approve or reject" for committees
- Linsky: No, forward or reject
- Rowan: I understand Randall. A malicious reading could twist the meaning of "forward." Say "forwarded by the committee"
- England: Are we still considering Jason's comment on removing con debate?
- Linsky: No
- Randall: I take back my comment on that
- Linsky: Do we really need 10.9a here?
- Rowan: Section a is necessary because it sets up certain things for pro/con debate. The way I'm reading it right now is that a closing statement is only granted if we have pro/con debate
- Linsky: It does say that any time not used in an opening is reserved for a closing
- Rowan: But we need to say when they closing happens. We also need to delineate that the motion to forward candidates is a 2/3 vote because we've gone through this twice before
- Linsky: Now we can get rid of a?
- Rowan: No. We can gut a, but we need to keep the part that says the motion to enter debate has to specify which candidates
- Linsky: Let's move on
- Randall: Take "assent" out of 10.12a
- Linsky: Make it "find the amendment favorable." It's the nomenclature we use on the floor
- Rowan: We have to keep "germane" in there
- Randall: What is that?
- Linsky: It's about the original purpose and intent of the bill
- Rowan: USF has a process where you can make a change to the intent/subject of the bill. It's subject to a 2/3 vote

- Linsky: I don't like that at all. It allows the Senate to hijack an individual's legislation, so why would someone even write a bill?
- Randall: Agreed. If you're going to change the intent of the bill, just change the whole thing
- Randall: It's a majority vote for amendments right?
- Rowan: Yes. But Budget and Sweeping can only be amended on the floor by 2/3
- **RECESS FROM 8:10-8:20pm**
- Randall: I have a problem with the wording "committee caucus" in 10.13
- Rowan: I've never seen this been done, only committee of the whole
- Randall: What happens if you don't accept the decision of the committee as the decision of the whole?
- Rowan: Then you have to do it over again
- Linsky: It's just a formality because you were technically in committee
- Rowan: We need 10.14d because you must be on the committee and must be on the prevailing side if you want to reconsider
- Randall: It's one of those rules that was made from a very specific situation
- Rowan: Yes, but it's important
- Rowan: For 10.15e, we have to say who finds it in violation. It's got to be an advisor
- Linsky: I think we should just delete 10.15e. It's the decision of someone employed by FSU. We don't need to be reminded of the Conduct code
- Rowan: We need to talk about 10.16d. I think it should be struck and you should only allow that resolution at Sine Die. In the 72nd, we passed the condolence resolution before Sine Die, and a student passed in between then. A follow up condolence resolution was not passed before Sine Die because of the boycott.
- Randall: We shouldn't put limits on the amount of time we should remember someone.
- England: I understand what you're saying Rowan, but it doesn't hurt to keep it in. We should have the ability to do it in case of a rare scenario, but there should be a general understanding that it's not waived
- Rowan: I'd assume this was written for equal condolences. So that a student's passing is treated with an equal amount of respect, but that's me inferring

- Linsky: I don't want to touch this. There are a lot of things Senate should regulate, but this is not one of them. We need to be cautious with provisions that impact bigger life events like a death in our community
- England: Is Rules where the order of the calendar is set?
- Rowan: We took care of that. Rules doesn't talk about it anymore
- England: Then where is that done?
- Rowan: We don't do that anymore. The calendar is simply a reflection of where measures are
- England: That was a preface. I wanted to merge the Executive Branch and Executive Cabinet
- Rowan: We need to talk about the difference between the Advisory Cabinet and Exec Cabinet.
- England: What's an Advisory Cabinet?
- Rowan: It's an ex officio thing of the class councils, the agencies, and one other group. It's in statutes
- England: No, I just wanted to combine Branch and Cabinet because it doesn't make sense. I'm in the Executive Office of the President, not Cabinet
- Rowan: The Executive Office of the President is in the Cabinet
- Linsky: Advisory Cabinet doesn't actually exist in any form right now
- Rowan: Can we bypass 11 for now and green out 10?
- Randall: 11 isn't formatted yet
- Linsky: We did 3 pages tonight. We have 9 to go. I say we consider meeting twice a week from now on
- Randall: What's your end goal?
- Linsky: We should be done with our first pass by the end of summer
- Rowan: We can make independent revisions on our own during the 1 month break and compare notes. Then we can talk about bundling and packing off resolutions
- Linsky: Let's meet twice a week for the next 2 weeks and do rule 15 now

Rule 15 Discussion

- Rowan: Let's move "in the form of a resolution" to 15.2 and cut 15.3
- Linsky: 15.2 should be the last thing
- Rowan: No because you say to change the rules you need to do it by resolution, and then 15.3 gives the process

Closing Announcements:

- Linsky: We're hoping to complete rules 11, 12, 13, and 14 by the end of the summer session
- Rowan: We should talk about committee organization on the final Thursday meeting before Fall
- Randall: Get people to apply for Central Reserves

Next Meeting: TBA

Adjourned: 8:57pm

Matthew E. Linsky

Signature of Chair Linsky

Meeting Recording:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1R_Fcuout4Y5buHdTUQX1FA1XBKNf5nIX/view?usp=sharing