

THE SEVENTY-FOURTH STUDENT SENATE

Calendar: March 30rd, 2022

Location: Zoom

Time: 7:30pm

Zoom Link: <https://fsu.zoom.us/j/92325341806>

Recording Link:

https://fsu.zoom.us/rec/share/kOWsz7AznMGciZg6lVDyg7WFNIIPMJhIvV1LpuTGrgEsy9CIs_e3VJH0ovlsambo.H7WyOLS8w7qvDUfW

Call to Order:

- President Hunter calls the meeting to order at 7:46pm.

Pledge of Allegiance:

- Led by DuChêne.

Moment of Silent Reflection:

- In honor of Women's History Month.

Land Acknowledgement:

Barker: 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.

Roll Call:

- Refer to Attendance.

Verification of Quorum:

- Verified.

Corrections and Approval of the Journal 3.23.2022:

- **DuChêne moves to approve the Journal of 3/23/2022, Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Journal of 3/23/2022 is approved.**

Student and Non-Budgeted RSO Comments: None.

https://fsu.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_b9EVvRotPr4y03r

Special Introductions and Announcements: None.

Messages from the Executive Branch: None.

Messages from Agency and Bureau Directors, SGA Organizations Officers and Employees:

- OGA Director Rawan: To better the administration as a whole we can obviously make things more coherent and increase transparency between the different entities. A large part of my job as this Bureau's Director is to form an educational surrounding with our students, with you, and with the other branches. I'm hoping this is effective to keep things open and honest with the other branches. The plan we had was creating tangible accomplishments to get things done as leaders on-campus must play a PR game which can be difficult. A balance between this and rebuilding relationships is important. You'll see OGA was mute because of COVID-19 so everyone became their own advocate. Our commitment to advocating for students is important. In terms of creating foundations, I don't want to create something that needs to start all over again, so my board works hard to have sturdy transition materials and a roadmap for the potential of OGA. For institutional knowledge it is our job to educate the student body and to educate you all and learn ourselves. I send 'thank you' messages as I cannot do things without the support that we have. At the University and civil level, I was thankful that we got to push in the realm of partners with the University and how we transformed OGA into a partner of advocacy via student affairs, the government relations office – which get our objectives across the finish line – local political visits, and the Office of the Mayor. We have not reached the City Commission and County Commission, and the Office of the President which I feel had a stronger relationship with the former President. On the State level, we built relationships with the Republican Leadership, Education/Appropriations, future leadership, Democratic Members, and the Seminole Caucus - as we can never stress enough that they legislate on behalf of us. Our future focus is the Republican Education Appropriations as it could be hit harder, Appropriations, New Leadership (who is an FSU alum), and the Seminole Caucus. In the Federal Branch, the offices reached include the Florida House Members and Florida Senators, where we did not reach Committee Chairs and Leadership. Shown again is the Budget Item which brought back Bright Futures, the SOAR Program, and the new FSU Health Tallahassee Center. FSU received \$125 million to have a Health Center and bring up our medical rankings. In legislation, redistricting happened as a result of the census. Governor DeSantis vetoed one of the maps which affected Tallahassee specifically. State legislation that passed included that applicants for President do not have to be public, we have been reaccredited by two institutions instead of one, and the Individual Freedom Bill was expanded from K-20. Bright Futures the service requirement can now be met with work hours, the "Don't Say Gay Bill," and financial literacy is being put into general education requirements for the State of Florida. A few Bills that failed included conceal carry, hunger free campuses and a few others. Federal legislation that passed included a raise in the Pell Grant and work-study. They are working on the fiscal budget for 2023 which would nearly double Pell Grants and other demographics. These are the last things – the OGA Executive Board confirmed before August to hit the ground running, I hope proposals and reports from the Director can stay, and the engaging for Senators in State legislation. Our Banquet's invitation will be posted on our Instagram.
- *Senate moves to 'Messages from the Executive Cabinet.'*
 - PSU Assistant Director Ash Soto: PSU applications are due April 4th at 11:59pm. Thank you.

- **Little calls for the ‘Order of the Day.’**
 - **No objections**
 - **Senate moves back into the ‘Order of the Day.’**
- *Senate moves back into ‘Bills on Second Reading.’*

Messages from the Executive Cabinet: None.

Messages from the Class Councils: None.

Messages from the Congress of Graduate Students: None.

Messages from the Judicial Branch: None.

Messages from the Union Board and Student Engagement Ambassadors: None.

Messages from the Campus Recreation Board: None.

Report of the SGA Accounting Office: Remaining Balances: Senate Projects \$5,020.22, PAC \$501.00, RTAC \$4,820.00, and ORG Fund \$3,000

Report of Senate Liaisons: None.

Report of Committees:

- Judiciary
 - We heard Bills 30, 31, 25 23. I believe they all passed, but I can double check.
- Internal Affairs
 - Internal Affairs did not meet this week.
- Budget
 - Met yesterday (3/29) at 5:00pm and passed Bill **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:26:14).
- Finance
 - Finance passed Consent Resolution 18 and Bill 30.
- Student Life
 - Tabled Bills 24 and 35, passed Bills 25 and 34, amended and passed Bills 30, 31, and 33, Bill 32 was withdrawn, amended and passed Resolution 20, passed Resolutions 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and tabled Resolution 27.
- Rules & Calendar
 - Met tonight (3/30) at 5:30pm. Resolution 9 was withdrawn, and we voted on a new Absence count for Senators Noel and Kaminski.

Senate Confirmations: None.

Consent Calendar:

CR18

Sponsored by Senator Roy (P)

Allocating funds to Friday Night Live (**Referred to Finance 3.23. Passed in Finance 3.29.**)

- **Gonzalez moves to approve the Consent Resolution, Rivers seconds.**
 - **No objections**
 - **Consent Resolution 18 is approved.**

Bills First Reading:

- Bill 24 Sponsored by Senator Suarez and Senator Wells (P) Murray (Co)
 To allow first-year college students to represent the college of undergraduate studies despite being enrolled in their University Division. (**Referred to Student Life and Judiciary. Tabled in Student Life 3.10 3.24.**)
- Bill 35 Sponsored by Senator Beall (P) Hunter (Co)
 To complete funding for Bill 88 that was passed in the 73rd senate to install one large picnic bench outside of the Rovetta building. The amount listed would be used to cover the freight and installation costs of the table. (**Referred to Student Life and Budget 3.23. Tabled in Student Life 3.24.**)
- Bill 36 Sponsored by Senator Diaz and Senator DuChêne (P)
 Pfeuffer-Ferguson(Co)
 Restructuring the statute pertaining to the Senate Award for Excellence and providing procedural guidelines for nominations.
- Bill 37 Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Roy, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Myers, Stewart, Bettley (Co)
 Providing for more internal accountability by adding the Directors of the Executive Institutes to the list of Major Offices and those appointed officers subject to impeachment by the Student Senate, and for other purposes.
- Bill 38 Sponsored by Senator Roy and Senator Diaz (P) Gonzalez, Russell, Pardee, Bettley, Downing, Stewart, Suarez, Myers, Tucker (Co)
 A bill to transfer \$2000 from the Organizational Fund to the Programming Allocations Committee.
- **Diaz moves for Bill 38 to be placed on ‘Second Reading,’ Gonzalez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Bill 38 is placed on ‘Second Reading.’**
- Bill 39 Sponsored by Senator Diaz and Senator Stewart (P) Barrett (Co)
 Providing a method by which non-Senators can endorse legislation.

- Bill 40 Sponsored by Senator Bettley (P)
 Transferring \$1500.00 from the Pride Student Union Food Category to their Contractual Services Category to bring a guest speaker for an AASU x Pride Speaker on April 21st.
- Bill 41 Sponsored by Senator Wang (P) Bettley, Gonzalez, Little, Rivers, DuChêne (Co)
 Allowing seats without sworn-in senators to become vacant.
- Bill 42 Sponsored by Senator Wang (P) Duchene, Bettley, Gonzalez, Rivers, Little (Co)
 Changing election results announcements from New Business to Special Introductions of the Senate Calendar.
- Bill 43 Sponsored by Senator Wang and Senator Little (P) Bettley (Co)
 Mandating questions asked during the Spring Semester Executive Debate to be asked to all candidates running for the same position.
- **Wang moves for Bill 43 to be placed on ‘Second Reading,’ Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Bill 43 is placed on ‘Second Reading.’**
- Bill 44 Sponsored by Senator Rivers (P)
 To ensure that the funds given to Homecoming follow proper student statutes changing the membership of the Homecoming Planning Commission. Also, to ensure that Homecoming is planning practical Homecoming activities.
- **Rivers moves for Bill 44 to be placed on ‘Second Reading,’ Gonzalez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Bill 44 is placed on ‘Second Reading.’**
- Bill 45 Sponsored by Senator Drackley (P) Diaz, Hunter, and Russell (Co)
 To move the duties of the Senate newsletter from the Senate President to the Senate Press Secretary and Senate Historian. This will allow the Senate newsletter to be done more consistently as well as open more transparency of what the Student Senate does to our constituents in the Student Body.

Bills Second Reading:

- Bill 25 Sponsored by Senator Rivers (P) Senators Wang & Gonzalez (Co)
 To transfer the power of Director of Homecoming Chief and Princess to Homecoming Executive Council. Also, to give Homecoming

the power of planning Homecoming Chief and Princess Election.
(Referred to Student Life and Judiciary 3.9. Passed in Student Life 3.24. Passed in Judiciary 03.29.)

- Opening Statement:
 - Currently DSO has control over the Homecoming Chief and Princess elections. They receive funds from SGA to put on that event and election. As I see it, I view this as something SGA should control, moving it under the Homecoming Executive Council so that the student body has more control, greater opinion, and easier access to the elections and share discrepancies/suggestions.
RECORDING INAUDIBLE (00:38:37). It will be much easier if we give Student Life Association the money for this. I'm open to any questions, comments, or concerns.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - No speakers.

- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Information: Pfeuffer-Ferguson to the Sponsor: Have you spoken with **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:39:27) about this Bill and gained an understanding with how they feel?
 - I've spoken to **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:39:37) about this piece of legislation, they did not give me an opinion on it.
 - Point of Information: Diaz to the Sponsor: Do you think there's a potential for a conflict of interest having students administer in such election?
 - No, especially considering how now alumni get choose who is put on the Board – which I don't believe makes sense – as this is somebody who is representing the student body; therefore, the student body should choose them and be involved in the election.
 - Tucker: I'm all about direct representation and think this is a smart Bill. I think the Senator has gone through the appropriate steps and I will be supporting this.

- First Round of Con:
 - Pfeuffer-Ferguson: I had a discussion with the previous SAA President about this, and they are completely against this Bill. There would be a conflict of interests having students involve. I am against this Bill.
 - Point of Information: Diaz to the Sponsor: Could you explain how the elections currently work and are run, and how they would be run with the implementation of this Bill?
 - I'm pretty sure it's a Qualtrics link they use, which is similar to how we used this semester. If this were run under SGA then the Supervisor of Elections can be monitoring the election and the same

Election Code would apply to homecoming as it does to the Spring, Fall, and various other elections.

- Point of Clarification: Gonzalez: For the last Homecoming election, they used same sex **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:42:18).
- Point of Information: Barrett to the Sponsor: Have you discussed with the Homecoming Council how exactly they put on the elections – do they have any plans if this were to switch over?
 - I have spoken to Homecoming before I had this legislation, and they were in approval of it and said it was a good idea. They shared confused why SAA does it and not them. As to their current plans, I cannot tell you as I cannot get in contact with them. I have gotten into contact with them as they try to gear up and start planning Homecoming for this fall semester. However, if the concern is that they do not have enough time to figure out how this will be run, I will friendly to a proviso saying that this will go into effect during the 2023-2024 school year, to give them time to formulate and converse with SAA to see the previous processes and how they could improve them.
- Point of Information: Garner to the Sponsor: This past fall, I was able to get 15 of the Black student leaders on campus to put out a joint statement condemning the lack of diversity on the Homecoming Court. Do you believe that passing this Bill will increase the chances of diversity becoming a thing of nature again?
 - I do not want to bash anyone on campus; however, I do know that when that happened in the Fall semester, SAA - particularly adults in charge – were not particularly concerned about the lack of diversity on their Council and didn't feel the need for a change. That right there proves to me that leadership is not an appropriate word on their end. If this is under SGA, I feel SGA is diverse (it could be more diverse) so I feel SGA would be better able to diversify the Council and choose representatives that could be representative of all students on FSU's campus.
- Point of Clarification: Jacalyn: This is under a Department and would affect a role that full-time staff advisors are already apart of, and I don't know that such person has been consulted with this. I want you all to know that Homecoming has an Advisor involved, and not under our Student Government's Department.
- **DuChêne moves to amend to add proviso language that “this Bill shall take effect August 28th, 2023,”**
Gonzalez seconds
 - **No objections**

- **Author finds it friendly**
 - **Amendment is adopted.**
 - Point of Clarification: Jacalyn: Because Homecoming Chief and Princess is held under somebody, **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:47:32), I don't know if this Bill has the ability to change the staff member's job.
 - Rider: Based off what we've spoken about where we discussed - as Senators - to reach out to Advisors and have a plan, it doesn't seem this Bill has done that so I would hate for us to do something that goes against a Staff Member's job (who is educated in this). I understand the point of this and see that Homecoming is their specialty; I just think that we shouldn't be doing this yet as not enough people have been consulted. I think we need to look at this a little more, and I'd be happy to do that.
 - Garner: Perhaps I may be the only one doing this to try to return some diversity to the Homecoming Court, but last semester was the first time in twenty years where there wasn't a Black man on the Homecoming Court. I think that is an avenue I will entertain if we can, perhaps, enforce some type of action to require something similar to 'quotas' instead of putting us in their hands of students as opposed to full-time, paid Staff Members.
 - Point of Information: Hockett to the Sponsor: How long this Bill has been amended as I feel it has been on the Floor a few times now?
 - President Hunter: A week.
 - Point of Information: Bettley to Advisor Jacalyn: Who would be the Staff Member and the Advisor that we could reach out to?
 - The full-time Staff Advisor is **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:50:56). As far as SAA, I know for them I want to say it's **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:51:03). I'd be happy to provide their contact information.
 - Diaz: I think SGA and the Senate has the capacity to do great things. I wish that this legislation was something we had SAA folks coming in and advocating for and these Staff Members providing their opinions on. I have slight concerns on conflict of interest with having students run elections versus someone more administrative. Given all that, I wish there was more involvement from the other outside organizations being affected by this Bill.
 - B. Suarez: I think this Bill has good 'bones' but I feel that I cannot vote in favor of something like this as I feel it necessary to make sure everyone's on the same page from Advisors, SAA, and Homecoming Council.
 - **Bowling moves to call the question, Barrett seconds.**
 - **Bettley objects.**
 - **Bowling withdraws.**
- Second Round of Pro:

- Bettley: This is not going into effect for an entire year, so we have time to have those conversations. I don't think those conversations are going to start if this isn't already passed. Contact might not be that easy. There are multiple other elections run by students. Our Supervisor of Elections is a student. I don't think that's a large concern, and it gives students more of a voice in the Homecoming elections. I will be voting yes to have these conversations and don't think they will happen if this isn't implemented.
- Gonzalez: I am doing my best not to assume anyone's opinion on anything, but I'm glad Senator Garner brought up the fact that a Black man was not on the Homecoming Court for the first time in twenty years because my boss was on the Committee that chose that Court and multiple times throughout the process, he spoke up saying that there is not a Black man on here. They shut him down and did not respond to any of his comments and kept moving. There were a small amount of Black men just chosen for the preliminary, just to be interviewed and from there none advanced. That is the reason I support this Bill as we do a lot of FSU's **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:55:28) and sometimes we do it the best, and I trust my peers and those I can hold directly accountable over Staff Members we've never met.
- Second Round of Con:
 - Garner: I appreciate what Chair Gonzalez said; however, I am not sure that blowing up the current system is the best route to go. I think entertaining a possibility to reform that system would have more 'buy-in' from all parties than starting something new. I think doing some more research is the best route to go instead of passing this Bill.
 - Diaz: If this were even to get passed, I completely agree that there could be some method to express support for reforming Homecoming, and that's what the Resolution process is for – expressing the Senate's beliefs on a particular issue. I don't believe amending statutes is the right way to reform a system that could use reform.
 - **Pfeuffer-Ferguson moves to call the question, Hockett seconds.**
 - **No objections**
 - **The question is called.**
- Closing Statement:
 - In regards of the Senate not having the power to take this away from a Department, that is something I became aware of and believe that with the passage of the Bill we can have conversations about what that would look like. My intention is not to take anyone's job away from them. My intention is to not have anybody appointed. I want there to be a better system. Technically, I've had meetings with certain individuals and organizations where one particular

one was not a great experience for me – I sat in a room with numerous other people and I was berated for being a transfer student and not having enough knowledge to write this Bill, and that I shouldn't be in the leadership roles I'm in as I am a transfer student. **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (00:59:16). That meeting shows that this Bill is needed. This Bill is a good thing, I know there are concerns about whether the allowing of students to run the election will make it unfair or if anybody will packing the Court. I don't see that happening as we do have a Supervisor of Elections who does their job well and fairly. When you have adults putting their opinions into who should be on this Court, that's when bias is coming in because you don't know where these people have gone into their life and what they think about certain people – that is where bias comes in. As students, we share a common thing: we are all students who have chosen this University as we like something about it and those running on the Court have spent their time at this University and obviously love this University. The fact that can be taken away from different groups of students is unacceptable. We have power to fix problems we see. If I thought this was something that could have been easily fixed with a conversation with certain organizations, I would have done that. However, I thought this needed a push further, and this Bill provides that – which is why I allowed the proviso language because I know this is a controversial Bill. I know there are many opinions on this Bill. If this passes, we have until August 28th of 2023 to figure out how best to do this.

- **Voting Results:**
 - **12 yes, 11 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bill 25 passes.**

Bill 30

Sponsored by Senator Wang & Senator Gonzalez (P)

A bill to grant the Finance Committee the authority to place limitations on funding SGA entities or Registered Student Organizations that commit egregious violations of the Finance Code and to make minor adjustments to the process for the restriction of funds. **(Placed on Second Reading 3.9. Referred to Finance and Student Life 3.23. Passed and Amended in Student Life 3.24. Passed and Amended in Finance 3.29. Passed and Amended in Judiciary 3.29.)**

- **Opening Statement:**
 - Gonzalez: This was sent to three Committees and amended in each, and came back the exact same way we sent to Committees. It's up to us to figure this out. In Student Life it was amended to no longer than "the remainder of the current fiscal year," which posed the issue that if we imposed sanctions one week before the next fiscal year, sanctions would only be in place for a week

and assumed Executive Boards change when the fiscal year changes. In Finance it was amended to say, “until such time that the responsible financial officers, as prescribed by that RSO’s bylaws, are no longer in office,” which means the ‘ball is in the RSO’s court’ but further implies that Finance has no leeway to say how long that takes.

- Wang: There is also no record of who the responsible financial officers would be, so it doesn’t make sense in our eyes as there isn’t much accountability.
- Gonzalez: Judiciary changed it back to “no longer than one (1) calendar year,” as it addresses the concerns put forth by the Student Body President and insured that after one year most Executive board would change out.

RECORDING INAUDIBLE (01:11:37).

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:

- Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Did you speak with the Student Body President like you said you would yesterday (3/29) in Finance?
 - Gonzalez: I’ve reached out to her multiple times and have not heard anything back.
- DuChêne: The original text said one year, Student Life changed it to the remained of the current fiscal year, Finance changed it, and Judiciary changed it to one calendar year?
 - Gonzalez: Yes.
- Garner: Who offered an Amendment to strike my Amendment in Judiciary?
 - Gonzalez: Senator little.
- DeChick: The sanctions are a case-by-case basis?
 - Gonzalez: Yes.
- DuChêne: Did you find the calendar year Amendment friendly?
 - Wang: Yes.
- Bowling: The amendment by Student Life was not friendly at first, so was Finance’s?
 - Gonzalez: Student Life’s was not friendly, yours was friendly, but then Judiciary found some concerns and their new Amendment was the final.

- First Round of Pro:

- Point of Clarification: Barrett: Student Life had two Amendments – one that was not friendly, and one that was.
- Point of Information: DuChêne to the Sponsors: What current iteration of this text do you find better as opposed to the original two Amendments?
 - Gonzalez: The only thing that is different is the calendar, and Judiciary put that in, but I believe a Senator brought up that if you just put a year, it’s

blurry if it's fiscal or calendar and putting calendar reinforces our intentions.

- Point of Information: Garner to the Sponsors: It was mentioned that the Amendment offered in Finance did not provide any specification as to who the responsible financial officer is. I believe the Amendment was worded in a way that referred to that RSO's bylaws, so the financial officer appointed in their bylaws is the one that is referenced to. I want to make sure that was your thinking.
 - Wang: No because if we were to apply sanctions as the Bill is currently written, only the name of the entity being sanctioned is allowed to be on the Resolution – we cannot name student names.
 - Gonzalez: There must be a statement so it could be the President, Vice President or Treasure, among others, so how could we differentiate the individuals.
- Point of Information: Rider to the Sponsors: You're looking for the people intentionally using money maliciously, right?
 - Wang: Technically it's on a case-by-case basis, and if we see no-fault then that is the Finance Committee's decision. That is also why there's such a high threshold of two-thirds required to apply these sanctions.
 - Gonzalez: I want to add this also affects everyone else involved in the Budget process who isn't just an RSO.
- Point of Information: Rider to the Sponsors: Does this happen a lot where a Bill goes back and gets amended continuously because doesn't that mean that all those people in those Committees did that for nothing, where only the last Committee's Amendments get to Senate. Is that normal?
 - President Hunter: No, this is not typical. I think it matters about the Committee makeup and sometimes we don't have people with similar opinions in all three Committees. This was brought back to the Senate floor for discussion. I don't think this is a Bill that will be sent back to Committee due to Committee attendance, various opinions in each Committee, and this isn't common.
- Point of Information: Roy to the Sponsors: Were there any proposed Amendments to make it a majority vote to rescind or modify any of the restriction's points.
 - President Hunter: Yes, on the Senate Floor last week, but not in Committee.
- Little: I was the Sponsor of the Bill **RECORIDNG** **INAUDIBLE** (01:19:16). I recognize why the other points were considered. I felt, and the Committee agreed, that the other wordings left holes. Such as with the Finance Committee's version, I am personally in an RSO right now that has six different people financially certified and who

are authorized to make purchases, so any of them could potentially commit something sanctionable and the Finance Committee would have no way of knowing which particular individuals are responsible or know when such individual is gone. I think that the “no longer than one (1) calendar year” allows the Finance Committee to still put a sanction for various amounts of time, which I believe is the simplest way.

- Point of Information: Pfeuffer-Ferguson to the Sponsors: Are names attached from whoever submits something from an RSO?
 - President Hunter: Yes.
- Point of Information: Pfeuffer-Ferguson to Jacalyn: Wouldn't that mean you could see the individual?
 - Jacalyn: I'm not sure you all could.
- Tucker: We spent a long time being meticulous with this Bill by not focusing so much on the individual at harm, we need more from the Finance side as it may be the culture of the RSO.
- Bowling: As the Chair of the Finance Committee, I appreciate this Bill and believe it to be a good idea. I don't think it brings hostility to RSO's. I think there do need to be checks and balances, which this provides for organizations that intentionally violate funding statutes. I think this is necessary and something the Finance Committee and Senate should be able to have in its 'back pocket.'
- **Stewart moves to amend with the removal of “two-thirds (2/3)” in Sections “2,” “3,” and sub-section “c,” Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.**
 - **Hockett objects.**
 - **Stewart does not withdraw.**
 - **Senate moves into debate on the Amendment.**
- Opening Statement on the Amendment:
 - I was in the Student Life Committee that created the original Amendment to change the one yea to read the current fiscal year. The reason why I'm okay leaving the Amendment at the top of this Bill the way it is, but also considering these two Amendments, because an Executive Board may misuse funding they are granted and have the possibility of being impeached for that. A calendar year may be a long time if you're withholding thousands of dollars, especially for Agencies that hold events year-round. This would make it easier for Senate to lift those restrictions, seeing f that be necessary it's easier. If JSU intentionally misused funding, this would make it easier for us to remove reprimanding if actions take place for the positive.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:

- Bettley: Would this also make it easier to extend the time of banning access to funding
 - I can't answer that as it's not technical non-debatable.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Roy: This is changing the majority of two-thirds, which I think it's important to keep a majority because with two-thirds to place sanctions, it means we need a very high threshold with bipartisan support. If you want to change something I don't think it still needs to be two-thirds because you could have bias. You don't need the same two-thirds if positive changes are made within the RSO. This makes it more friendly and understands that two factions may disagree.
 - Diaz: I am voting in favor of this Amendment, but I want to mention something to the Amendment Sponsor of what the Bill Sponsor mentioned, which is that changing it to majority could make the Bill open to making it easier for Finance Committee to extend sanctions, which may not be the intent of the Amendment. Everywhere in this Bill where the Finance Committee is mentioned, it specifies a majority vote. What does it say about Senate is if the only time the Finance Committee requires a two-thirds vote is to lift sanctions. Are we making it easier or harder for RSO's?
 - Point of Information: Bettley to the Sponsor: Would you be friendly to an Amendment that says restrictions can only be shortened rather than extended?
 - Yes.
 - Point of Clarification: Gonzalez: Currently the beginning of the Bill says no longer than one year, so it can never be extended past one year.
 - Point of Information: Barker to the Sponsor: If we kept Point 2 as two-thirds, that's part saying shall be amended. Number 3 is talking about it being lifted, so if we kept Point 3 as a majority and the other as two-thirds, would that solve the issue of the extension?
 - Stewart: I would find that friendly.
 - **Gonzalez moves to amend Section 2 to read "two-thirds (2/3)" instead of "a majority," Wang seconds.**
 - **No objections**
 - **Author finds it friendly**
 - **Amendment adopted.**
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Gonzalez: We would find this Amendment friendly.
 - **Hockett withdraws his objection.**
 - **Authors find it friendly.**
 - **Amendment adopted.**
- First Round of Pro:
 - Stewart: With the current Amendment just passed, I think there have been proper restrictions placed.

- First Round of Con:
 - Point of Information: Hockett to the Sponsors: If someone **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (01:37:19)?
 - Gonzalez: As we're holding the organization responsible, not the - individual - I believe we are required to invite the organization to come to Finance Committee where the sanctions are being voted on and invited to the Senate meeting. If the sanctions are being heard in the full Senate. They can offer a way to remedy the sanctions. It's up to the discretion of the Finance Committee.
 - Point of Information: DeChick to the Sponsors: Do you believe that **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (01:38:21)?
 - Gonzalez: Yes.
 - Garner: As it stands, I cannot support this Bill as the Amendment I offered in Finance, we use the funds appropriately instead of punishing the entire organization itself. The Point of Information raised earlier regarding student's name on purchasing receipts, I'm not entirely sure with saying we are going to take away the ability for an RSO to get funds when we do know which individuals are responsible.
 - Point of Clarification: DuChêne: The member is more than welcome to re-offer the original Amendment.
 - Pfeuffer-Ferguson: I am opposed to this Bill as there has not been a meeting with the Student Body President and this Bill has been vetoed for a reason and speaking to RSO's themselves. This is something that makes SGA seem inaccessible and someone with power over our RSO's. We don't see this happen as often as it's implied.
 - Garner: I have a feeling the Student Body President will veto this Bill again as her primary concern was not addressed. While she may mention the original two-year ban was inappropriate, I believe the spirit she was getting at was not to hold RSO's responsible who have a change in leadership, and this does nothing to address that.
 - **B. Suarez moves to call the question, Tucker seconds.**
 - **Roy objects.**
 - **B. Suarez withdraws.**
- Second Round of Pro:
 - Rivers: This Bill affects more than just RSO's: every single entity SGA is funding. What about the other entities that are spending money in ways they shouldn't? This isn't just for RSO's.
 - Barrett: In Student Life the response to this Bill came with a very detailed explanation of an entity who has misused funds, and nothing had been done.
 - Tucker: One of our duties is to be a check, so we must fulfill this duty.

- Point of Information: Rivers to the Sponsors: Can you go into detail on some entities that SGA funds?
 - Gonzalez: Budget has made this very clear, **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (01:46:47), but we're not allowed to govern over anything in the Executive Branch or in Executive Projects.
- DuChêne: One of the concerns is that the Student Body President has not talked about this Bill, it's now been a week and they have not engaged with anybody in Senate over this. At that point it's in our hands and we improved this Bill for the Student Body President to do what she wishes.
- Roy: This is positive. RSO's will always come to PAC, and we will look at every small detail. If they do something egregious, that's something the Senate should look like. Academic year is better than the fiscal year, and we can never see who would be individually responsible. The RSO's get their chance to be heard in the Senate.
- Second Round of Con:
 - Point of Information: Diaz to the Senate President: Is there anything about your conversations to the Student Body President pertinent that you would like to share?
 - President Hunter: Nothing I'd like to share.
 - **Tsouroukdissian moves to call the question, B. Suarez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
- Closing Statement:
 - Gonzalez: Next year's budget is \$14.6 million. Out of that money, \$90,000 was given to PAC and \$70,000 was given to RTAC. We fight over those Consent Resolutions to ensure that this funding is handled well. If we don't call out these mistakes, then shame on us.
 - Wang: It's been happening in the past where people aren't putting in **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (01:50:34). That's not something the Treasurer or President is committing to via purchase orders.
- Voting Results:
 - **19 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bill 30 passes.**

Bill 31

Sponsored by Senator Rivers (P) Hockett (Co)
 To make it so that a majority of the incoming Senior class are able to vote on the incoming Senior Class Council. **(Referred to Student Life and Judiciary 3.23. Passed and Amended in Student Life 3.24. Passed in Judiciary 3.29.)**

- Opening Statement:

- The purpose for writing this Bill is that as it stands currently, Senior Class Council is elected during the Spring semester, and only Seniors can vote in this election. A majority of people voting for the incoming Senior Class Council in the Fall are Seniors graduating in that Spring who will not be around for the elected administration in the Fall. A majority of those around with this administration are Juniors, so this allows Juniors to be able to vote in the Senior Class Council election. Student Life added the “and Senior Classes” Amendment which I found friendly.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - No speakers.
- First Round of Pro:
 - DuChêne: Student Life added “and Senior Classes” as it makes sense to allow Juniors to vote but as they will be Seniors next year. We included Seniors as a lot of third-years or ‘Juniors’ are academic Seniors and so it would ensure the full gambit of Juniors are able to vote for Senior Class Council. Right now, only academic Seniors are allowed to vote for Senior Class Council. That is why myself along with the entire Student Life Committee were in favor of this Bill.
 - Point of Information: B. Suarez to the Sponsor: Would the author find it friendly to include classified Juniors, because the languages makes it seem if you’re enrolled in a Junior class you can vote for them but you could be a Freshman enrolled in the Senior Class.
 - When it says Seniors, they go through the FSU Portal themselves and vote, just how they are voting for Senate seats. Originally I want to say no but if we talk about it I may change my mind.
 - Point of Information: Stewart to the Sponsor: Have you talked to the current SOE about this Bill?
 - No.
 - Point of Clarification: Roy: From my reading of language don’t I think it means classes as in like the classroom, I think it already means the classification of Junior or Senior class.
 - Point of Information: Gonzalez to the Sponsor: Would you be friendly if we strike “those enrolled in **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:08:44)” and write “academic Juniors and Seniors.”
 - I want to say no because I feel that was the previous idea mentioned.
 - Point of Clarification: Bettley: I feel like the word ‘enrolled’ already covers that and the only part being changed/amended is adding Junior and Seniors. I feel as though changing that verbiage that has been used for all the past elections is going to alter other factors beyond just the classes.

- Point of Information: Diaz to the Parliamentarian: Is the definition of Junior/Senior ever defined in statutes?
 - No, they are not detailed explicitly.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: B. Suarez: Can you look if third or fourth year is in there?
 - It's not.
 - Point of Clarification: DuChêne: The problem of putting years is that years vary as people come to college for various years. Currently those classified as academic Seniors get to vote for Senior Class Council. The only thing this changes is that it makes academic classified Juniors also allowed to vote in these elections. Our past elections have been fine with this verbiage. We're just enfranchising if we alter the verbiage.
 - Point of Information: Barker to President Hunter: Is this the same for all Class Councils?
 - President Hunter: Senior Class Council is elected. Junior and Sophomore Class Councils are forwarded to the Senate for their positions.
 - **Stewart moves to amend the sentence currently amended to say "only those enrolled as academic Juniors and Seniors shall be eligible to vote for candidates seeking office for the incoming Senior Class Council," DeChick seconds.**
 - **No objections**
 - **Author does not find it friendly.**
- Opening Statement on the Amendment:
 - This is pretty blatant and would allow the classification as an academic Junior or academic Senior on your myFSU student page to make you eligible to vote for Senior Class Council. This also extends to transfer students and those staying longer than four years, which is more inclusive than what was stated before. This could allow for more clarification that the SOE could benefit from – especially if things are brought to trial. I think this is simple to make it straightforward.
 - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Rivers: What is the difference between the unamended version of this and the amended version of this in regards to students seeing Senior Class Council on their ballot.
 - There are academic standing Juniors and academic standing Seniors, and if you're classified as Junior most of the time people interpret that as being a third-year student. You could be a third-year student and have come here three years ago and be classified as a Junior, whereas you could be here as a second-year student who's classified as a Junior. But most people will sometime change their minds and say 'I want to graduate early' or wish to

- someone who has been a Senior for four semesters, there are situations where I've been able to vote for the Senior Class Councils while Junior can't. I'm in full support.
- Little: I agree with those sentiments as I've also been a Senior for two years, so I've voted for Senior Class Councils before. I think the Senior Class Council represents Seniors, even as a fourth-year senior. This allows the Senior Class Council to work for those they represent.
 - B. Suarez: Although I don't like how SOE was not advised, I support this Bill as I was not able to vote for who I wanted to in the Senior Class Council in the past.
 - Hockett: This Bill allows for better representation within the Senior Class Council.

- First Round of Con:

- **Diaz moves to pass by unanimous consent.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Bill 31 passes by unanimous consent.**

Bill 33

Sponsored by Senator Rivers (P)

To become more involved in the Legislative Branch of Student Government, have the Class Councils update Senate on their current projects and goals once a month at any given Senate meeting. **(Referred to Student Life and Judiciary 3.23. Passed and Amended in Student Life 3.24. Passed and Amended in Judiciary 3.29.)**

- Opening Statement:

- I am currently in Class Councils, so I am well aware of the stigma that Class Council has in SGA. I think a big part of that is that Class Councils are not involved in SGA as much as they can/would want to be. Coming to Senate is the best thing for everyone, especially for Senators who are liaisons to different organizations as this allows such Senate liaisons to go back and tell them about Class Councils' thoughts for potential partnerships – which is the goal of SGA, to get people involved. This is something necessary to ensure that students feel welcome here and are engaged.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:

- Diaz to the Senate President: Is there a liaison for the Senior Class Council who can deliver reports for them?
 - No, only Leadership Councils must have liaisons, however if somebody wanted to be one, they could always ask.
- Stewart: Have you previously spoken with the Senior Class Council-elect about this piece of legislation?
 - I spoke to a singular member.
- Stewart: May I ask what the sentiment of the singular member was?

- It was not a conversation about this piece of legislation as I wrote this legislation after speaking to them, and they shared with me that they want (like I said) the stigma and disapproval that Class Councils have in SGA to be alleviated. That is why I created this.
 - B. Suarez: Did you speak to any outgoing members of the Senior Class Council?
 - No because I did not deem it necessary.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Information: Edouard: Do you believe that this is similar to the portion we have here in Senate where a representative from the Class Councils could come and speak, just so it's not made mandatory. Don't you believe that if there are pressing things they need to bring to the Senate, then they will do so then?
 - No, because what's to say they actually come, give us updates, and share what they want to do. This is requiring them to do that as they can go an entire year and not come to Senate once and share any information – not once. If we want Class Council to be more of an entity in SGA, then the mandating of coming to Senate once a month (just once a month) is necessary in my opinion.
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Stewart: In Student Life's meeting on Thursday (3/24), there was a conversation that was had with the Sponsor, that the Sponsor is knowledgeable of - and is in Committee Minutes as well as the recording that I can send to have shown to Senate if need be - where the Sponsor used language that spoke on behalf of the current Senior Class Council-elect, in which he basically eluded to the idea that Senior Class Council-elect had requested something of the sort to be written, and/or supported something of the sort to be written. Upon further investigation myself, I have come to learn that not a single member (not a single member) of the current Senior Class Council-elect – nor a single member of the current Senior Class Council (just in case there are any 'mix-ups' or confusion) - had been spoken to about this. Basically, what I'm getting at, is the Sponsor essentially used that information to further his legislation, which is inappropriate and disgusting behavior, and I do not condone this.
 - Point of Order: Parliamentarian Rowan: Points of Personal Privilege are to raise an issue of the comfort of the Senator themselves or the Senate as a whole. Points of Personal Privilege are not a free debating point. It's there to talk about comfort in the Senate. If you wish to engage in debate, please wait until you come out of Pro or Con.
 - President Hunter: In general, Points of Personal Privilege can address misconduct, however our systemic rules don't allow addresses of misconduct. Although, in general,

- Points of Personal Privilege can address misconduct, our rules are different and cannot address misconduct. You can address misconduct in Con.
- Point of Information: Pfeuffer-Ferguson to President Hunter: Are we allowed to mandate an organization to come give us monthly reports?
 - I wouldn't use the word 'mandate,' but we can put in statutes that someone needs to be here once a month. We have something like that similar for liaisons by making a certain number of reports. If we say they have to, they come or break statutes.
 - Point of Information: Drackley to the Sponsor: If this goes in statutes, and no officer comes - which technically violates statutes - would that be an impeachable offense?
 - Technically, yes.
 - Point of Information: Drackley to the Sponsor: From the wording I'm gathering this would be a mandate, would the Sponsor say that it should be applied to other Bureaus and Agencies under SGA as well to prove that they carrying out their duties?
 - I cannot speak on other Agencies and Bureaus in SGA are required to do, or what I believe they should be required to do as this is not legislation that pertains to that. I can only speak about what I believe Senior Class Council should do.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Tucker: On the subject of Points of Personal Privilege, what does 'comfort of the Senate' mean?
 - President Hunter: Typically Points of Personal Privilege can address misconduct and if someone feels uncomfortable, I lean towards allowing that to be considered a Point of Personal Privilege.
 - Parliamentarian Rowan: The Senate President has discretion of what "comfort of the Senate" means.
 - Point of Information: Bowling to the Sponsor: Is any other organization that has announcements during the beginning of Senate meetings required to have a monthly report, to your knowledge?
 - No.
 - Point of Information: Diaz to the Sponsor: Are you comfortable making this a potential impeachable offense?
 - No, I am not which is why I did not designate a specific officer that has to come. Senior Class Council, by statutes, is required to have a President, Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary, and at least five members at large. I don't see an issue with getting one of nine people to come to Senate once a month to speak at the beginning of Senate and leave right after.
 - DuChêne: A lot has happened in this conversation. This Bill is not controversial. Is it technically an impeachable offense if one of the ten members of the Senior Class

Council don't come to Senate for at least five minutes a month, yes. I don't think this is a hard ask, to ask for a member of the Senior Class Council (of which there are ten) to come for at least five minutes a month to share what they're doing. I've been here for a year and in my entire time in Senate I have never heard the Senior Class Council speak before us. As the Chair of Student Life, from a Student Life perspective, that is unacceptable. We should know what is happening in our Class Councils and I would love to hear from everyone on the announcements list, and don't think this is a hard ask – this is not expressing anyone's opinions on the Sponsor's behavior; that doesn't matter. This is not controversial, and I think that we as a Senate should be wanting to hear more from our Class Councils, especially as they have not been coming.

- **President Hunter calls for a two-minute recess.**
- *President Hunter calls the meeting back to order at 10:37pm.*
 - First Round of Pro:
 - **Wang moves to censor Senator Stewart as she called a member of the Senate disgusting.**
 - **Motion fails as there are not four Senators who second this motion.**
 - **B. Suarez moves for Senior Class Council President-elect Bruce Suarez to speak, Rider seconds.**
 - **Gonzalez objects.**
 - **B. Suarez does not withdraw.**
 - Opening Statement on the Motion:
 - Seeing how in the original Sponsor's opening, Senior Class Council was consulted on this, and later said they were not consulted on this specific Bill, I think it is only right for Senior Class President-elect Bruce Suarez to speak, as this will affect his upcoming presidency. **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:54:17). I think it's only fair to do our due diligence **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:54:26) to speak on behalf of those impacts, on behalf of them, when they're not consulted.
 - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Rivers: Your statement was that the Sponsor said they spoke to the Senior Class Council-elect, and then it was said the Sponsor went back and said they did not. When was that original statement (the first statement) said?
 - I believe I said Senior Class Council.
 - First Round of Pro:
 - Diaz: There is unnecessary hostility in this room right now. This is a very simple motion to let a soon to be elected

official of the Senior Class Council to speak, so let's be efficient with our time.

- Point of Personal Privilege: Stewart: I am ultimately in support of this Bill - that's not what I was getting at with my previous Point of Personal Privilege. The environment of the Senate, as we've seen through previous discussion with administration, is that it has gotten to be an untrusting place and sometimes individuals have been speaking on behalf of other people that have either been misrepresented or simply lied about. I think – in my own personal experience with this – that I am choosing to make this a bigger deal than necessary because I am personally frustrated by the actions that certain people have taken to try and advance their Bills, Resolutions, or whatever it may be and using the name of somebody else.
 - Point of Information: Gonzalez to the Sponsor: Will a question be directed to him?
 - Yes.
 - **Gonzalez withdraws their motion.**
- First Round of Pro:
 - Little: I sponsored the Amendment that included the three specific Councils, and I wanted to speak in Pro of the Bill in this form. There is still that spot on the Calendar if a Class Council Representative wanted to come and speak – this doesn't prohibit them from doing that. This is just making it so that at least once a month we are hearing from someone about the business of the Councils. In my personal experience in Senate, aside from people who serve on Councils and in Senate, we don't get a lot of people from the Class Councils in here during the announcements, so I think this is great in increasing transparency.
 - Point of Information: DuChêne for the Senior Class Council President-elect: My question doesn't regard the consultation process; it only refers to the statute itself. Do you see a benefit to the Senate essentially mandating for one of your ten members to visit us at least once a month?
 - Bruce Suarez: This is the first time I'm reading this in its entirety. I see positive things that can come from it **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (03:01:45).
 - Bell: Last time we discussed this in Judiciary I asked the Sponsor of this Bill a question regarding why the Senior Class Council should be responsible for relaying information to the other Councils. It included for the reasons that once a month they are required to know the information of the other Councils and what they are doing. So, the Senior Class Council knows about the other Councils, and I think (again) it's super important that it is essentially mandated that we know what's going on with all our Councils because we are trying to improve communication.

- **Garner moves to pass by unanimous consent, Tucker seconds.**
 - **B. Suarez seconds.**
 - **Motion fails.**
- Bettley: I think this is going to be fantastic as it gives accountability to the Senior Class and other Councils. At the beginning of every Senate meeting, we have messages and there have been so many meetings where no one from such entities is here. I will be going through statutes to create more accountability, so that it's not just Class Councils who have to be here once a month because I think this is part of a great progress towards making sure we know what is actually going on. If they need any sort of assistance this gives them a dedicated time once a month to make that announcement.
- First Round of Con:
 - No speakers.
 - **Tsouroukdissian moves to call the question, Bell seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
- Closing Statement
 - I just want to reiterate that this Bill (and my submitting of this Resolution) has no malice behind it. This is something I feel is a betterment of SGA as a whole, regardless of what was said here or what people feel. I just implore every single Senator sitting here – and on Zoom - to put personal biases aside and look at this legislation as is and do all our jobs and due diligences as Student Senators at Florida State University, to better the student environment and the day-to-day life of students here at Florida State University. I believe that this Bill is nothing bad, it just has a lot of negative energy to it, so however you vote – cool. I will still implore you to do the job that all of us have sworn in to do as student Senators at Florida State University to represent our constituents - represent the people we are sitting here representing - and doing our job, and doing it well.
- Voting Results:
 - **22 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bill 33 passes.**
- Point of Personal Privilege: Rivers: May Pro Tempore Nemeth say the voting results again.
 - Pro Tempore Nemeth: 22 yes, 3 no, and 1 abstention.
- Point of Personal Privilege: Garner: I would like to comment on the environment of the Senate. I think we had a very robust debate about the Bill that just passed, but I

would like to remind all of us that we genuinely agree on a lot of stuff, and if we could tone down some of the outside feelings that may be seeping into some of the things we're discussing tonight, I think we can leave here feeling like we've accomplishing a lot for those Senators who will no longer be with us.

- **DuChêne moves to suspend the Bedtime Rule indefinitely, Tsouroukdissian seconds.**
 - **The Bedtime Rule is suspended indefinitely.**
- *President Hunter relinquishes the Chair to Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson.*

Bill 34

Sponsored by Senator Tsouroukdissian (P)

To purchase a second water bottle filling station for the College of Engineering campus. **(Referred to Student Life and Budget 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24. Passed in Budget 3.29.)**

- Opening Statement:
 - To begin with a story that inspired me for this Bill. I try to fill my water bottle and noticed that it was down – the only one in the whole building. I talked to the Facilities Director and we emailed a few times, had some contractors come out, and got a couple quotes: one for a water bottle filling station on Building B, which the current water bottle filling station is on the second floor in Building A and **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (03:11:21). The price is for the instillation and a few other things in the quotes that I sent to every one of you.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Bell: How much money is in Senator Projects currently?
 - \$5,020.
 - Bowling: Where would the water bottle filling station be?
 - It would be on the same building the current one is on, but on the first floor of Building A – the current one is on the second floor. This would create a more sustainable campus in the College of Engineering as well as more accessible for those students.
 - Diaz: This is the FAMU-FSU campus?
 - Yes.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Bettley: This came through Budget, and I think it's fantastic. This is exactly what we're meant to do (to represent the constituents in our College) and this is doing that. I'm surprised there's no second water bottle station, and this is more sustainable which is why I'm in further support of this Bill.
 - Gonzalez: The Sponsor did his due diligence and sent me a quote to tell Budget. This does a good job of us representing our Colleges. Sometimes we get caught up in

other things, and this ensures we are also serving our constituents.

- Bell: I just learned recently there is another project being proposed next week and the Sponsor made sure to allow the other project enough room, so I fully support this Bill.
 - Hockett: The College is a distant land that seems waterless at times. I think a nice cold refillable station would be great for our bright minds.
 - DuChêne: There is no better way to mark the Sponsor's last Senate meeting than with a fantastic Bill that directly represents their constituents.
 - Rivers: The Sponsor reached out to me earlier and I wanted to publicly acknowledge him, and I told him that this is a great Bill that is truly benefiting the entirety of the student body, which is what we're here to do - to benefit the entire student body.
 - **Bowling moves to pass by unanimous consent, RECORDING INAUDIBLE (03:16:54) seconds.**
 - **Roy objects.**
 - Bowling: This is a straightforward and great Bill that gives people what they need, and I think that's pretty refreshing.
 - **Gonzalez moves to call the question, B. Suarez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
-
- First Round of Con:
 - N/A.
 - Closing Statement
 - I appreciate all of the support – it really means a lot. **RECORDING INAUDIBLE (03:18:02).**
 - Voting Results:
 - **25 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.**
 - **Bill 34 passes.**
-
- *The Chair is relinquished back to President Hunter.*
 - **Chair Russel moves to unlock the Calendar and move to 'Agency and Bureau Announcements,' Gonzalez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Senate moves to 'Agency and Bureau Announcements.'**
 - *Senate moves to 'Agency and Bureau Announcements.'*

Bill 38

Sponsored by Senator Roy and Senator Diaz (P) Gonzalez, Russell, Pardee, Bettley, Downing, Stewart, Suarez, Myers, Tucker (Co)
A bill to transfer \$2000 from the Organizational Fund to the Programming Allocations Committee.

- Opening Statement:
 - Roy: Gotta keep it fresh. We have an organizational fund at the beginning of each school year which is meant to help get RSO's around \$200 or less. They can access this, apply, and get it, and the link closes around November. This year we still had \$3,000. This Bill is transferring \$2,000 of which to PAC so that we can continue funding things as we have around \$203. Otherwise, it would be waited until the end of the year and transferred to Sweepings or elsewhere.
 - Diaz: I want to second everything Chair Roy said. These are funds I don't want to go to waste and that could be used to fund RSO's which I think is one of our main priorities in Senate – a spirit I hope to continue for the rest of the school year.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - No speakers.

- First Round of Pro:
 - Rivers: I am in support of this solely because the Sponsor is so fresh on the Floor right now. How can you say no with the Sponsor looking like this.
 - Point of Information: Gonzalez to the Sponsors: The application for this year is closed?
 - Roy: Yes, to my understanding.
 - Point of Information: Gonzalez to the Sponsors: Why not drain the whole account?
 - Roy: We did not want to do that if there are any concerns. PAC would spend everything. That's entirely up to you guys.
 - **Little moves to amend from \$2,000 to \$3,000, Gonzalez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Authors find it friendly**
 - **Amendment is adopted.**
 - Bowling: I have had the privilege of working with PAC and Chair Roy in Finance. PAC is one of those organizations that is constantly working with the student body, and I am very happy this was amended to \$3,000. I think PAC deserves this funding. I am excited to vote in favor of this Bill.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Would Roy be able to object if someone moves to pass this by unanimous consent?
 - Yes.
 - Little: I will be voting yes as these funds will be used anyways. There is only one line in statues about the Organizational Fund and simply says that it is open to organizations and students at the beginning of the Fall semester, and on the SGA website it's open from July to

- November. If we don't use all of it, it's just going to be swept anyways. There are organizations interested in this money from PAC. It makes giving it to them if they want it.
- Point of Information: Bettley to the Sponsors: Why the Organizational Fund is only opened for a certain amount of months and not the whole year?
 - Roy: I'm not sure as the entire point is to get the money to RSO's. It should be but given the current situation they have tried revisiting that conversation with Accounting, but still have excess funds.
 - **Gonzalez moves to call the question, B. Suarez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
- First Round of Con:
 - N/A.
 - Closing Statement
 - Roy: Thanks for helping with this rad, righteous cause. I yield man.
 - Voting Results:
 - **23 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.**
 - **Bill 38 passes.**

Bill 43

Sponsored by Senator Wang and Senator Little (P) Bettley (Co)
Mandating questions asked during the Spring Semester Executive Debate to be asked to all candidates running for the same position.

- Opening Statement:
 - Wang: This changes the way the Executive Debate is structured in the Spring. Six questions were asked in total to all the candidates; however, it was not an accurate mashup of who was answering which question. This allows you to compare the answers of each candidate and allows for voters to vote with conscience and not based on what they're hearing throughout campus.
 - Bell: In the debate this year they asked each candidate really good questions, so this makes it so that if a question is asked to the candidate for Student Body President, any other candidate for Student Body President any other candidate is also asked that question, so those at the debate can see any differences in their answers.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - DeChick: Have you spoken to the Supervisor of Elections about this?
 - Wang: No, I wrote this last night.
 - B. Suarez: Were you asked to create this legislation on behalf of a candidate?

- Wang: No.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Garner: This is a commonsense Bill as I have wanted to hear the same question asked of both candidates.
 - DuChêne: This Bill does not benefit a particular campus political party as it really just helps the students.
 - DeChick: This is a great thing to put in place as it allows us to ask a difference between the two major parties and prove comparisons. I think an official format would be best for that.
 - Point of Information: Rider to the Sponsors: Do you know if at other public schools (if they have a debate) do they do this, or do they follow the way we currently structure debates?
 - Bell: I went to one of the UF debate's pre-COVID-19, but I think it was where candidates answered the same questions. In our most recent debate, the second portion for student questions we did do it this way.
 - Bettley: I think this is fantastic as people need to know the answers of the other perspectives as we are waiting to see the reaction of the other parties. This would be a fantastic resource and can make bullet points for each of the answers. It will set an equal standard. I think this is fantastic as it further structures the debate.
 - Point of Information: Stewart to the Sponsors: Is there language in this legislation and/or statutes - that wasn't necessary included - that states whether each candidate are alternated in question. Is there language that states the following question can be given to the other party?
 - Wang: Not specifically in this Bill.
 - Bell: I don't think that's listed in statues anywhere, but my position on it is if the question gets asked to both candidates, I think this does the job.
 - Point of Clarification: Rider: I want to make sure that there is something says that this will alternate, and that one party will not be answering the question first the entire time.
 - Point of Clarification: Bell: I would be friendly to something of the effect that no candidate shall be the first to answer two questions in a row, if you think that makes more sense.
 - **Stewart moves to amend and add in Section 5, "the questions shall alternate between all candidates based on the position that the candidate is running for," B. Suarez seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Authors do not find it friendly.**
 - **Stewart withdraws.**
 - Point of Clarification: Bell: To me what was proposed it too vague as to how "alternate between all candidates" may be interpreted. If you mean one position or party, it needs to be more specific.

- Point of Clarification: Wang: I think it might work better if you put it at the end of everything underlined as it outlines how the question process works.
 - Point of Clarification: Stewart: I'm trying to make this so that, for example, it will be a question presented to the candidate for Student Body Treasurer for on party, a question presented to the candidate for Student Body Treasurer for another party, question presented to the candidate for Student Body Vice President of the second one to answer, etc. I will stick by withdrawing if somebody else would like to make an Amendment.
 - Point of Information: Gonzalez to the Sponsors: Would the Sponsors find it friendly if you changed "candidates" to something like "entities"?
 - Little: No.
 - Point of Clarification: Diaz: You could say alternate between the parties and independent candidates, or something along those lines.
 - Point of Clarification: Little: I think something that is trying to be done is going to need to be worked through as I don't think it's normal to run independently as it might interrupt that 'snake' method.
 - Point of Information: DeChick to the Sponsors: Would the Sponsors be friendly to **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (03:49:22).
 - Little: No because it still doesn't address parties alternating.
 - Point of Clarification: B. Suarez: I believe this would be revisited in Election Commission to be put into Election Code.
 - **DuChêne moves for a two-minute Recess given that there is common ground that can be reached, and given that this is one Sponsor's last meeting with a solution that can likely be reached tonight, Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Senate moves to Recess for two minutes.**
- *President Hunter calls the meeting back to order at 11:38pm.*
 - **Bowling moves to amend to add "Candidates will receive questioning in order of position. Candidates shall receive questioning in alternating order in each round of debate," at the end of Section 5, Hockett seconds**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Authors find it friendly**
 - **Amendment adopted.**
 - Bettley: I think this Amendment strengthens the debate for sure by ensuring that there is not have an unfair advantage every time questions arise. I'm in full support of the Bill with that Amendment.

- B. Suarez: I like this Bill with the clarification added.
- **B. Suarez moves to pass with unanimous consent.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Bill 43 passes with unanimous consent.**

Bill 44

Sponsored by Senator Rivers (P)

To ensure that the funds given to Homecoming follow proper student statutes changing the membership of the Homecoming Planning Commission. Also, to ensure that Homecoming is planning practical Homecoming activities.

- Opening Statement:
 - I have not talked to anybody about this Bill as I submitted this to be read before I get kicked out of Senate. However, I will be having conversations with these entities after tonight. The purpose of the Commission is to fund and review Homecoming and its entities to give them the money to do what they need to do. The structure was weird as the Homecoming and Homecoming Live Director sit on this Commission, and in my opinion, someone being funded and voting on funding for their own entities should not be allowed to vote on that Commission. I changed it to the Budget, PAC, and Finance Chairs as those are the three people who know what they're doing in following financial regulations and properly manage funding. I did not include RTAC Chair as that would be a debacle, and I felt PAC needed to be on this, as this is what PAC does. There were questionable things funded when I sat on this Commission. With these three Chairs, such questionable funding would be cut off. This would actually help them not be sanctioned by Senate.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Roy: How many organizations do they fund through this Commission?
 - Three: **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (04:00:42), Homecoming as a whole, and Homecoming Live.
 - Point of Clarification: Pro Tempore Nemeth: I chaired this Committee last week and the funding request form is posted on the SGA website, so it is also opened to other entities.
 - Roy: What are the requirements to be one of the groups to receive that funding?
 - I would have to relieve that question to Pro Tempore Nemeth.
 - Pro Tempore Nemeth: I do not have an answer as statutes are extremely vague.
 - DuChêne: Would you say this Commission allocates the funds?

- I do not have the statue in front of me so I cannot say that to be true, but to my best knowledge they allocate the funds.
 - Point of Information: DuChêne to President Hunter: Could you read the powers?
 - Absolutely.
- *President Hunter reads the Powers.*
 - Diaz: What was the reasoning for removing the IRHC Director from that Commission?
 - I saw it as a better fit for someone in a financial branch of Senate to be in there, instead of the IRHC.
 - Pfeuffer-Ferguson: Would you find it friendly if you brought back the IRHC Director and removed someone from the Senate, as there quite a lot of people here in the Senate?
 - I would – it would just be a matter of who you're moving.
 - Roy: Would you be friendly being PAC removed as they already do a lot of funding entities, and as this may be too much for them to handle?
 - I would be friendly to removing PAC and reinstating the IRHC.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Clarification: Gonzalez: I feel like both Chairs can clarify more, but in the past two years only the power used significantly has been to allocate funds.
 - Point of Clarification: Pro Tempore Nemeth: I'm not sure if there's been a presentation in past years. However, at my request, the Homecoming Director did give on this year. There was not much debate afterwards, but we expect regular collection of data throughout all Homecoming events to better the planning for the future.
 - Point of Information: Little to the Sponsor: Could the Homecoming and Homecoming Live Director still serve as ex-officio non-voting members withing this Commission.
 - I relieve this question to Pro Tempore Nemeth.
 - Pro Tempore Nemeth: Under statutes, the Chair has the power for anyone to serve as an ex-officio non-voting member.
 - **Gonzalez moves to amend and strike “Student Senate PAC Chair” and add “and Inter-Residence Hall Council Director,” Pfeuffer-Ferguson seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Author finds it friendly.**
 - **Amendment is adopted.**
 - Little: I am pro of this Bill and thinks it makes sense to remove the conflict of interest where the Director can vote on fudging for their own organization, but I like that non-voting members can still become ex-officio non-voting

members. I think it would make sense for the Chair of the Commission to appoint the Director of Homecoming and Homecoming Live to come talk about what they think should what they've done without voting on their own funding. I like this and will be voting yes.

- Tucker: I'm all about combatting immoral practices and I'm in full support of this.
- Point of Information: Gonzalez to President Hunter and Pro Tempore Nemeth: Has the IRHC Director shown the past few years?
 - They were shown during Hunter's term, not Nemeth's.
- Point of Information: DuChêne to Pro Tempore Nemeth: Have found that the Homecoming and Homecoming Live Directors being present in the process has been beneficial?
 - Yes. I found it beneficial as they were present, but I was not sure about their voting capacity.
- Point of Information: DuChêne to the Sponsors: Would you find it friendly to mandate the Homecoming and Homecoming Live Directors as ex-officio non-voting members of this committee?
 - No.
- Point of Clarification: Gonzalez: Since they have to present their allocations, technically they have to be present.
- Point of Information: Little to the Sponsor: Why would you not find it friendly to have those two Homecoming Directors be non-voting members?
 - The previous Senator included 'mandate' and I think it beneficial to stay away from mandating stuff. I don't see them needed to be specifically on the Council as others have expressed – someone can come in their place. I suppose they will have to be Council Members if they want to present, but I can't speak to that statement. **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (04:11:52). I don't see them needing to be on the Commission. I see that being a back-and-forth thing.
- Point of Information: B. Suarez to the Sponsor: Would you find it friendly to have the Pro Tempore appoint them to the Commission, rather than mandating them?
 - I would not be opposed, but I want to stray away from adding a layer of difficulty. I see a large part of the Council as funding them and reviewing the funding and everything they need to do. I don't see them needing to be Council members for that, but I am still open to changing that.
- Point of Clarification: Gonzalez: With Point A on this Bill, the Pro Tempore can always appoint the ex-officio non-voting members they see necessary to serve in that capacity.

- Russel: I'm in full support of this as when I attended a Commission meeting, I was immediately thrown off with people presenting funding, and voting on themselves, and thought it was a conflict of interest. I think this can be beneficial for checks and balances without having to put sanctions on huge organizations like Homecoming that do so much for the University.
 - Pfeuffer-Ferguson: I think this is fantastic Bill that allows for more diverse perspectives with an experience in funding, in a space where that is desperately needed. Most students who benefit from Homecoming are those who live on campus. I stand in strong support of this Bill.
 - **DuChêne moves to amend to add a new Point C that reads "The Chair of the Commission shall offer ex-officio non-voting membership to the Homecoming Director and Homecoming Live Director," Little seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Author finds it friendly**
 - **Amendment adopted.**
 - Point of Information: Barker to the Sponsor: Is there a reason why the Student Body Treasurer was not included in this Bill?
 - I did not introduce the chapter, so I don't know why they weren't included so I can't give an answer on that.
 - Bettley: I think is a great Bill and I know there is a lot of concern about placing sanctions on different people, so this will alleviate that pressure as this will have people involved in the Senate in that Committee to ensure all guidelines are followed. This also offers a lot of different perspectives for people who know how this is supposed to work.
 - Point of Information: Roy to the Sponsor: Is it likely that the Student Body Treasurer must sign off on this?
 - Hunter: I doubt that's the reason they are not included in this Bill.
 - Point of Clarification: Gonzalez: During the Budget process we learned that Homecoming's money is housed under the Union not SGA Accounting.
 - **Diaz moves to call the question, Little seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
- First Round of Con:
 - N/A.
 - Closing Statement
 - I just want to thank you all. I'm glad you saw the problem with the current set-up of the Commission and I'm glad we introduced IRHS Director, I didn't think of how many

students are attached to this Bill and I'm glad for that perspective. Thank you for working with me.

- **Voting Results:**
 - **22 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bill 44 passes.**

- Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Rivers: Can I remove my first name from the Primary Sponsor spot?
 - Yes.
- Point of Information: Bettley to President Hunter: If we stop at 1:00am what will happen to the legislation with current Senators named as Primary Sponsors who are going to term out.
 - None of the Bills die and none of these are left by those terming out only, except for one Resolution.

Bill 46

Sponsored by Senator Edouard (P)

The purpose of this Bill is to transfer \$550 from the Junior Class Council Expenses into Food. This is to subsidize the food costs at the final event for the Junior Class Council and incentivize engagement in efforts to bring more students together.

- Opening Statement:
 - We have one last event for the Junior Class Council, who wants to put on an event that engages the entire student body and will be held on Landis. Most of our funding is in our Expense category and we want to move some to the Food category to create an incentive to have more people come out.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Diaz: Why is there a chart for itemized expenditures when this Bill is not explicitly purchasing anything?
 - I included that by accident it was a bit of a misinterpretation. I was able to get a quote from the SWAT Food Truck first because I wanted to be able to have a direct quote before I requested the funds.

- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Information: Rivers to the Sponsor: Would the Junior Class Council Expense and Food be the correct name for those accounts, as Senate does not fund the Junior Class Council directly?
 - President Hunter: We don't fund Junior Class Council, only Senior Class Council - however I have no idea if they have their own accounts. I believe Senior Class Council funds the other Class Councils, but I believe that's correct.

- Point of Information: Gonzalez to Jacalyn: As this isn't a budgeted item as we don't fund Junior Class Council wouldn't the transfer be from Senior Class Expenses to Food?
 - I do not what happens **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (04:26:40).
- Rivers: I'm in support of this as I'm in the Junior Class Council and we just need this transfer of funds to put on our last few events.
- DeChick: \$559 is the cheapest I've ever heard, so based on that I am in support.
- Point of Information: Gonzalez to the Advisor: How do we move the funding if we don't control it?
 - Jacalyn: I think you're approving that those funds *can* be moved to the other category. You are letting Accounting know that such move can be approved.
- **B. Suarez moves to pass by unanimous consent, Rivers seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Bill 46 passes by unanimous consent.**

Constitutional Amendments: None.

Resolutions:

Resolution 9 Sponsored by Senator Roy (P)
 Rules of Procedure Changes regarding masks and Zoom cameras.
(Referred to Rules and Calendar. Tabled in Rules and Calendar 2.9. 2.16 2.22. 3.9. 3.23.)

- *Withdrawn by the Sponsor in Committee.*
- **Russell moves to table the Bureau Review Resolutions.**
 - **All Bureau Review Resolutions are tabled.**

Resolution 20 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
 Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
 Drackley (Co)
 The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Office of Governmental Affairs. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed and Amended in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 21 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
 Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
 Drackley (Co)
 The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Inter-Residence Hall Council. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 22 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
Drackley (Co)

The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Student Council for Accessibility and Advocacy. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 23 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
Drackley (Co)

The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Mental Health Council. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 24 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
Drackley (Co)

The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Student Council for Undergraduate Research and Creativity. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 25 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
Drackley (Co)

The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Office of the Student Sustainability. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 26 Sponsored by Senator Russell & Senator Diaz (P)
Lessard, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pfeuffer-Ferguson, Barberis, Downing,
Drackley (Co)

The Internal Affairs Committee's Bureau review recommendations for the Center for Participation Education. **(Referred to Student Life 3.23. Passed in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 27 Sponsored by Senator Diaz & Senator Suarez (P) Russell,
Downing, Lessard, Barberis, Fronczak, Wells (Co)

Proposing amendments to the Student Government application that would clarify a question pertaining to applicants' academic classification. **(Referred to Student Life and Internal Affairs 3.23. Tabled in Student Life 3.24.)**

Resolution 28 Sponsored by Senator Bowling (P) Rivers, Diaz, Masters,
Tsourdissian, Hautrive, Russell, Barker, Stewart (Co)

Not condoning the Russian invasion of Ukraine and encouraging the Florida Government to divest in Russian assets.

- Opening Statement:

- The invasion of Ukraine is affecting me personally as all my extended family is in a region of Ukraine that is currently under control of the Ukrainian forces. My family has suffered from the Russian invasion of Ukraine, all while Florida refuses to divest in Russian assets. I think that's unacceptable - its time the Florida government divests in Russian assets and properly sanctions Russia as what they are doing in Ukraine is a war crime. The Florida government should be held accountable and should divest in Russian assets.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - DuChêne: Do you not feel worth sending this Resolution to Rules to use the strongest language possible?
 - It's personal to me
 - Tucker: Do you believe divesting in Russian assets will harm Russian citizens not promoting this war.
 - Florida has \$350 million invested in Russian assets and companies. Divesting will affect Russian oligarchs and corporations and showing support for Ukrainian people is more important than the Russian economy.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Wang: I am in support of this Resolution to stand in unity with the Ukrainians. I am a daughter of two Chinese immigrants, and we are seeing similar things happen in Taiwan. My heart goes out to you and your family.
 - **Diaz amends to add "Marco Rubio (U.S. Senator for Florida), Rick Scott (U.S. Senator for Florida), and Al Lawson (U.S. Representative)" to be recipients of this Resolution, Roy seconds**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Amendment is adopted.**
 - Little: I am in support of this, but I want to say that as Senators we should be conscious of making actionable changes. I love this Resolution and will be voting yes, but make sure to consider donating money or something similar as this this is just a piece of paper and I want us to do more than that. I hope we can put our money where our mouth is.
 - Hockett: As some who has been dating someone born in Ukraine, I'm in full support of this legislation so I think divesting would be the right action to do.
 - Roy: There is nothing worse than what's happening in Ukraine right now. This was caused by the Russian government, and we should be supporting Ukraine. This is a historic event and vessel to support others. I appreciate the Sponsor's willingness to write this.
 - Barker: A lot of us involved in the political scene so I would love that you make sure your representatives are doing something on behalf of all of this.

- Rivers: I applaud the Sponsor of this Bill and feel there has not been enough action done, so thank you.
- **Pfeuffer-Ferguson moves to pass unanimous consent, Bell seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Resolution 28 passes by unanimous consent with a Closing Statement.**
- First Round of Con:
 - N/A.
- Closing Statement:
 - In February when Ukraine was invaded, it was around 9:00pm. A couple hours later I got a text from my cousin saying, "I hear missiles." I can't stop thinking about that, to be honest. If you want to donate, please go to Ukraine Red Cross. Please keep Ukraine in your prayers and have them in your thoughts.

Resolution 29 Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Stewart, Russell, Roy, Barrett, Pfeuffer-Ferguson(Co)
Amending Rule 12 of the Senate Rules of Procedure to discourage Senators from indicating or implying that individuals or entities support or oppose legislation without their explicit consent.

- *Resolution 29 is sent to Student Life and Rules & Calendar.*

Resolution 30 Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Bowling, Rider, DuChêne, Bettley, Hunter, Pfeuffer-Ferguson (Co)
Nominating a particularly outstanding individual to the Student Senate Hall of Fame.

- Opening Statement:
 - I don't want to add anything, as these testimonies clearly prove Chair Roy to be astounding. Somebody in the Hall of Fame should go above and beyond their statutory requirement and adds to the environment – representing the best of Senate. Chair Roy has been the outward face of Senate to countless RSO's in the managing of thousands of dollars through every Consent Resolutions he's sponsored. I think there's nobody more qualified and deserving of this award. While he's not terming our quite yet, I wanted people to know him.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Stewart: In my year-long term in Senate I have gotten to know Tyler Roy in a personal way, and you continue to amaze me. Your dedication and passion is amazing and unique to see in somebody who has given so much time, energy, stress, and dedication, I have the most respect for

you. I don't have any critiques - you are beyond deserving of this.

- Rivers: I had the opportunity to speak with many RSO's and it's astounding how many people have praised Tyler and the work he's done; they said he holds their hand throughout the entire process and that he tries to help them through that difficult process of requesting funding. I have been amazed with the overwhelming love and support of this individual from these RSO's.
 - Hockett: Before I was a Senator, I remember sitting in the back watching, and I remember you walked up to me and introduced yourself - and let out your hand out. This guy came up to me and doesn't even know me at all. I think you gave me your newspaper which was on my counter for a while. It's nice to see someone so devoted to something, and you've had some exemplary work. I will most certainly be voting yes.
 - **Pfeuffer-Ferguson moves to pass by unanimous consent, Bell seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Resolution 30 passes by unanimous consent.**
- Closing Statement
 - I want to publicly thank our good friend **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (04:58:56) for some of the details on this. I'm always happy to consider Chair Roy my friend.
- *Tyler Roy is nominated to the Florida State University Senate Hall of Fame.*

Resolution 31 Sponsored by Senator Bettley and Senator Tsouroukdissian (P) Berger, Barker, Bowling, DeChick, DuChêne, Himatsingani, Little, Myers, Nemeth, Ritzel, Rivers Russell, Tucker, Wang(Co)

Commemorating the work that Chair Gonzalez has done during her time in Senate, and nominating her for the Florida State University Student Senate Hall of Fame.

- Opening Statement:
 - Bettley: I feel like this document speaks for itself with how many people admire Chair Gonzalez and all the work she has done within Senate, but for me personally everything in my testimony was true. I was overwhelmed, and had I not be placed in Budget committee, I would never have found my friends in Senate and voice my opinions the way I do. I saw how she stood up to students and administration during Budget week and it was inspirational. By putting her foot down, we were able to fund these agencies in years. Chair Gonzalez puts her money where her mouth is. I cannot think of someone more deserving of this.

- Tsourkdissian: Even though we don't see eye-to-eye on things, I genuinely think she's very impactful in our SGA and I'm looking forward to what she has for our future.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Rivers: You can dislike someone, but you cannot take away certain things from a person, and I believe nobody can take away that she is an impactful, strong, and resilient leader from Chair Gonzalez. I watched the Budget Zoom meetings in its entirety and saw her go head-to-head with administration in ensuring that these organizations and Agencies receive the correct funding they deserve. I watched the passion and resilience - and it was inspiring to see something that most people wouldn't do. That's what institutes a great leader.
 - Wang: I was appointed to Senate in March of 2020. Shortly after that, Ashley came in with knowledge of so many statutes. We did not see eye-to-eye for a long time, but I knew she was a caring person, and cares about her constituents. I have never seen someone fight harder to get funding for the BSU and AASU and all these identify-based Agencies. I have never seen someone work harder to secure that funding. I have never seen someone more passionate and dedicated to their student body. I'm just so proud of you, Ashley.
 - Tucker: I have grown to admire Gonzalez. Her strength as a leader is not often seen. I have stood strongly in support and against her in many instances, but I could not have asked for a more capable and intelligent Senator to be in Senate. The Senate Hall of Fame is for those with leadership capabilities rarely seen, and Chair Gonzalez represents these aspirations.
- Second Round of Pro:
 - DuChêne: This is a common theme, but my first impression of Chair Gonzalez was a Resolution that she was the Primary Sponsor on, that I strongly disagreed with, but I quickly learned that she was the most knowledgeable Senator in this Chamber; I am amazed at the sheer number of facts from those statutes that she knows. I quickly realized that she is a perfect example of someone who separates work from personal relationships. I have a great personal relationship with Chair Gonzalez, but she is not afraid to tell me what she thinks, so honestly about the work that I'm doing. I'm in full support of this.
 - Little: I met her through a Zoom screen and I was terrified, and thought she had been in Senate for a year. I remember being shocked that she was new, and over that time (and meeting her in-person) I realized it's because she cares that much, which is so impressive to me. She's held herself to that standard since then. I can't think of anyone more deserving of this than her.

- **Wang moves to pass by unanimous consent, Little seconds.**
 - **Pfeuffer-Ferguson objects.**
- **Stewart moves to call the question, Rivers seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
- **Closing Statement**
 - Bettley: I've never known someone like Chair Gonzalez who knows the sheer amount of information that she does. It has been repeatedly mentioned that being inducted in the Senate Hall of Fame is something of the highest prestige, and she has shown nothing but that since the second she has entered these Chambers. It is rare to see someone as qualified as Chair Gonzalez, and that needs to be taken into consideration. It is so important and honorable thing to be inducted into and I could not think of anyone else more deserving.
- **Voting Results:**
 - **15 yes, 6 no, 3 abstentions.**
 - **Resolution 31 passes.**
- *Ashley Gonzalez is nominated to the Florida State University Senate Hall of Fame.*
- **DuChêne moves to adjourn.**
 - **Senate is adjourned at 1:08am.**

Resolution 32 Sponsored by Senator Bettley (P) Bowling, DuChêne, Gonzalez, Meyers, Nemeth, Rivers, Wang, DeChick, Tsouroukdissian (Co)

Commemorating the work that Senator Little has done during her time in Senate, and nominating her for the Florida State University Student Senate Hall of Fame.

Resolution 33 Sponsored by Senator Pfeuffer-Ferguson and Senator Tsouroukdissian (P) Fronczak, DuChêne, Hunter, Diaz, Drackley, Nemeth (Co)

Nominating Chair Russell for the Senate Hall of Fame.

Unfinished Business: N/A.

- Impeachment Hearing: Senator Thau (Communication and Information Seat 2)

Statements of Dissent: N/A.

New Business: N/A.

Closing Announcements: N/A.

Officer Announcements: N/A.

Advisor Announcements: N/A.

Final Roll Call: N/A.

Adjournment:

- **DuChêne moves to adjourn.**
 - **Senate is adjourned at 1:08am.**