

THE SEVENTY-FOURTH STUDENT SENATE

Calendar: April 20th, 2022

Location: Zoom

Time: 7:30pm

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

Recording Link:

https://fsu.zoom.us/rec/play/Zbg3Jett5jH_2NWG1pYcVqSoCrgeJGjkUueZNFpxt3u6fl122Eu2KvQ8H53cYESPfX_daAz6SaF0eB3x.ekWLxZxZmE7-nZCp?continueMode=true&_xzm_rtaid=fuiiCH90QeCkiV79ekvdWA.1656270163622.3d22f9cf7853f0c606cbcb92a8c34547&_xzm_rhtaid=620

Call to Order:

- President Hunter calls the meeting to order at 7:51pm.

Pledge of Allegiance:

- Conducted.

Moment of Silent Reflection:

- Conducted.

Land Acknowledgement:

Mantilla: 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 04.13.2022:

- **Soares moves to approve the Journals of 04.13.2022 and 04.04.2022.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The Journals 04.13.2022 and 04.04.2022 are approved.**

Student and Non-Budgeted RSO Comments:

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

- Alex Harmon: I have found this t-shirt I do not want, would anybody like it? The Garnet & Gold Key (GGK) Leadership Honorary will be having our Senior Hall of Fame ceremony this Friday, (4/22) in Longmire at 5:00pm. This is a great way to show interest in GGK.

Special Introductions and Announcements:

- Florida State University Academic Honor Policy Chair - Dr. Amy Gurette: Thank you for allowing me to speak. I am the Associate Dean in the College of Education and the Chair of the Academic Honor Policy Committee for Florida State University. I am excited to be here to propose some revisions we are proposing for the Academic Honor Policy. Some background – in the summer of 2021 the Academic Honor Policy Committee met with a variety of individuals from Central Administration, including Joshua Morgan (one of our esteemed guests tonight who is from the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement). He works closely with our Academic Honor Policy, overseeing hearings and working with faculty. We had a goal this past summer to look at the Academic Honor Policy and think about three different things: how can we make the policy more clear for students and faculty (especially for students as the terminology may be confusing), amplify the educational tone and nature of the Academic Honor Policy and lessen its punitive nature, and make sure it was more closely aligned with the Student Code of Conduct in terms of its processes. To show you some statistics, you will see that in Fall 2020 there was quite a significant change in Step One Agreements (first-time violations of the Academic Honor Policy). This was in the remote era, and you have seen the numbers stabilize compared to prior years. The next slide shows the number of referrals to contest sanctions, which is a student presented with a Step One agreement and takes responsibility for the violation but consider the sanction extraordinary. In 2021 those numbers rose but are stabilizing. The next slide shows the number of Step Two violations in categories of students who either have a second violation of the Academic Honor Policy, or students who have an egregious violation – primarily graduate students who have a violation at a major milestone. The gold bar refers to ACR, but you'll see a spike in fall of 2020 but a recent, positive stabilization of numbers. The next slide shows the type of academic violations by academic year. Typically, plagiarism had been the largest number of violations, but you'll see in 2020-2021 that cheating was the largest violation during our more remote era. This was an extraordinary year and something we see again in the stabilization of numbers. The next slide shows the sanctions by academic year, where a reduced grade in the class is consistently the number one sanction instructors propose and are enforced. In terms of proposed changes to the Academic Honor Policy itself, this goes over the page numbers of the Policy. The proposed changes to Page One refer to clarifying the scope of the policy. The biggest thing we put in, is that this does not apply to the admissions process – a student who has an academic integrity violation while applying to Florida State University is dealt with through a different process than the Academic Honor Policy – this applies to credit-bearing coursework. On Page Two we list out the violations to the Academic Honor Policy and put that examples are not all-inclusive and outlined that 'attempting' is a part of all violations. On Page Three we have Student Rights where we added new language around Administrative Case Resolution. Number Six was an addition that allows students to report potential bias or prejudice prior to a hearing – a student will see who is on their hearing panel and can voice bias or prejudices based on those selected for such hearing panel. It also clarifies that once an alleged violation is discovered, the student cannot withdraw or drop a course until that process has been

seen out – which was always implied but we added proper clarification. The next slide continues to talk about Student Responsibilities and that FSU email is our official mode of communication, which is common across the University. The next slide refers to egregious allegations which is a word we needed to define through the five following bullet points. Any one of these instances constitutes an egregious allegation, which means if it is a Step One it automatically escalates to a Step Two. The student and faculty body felt like these were things that should (even in the first violation) be escalated to a Step Two. The next slide shows the change in terminology that will be much more straightforward. This is what we're calling 'First Offense Cases' – prior 'Step One.' This will include a Student & Instructor Resolution where this is a first offense and the instructor sits down with the student, presents what used to be the Step One form, and shows the documented incidence. The student accepts the responsibility and the sanction, and it is filed away. 'Disputing the Sanction' is the same terminology as before. This is where this is the first violation but the student disagrees with the proposed sanction. A 'Hearing at Student's Request' is where the student denies responsibility of the overall violation and requests this go to a hearing. The new part is the 'Administrative Case Resolution' which we test-piloted during the pandemic when we saw a large surge in the number of students requesting hearings or needing hearings as a result of being Step Two. This is an alternative format to the Academic Honor Policy hearing, and is for more straightforward cases that don't require additional evidence. The outcome would not result in suspension or dismissal and this is for students who have requested a hearing, are in a Step Two situation, or a second offense situation where a hearing would be required. The first thing Joshua and his staff do is review this and determine if it would meet the standards we have set out – is straightforward. They first ask the instructor if they agree to FDA offering the student an Administrative Case Resolution. If the instructor agrees, then the student is presented with the option – it gives a student an alternative to a 'Formal Academic Honor Policy Hearing.' We've received very positive feedback from students and instructors as this is an expedited process that involves Joshua or his staff, an administrator in FDA who does a one-on-one process with the student to review the alleged violation, and takes out the need to schedule a hearing that involves two faculty members and two students. This enables students who don't want to receive an 'Incomplete' if it goes into the next semester and affect a milestone or graduation. We've received positive feedback. This would be new, but we have been doing it during the last few semesters of the pandemic. The next slide shows the 'Second Offense Cases' that removes the notion of language of 'Step Two' which may be interpreted in a confusing way as the student may have had a first offense and is going through a Step Two hearing, so we are now just calling it an "Academic Honor Policy Hearing." We've added a few things to clean the number of days. The makeup of the hearing panel will still be two faculty members and two students, but does remove the FDA Administrator from breaking a tie – which is important as someone like Joshua works with students and faculty on the front end of the process and the logistics of the hearing, which we didn't want to put them in a situation where they had to make a decision on the outcome of the hearing panel. If it is a tie, the outcome will be the student's not responsible as we haven't met the evidence needed to find the student responsible. The next slide refers to a small update on Page Seven removing 'dismissal' to its redundancy with 'suspension.' In Records, with some debate in Faculty Senate, we put in that a student who has one violation of the Academic Honor Policy and is within one year of graduating can petition to FDA to ask that their records be expunged. If you have an Academic Honor Policy violation it does not go

on your transcript, it is not in your record in the Registrar's office, rather it's in a confidential database kept in FDA. Students may ask for this to be expunged if applying to law school, medical school, and any of the health science areas as their graduate programs often ask the University to verify that the student does not have – anywhere in their records – an academic integrity violation. We wanted to give students an option to have this expunged so this would not affect their next step in life. Again, this is a student with one violation and within one year of graduating. Any egregious cases would stay on file for five years, which is Florida State policy. The last slide is around Appeals where we synced with the Student Code of Conduct process. Instead of having an entire Appeals Committee which relates to lots of people and time, we would have one Appellate Officer (a faculty member) appointed for an academic year that would oversee the Appellate Process. Appeals is not a second hearing, rather a chance for students to voice a violation of their student rights and processes/procedure, or some kind of demonstrated prejudice. This allows a more streamlined, expedited outcome. We will need a vote on this.

- Schindler: In order to request to expunge your records, is that one year before graduation or a year after you graduate?
 - One year before, that way when applying to graduate programs you can do that before the application process starts.
- Diaz: Is this a vote by the Student Senate?
 - Yes. Every time we propose revisions to the Academic Honor Policy it needs to be approved by the Faculty and Student Senates.
- Diaz to President Hunter: Is that a vote that will take place tonight?
 - Likely.
- DuChêne: Is this something that needs to be drafted in the form of a Bill or Resolution or do we simply vote on your proposal as a body.
 - My experience in the past fifteen years has been a vote tonight.
- Bettley: What would happen if a student gets a violation while within one year of graduating? What would that be the same process for someone who got a violation freshman year – would they both have the option for it to be expunged?
 - If it is there first violation, yes – they would be able to request the record to be expunged.
- Hockett: What was the voting record in the Faculty Senate?
 - 65% of the Faculty Senate voted to approve this.
- DuChêne: Does your colleague have anything to say before we discuss this?
 - Joshua: Amy did a great job and thank you all for taking the time to listen tonight. I want to emphasize that my administration has always tried to make this an education, non-adversarial process, and IO think these revisions make that even stronger of a message. We want you to have an opportunity to be redeemed from errors made.
- Kariher: When a student has this academic honor violation are they sent the handbook for the Honor Code – is this text the same text they will be reading?
 - Yes. The policy in process is the only thing changing.
- Schindler: A student can oppose ACR hearings, if that gets delayed will that delay meeting milestones within their major?
 - There is the chance – depending into the number of Academic Honor Policy hearings required – those will be delayed into the next semester. We found ACR helped to streamline this process if they opted for this process, it just depends what point the violation happens where it may spillover into the next semester. A student who has an alleged violation

- and isn't able to have a hearing in that given semester receives an incomplete in that class which may affect progress towards milestones.
 - Joshua: That Incomplete grade is to keep the process unbiased as you would not want the instructor to implement a grade penalty that is hanging over the student before their due process and actual hearing. It's purely logistics.
 - Hockett: If you accrue a violation during that period of within a year, can they still appeal it?
 - Yes. This was to outline the earliest a student could appeal a violation.
 - Hockett: If there is a violation appealed, and they had one and taken off, and received another within that time period, can they also have the latter appealed?
 - No, as that would be considered a second offense. This is meant to be an educational process for the student.
 - Boisvert: Will we be able to review discussions held in the previous meetings voted on this?
 - The Wednesday, April 13th, agenda has been uploaded. The Minutes have not but it is a delay.
 - Folwell: Can you outline the primary opposition the remaining 35% of people had against this?
 - It was to the records expungement. There was a lot of initial opposition to the notion of expungement, but again 65% thought this was a good idea and voted in favor of it.
 - Hunter: For this Academic Honor Policy I noticed there isn't a date to be approved, is this something that needs to be done today? We have Summer Senate meetings in less than four weeks which will allow everyone more time to go over it. Is this something that needs to be approved today or can it be pushed?
 - It can be pushed to the next meeting. When we approached Pro-Tempore Nemeth about getting on the agenda, Summer was an option. If it can be approved in the next week or two it allows us to take it to the next step – the Board of Trustees for their June meeting, which needs a certain window of notification for that. If it can go to the June Board of Trustees meeting it can be in effect for the next academic year, but if not, it pushes it off some more. We want to work on your schedule.
 - Hunter: How often does the Board of Trustees meet?
 - I believe three times a year. They require a three- or four-week notification of anything we propose to put in front of them.
 - Diaz: This is our own, independent decision but I have slight concern with pushing it to Summer Senate as we will have a whole lot of new Senators who might want to hear this presentation again.
 - Schindler: If this is pushed it has the possibility of not making it to the Board of Trustees meeting, which could affect another year of students who are applying to graduate schools. I think it is in the Senate's best interest to vote on it today as its benefits the clarity of the student body and give them a second opportunity.
 - **Soares moves to approve the Academic Honor Policy proposed revisions.**
 - **Kariher? objects.**
 - **Soares does not withdraw.**
- *Senate enters debate on the Academic Honor Policy proposed revisions.*

- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Information: Downing: For voting on this, are we voting individually or is it by unanimous consent?
 - A motion to approve would be whole unless there is an objection, where we would go into debate. The amendment to the Academic Honor Policy must be approved by Faculty and Student Senates, and the Board of Trustees – so we're only entertaining a motion to approve.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Hockett: We are entering 'Pro/Con' debate on whether to approve of this, not the amendments themselves?
 - The motion has been made to approve the revisions to the Academic Honor Policy. We are now in the 'First Round of Pro.' The debate is on revisions to the Academic Honor Policy itself. If Senators wish to push that can happen. If Senators wish to vote now, they will have to call the question, etc. If it comes to a vote, that vote is to approve the revisions to the Academic Honor Policy.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Suarez: We are in-line to debate on whether we should move to pass this?
 - We are debating on the revisions themselves. The Provision, Policy Proposal, Amendments, etc.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Suarez: Motion objected was to approve the revisions?
 - Yes, this is not a Consent Resolution process.
 - Kariher: I think the Academic Honor Policy should be balanced, and it's not very balanced with these changes. I feel there should be some sort of Advisor to meet if something like this were to happen. However, I do think this is a step in the right direction to make things more balanced.
 - Diaz: I wanted to take this opportunity, as I've been in contact with the former Senator who claims to have been the only one who went to these meetings as of representative of the Student Senate to the Academic Honor Policy Committee (Lessard), and they believe these are the best changes that can be made to the Academic Honor Policy.
 - Schindler: These changes are to only benefit the student body, which is what were here to do. This gives them an opportunity to help them for graduate school.
 - Turkomer: The goal of education should be to educate, not punish, and this allows students to have a second opportunity rather than force harsh punishments. This assists those trying to get into graduate programs.
 - Point of Parliamentary Inquiry: Hockett: Can any Senator motion for unanimous consent even if in 'Pro/Con'?
 - Yes.

- **Schindler moves to pass by unanimous consent.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The Academic Honor Policy proposed revisions approved by unanimous consent.**
- President Hunter: This Senator was awarded Chair of the Year – an award that recognizes the Chair of one of our Committees who has done an exemplary job doing their work throughout the year – and was unable to attend the Inauguration. Throughout her time in Senate, this Senator has worked to serve Senate and the student body in a fashion that is not only exemplary of professionalism, but also leadership. Through their time as the Chair of the Internal Affairs Committee, they worked to ensure that it maintains a great relationship with Agencies, Bureaus, and the Executive Branch as a whole. Moreover, their advocacy for candidates through the confirmation process has been one like no other – sending countless emails, facilitating communication between branches, and sharing their passion for the process in every room they step into. I could not be more proud of my dear friend and colleague, former Internal Affairs Chair Katie Russell, for all you've been able to do within the role and beyond the Chambers.

Messages from the Executive Branch: None.

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

- JSU Director Gabay: Hey everyone! For those of you I haven't gotten the opportunity to meet, my name is Brandon Gabay and I am the Executive Director of the Jewish Student Union. Just a few quick updates from JSU - we started interviewing candidates for the JSU Board today, and we will be doing deliberations for the board next Wednesday (4/27) at 5:00pm. We also have our final event of the semester on Monday (4/25) starting at 9:30am. Find us on Landis with HLSU, AASU, and WSU giving out coffee and bagels for finals week! Thank you all and have a great Senate.
- Jacalyn: It is good to see you all in person. My name is Jacalyn Butts, and I am the Assistant Director for Student Government and Advocacy. One component of my role is to advise your committees and everything you do in these Chambers. Outside of this space I advise some organizations within SGA and the Elections Office. I didn't get to make it to your orientation, and I know they have done a great job going over formalities and expectations. We got an update that we will likely not having Zoom in the Fall. As far as Summer, President Hunter and I will talk about what that looks like for you all to be meeting. Some background information: I have a lot of expectations for you and hope to expect a lot of you engaging within the student body - your name is tied to my name and our department. Please reach out, I do respond to your emails. I work with seven staff members, and we ask that you respect and communicate with us as our office of seven supports over fifteen student organizations and five-hundred organizations processing funding requests. Please make sure you are adhering to guidelines, communicating, and respecting all of us - respect my staff, your peers, and the Chamber. From the back I can see everything, and you should keep that in mind. Be present in this space - Statutes and Code are your best friend. Please read those and if you have questions ask us. Bedtime is 11:00pm, and we will not be waiving that often. Please keep efficiency of your time in mind. I don't want to do double the work as you all have obligations. I'm excited to see you all become leaders so please share your aspirations with me. Thank you.

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 \$41,128.00, RTAC \$4,828.00, and ORG Fund \$0.00

Report of Senate Liaisons:

- Turkomer: I am the liaison for the College of Social Sciences and Public Policy Leadership Council - tomorrow (4/21) from 10:00am-1:00pm in the Bellamy atrium they will have breakfast to-go, so grab a bagel. Also, Friday (4/22) from 10:00am-12:00pm Frother's Daughter and first the 150 people who show up will be getting their coffee on the Council.
- Point of Information: Rider to President Hunter: Is that how much is left in PAC's budget right now?
 - Yes. There was a mistake with the previous 73rd Student Senate with the Sweepings allocation, so there was \$41,000 in the 73rd Student Senate and that did not get put by Senate Leadership in the correct spot, but now it is there. If you have any more questions you can refer to Jacalyn as she has all the information.
- Point of Information: Rider to President Hunter: So that includes the extra money we gave them a few weeks ago?
 - Yes. I can't speak to what the 73rd Student Senate did as I wasn't in Leadership at that time, but there were Sweepings and the money never got into the account for PAC.
- Point of Information: Rider to President Hunter: Will that be swept into their budget again for next year?
 - Yes
- Tucker: The College of Criminology and Criminal Justice SLC just had our executive announcement come out with all new people – it's a solid group. We will have a lot of internship opportunities and employers, a lot of events particularly for many here interested in going into the field of law. I will keep you all updated.
- Pedraja: I am the liaison for the Veterans Student Union (VSU) and we had a tab at Dirac Starbucks and there is still \$85 left before Dirac closes at 10pm. There will be another tab open next Wednesday during finals week.
- Bettley: Florida PURG is having an event on Earth Day April 22nd, at 2pm out on Landis. It will be 'Paint-A-Pot' but will be an actual flowerpot.

Report of Committees:

- Judiciary
 - Met last night (4/19) at 7pm. Passed Bill 37 unamended, Bill 39 was withdrawn by the Sponsor, Constitutional Amendment 2 was amended and passed, and Resolution 34 was passed unamended.

- Internal Affairs
 - Met Monday (4/18) at 5:30pm and passed Constitutional Amendment 2 amended.
- Budget
 - Bill 35 was passed unamended.
- Finance
 - Met Monday (4/18) at 6:30pm and passed Constitutional Resolutions 20 and 21 unamended.
- Student Life
 - Resolution 35 passed unamended, Bill 35 passed unamended, Bill 47 did not pass.
- Rules & Calendar
 - Met tonight (4/20) at 5:30pm. We did not pass Resolution 29.

Senate Confirmations: None.

Consent Calendar:

CR20

Sponsored by Senator Rider (P)

To fund the travel of The Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia Epsilon Iota Chapter and Club Golf at FSU. **(Passed in Finance 04.18.)**

- Opening Statement on the Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia Epsilon Iota Chapter line-item:
 - We have \$4,820 left in our budget and I was given permission from SGA accounting that she believes it's in the best interest of these RSO's to finish their budget today, which is the total shown to finish the RTAC Budget – I did receive permission to say this. The goal of this RSO is for the development of mutual welfare of musical students and loyalty to the alma mater. The event is Phi Mu Alpha National Convention happening July 20th-24th - conventions are held every three years and were supposed to go last summer, but that did not happen due to COVID-19. This Convention is important for them as they are in the midst of a national emergency with their fraternity. Each chapter has voting power to select the new National Executive Committee, among numerous workshops at this event. This event is open to the public. They are a smaller chapter but have fundraised and the fact they have the option to select the national council and ensuring we get a group of students there to represent us at Florida State. They will be flying. They will have about four people to go on this event and have done a great job advertising to the public. They are all Financially Certified and presented to RTAC conveying the importance of the event. We cut them in finance due to the remaining budget. It is important to realize they didn't get to go on this event and it's our duty as Senators to ensure they go and have representatives in the National Executive Council.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Suarez: Where are they going?
 - They are flying out of Orlando (MCO) to Atlanta (ATL), connecting to St. Louis (STL).
 - Soares: Moves to enter Roundtable on this line-item.
- *Senate enters Roundtable on the Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia Epsilon Iota Chapter line-item.*
 - DuChêne: RTAC did a great job - they used every dime of their remaining balance in these two and its clever.
 - Point of Information: Boisvert to the Sponsor: How much were they asking for initially?
 - They were initially asking for \$8267. The initial line-item for lodging was \$1403, travel at \$3944, registration at \$2920 which was obviously changed to \$0 and reflected up there.
 - Diaz: I was at the RTAC meeting and they requested \$8000 which was a lot, and I commend RTAC for being able to cut it down. RTAC cannot meet over the summer so this is the last opportunity - do not be afraid of zeroing out their budget.
 - St. Hilaire: This event is available to anybody?
 - Yes, according to statutes you have to publicly advertise and they chose to use social media.
 - Point of Information: Casiple to the Sponsor: What if they are not able to fundraise the remaining amount that was cut from?
 - I asked that question in RTAC and they have cut the roster down and have said that they can go with this number. We have found ways to find cheaper flights.
 - **Tucker moves to call the question on the line-item, DuChêne seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Question is called on the line-item.**
- Closing Statement:
 - Thank you all for your support and those who were there. I really like this Consent Resolution because we have a music-based RSO and an athletic-based RSO, making this a diverse resolution, providing funding for several different entities on campus. RTAC is a very strong Committee at the moment and this is best way we saw fit for them to still be able to go on this trip.
- Voting Results:
 - **45 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.**
 - **The Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia Epsilon Iota Chapter line-item passes.**

- Opening Statement on the Club Golf at FSU line-item:
 - The attendees were selected through a selective 18-hole qualifier, so open to the public. They have advertised through group messages and their Instagram. This trip will benefit FSU as we are being able to presenting more of our high-performance athletic on more of the national level. Their presentation was well done. They first asked for \$3200 and so we were able to get something closer. They have more people, which is why we funded more. Five to eight are for sure going. This event is called the Spring 2022 NCCGA National Championship. This RSO did go on this trip last year and got enough personal funds to go so this trip, which means this means a lot of them and is something major in the golf world. They had to qualify through the eighteen holes. This RSO worked well with us to ensure they get enough funding and have plans to get this cub to be larger on-campus. This is a great way to give them funding – we’ve never funded them before.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Wang: Are they able to get that amount of money by tomorrow?
 - Yes, but I’ve been trying to get to Accounting so that may be and Advisor question. As RTAC Chair I’ve just been doing best to get them the funding. I’ve seen RSO’s in the past get it in two days.
 - Wang: Is this club funded by Campus Rec?
 - No.
 - **Wang moves to enter Pro/Con debate on the line-item, Beall seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Senate moves into Pro/Con debate on the line-item.**
- *Senate moves into Pro/Con debate on the Club Gold at FSU line-item.*
- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Information: Wang to Jacalyn: Are they able to get their money by tomorrow (4/21)?
 - I’m not sure
 - Hockett: I had the pleasure of being at this Finance meeting. The club golf community is growing and if we can show our appreciation through this funding, then it will open a channel for funding in the future - and we may even win the tournament.
 - Point of Information: Tucker to the Sponsor: In the event they aren’t able to secure their money by tomorrow, we get it back?
 - Yes, it stays in the Accounting Office’s budget. From what I’ve seen it sticks in the account which is

why I thought it would be better to allocate the funding if this is possible, rather than deny the request.

- Kaminski: This number is under \$500 per person. Tee times are five to six-hundred dollars - this seems fair. You can get tee times for more expensive per person than this.
 - Point of Information: DuChêne to President Hunter: Can this money be reimbursed if we don't get this money to them by tomorrow (4/21)?
 - If they don't get the money by the time they leave, then we keep the money in our account.
 - Point of Information: Hockett to the Sponsor: The plane tickers have already been purchased?
 - Yes.
 - Point of Information: Hockett to the Sponsor: So this money is meant to reimburse them on the plane tickets?
 - No, I was under the impression that it was being used with some type of credit card system so they bought them expecting FSU to pay for it. The RSO is here.
 - O'Malley: This is a great way to spend this money as club sports are expensive on students and FSU only covers D1 athletes. This can increase involvement in club sports.
- *President Hunter: Air travel can be reimbursed with prior approval and receipt.*
 - Point of Parliamentary Procedure: Boisvert: On Consent Resolutions can you move to pass by unanimous consent?
 - Line items over \$200 need a two-thirds (2/3) vote.
 - **Garner moves to allow a non-Senator to speak.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The Representative from Club Golf at FSU can now speak.**
 - Point of Information: Garner to the Representative from Club Golf at FSU: Have you purchased your plane tickets yet?
 - Yes, we have.
 - Suarez: I've played golf since second grade, and this is a big deal. This is teaching students how to become involved in golf. The RTAC Chair has used the budget wisely.
 - Point of Information: Bettley to the Sponsor: Have the receipts been approved?
 - Yes.
 - **Tucker moves to call the question on the line-item, Beall seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called on the Club Golf at FSU line-item.**

- Closing Statement:
 - Thank you for your great questions. I promise you to ensure this process with refunds, receipts, rosters with accounting is set-up. This is going to be really fun for them. They are trying to make golf more accessible which drew me in.
- Voting Results:
 - **44 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **The Club Golf at FSU line-item passes.**
- **Wang moves to approve Consent Resolution 20.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Consent Resolution 20 is approved.**

CR21

Sponsored by Senator Turkomer (P)
To fund Student PIRGs in regards to Earth Week. (**Passed in Finance 04.18.**)

- **DuChêne moves to approve Consent Resolution 21, no objections.**
 - **Consent Resolution 21 is approved.**

Bills First Reading:

Bill 48 Sponsored by Senator Diaz and Senator Russell (P) Downing, Hautrive, Fronczak, Pardee, Anderson, Crocker, McMahon, Roogow (Co)
Abolishing the Office of Student Sustainability following the Internal Affairs' bureau review deliberations.

Bill 49 Sponsored by Senator Diaz and Senator Russell (P) Hunter, Drackley, Hautrive, McMahon, Downing, Roogow, Fronczak, Anderson, Vollick, Crocker (Co)
Providing clearer guidelines for the annual process of bureau review conducted by the Internal Affairs committee.

Bills Second Reading:

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. Passed in Student Life 04.14. Passed in Budget 04.18)

- **Hunter relinquishes Chair to Pro-Tempore Nemeth.**

- Opening Statement:
 - I am Senator Beall and this my first Bill. The purpose of this is to complete funding for Bill 88 in the 73rd Student Senate to install one large picnic bench outside of the Rovetta Building. The total is \$1202.41 which is not the original amount. In the 73rd Student Senate there was a Bill proposed to install two small picnic benches in front of Rovetta which was part of a much larger project to fund five. The original amount for the first Bill was \$3102.25 for all benches. The leftover is \$1201.41. The table is black and will match the rest of the picnic tables and is ADA accessible.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Hockett: Where is it located?
 - If you are going to the parking lot, it's behind that by the huge ramp.
 - Kaminski: Do we have a picture of this table?
 - Yes. *Picture shown.*
 - **Soares moves to enter Pro/Con Debate on Bill 35.**
- *Senate enters Pro/Con Debate on Bill 35.*
- First Round of Pro:
 - Hunter: I think the work of Senate is to make tangible changes on campus. None of the current tables are ADA accessible. The Sponsor of this Bill this worked hard to complete something that happened in a Senate they weren't in and was thorough.
 - Wang: I'm commending the Sponsor on their first piece of legislation, especially as this affects myself. This helps the College of Business, especially as the Alpha Kappa Psi brothers have to unfortunately do their interviews on that brick bench that you see. This encourages them to talk and spend time with one another
 - DuChêne: This is rad as it has been in the works for too long. The Sponsor is bringing it home. I also commend the Co-Sponsor because a while ago they said they use Rovetta Building zero times but found it important enough to Co-Sponsor. Let's bring it home 74th.
 - Point of Information: Hockett to the Sponsor: Do you know long the installation would take?
 - As soon as possible.
 - **Tucker moves to pass Bill 35 by unanimous consent, Wang seconds.**
 - **Roy objects.**
 - **Tucker moves to call the question on Bill 35, Wang seconds.**
 - **No objections**
 - **The question is called on Bill 35.**

- Closing Statement:
 - Thank you to everyone, this is nerve wracking but I appreciate the support.
- Voting Results:
 - **44 yes, 1 no, 0 abstentions.**
 - **Bill 35 passes.**

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. **(Referred to Judiciary 3.30. Passed in Judiciary 04.19)**

- Opening Statement:
 - Diaz: It adds Directors of the Institutes as 'Major Offices.' The major offices are in SGA that have large responsibilities and our constitution says that you can only hold one 'Major Office' at a time. FLI and TLI Directors are these very important positions that only dedicated people should have without holding other positions at the same time, which also helps with conflicts of interest. This also allows the Judiciary Committee the authority to initiate impeachment proceedings by allowing the Directors to be impeachable. We currently do not have authority to impeach the Directors. This also requires the Director and one other officer considered a 'financial officer' to be certified for that institute to receive A&S fees/funds. This is simplifying language around Student Senate Officers by also striking Senate Historian, Clerk, Parliamentarian, and Press Secretary.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - Suarez: All leadership positions are consolidated in one line?
 - Yes.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Point of Information: Bettley to the Sponsor: What were the motivations for striking Student Senate Officers.
 - Mostly because why not as it makes it more clean and if we wish to impeach any of these individuals we have to remember to go back to it, being an unnecessary step.
 - DuChêne: FLI and TLI Director do a lot of work and if you are one of those Directors you should not hold another 'Major Office' and it passed unanimously in Judiciary.

- Point of Information: Bettley to President Hunter: Anywhere those positions are in Statutes for future Senates.
 - They are in Rules and Procedure.
- Roy: I came through FLI and it really is transformative for students and demanding for those running it. Heads of it are constantly having to make their programs as fulfilling as possible. I don't see the topic of Senate Officers as a problem as we give ourselves the power to appoint within ourselves.
- Point of Information: Carter to the Sponsor: Does Executive Institute include the Diversity and Inclusion Institute?
 - Not currently as it is not in statutes.
- **Myers moves to call the question on Bill 37, Beall seconds.**
 - **Bettley objects.**
 - **Myers withdraws.**
- Garner: I have been a victim of a previous Bill that made 'OGA Director' a major role. I think this is good as I was stressed handling Senate business and OGA business and it's in the best interest not having to take on two major positions.
- Point of Information: Bettley to the Sponsor: Have you spoken with the Senate Leadership team how this would impact each of them? Would this impact the logistics of the Student Senate Officers?
 - This does not change anything.
- Point of Information: St Hilaire to the Sponsor: You have mentioned **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (01:56:35), can you go into detail what that means?
 - If we decide to change the composition of Office of the Senate President - such as if we want to add or remove a new Officer - we would also have to remember to go to this statute and amend it. The reason I changed as this makes it more broad. The statute currently says that anybody as a Senate Officer can be impeached.
- **DuChêne moves to amend to strike 'Student Senate Officers' and un-strike all the positions that have been struck, Roy seconds.**
 - **Tucker objects.**
 - **DuChêne does not withdraw.**
 - **Senate moves into Debate on the Amendment.**
- Opening Statement on the Amendment:
 - DuChêne: I don't think this change is necessarily a bad thing but I think the main purpose of this Bill is making FLI and TLI Directors 'Major Offices.' This is a semantics change the Sponsor of the Bill slipped in to improve statutes in their opinion. Given Senate Leadership were not

consulted on this change I just don't know that it's necessary. When we eliminate or add Senate Officers is was not difficult to 'Control F' to add the Senate Historian. If a standalone Bill wants to come up to consolidate these positions, I think that's fine. It's clear the Leadership Team did not expect this change so we should keep this Bill to putting those Directors as 'Major Offices' and put this for some time else once those discussions are had.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - No speakers.
- First Round of Pro on the Amendment:
 - Point of Information: Boisvert to the Sponsor: For Executive Cabinet Members, that's supposed to be reinstated and Officers struck out?
 - My amendment is highlighted.
 - Point of Information: Folwell to Diaz: If this Amendment passes do you intend to propose another Bill that has this as well.
 - I can but if Senate does not have interest, I have other priorities.
 - Point of Information: Wang to the Sponsor: 400.2 Office of Senate President in statutes states Senate President and Senate President Pro-Tempore, and Officers of the Student Senate shall be referred to as 'Senate Officers.' Are those four positions not included in 'Student Senate Officers.' Does 'Student Senate Officers' encompass those four positions.
 - Yes.
 - Point of Information: Wang to the Sponsor: Why not combine them?
 - I don't take issue with the combination. I proposed this as the main intent of the Bill is completely different and also having watched Senate Leadership take visible issue with not being consulted with this.
 - Suarez: Thank you to the Sponsor for the Amendment as I took issue with the striking of all the positions. I don't see the need of changing something when the entire intent of the bill as a whole is completely different. I'm in full support of the Amendment.
 - Point of Information: Wang to the Sponsor: One of the issues is that changing it to 'Student Senate Officers' is not the main intent of this Bill?
 - Yes.
 - Point of Information: Wang to the Sponsor: This is an **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:05:15) Bill which can cover three or more titles of statutes, correct?
 - Yes.

- Point of Information: Wang to the Sponsor: Considering it can span three different titles, does relevance matter?
 - No.
- Roy: This Amendment doesn't changed much but I think keeping the names allows for more dignity to the positions, which I really respect. People don't 'Control F' Senate Officers, only positions. Keeping each one listed is quicker to look, to add and change something new. I yield in full support.
- Bettley: This takes what the original Sponsor intended and executes it properly as what I've seen a lot of people don't have issues, but mainly with this wording. If we want to consider this at a later date we should have that conversation. The Amendment changed the Bill to focus on its intent.
- First Round of Con on the Amendment:
 - Wang: This Amendment doesn't do much, however the Office of the Senate President already states that these four positions are already listed under 'Senate Officers.'
 - Kaminski: We talked about efficiency and using our time wisely. New Senators take note that the verbiage here does not change anything.
 - Kariher: The motivations were mentioned that this Bill did not follow due process. It went through all the Committees it was supposed to and it's not as if it hid anything.
 - Point of Clarification: President Hunter: I look like this all the time. I don't have any issue on the Bill.
 - Point of Information: Boisvert to the Sponsor: Do any of the Senate Officers have a problem with the original wording of the Bill?
 - We cannot go into that.
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Tucker: We have little time left so let's get this done.
 - Garner: I understand the sentiments and a previous Senator almost swayed me but statues can often be ambiguous and contradictory and I see no problem with this to make things flow easier.
 - **Suarez moves to call the question on the Amendment, Wang seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called on the Amendment.**
- Closing Statement on the Amendment:
 - Vote how you want, I proposed this as it seemed the issue around this Bill had to do with this exact thing.
- Voting Results on the Amendment:
 - **21 yes, 21 no, 3 abstentions.**
 - **Tie.**

- Point of Personal Privilege: Beall: If the results are the same, will we keep doing this?
 - No, I will be a tie breaker.
- Point of Clarification: Hockett: We are voting on the Amendment only.
- Revote on the Amendment:
 - **20 yes, 22 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Amendment fails.**
- First Round of Pro:
 - **Garner moves to call the question on Bill 37, Wang seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called on Bill 37.**
- Closing Statement:
 - The intent of this Bill was to add some accountability to FLI and TLI, and we can all try to be more direct in the future. I apologize if it cost some controversies. The additions have no affect for the Senate Officers, just verbiage.
- Voting Results:
 - **37 yes, 2 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bill 37 passes.**

Constitutional Amendments:

CA 2

Sponsored by Senator Wang (P)

To make appointed Temporary Justices subject to Senate confirmation. **(Referred to Internal Affairs, then Judiciary 4.4. Passed and amended in Internal Affairs 04.18. Passed and Amended in Judiciary 04.19)**

- Opening Statement:
 - Wang: The original intent of this was to make temporary Justices in the Supreme Court subject to Senate confirmation. In the Supreme Court there is one Chief Justice and four Associate Justices are appointed by the Student Body President, confirmed by Judiciary, confirmed by the whole Senate. We have a loophole with temporary Justices where if there is a vacancy, they can be appointed by the Chief Justice without going through Senate confirmation. The way I read this is if an Associate Justice or the Chief Justice was to vacate their position, the Chief Justice can appoint any law student, circumventing the Senate process. Further consultation with Parliamentarian Rowan, found out the legislative intent of the original Constitution was to have this be a process an Associate or Chief Justice recuses themselves from one case. I made

the Bill with that intent – the only time we can have a temporary Justice is if a Justice recuses themselves from a case.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - How many serves on the Supreme Court?
 - Five.
 - **Myers roundtable, Hockett seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Senate moves into roundtable on Constitutional Amendment Two.**
- Roundtable:
 - Tucker: In Judiciary we analyzed this and made sure it upheld statutes - as it stands people can be worried we don't have overnight but this is on a temporary case by case basis. If there is a conflict of interest the Chief can appoint someone who can serve on it.
 - **Kariher moves to call the question, Boisvert seconds.**
 - **Diaz objects.**
 - **Kariher withdraws.**
 - Kaminski: Can you elaborate on the striking of Student Body President?
 - Wang: The original Amendment I wanted to have in Internal Affairs was to have the Student Body President appoint them as of an advisory opinion from the court that says the Student Body President has the sole authority of appointment power – which is not true as the Senate President clearly points all of these Officers. Therefore, I converted it back to the Chief Justice for a case-by-case basis. After the one case is done the original Justice comes back.
 - Garner: My biggest fear is when I was in cabinet there were three Justices on the Court, so there is precedent on not having a full bench. I think it is necessary to have an even number of Justices in the Court. I understand the sentiment and desire to make it more transparent.
 - Point of Clarification: President Hunter: I did not appoint my Officers, they are appointed in the confirmation letters received to me by the Student Body President.
 - Pedraja: Why did you cross out **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:24:24)?
 - DuChêne: If there is a recusal, a Justice rescues themselves from a case, then the Chief Justice would be appointing a Justice to sit for that one case that the permanent Associate Justice recused themselves from. We do not feel appointing a temporary Justice for one case needs to go through the full Senate process. This keeps it consistent with the only Justices to the Supreme Court that the

full Senate are approving to sit permanently as Associate and Chief Justices.

- Suarez to President Hunter: Does it go against statutes giving Chief Justice the power to appoint someone?
 - President Hunter: My interpretation of the advisory opinion says the Student Body President has the only power to appoint. The Student Body President appointed my offices because of that advisory opinion. I am unsure if it goes against statutes but it does go against the advisory opinion of the Supreme Court.
- Point of Clarification: Parliamentarian Rowan: The Constitution is our document, so if this passes the Chief Justice has that power regardless of what an advisory opinion says. If the Senate wants it to be the Chief Justice then we can do that. Statutes say the Student Body President has the power to appoint - this would make a caveat.
- Hockett: Is there another part that addresses long term vacancies for Justices?
 - DuChêne: That would be subject to the typical process of approving an Associate Justice in the Supreme Court - it does not change the typical process. If they resign it is a permanent vacancy and we go through the normal process. This only clarifies if there is a recusal the Chief Justice can appoint a vacancy.
 - Wang: Reason we refer to that advisory opinion is because the only mention of appointment power is in the Executive duties in the Constitution.
- Hockett: Doesn't compromise any language of a long-term vacancy?
 - Collective: No.
- Point of Information: Suarez to the Sponsor: By allowing this to happen will there be an 'open floodgate' for **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:29:02).
 - DuChêne: No because this is an amendment to the Constitution.
 - Wang: This clarifies the legislative intent of the writers of the Constitution.
 - DuChêne: If ratified by voters in the fall election, it requires more than half of voting students to approve.
- Point of Information: Garner to the Sponsor: Given current guidelines, how long would a temporary appointment last?
 - Collective: One case.
- Point of Information: Bettley to the Sponsor: Is this not just supposed to expedite a process in an extraneous circumstance?
 - DuChêne: Yes, the original Constitution said if there is a vacancy on the Supreme Court the Chief

Justice shall appoint a temporary Justice to sit by designation – which is extremely vague. We're saying they can only appoint someone if there is a recusal - a more permanent vacancy would go through whole process.

- Point of Information: Folwell to the Sponsor: What happens if the Chief Justice recuses?
 - Wang: An Associate Justice is appointed to serve as the Chief Justice for that case.
- **Boisvert moves to amend to reinstate text “Student Body President, having consulted with the,” Kaminski seconds.**
 - **Kariher objects.**
 - **Boisvert does not withdraw.**
- Opening Statement on the Amendment:
 - To echo what Senator Tucker said previously, this passed unanimously under the guides of the opinion that the Senate President could also make appointments. Having now clarified that's not the case, this language makes it more clear that the Student Body President would be the only one with that power.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - No speakers.
- First Round of Pro on the Amendment:
 - **Garner moves to extend bedtime to midnight, Wang seconds.**
 - **Turkomer objects.**
 - **Garner does not withdraw.**
 - **Vote:**
 - **19 yes, 22 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bedtime is not extended.**
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Bettley: Some Senators are graduating tonight and there is some legislation we would like to get through for those graduating Senators.
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Kaminski: We are working to be more efficient – we should stick to the matter at hand.
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Pro-Tempore Nemeth: We only have the room reserved until 11pm.
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Garner: We have been in this room past midnight, and the amount of things we have to get accomplished is feasible by midnight.
 - Point of Information: Myers to the Sponsor: Did you write this as of worry the legislation was violating statutes
 - Yes.
 - Point of Clarification: Myers: This is regarding the Constitution – the supreme law – so it will take precedent. If the intent of this amendment is to address violating statutes, it doesn't.

- Point of Clarification: Kaminski: This amendment could be regarding powers of the Student Body President as well.
- Point of Clarification: Wang: Advisory opinions are non-binding per the Supreme Court.
- Point of Clarification: Boisvert: Wouldn't want to go against the opinion of the advisory opinion.
- **Kariher moves to remand to Judiciary, Tucker seconds.**
 - **Garner objects.**
 - **Kariher withdraws.**
- **Soares moves to call the question, Barrett seconds.**
 - **Garner objects.**
 - **Soares withdraws.**
 - **The question is not called.**
- **Kaminski moves to call the question, Wells seconds.**
 - **Tucker objects.**
 - **Kaminski does not withdraw.**
 - **Motion fails.**
- **Barrett moves to extinguish time in Pro, Beall seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Time is extinguished in Pro.**
- First Round of Con on the Amendment:
 - Diaz: This amendment removes the stipulation that these temporary Justices must be appointed by the Senate, so I don't understand what the point of the Student Body President appointing is. I'm in Internal Affairs and know how appointments work – they are very slow. If we need temp Justices appointed quickly, I think the Student Body President appointing these people would slow the process.
 - Garner: I have reservations about the amendment, however this amendment **RECORDING INAUDIBLE** (02:42:53) passes having the original text would be a better alternative than this. I think we're forgetting our prerogatives as a Senate as we have the ability to change text in the Constitution. If we are going to allow temporary appointment power for expediency, it is better to leave it in original format.
 - Point of Information: Downing to the Sponsor: If you were to keep this amendment, you would be making the Student Body President appoint them, so would have to go through confirmation of the Senate – which will make this process long for one or two cases.
 - That was not my intent.
 - Point of Information: Downing to the Sponsor: Wouldn't we need it to go through the Senate?
 - Parliamentarian Rowan: The language currently states assuming this amendment passes, the Student Body President would use the appointment

- and put the Justice on the Court without going through the Senate.
 - Point of Information: Suarez to President Hunter: Who has veto power over constitutional amendments?
 - It goes to a vote to the student body.
 - **Soares moves to call the question, Myers seconds.**
 - **No objection.**
 - **The question is called on the amendment.**
- Closing Statement on the Amendment:
 - My intent on this amendment was that having the Student Body President, having consulted with the Chief Justice, would be on a case-by-case basis and would happen quickly which is why we removed the bottom text. The whole point is to get them 'in and out.'
- Voting Results on the Amendment:
 - **16 yes, 25 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Amendment fails.**
- Roundtable on Constitutional Amendment Two:
 - Point of Clarification: Tucker: We started forty-five minutes late and have more time-sensitive legislation to go through.
 - **Folwell moves to call the question, __ seconds**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called on Constitutional Amendment Two.**
- Closing Statement:
 - Wang: This changes the Constituent, making the Chief Justice able to appoint a temporary Justice. The only reason the advisory opinion is as following is due to the fact that the only mention of appointment power is in the Executive Branch as it stands. This would speed up the process on a case-by-case basis.
 - DuChêne: Our Constitutional Amendment clarifies a lot of the Student Body President's power. The only time you can fill a position is in a temporary sense.
- Voting Results:
 - **32 yes, 7 no, 0 abstentions.**
 - **Constitutional Amendment Two passes.**

Resolutions:

Resolution 34

Sponsored by Senator Wang and DuChêne (P)

Rule change outlining the process of voting on additional absences once a Senator is unsuspended in an impeachment hearing held by the Judiciary Committee. **(Referred to Judiciary and Rules and**

Calendar 04.13. Passed in Judiciary 04.19. Passed in Rules and Calendar 04.20)

- Resolution 35 Sponsored by Senator Barrett (P)
The College Leadership Council Funding Committees recommendation of allocation of funds for the 2022-23 school year from the 2022-2023 budget line for College Leadership Councils. **(Referred to Student Life and Budget. Passed in Student Life 04.14. Tabled in Budget 04.18)**
- Resolution 36 Sponsored by Senator Tucker (P) DuChêne, Beall, Nemeth, Wang, Hautrive, Myers, Boisvert, Anderson, Kariher, Schindler, Garner, Diaz (Co)
This resolution encourages active communication between Florida State University Administration and Florida State University Student Senate when it comes to matters of student traditions and safety. Following this encouragement, a plan is outlined as to how the two entities can cooperate on the subject of student traditions and safety.
- Resolution 37 Sponsored by Senator Myers and Senator Tucker (P) Alaimo, Beall, Bettley, Burton, DuChêne, Folwell, Kariher, Maglin, Mantilla (Co)
Nominating an exceptional senior senator to the Florida State University Student Senate Hall of Fame.
- **Garner moves to extend bedtime until 11:30pm, Bettley seconds.**
 - **Kaminski object.**
 - **Voting Results:**
 - **20 yes, 19 no, 1 abstention.**
 - **Bedtime is extended until 11:30pm.**
 - Point of Personal Privilege: President Hunter: Bedtime will be extended until 11:15pm.
 - Point of Information: Suarez to the Sponsor: Is bedtime a statute?
 - President Hunter: It's a rule and procedure.
 - Point of Information: Rock to President Hunter: If we don't go through all of the legislation does that mean it will be pushed?
 - President Hunter: If there is a co-Sponsor the legislation does not simply die, it can be pushed to Summer Senate.
 - Point of Personal Privilege: Beall: I think we are all anxious so let's get through everything.
 - Opening Statement:
 - Wang: I chaired Rules & Procedure last year when a rule change was brought to us (C2) where now the Rules & Procedure committee must vote on how many additional absences a Senator gets before they are resuspended. This doesn't cover what happens if they get forwarded for impeachment and Judiciary finds they can continue to serve in there capacity as Senators. This makes the Rules

& Procedure committee apply the number of absences that Senator gets before they are resuspended - closes that loophole.

- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - No speakers.
- First Round of Pro:
 - Garner: This makes sense.
 - Myers: We had an issue with this where the process doesn't exist. This is what Rules and Judiciary ended up doing that I think worked well.
 - Boisvert: This passed by unanimous consent in Judiciary
 - **Tucker moves to call the question, RECORDING INAUDIBLE (02:57:51) seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called**
- First Round of Con:
 - N/A.
- Closing Statement:
 - Wang: This is the last closing statement ever - I'm terming out. Thank you for all your support.
- Voting Results:
 - **40 yes, 1 no, 2 abstentions.**
 - **Resolution 47 passes.**

Resolution 38 Sponsored by Senator Edouard and Senator Nemeth (P) Downing, Beall, Vollick, Diaz, Hautrive, Tucker, DuChêne, Suarez, Hockett, Pardee, Soares, Kaminsky, Fronczak, Barrett, Weintraub, Garner, Barberis (Co) Nominating President Hunter for the Senate Hall of Fame.

Resolution 39 Nominating Senator Wang for the Senate Hall of Fame.

- Opening Statement:
 - Myers: Everything stated reflects her character and the amount of work she has put in the last three Senate terms. She is the type of Senator who should be inducted into the Senate Hall of Fame.
 - Tucker: I wish you could've been here longer to see the amazing things she's accomplished - she's the most deserving of this award.
- First Round of Pro:
 - **Bettley moves to amend "a copy of this be sent to" after the final "be it further resolved."**
 - **No objections.**
 - **Authors find it friendly.**

- Bettley: There are so many things she has done that have expanded upon the day-to-day functions in Senate to improve the efficiency of our Chambers – especially with mental health days. She takes the time out of her day to help other Senators.
- Hockett: She always seems to be running the room - she has been fully engaged. It seems she never skips a beat, rather is always attentive.
- Madelyn: I met Wang before I knew what Senate was, and could tell she was very passionate. She commands the room and I sit in awe watching her. I am inspired and grateful to have her as a role model and mentor.
- DuChêne: I have a special place in my heart for anyone who represents a small college. The fact that a Senator from a college so small became the Pro-Tempore of this body and has been a leader is inspiring for anybody who has aspirations as a student leader, no matter their background.
- Roy: She is a giant in Senate who legitimately created a great culture as Pro-Tempore. Thank you.
- Second Round of Pro:
 - **Diaz moves to call the question, Beall seconds.**
 - **No objections.**
 - **The question is called.**
- Closing Statement:
 - Myers: I hope you can see for yourself some of the work she has done.
 - Tucker: Look at the person she is and what she's achieved. She deserves this.
- Voting Results:
 - **28 yes, 9 no, 7 abstentions.**
 - **Resolution 37 Passes.**
- *Renee Wang is inducted into the Senate Hall of Fame.*

Unfinished Business:

- **Tucker moves to 'unlock the Calendar' to go back to Resolution 36, Diaz seconds.**
 - **Kaminski objects.**
 - **Tucker does not withdraw.**
 - **Voting Results:**
 - **N/A.**
 - **Withdrawn.**
- Point of Information: Diaz: Bill 45 was withdrawn?
 - It passed in special session.

Statements of Dissent: *Garner, Roy, Tucker, Russell.*

New Business: None.

Closing Announcements:

- Wang: Thank you.
- Roy: I waive my time.

Officer Announcements:

- Clerk Latiff: Goodnight and good luck on your finals.
- Parliamentarian Rowan: We are all going to miss you two so much.
- Press Secretary Allen: N/A.
- Historian Cofer: I will see you all in the fall, have a great summer – goodnight.
- Pro-Tempore Nemeth: Sorry about the Academic Honor Policy stuff earlier, I was not aware we were doing a full vote. I am disappointed the Zoom cameras have been off since the conclusion of the presentation.
- President Hunter: I will send my announcements in the GroupMe.

Advisor Announcements:

- Jacalyn: Fill out the Summer Intent Form so we can see if your seat will be available. Good luck on finals if you need please resources reach out.

Final Roll Call:

- Conducted.

Adjournment:

- **President Hunter adjourns Senate at 11:20pm.**