



**72nd Student Senate
Judiciary Committee
Date: January 13th, 2020**

Call to Order: p.m.

Members Present: Chair Leckie, Vice Chair England, Senator(s) Absten, Ascanio, Gerdts, Primozić, Ready, Recht, Silvia, Slimak, Sojos

Members Tardy: None

Members Excused Absent: Weber

Members Absent: None

Guests: President Denton, Senator(s) Lavender, Daraldik, Haslett, Legislative Aid Kilinc

Announcements:

- Chair - Looked back at our past semester, which was two meetings. Senator Recht made 11 comments. Senator Gerdts and Weber made 10 comments! Over 40 questions and statements over those 2 meetings. Keep it up! Lots of important business tonight, including Constitutional Amendments.
- Vice Chair - Welcome back!
- Members - Gerdts: I hope you read my bills! The krampus didn't come, so I'm assuming you read it all.
- Guests - None

Committee Business:

- **Bill 3** - Sponsored by Senator Sojos - To ensure all necessary campaign related documents submitted to the Supervisor of Elections by candidates or political parties are made publicly available before any campaign violation decision is issued by the Supervisor of Elections, the Elections Commission, or the Supreme Court.
- **Bill 6** - Sponsored by Senator Sojos - To allow for Senators to be inducted to the Senate hall of fame solely by resolution.
- **Bill 11** - Sponsored by Senator Lavender - Revision to Chapter 205 Code of Ethics.
- **Constitutional Amendment 1** - Sponsored by Senator Gerdts - Ensuring the current Student Constitution is Gender Neutral.
- **Constitutional Amendment 2** - Sponsored by Senator Gerdts - To ensure future amendments to the Constitution are Gender Neutral.
- **Bill 12** - Sponsored by Senators Leckie and Absten - To ensure that all resolutions denouncing an individual or organization are considered under the same circumstances as a resolution to commend an individual or organization.
- **Bill 14** - Sponsored by Senators Gerdts and Blackthorne - To amend Chapter 705.5 to resolve the decades long issue of empty and non-competitive graduate senate seats whilst preserving the ability of graduate students to participate in the Senate.

- **Bill 15** - Sponsored by Senators Gerdts and Blackthorne - To amend Chapter 607.1.D of the Student Body Statutes to empower the Congress of Graduate Students to better express its opinions on legislation regarding chapter 607 and other matters that the congress deems important.
- **Bill 17** - Sponsored by Senator Slimak - To update and add to the Senate Officers within statute 400.2, 405.2, and 413.2.

Old Business:

- **Bill 3** - Sponsored by Senator Sojos - To ensure all necessary campaign related documents submitted to the Supervisor of Elections by candidates or political parties are made publicly available before any campaign violation decision is issued by the Supervisor of Elections, the Elections Commission, or the Supreme Court.
 - Opening Statement
 - Sojos: The purpose is to make the supervisor of elections release all the documentation before the supreme court hears the violations during elections. The last election had violations in which the student body does not know the details
 - Sponsor yields 2 min 13 sec to closing
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - Recht: would you be willing to table this until the election code review?
 - Sojos: no, let's do it now
 - Senator Ready moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Recht seconds
 - Round Table
 - Ready: When violations are filed, the quart has the power of supeans, this must be released before the quart can go on?
 - Sojos: yes, as students need to understand the actions prior to the violation being heard
 - Absten: How would this work with inauguration? Would it delay it?
 - Gerdts: I think what Senator Absten was getting at is that it takes time for the Supervisor of Elections to get everything together and get everything out. Taking the time will slow down the election committee. I think this would be done better with the large overhaul of election code that's coming. It would make sense to do this in a holistic manner as opposed to doing it piece by piece. Dealing with this would be best for the election ad-hoc.
 - Senator Sojos moves to table until the elections ad-hoc is formed
 - Senator Recht seconds
 - **Bill TABLED**
- **Bill 6** - Sponsored by Senator Sojos - To allow for Senators to be inducted to the Senate hall of fame solely by resolution.
 - Opening Statement
 - Sojos: This bill was brought to my attention by Jack. Right now, inducting a member to the Hall of Fame requires a committee vote. Nobody has been denied by the recognition committee and there's no need for this committee.
 - Yields 2:27
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - None
 - Senator Ready moves to enter Pro-Con
 - Senator Recht seconds

- Point of Information: Gerdts - Did you think of section b1 which removes limitations?
 - Sojos: I think it's better to let the Senate decide if anyone should be able to be in the Hall of Fame
- 1st Round of Pro:
 - Ready: I concur with the sponsor on the need for the resolution. I think the committee is bureaucratic and red tape that we don't need. Criteria on removal I'll speak on later.
- Point of Information: Primoziac - Would it be 50% of the Senate to pass?
 - Sojos: Yeah, just like a regular resolution
- 1st Round of Con:
 - Slimak: I think the checks and balances are important in Senate. I think that by having other people look at this can ensure that we award those who really did make a difference to Florida State. I don't want to remove all the requirements as I think they're important.
 - Gerdts: My issue is not the problem with removing the committee. I don't actually think a committee meets for things like this. Even if one does, outside understanding would be good. I doubt this committee would say no to the Senate and I don't think they'd spend much time on it. I think the Senate Hall of Fame should be decided by the Senate themselves. It's an award from the Senate and it should therefore be awarded by the Senate. I don't want the criteria to be removed though. Senator Glanton as a perfect example.
- Senator Ready moves to extend the 1st round of con by 2 minutes
- Senator Recht seconds
- Senator Ready moves to suspend the rules for this particular instance
- Senator Recht seconds
- 1st Round of Con (Cont.):
 - Recht: I'd prefer for the requirements to be kept. I think the Senate Program Assistant should have the ability to review it. Just a little bit of checks and balances.
 - Ready: My only reservations are the criteria being removed. I'd like to see them brought back in. I think they need to be there. I'd like to have continuity of the rules that people have already been passed under. We do fail candidates on occasion. As Finance Chair I put a candidate up and the Senate failed the candidate.
- Point of Information: Absten - Would Senator Sojos be open to an amendment?
 - Sojos: Yes but only if we can get someone to enforce the criteria
- Point of Information: Ready - Wouldn't passing it be enough of enforcement?
 - Senator Gerdts moves to amend the bill to read "**Once a nominee has been selected to be a member of the Senate Hall of Fame, they will be notified in a timely manner as to the award.**"
 - Sojos finds it friendly
- Senator Ready moves to amend the bill to unstrike section C. of the bill
 - Sojos finds it friendly
- Point of Information: President Denton - The committee to approve these things is now just Dr. Acosta. She said it was useless as they're never going to veto someone. The power should lie in the Senate, according to Dr. Acosta.
- 2nd Round of Pro:

- Slimak: Now understanding who's in the committee, I would now be in support of this bill. I would like to see the amendments go through.
 - Senator Slimak moves for a 1 minute recess.
 - Senator Primozic seconds.
 - Senator Primozic moves to amend the bill on section A. to make it 2/3rds of Senate required to pass the resolution
 - Sojos finds it friendly
 - Senator Gerdts moves to call the question
 - Senator Absten seconds
 - Closing: I'm happy everyone assisted with amending this.
 - Vote
 - Absten - Yes
 - Ascanio - Yes
 - England - Yes
 - Gerdts - Yes
 - Primozic - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Recht - Yes
 - Silvia - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
 - **Bill PASSES 10-0**
 - **Bill 11** - Sponsored by Senator Lavender - Revision to Chapter 205 Code of Ethics.
 - Opening Statement
 - Lavender: Hi! Thanks everyone for hearing the bill. I've heard a lot of feedback about this bill. A couple times at FSU Day at the Capitol and when representing FSU people have worn their name tags. People should remove their name tags when giving personal opinions. 2:17 yielded.
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - Gerdts: If I were to write a letter or endorse someone, would I be able to identify myself as a Senate member?
 - Lavender: Yes, as long as you clarify your views aren't reflective of the whole Senate
 - Recht: Is there any sort of punishment for any violation?
 - Lavender: As of right now, no. I would be open to hearing interpretations.
 - Daraldik: The way to reprimand someone for a code of ethics violation is to file a complaint with the Supreme Court
 - Sojos: If we wore our name tags in the Senate and gave an opinion, is that okay?
 - Lavender: Yes.
 - Senator Ascanio moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Sojos seconds
 - Round Table
 - Gerdts: I would say that I originally had reservations but thinking more on it, this sort of bill would put us more in line with the attitude in line of the student Senate. When we deal with Senate matters and FSU Day at the Capitol, we need people to know the separation. I support this and am surprised it's not already there. It means there's no purposeful or non-purposeful misrepresentation.

- Lavender: I want to add that I'm open to clarifying language if necessary
- Primozic: My only reservation is that it's easy enough to find out who is a Senator and who isn't. I'm not sure if removing a name tag is enough. Not sure if the bill is covering all bases.
- Lavender: Only when expressing your own views should you take your name tag off.
- Recht: For me, obviously I support everything this bill is trying to accomplish. When someone is elected to an office, you're electing them for who they are. Anything that happens can reflect on the office.
- Sojos: What about having a resolution passed to clarify when a violation should be recorded
- Recht: I think this could be separating the things. If you're lobbying for private interests with your office, that's actually illegal. Important to clarify who you're speaking as.
- Ready: Current language would forbid any person from wearing SGA t-shirts, including any organisation who has received funding from PAC. Would prefer some clarity on this language in the bill.
- Gerdts: I suppose that was my original issue. I would probably use more specific language and less sweeping language if I was to write this. I do support this bill as an idea and what it's trying to achieve. The last section is extremely large and broad. Being as specific and as targeted as possible whenever we want to ban something is important. We don't have definitions for some of the things written in the bill.
- Lavender: Thank you all for these valid points. Writing stuff well is important when dealing with statutes. Would you like me to amend this in committee or re-write it?
- Gerdts: Given the fact I think more words need to be put into this and we might be changing the specifics, I would prefer for it to be pulled and re-written.
- Recht: I see this as two separate things. Everything except for the last sentence is directing how student senators should act when representing themselves vs. FSU. I think this itself could be a resolution and pass. The last sentence is something that needs to be enforced and worked on.
- Senator Gerdts moves to table the bill for 1 week
- Senator Primozic seconds
- **Bill TABLED**

New Business:

- **Constitutional Amendment 1** - Sponsored by Senator Gerdts - Ensuring the current Student Constitution is Gender Neutral.
 - Opening Statement
 - Gerdts: These amendments are not new, they've already been sent to the people twice. The first time it got a couple dozen people away from passing last spring. Former Senator Alvarez spoke to the Supreme Court who said he could put it back up to the people. The second time got over 66% but didn't have over 10% of the student body voting. I'm looking to put it back up again. It would make the entire Constitution gender neutral.
 - Yields 57 seconds.
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - Absten: I just don't know if 10% of people vote in the spring
 - Gerdts: Yes

- Senator Sojos moves to enter Round Table Discussion
- Senator Recht seconds
- Round Table
 - Sojos: I was always taught that “they” isn’t grammatically correct to refer to a single individual.
 - Gerdts: It can be used, especially in modern English.
 - Sojos: Surely it’s just a he/she isn’t it?
 - Gerdts: There are a number of people on campus who don’t identify as he/she and modern concepts allow for people to be in between. Whether or not a Senator agrees with those isn’t important, we have to make sure the Constitution is as inclusive as possible.
 - Sojos: What about those that want to be referred to as “he” as opposed to “they”?
 - Gerdts: Using they as a general term is in line with other generalisations Senate have made. The Constitution having as much inclusivity as possible is a good idea. This isn’t banning people from identifying someone as a man or a woman, but is just referring to a more generic group of people. Using “they” is a better way in my mind and has already been supported by the Senate twice.
 - Recht: I would like to put any concerns to rest about using “they” versus “he” or “she”. I think it just makes everyone included and it’s no bigger gesture than that.
 - Sojos: Wouldn’t it be more inclusive to say for example: “if the Justice” instead of “they”?
 - Gerdts: The second side of them/they/theirs is to give things a lot more simplicity and the free use of pronouns. I don’t think we need to refer back to a proper noun all the time. Using pronouns will work here.
 - Primozic: I think it could be very repetitive without using pronouns
 - Recht: The first thing said in the Constitution is that this document applies to everyone. Using them instead of he/she would then allow for everyone to be included.
 - Gerdts: I’d also note that in the Judiciary Supreme Court procedures it says “he”. In other places it says “he/she”. It’s annoying to me that it alternates and in some places is sexist by nature. I think we’re nitpicking this on something that doesn’t matter.
- Senator Absten moves to call the question
- Senator Slimak seconds
- Closing: That was a lot more spirited than I thought it’d be. I think removing “his” is great. Putting them/their includes everyone and we should let the student body decide once again. Please support this! Yields 22 second.
- Vote
 - Absten - Yes
 - Ascanio - Yes
 - England - Yes
 - Gerdts - Yes
 - Primozic - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Recht - Yes
 - Silvia - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes

- **Bill PASSES 10-0**
- **Constitutional Amendment 2** - Sponsored by Senator Gerdts - To ensure future amendments to the Constitution are Gender Neutral
 - Opening Statement
 - Gerdts: Basically says all future Constitutional amendments will be gender neutral so we don't have to go through this process in the future.
 - Yields 2:41 to closing
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - None
 - Senator Recht moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Ascanio seconds
 - Round Table
 - None
 - Senator Ready moves to call the question
 - Senator Slimak seconds
 - Closing: Thank you.
 - Vote
 - Absten - Yes
 - Ascanio - Yes
 - England - Yes
 - Gerdts - Yes
 - Primozić - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Recht - Yes
 - Silvia - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
 - **Bill PASSES 10-0**
- **Bill 12** - Sponsored by Senators Leckie and Absten - To ensure that all resolutions denouncing an individual or organization are considered under the same circumstances as a resolution to commend an individual or organization.
 - Opening Statement
 - Leckie: Pass resolution condemning to be the same as one commending.
 - Yield 2 minutes 3 seconds
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - X:
 - Senator Gerdts moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Primozić seconds
 - Round Table
 - Gerdts: resolution against his will passed by one vote, wishes this would have been in place in order to help "make sense"
 - Senator Primozić moves to call the question
 - Senator slimak seconds
 - Closing: Thank you!
 - Vote:
 - Absten - Yes
 - Ascanio - Yes
 - Leckie - Yes
 - Gerdts - Yes
 - Primozić - Yes
 - Ready - Yes

- Recht - Yes
 - Silvia - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
 - **Bill PASSES 10-0**
- **Bill 14** - Sponsored by Senators Gerdts and Blackthorne - To amend Chapter 705.5 to resolve the decades long issue of empty and non-competitive graduate senate seats whilst preserving the ability of graduate students to participate in the Senate.
 - Opening Statement
 - Gerdts: I have awaited this moment for months. This is apportionment, this is the main bill that you have been threatened to read. It basically removes the distinction between “undergraduate” and “graduate” students. If I’m a poli-sci major I’m part of the social sciences college. Same with an applied-economics masters student. Those students can then still run for those seats. There is one section that is unconstitutional - I just wanted to see if I could get away with it.
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - Primozic: I know that some graduate seats go unfilled. Has there been any effort from SGA etc to get them filled or has it been an underlying problem?
 - Gerdts: We’ve not had 2/3rds filled in over 14 years. That means we haven’t had a real and meaningful graduate Senate election. It’s an underlying problem. SGA doesn’t tend to make an effort to fill Senate seats. Even the Congress of Graduate Students have problems trying to get people.
 - Senator Ready moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Sojos seconds
 - Round Table
 - Ready: Has Dr. Acosta signed off on this?
 - Gerdts: I gave this to her about a month and a half ago. She hasn’t expressed to me that she’s against it. She has expressed that it’s legal and wants us to make sure we understand the ramifications of this and what it would do.
 - Ready: What was the COGS’ opinion on this?
 - Gerdts: He basically said Senate should become like COGS and meet only once every 2 weeks for a maximum of 2 hours. His only other concern was this could entirely eliminate the voice of graduate students in Senate. I noted that this doesn’t exclude graduate people from running. The Supreme Court noted that this makes it more difficult for graduate students to get into the Senate and it does.
 - Ready: I know that in the committee meeting we had on this, the only problem I had was where law students come into this.
 - Gerdts: I got to create a new section of statues that basically gives the Law college a single seat. That may expand if the Law college grows.
 - Senator Gerdts moves to amend the bill to strike an unconstitutional portion
 - Sponsor finds it friendly
 - Ready: So Law students wouldn’t be able to just keep their Senate seat? They’d have to move over
 - Gerdts: It’s unfortunate but that’s how it’s fallen

- Senator Sojos moves to call the question
- Senator Recht seconds
- Closing: I am almost emotional. This has been a long time coming. It's not perfect. I believe this is the only reasonable and legal way to reapportion seats. I hope you all vote in favour and I look forward to seeing the vote tally. I'm proud of the work myself and my committee did on this. Yields 40 seconds.
- Vote
 - Absten - Yes
 - Ascanio - Yes
 - England - Yes
 - Gerdts - Yes
 - Primozic - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Recht - Yes
 - Silvia - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes
- **Bill PASSES 10-0**
- **Bill 15** - Sponsored by Senators Gerdts and Blackthorne - To amend Chapter 607.1.D of the Student Body Statutes to empower the Congress of Graduate Students to better express its opinions on legislation regarding chapter 607 and other matters that the congress deems important.
 - Opening Statement
 - Gerdts: This would mean that Senate legislation affecting COGS (Section 607) would require the input of COGS. It would go through the whole process, get to second reading, immediately tabled and will be sent to COGS.
 - Yields 1:32 to closing.
 - Technical, Non-Detableable
 - None
 - Senator Ready moves to enter Round Table Discussion
 - Senator Sojos seconds
 - Round Table
 - Ready: I commend the sponsor on this bill. I did like this section a lot and the former COGS speaker really liked it. I'm always for giving COGS more representation. I find this bill not only prudent but I commend the sponsor.
 - Senator Recht moves to call the question
 - Senator Sojos seconds
 - Closing: Thank y'all. I love COGS. I look forward to a hopeful approval!
 - Vote
 - Absten - Yes
 - Ascanio - Yes
 - England - Yes
 - Gerdts - Yes
 - Primozic - Yes
 - Ready - Yes
 - Recht - Yes
 - Silvia - Yes
 - Slimak - Yes
 - Sojos - Yes

- **Bill PASSES 10-0**
- **Bill 17** - Sponsored by Senator Slimak - To update and add to the Senate Officers within statute 400.2, 405.2, and 413.2.
 - Chair Leckie tables this bill due to time constraints.

Unfinished Business: None

Committee Legislative Round Table: None due to time constraints.

Final Announcements:

- Gerdt: Thanks everyone!
- Leckie: Good job everyone! We had a lot to get through. Good questions.

Date and Time of Next Meeting: To be determined

Adjourned: 9:37 p.m.

Griffin Leckie

Signature of Chair