



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

Call to Order: 6:01

Members Present: Chair Linsky, Vice-Chair Tackett, Parliamentarian Rowan, Senator Randall

Members Tardy:

Members Absent: Nemeth

Guests: Senators: Roy, Bowling, Marcus

Approval of the Minutes:

- Rowan: **Moved**
- Tackett: **So Second**

Announcements:

- Roy: This week has been Central Reserves. Everyone here has been in the Central Reserves Committee. It is great to see these senators still working hard after the Central Reserves meetings today.

Student Comments:

- None

Committee Business:

- First read through of Rule 11 and Rule 12 of the Senate Rule of Procedure

Old Business:

- None

New Business:

Rule 11

- Rowan: I will start by reading out Rule 11 until we find an issue.
- Randall: In 11.5, it should say “presiding officer” instead of “president or other officer”
- Rowan: I agree. We also need to address the “Senate Program Assistant” language again. We should change it to “SGA Staff” like we did earlier.
- Linsky: 11.1 through 11.5 looks good to me. We need to deal with 11.6 though, specifically 11.6.E where it only says “vote”. In 11.6.D I will change the “his or her” language to “their”.



- Rowan: I think Pro/Con debate can get boring. It is back and forward for 3 minutes at a time. I would want to do something more like a roundtable.
- Linsky: How would it be better?
- Rowan: It can improve debate and make it more constructive.
- Linsky: Is there something inherently flawed that we need to change?
- Marcus: That idea would be hard to maintain order.
- Rowan: I don't think it should be a roundtable format, because on the senate floor we need the President to preside and control it.
- Randall: It can be roundtable debate but you need to raise your hand first to speak
- Rowan: I like that, it can be more constructive.
- Linsky: I do not agree. The best part of this pro/con is the time constraints. Rule 11.7 with its time constraints are needed. I do not see the need to make a drastic change.
- Tackett: I feel like we do not need to reinvent the wheel. Let's leave it as it is.
- Linsky: We can get rid of 11.6.E because the vote is not a part of the debate and it is enumerated already in this rule.
- Rowan: I do not like that the presiding officer can let a senator speak more than twice. That can lead to biases. This hasn't happened with the current president but it could
- Linsky: I agree.
- Marcus: I feel that Section A can limit debate.
- Linsky: I agree, we should get rid of it. I
- Randall: I agree. I think we should also get rid of section B since it is always stated.
- Linsky: I think B needs to stay. This can allow for someone to speak more than once.
- Rowan: What if it says it shall not be applied to "raising motions or points".
- Bowling: I think you can always raise a point of order.
- Randall: I think we should enumerate it to say that "points can be raised at any time except when raised by a question"
- Rowan: All the rules about points are in section 11.13.
- Randall: Then why are the rules about points in 11.7.
- Rowan: let's just have it say in 11.13 "Any senator may raise a point at any time unless denoted otherwise in these rules".
- Randall: That works
- Rowan: After reading 11.9, this gives a senator more power than they should have. They should not have the power to waive the remainder of the time in debate.
- Randall: I agree, let's strike that part.
- Rowan: We should also strike section A, which seemed like it was fixing the problem created by section B.
- Randall: I agree. Looking at Rowan's amendments in 11.10, I see that he is trying to fix the issue when we call a question during a con debate.
- Linsky: The way he wrote it makes it function to how we operate now.
- Randall: Well, this will make it so there always has to be a transition period after a round of pro/con.
- Rowan: I agree
- Randall: I do not like the use of the word "expired"
- Tackett: That is the language we use on the floor.



- Randall: That word itself is used correctly, but we have used that same word in a different context and it could be confusing.
- Rowan: Let's have it say "if no time has expired".
- Randall: I agree with that. It is elementary but it works. I want to change something in 11.10.A.1 to elaborate more on the motion to Call to question.
- Rowan: I agree, I do not know why I used other words. We should keep it at the original "call to question" language
- Randall: In 11.10.C, I want to make the language more affirmative.
- Rowan: I think we need to include the word electronic in 11.11.
- Randall: I do not think so, the presiding officer has the power to conduct the vote electronically.
- Rowan: There was a case in the Florida government where they decided electronic votes over zoom do not count. We need to enumerate that Senators can call for an electronic vote.
- Randall: Should we include a voice vote then?
- Rowan: No, that is the most basic principle in Robert's Rules. That is how votes are conducted automatically and senators make motions to move away from that.
- Randall: I see, I agree.
- Linsky: We should change 11.11.B to say "cast or change their vote" instead of enumerating each one separately. In 11.12, we should change the language of "for another" and make it "in place of another"
- Randall: I like the language "on behalf".
- Rowan: Looking at 11.13.A, it is wrong and should be cut.
- Randall: I agree.
- Rowan: If the motions are covered in Roberts Rules, we do not need them here. In 11.13.A.2, we need to specify that points of information can be directed to a specific person by the presiding officer.
- Randall: We have finished Rule 11.
- Linsky: Let's do a final read-through of the rule before we leave.
- Rowan: Tackett and Randall, we need people in central reserves.
- Randall: Let's recess so we can leave for that.
- Linsky: I'll entertain a motion to recess for 30 minutes.
- Randall: **So moved**
- Rowan: **So Seconded**
- Linsky: Welcome Back
- Rowan: I think 11.7 should specify that the rule only applies for "in-debate".
- Linsky: I agree
- Rowan: In 11.10, Calling a question is not debatable, we need to specify that.
- Linsky: I agree.
- Randall: Looking 11.13.A, what other points are there.
- Rowan: There are none.
- Linsky: We should get rid of the "not limited to" language. After that, we are done and moving to Rule 12



Rule 12

- Linsky: Looking at this first rule, it means nothing. The Rule of Procedure does not apply to non-senators or SGA. I think we should get rid of it but it sets a tone.
- Tackett: Reading 11.2, since they enumerate the ban of tobacco, do we need to ban the use of drugs on the floor too.
- Linsky: It is inferred by the university rules that cocaine wouldn't be allowed on the floor of the senate.
- Rowan: We do not need to explicitly say "do not murder anyone" in the rules either so this is inferred.
- Linsky: I think we should cut the part in 12.4 that says we can not have disruptive attire on the senate floor. Cohen V. California protects the right to wear what you want. If this rule is invoked it is wrong.
- Randall: Good point, let's cut it.
- Rowan: Let's cut "shall be permitted" in Rule 12.5.
- Randall: I agree, let's cut it.
- Linsky: For 12.6, I will research to see if it is copacetic.
- Randall: With 12.6.A, Committee chairs are presiding officers, so this subsection is redundant.
- Rowan: With the new 12.6.A, how is it enforceable? Who interprets the punishment? It is difficult to determine intent.
- Linsky: I think we can get rid of it because partisan motivation can be connected to real intent.
- Rowan: I want to make sure that people would not abuse this rule to call something partisan to get around it.
- Randall: It is open to abuse.
- Rowan: With 12.7, this rule is there to be in compliance with Sunshine Laws.
- Linsky: I think we can get rid of it.
- Rowan: I wonder what the story was behind 12.8
- Randall: It applies that someone in the past maliciously destroyed a bill.
- Linsky: Let's cut it. 12.9 doesn't make any sense. It is a stupid rule and should be cut.
- Randall: I agree.
- Linsky: Same thing with 12.10, this rule is enumerated somewhere else.
- Randall: I feel like 12.11 can be abused.
- Linsky: I agree, but a person who abuses it would not be viewed as reasonable. With it being in the Rules it shows its importance.
- Randall: Bribery belongs in the Code of Ethics.
- Linsky: I think this Rule should stay. If we get rid of this rule then we have to get rid of this entire Rule.
- Randall: If we have this here, then why do we need a code of ethics.
- Linsky: I do not think we will agree on this Rule, let's leave it for Rule and Calendar.
- Tackett: I have an issue with 12.2, the state of Florida Bans indoor vaping and smoking. We also are a tobacco free campus. This rule is duplicative.
- Rowan: I agree.



- Randall: But should we keep it there to inform the senate.
- Linsky: I do not think enough people know about it and it should be there to inform them.
- Tackett: I disagree, it is a duplicative rule. It is a senator's own fault if they do not know about state laws. We don't need a rule that informs senators not to do drugs on the floor. This does not need to be there either.
- Randall: I have not seen things on campus informing students of these rules so we should keep it there.
- Rowan: Whatever, let's leave it.
- Tackett: I disagree, this needs to leave, but we can move on.
- Linsky: Let's do a read through. I think we are good. I'll entertain a **motion to adjourn**.
- Rowan: **So moved**
- Tackett: **So seconded**

Unfinished Business:

- None

Final Announcements:

- None

Date and Time of Next Meeting: Saturday July 17th, 2021 at 7:00pm

Adjourned: 8:45pm

Meeting recording:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_CwhjiCj9gM_gDGCSOqQWPGyVzeZjVtX/view?usp=sharing

Matthew E. Linsky