

E&A MEETING AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order: 10:32 AM
- 2. Roll Call & Verification of Quorum: 4/6 (4)

Name	Email	Initial	Final
Chair Escobar	sga_ea@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Vice Chair Beneche	sga_sci2@ucf.edu	Е	Е
Senator Patel	<u>sga_med1@ucf.edu</u>	Е	Е
Senator Gaudio	sgaecs9@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Connolly	<u>sga_ecs3@ucf.edu</u>	Р	Р
Senator Rickett	sga_grst2@ucf.edu	A (P: 10:36AM)	Р
LJR Representative, Chair Courts	<u>sga_ljr@ucf.edu</u>	Р	Р
Pro Tempore Representative	<u>sga_pro@ucf.edu</u>	Е	Е
Supervisor of Elections Brown	<u>sga_ec@ucf.edu</u>	E (P: 10:33AM)	Е

- 3. Approval of the Minutes: <u>03.26.2024</u> Approved by GC
- 4. Approval of the Agenda: Approved by GC
- 5. Announcements from the Chair Escobar
 - i. Hello everybody! Good morning, we have four bills to see today. This is our second to last meeting! If we have any final updates to Title VI, they must be written and submitted for remanding today.
- 6. Announcements from the Vice Chair Beneche
 - a. None.
- 7. Announcements from Committee Members-



- a. LJR Rep: Hello E&A! We saw a few bills last week, one to make a penal action process and just a few clarifying ones. Today is the last day to submit legislation without it needing to be adopted so be aware.
- b. Pro Temp Rep:
- c. Supervisor Brown: Hi everyone! I am currently on SG on tour so apologies for any background noise! Incredibly exhausted from the Election but hopefully.. Its over!! Below is my memorandum as required by statues! I am happy to answer any questions about it.
 - i. Memorandum 2.pdf
- 8. Announcements from Non-Committee Members
 - a. None.
- 9. Old Business
 - i. Internal Bill 56-36 [Updates to Title VI Paid Endorsements].docx
 - 1. Speech SQD: 3-4-5 Approved by GC
 - a. Chair Escobar: This bill states that professional services like advertisements must be reported in a clear way, and it must be stated that it is a paid endorsement. IT also says that it is under the discretion of the Supervisor of Elections.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a. Rickett: Would you have to disclose the amount of money, or disclose payment
 - i. You already have to disclose payment, this is saying that paid endorsements must say that it is a paid endorsement in a clearly stated way.
 - 1. Brown: EC already knows they're spending money on endorsements. It's more so that it makes it more aware and increases transparency, kind of how if influencers are doing paid endorsements they have to tell.
 - 3. Debate
 - a. Courts: I will be voting in favor, as I believe that the students deserve to know whether an individual is speaking in favor because they are paid or if they just think the candidate is cool.
 - b. Escobar: I will also be voting in favor, as in regular campaigns it has to be disclosed.
 - c. Brown: I am really in favor of this as well, as transparency has been a big initiative for me this year. This provides a clear distinction for



students to know if someone actually cares or if they're just getting paid

4. Vote 5-0-0 Passes E&A

10. New Business-

- a. Confirmations:
 - i. None
- b. Bills:
 - i. <u>Internal Bill 56-51 [Updates to Title III Allowing any Senator to Motion to Vote</u> <u>on Presidential Appointees]</u>
 - 1. Speech SQD: 5-5-5 Approved by GC
 - a. Chair Escobar: Reading the Whereas clauses, as the senator is not present. The bill strikes the provision that E&A leadership make the motion to vote during confirmations
 - b. Caringal: This bill simply gives any senator the ability to motion to vote during confirmations. The main reason I wanted to introduce this was because I feel there is no real circumstance needed for E&A leadership to make that motion to vote. It is a normal voting motion, so it doesn't need to be specific to the E&A leadership. We don't use that specific provision for other bills such as fiscal for fiscal leadership, and it could just ease confusion.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a. Rickett: What is this bill doing?
 - i. During confirmations, only E&A leadership can make the motion to vote.
 - 1. Rickett: To open it up to everyone?
 - a. Escobar: Yes
 - b. Rickett: Do you like this bill?
 - i. Escobar: Confirmations are a unique process, so I believe that it should stay E&A leadership. I understand the intention, but I think that this power should be retained.
 - 3. Debate
 - a. Gaudio: I have given this a bit of thought, as I believe that there is a valid point. Under current title III, if the E&A committee says by majority vote that they will not see that person Senate can overturn. In theory as it stands now, if E&A leadership doesn't want to see that person they could just not make the motion serving as a sort of



hard veto, and the Senate has no way of overturning this. Once a measure hits teh floor, it is now in the hands of the floor rather than the E&A committee, so I'm not sure why E&A should retain an exclusive authority on the floor.

- b. Rickett: I agree with Gaudio. I understand precedent, but at the end of the day how we vote and confirm it should just go to senate as a whole. Someone can come to E&A and not be liked by the committee, but they still deserve to be seen by the floor.
- c. Courts: This bill doesn't really do a lot, so I'm neutral. I could see it in the sense that it takes away confusion, but I don't think this bill really does a lot.
- d. Escobar: I see it like if the E&A Chair believes that there hasn't been enough debate, they can keep it in debate.
 - i. Brodie: Great question, no idea. It's been there for a while. Something you can consider is "would i write it with this language".
- e. Connolly: I kind of like this because i got confused in the beginning, especially because it was summer and online and already confusing
- 4. Vote: 4-0-1 Passes E&A
- ii. <u>Internal Bill 56-54 [Updates to Title VI Ranked Choice Voting].docx</u> Postponed in Committee
 - 1. Supervisor Brown: I cannot access this
 - **a**. Collazo says these need to be copied from the senate agenda so i can access them
- iii. Internal Bill 56-53 [Updates to Title VI Requirement for a list of Presidential Campaign Staff].docx
 - 1. Supervisor Brown: I cannot access this
 - 2. Speech SQD: 5-5-10
 - a. Gaudio: This is a bill I drafted by suggestion of an election commissioner, and Supervisor Brown, VP Brawley and SBP. The election commission sometimes has trouble differentiating who is a part of a campaign and who isn't. This makes it to where they have to submit a list, that they can edit whenever, to submit to the commission. There is a second part that says that leadership members and student government agents may not aid in campaigns



- b. Brown: A lot of my recommendations have been added for due process and fairness. We have to make sure to put in a clarification
- 3. Questioning

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- **a**. Rickett: Is there any precedent in state, locla, or federal elections that has this same type of provision?
 - i. Gaudio: Not that I know of, as I didn't look into that. I don't think that we should look at those models as gospel
- b. Rickett: If I'm advocating for
 - i. Gaudio: How could you hold someone accountable, even if the campaign is aware, refuses to comply
 - 1. Brown: Point of Information: Regardless of whether or not osmeone is speaking in favor or against EC can't do anything about it. Unless the ticket itsself condones, we can't do anything about that.
- c. Connolly: With this, a Senator wouldn't be able to endorse at all?i. Gaudio: No.
- d. Escobar: A senator can still support, just not actively campaign
 - i. Gaudio: Technically no, with how active campaigning is written into Title VI
- e. Rickett: This would extend to everyone in Student Government?
 - i. Gaudio: Judicial, EC, and AG already cannot
 - 1. Rickett: I know, I just want to say for the record
 - a. Rickett: What about OSI
 - i. Gaudio: Yes, technically with the wording of another bill
- f. Escobar: You mentioned SBP and VC having concerns, can you elaborate
 - i. Gaudio: Yes, they had questions about both sides. With the list they were concerned about participation and candidates wanting to get participation.. They are still very against the prohibitions on student government agents, as they feel that it is stepping on the rights of agents.
- 4. Debate
 - a. Brown: I'm not entirely against the prohibition, but I think this should be in a different bill because I don't think that it would be



accepted in it's current state. I highly encourage Senator Gaudio to put those provisions

- b. Rickett: I will be voting against, as I feel that it infringes on Article I and Article VI.
- c. Chair Escobar: I will be voting strongly in favor, as we already have half of our branches not being able to do this. I have concerns over SG Agents campaigning while they are in their positions of power, but I could see if they wanted to do it as a student
- d. Motion to see Gaudio's Amendments: Approved by GC
 - i. Speech
 - Gaudio: Taking the advice of the Supervisor of Elections, as I don't want the really good parts of this bill to be dragged down by the controversial parts
 - ii. Questioning
 - 1. Escobar: Will that be submitted today?
 - a. Gaudio: Yes.
 - 2. Escobar: Will there be provisions written to where agents can express their free speech outside of their positions?
 - a. Gaudio: Good question for when the bill is on the floor.
 - iii. Debate
 - 1. Connolly: I like these amendments, as it gives the bill a better chance of surviving.
 - iv. Vote: 3-0-1
- e. Gaudio: Another concern raised by the SBP and VC was potentially playing the list system by immediately removing people from the list. Would like to put it forward before it is voted by committee
- f. Brodie: I have a few questions. One is what happens when the person is removed, and the other side of adding someone to the list. Similarly, what is the incentive of the candidate doing so before they start actively campaigning? For me, allowing EC to use their judgement is better than a list as I don't love the idea of giving tickets a large piece of evidence.
- g. Rickett: If I wanted to name anyone, would I be able to?



LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- i. Brodie and Gaudio: You would be liable to everything they do, but yes.
- h. Gaudio: Going against concerns mentioned, I think that the discretion of EC should be reduced from broad determination to did the campaign know about this person and allo them to do what they are doing. The idea of just adding people is the idea. We don't want to stomp on students' ability to help when they are able to. The point of this is to narrow down where EC has to exercise discretion and it is written in plain language
- i. Brown: One, to address Brodie's concerns the statement ensures that they can't add people last minute. It would be up to EC for provisions on adding people to the list later on, but this ensures that they can't add people at the last minute. We had a case this year where a candidate switched their campaign manager. You can always add an amendment to help the EC with the provision.
- j. Brodie: It seems that the bill intention has changed, as I am now hearing that candidates have to go to info sessions. Is the purpose so that people can be added at any point, or that they must have already gone through these sessions.
 - i. Escobar: I can see the troubles with having the list befoer declaration of candidacy because they would have to get people, but also, I don't know if there are provisions on how EC would go about this. Another point is that this has to do with active campaigning, which is a clear definition but at the same time it is not.
 - 1. Gaudio: To not include simple statements of support?
 - a. Escobar: Currently people can still say support, but the media provisions are what could be changed.

k. Motion to see Gaudio's amendment

- i. Speech SQD: 5-5-5
 - 1. Current statutory requirements one would not be enough because you would have people who want to aid in the campaign. This would help to elevate
- ii. Questioning



- 1. They already can do this, say there is only a few people who want to campaign. SO what is the purpose?
 - a. They can if they want to, but they don't have to. I can see this being a problem. As for the one candidate problem, the total number has not changed. It just shifts when they have to be done
- 2. Brown: Point of Clarification: This amendment requires that we would have 12 info sessions, have added an amendment
- iii. Debate
 - Is supervisor allowed to add amendments?
 a. full voting member so yes
 - 2. Brodie: I just want to, again you can disregard, add that you are trying to make it easier for EC but also adding other work in another area
 - 3. Escobar: I think that since we have the at least 1 provision, it should be up to EC's discretion. I will not be voting in favor of this amendment.
- iv. Vote 0-5-0 Does not Pass

5. Vote 4-1-0 Passes E&A

- 11. Member Discussion
 - a. DLEG Collazo: Links to bills must be copied from the Senate Agenda. This is so all senator and SG advisors can see the amendments and vote count.
 - b. Transition binder MTI: Approved by GC
 - c. Appointment questions for next session <u>https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1QP6RCCD1bjhANvoJCstOJw0Tb36r6WvX</u>
 - d. Courts: <u>E&A Duties and Responsibilities</u>
- 12. Miscellaneous Business MTF: Approved by GC
 - a. Ice breaker: Dream vacation spot?
 - i. Gaudio: My bed, Czechia
 - ii. Courts: Germany
 - iii. Connolly: Germany
 - iv. Escobar: Carribean
 - v. Rickett: Four Seasons in Seashells



- 13. Final Roll Call: 5/6 (4)
- 14. Adjournment: 12:14 PM

Key:

P - Present A - Absent MTD - Move to Debate MTV - Move to Vote MTA- Move to Amend MSQD – Motion for Speech, Questioning, & Debate Time PP - Postpone PPI - Postpone Indefinitely GC - General Consent