

MEETING AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order: 1:02 PM
- 2. Roll Call & Verification of Quorum: 6/6 (4)

Name	Email	Initial	Final
Chair Courts	sga_ljr@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Vice Chair Gaudio	sgaecs9@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Naguib	sgachps4@ucf.edu	Е	Е
Senator Benwick	sga_sci7@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Trejo-Hernandez	sga_ecs1@ucf.edu	Р	Р
ELA Richmond	sgaela@ucf.edu	Р	Е
Pro Tempore Representative Collazo	sga_dleg@ucf.edu	Р	Р

- 3. Approval of the Minutes: <u>02.12.25</u> Approved by GC
- 4. Approval of the Agenda: Approved by GC
- 5. Announcements from the Chair Courts
 - a. Hey guys, very serious meeting today and I have many expectations.
 - Decorum
 - 1. No speaking unless you have been called on by the chair.
 - 2. Use proper speech to the best of your ability.
 - Questioning and Speaking in Debate
 - 1. No question is a stupid question
 - 2. Debate is aimed towards chair. Whether voting in favor or not, please make sure to give an explanation as to why.
 - Abstaining



- 1. As far as I am aware, there is no reason for anyone except for the Chair to abstain in this matter. You chose this committee and must carry out your role.
- b. As for how this is going to work, per the message that I sent yesterday, we are to only determine if this Recommendation has merit. You can scroll down and see how the process is outlined, and we will be strictly adhering to it.
- c. On a lighter note, I am so proud of my LJR Reps. The other internal committees (with the exception of E&A) are also looking at their Title III duties and, for a large part, you are the reason for this. You have let them know what we are doing here, and they have taken initiative.
- d. We will finish looking out prospective Title III changes and dividing them amongst the committee.
- 6. Announcements from the Vice Chair Gaudio
 - a. Hello friends, just to expand on what Chair Courts said, make sure to keep all questions in respect to our duty as a merits board when we enter questioning and avoid any questions which may be leading or have subjective answers. We are seeing this censure to ensure that the allegations both have merit and are sufficient to warrant a censure, and I have full faith that this committee will carry this out professionally and expediently. As a reminder, Title IX states that grounds for a censure encompasses but is not limited to:
 - Repeated disruptive behavior by any Student Government Agent.
 - Knowingly providing false information to the Student Body Senate or to any other Student Government Agent, or Student Government Staff.
 - Disregard for Student Government Regulations.

To reiterate, it does not have to be something specifically from the list in Title IX, but anything which warrants a similar level of concern to potentially require formal condemnation.

- 7. Announcements from Committee Members
 - a. Deputy Pro Tempore Collazo: Throughout today's meeting I ask that you treat the Chair and parties with respect. This is the first time LJR is acting in their ethical capacity this session. Please respect the censure process, ask questions, and keep debate germane. I am receiving bills and reviewing and advising Senators. These bills will be remanded to LJR.
 - b. LJR (GAP) Rep: Good afternoon LJR, I will keep this brief. We met our quota last week! Over 350+ signatures, and we are still working to higher goals and wrapping up our DATC research with our Legislative Briefs.
 - c. LJR (E&A) Rep: Saw two confirmations, one for EC and one for College of Business. Also had more conversations regarding a prospective bill regarding special elections.



- d. LJR (SBA) Rep: Yesterday SBA saw a whole 7 proclamations! We also had some discussion on potentially amending Senate Rule 2 to possibly further detail to future Chairs some important responsibilities of SBA and make sure it's permanently listed somewhere outside of transition binders where it may get lost between sessions.
- 8. Announcements from Non-Committee Members
 - a. None.
- 9. Old Business
 - a. Bills
 - None.
 - b. Resolutions
 - None.
 - c. Absences
 - None
 - d. Blanket Excuse
 - None.
- 10. New Business
 - a. Recommendation of Censure S-Q-D (10-10-10)
 - Issuer (Chair Al-Qudah)
 - 1. Good afternoon, LJR. Before I begin, I kindly ask you all to please refer also to my statement of events and ensure you have read through my detailed account of my experiences with Chair Lipner which led me to recommend a censure. Additionally, I wanted to quickly explain Title 9 Chapter 905 Section 1 which outlines the procedure of a "notification of censure" which is "a written notification which shows the condemnation or disapproval of the actions or inactions of an individual in accordance to the Student Body Constitution, Student Body Statutes, Senate Rules, Senate Bills, and/or other legal mandates." Furthermore, the actions or inactions committed by an individual may include but are not limited to "repeated disruptive behavior by any Student Government Agent" as noted by Subsection A. It deeply saddens me to return to LJR under these circumstances. When I first joined Student Government, I never would've imagined I would be in such a position and be forced to address such a racist comment made to me by a fellow Senator. As an Arab American from a very small town, for the majority of my life, I was complicit in suppressing my identity and any sense of culture in efforts to "fit in." However, when I came to the University of Central Florida, the second



largest institution in the nation, and thereby one of the most diverse, I quickly found community and an environment that would enable me to finally embrace my heritage. I have channeled much of these personal experiences into my passion for advocacy that I embody in the work I do as a Senator. It is this same fervour that led me to create the first official form of representation for the Arab American Community at the university through the Arab Caucus. I will not get too detailed into all the events I described in my statement of events since it is there for you all to review as well, but as you can see, a few weeks ago, I received a Teams message from Chair Lipner. He raised concerns about the scope of the Arab Caucus and why it did not represent the entirety of the Middle East, specifically the Israeli and Jewish community. The following day, I explained to him the vast difficulties in that and the need for Arab-specific representation to address the niche issues students of the community face that otherwise go overlooked or neglected. I did not receive a response from Chair Lipner, although he did view my response. The next day, I saw Chair Lipner in the office and while this interaction made me severely uncomfortable as he raised an issue of Israel and Palestine, I shut that down and believed Chair Lipner when he said that I had settled the matter he brought forth to me. For a few weeks, there was no interaction between Chair Lipner and I, furthering my impression that all was settled and we could move on without any further issue. However, during the Caucus Takeover Event, on Monday, February 10th, I was tabling for the Arab Caucus when Chair Lipner approached my table. I was preoccupied speaking to a student when Chair Lipner first came over, but he chose to wait until I was done to initiate a conversation. It's important to note that this time of waiting provided him plenty of opportunity to think carefully about the remarks he would then go on to make to me. Additionally, the full detailed account of the conversation can be found in my statement of events, so I once again emphasize the importance of reviewing that document for all relevant evidence and insight. During this interaction which Chair Lipner initiated, after pointing to and inquiring about the meaning of the Arabic writing on the Arab Caucus logo, Chair Lipner warned me to "be careful" because "when students see Arabic writing or Arabs they're going to assume the worst." These words are the essence of why I chose to recommend a censure against Chair Lipner. As an Arab American, as Chair of the Arab Caucus, these words are deeply



offensive and inappropriate. Not only that, but they are a direct violation of Title 11, Chapter 1100 Section 6 that states "No Student Government Agent shall discriminate, nor engage in discriminatory harassment against any individual based upon race, national origin, and ethnicity." Chair Lipner's sentiments are an insult to me and our Arab constituents, to the entirety of the over 300 million individuals within the Arab community, and to a language that is nearly 3000 years old and spoken by nearly 400 million people across the world. I do not believe they have any place in the mindset of anyone, but especially a Student Government Agent and student leader. I condemn Chair Lipner's sentiments and I encourage you all to do the same. Thank you and I yield the remainder of my time.

- Questioning
 - 1. Collazo: In your statements, you said that Chair Lipner violated the repetitive disturbance. How do you believe this behavior is repeated?
 - 2. Al-Qudah: This was the first time that this was brought to my attention, however my messages were very thorough as to my reasoning on the topic of his inquiry and why the Arab Caucus is Arab and not Middle Eastern. Those sentiments remain the same since I proposed the Resolution to create the Arabic Caucus. The next day when I saw him, he brought up the issue and said he had a personal experience with Israel-Palestine but I did not believe it was appropriate or get into the topic. He stated there was a reason he hadn't joined, but I believe that is a bigger issue than the caucus and did not feel comfortable having that conversation. I attempted to shut it down, and he said that the matter was settled. However, he then made his remarks at the Caucus Takeover Event and so I believe it to be a pattern I want to shut down.
 - 3. Benwick: In regards to Chair Lipner stating there's a reason he didn't join, was that question one that was brought up in discussion or a statement that was just made?
 - 4. Al-Qudah: That was a statement he made when he saw me in the office the next day. As you can tell in the Teams message, my interpretation was that he said that the reason he hadn't joined the caucus because he did not feel Israeli students were included under the purview of the caucus. He then stated he wanted to meet with me the next day, I told him I did not have any availability and did not feel comfortable having that conversation
 - 5. Benwick: Motion to extend questioning by 5 minutes Approved by GC



BRANCH

- 6. Collazo: In your own words without using the example of Chair Lipner's behavior, could you describe what disruptive behavior is to you?
- 7. Al-Qudah: I would say that disruptive behavior is any sort of inappropriate action taken by another individual which detracts from productive going about affairs.
- 8. Collazo: Could you describe the emotions that you were feeling throughout your interactions with Chair Lipner?
- 9. Al-Qudah: I will preface this by me saying that this position to begin with is difficult for me by needing to be here to fight for justice. I assume the best in everyone, and so my text was intended to alleviate any concerns I had seen in his original message to me in any further interaction. But when he brought up Israel-Palestine, that is the discussion that made me begin to feel uncomfortable, especially at the Caucus Takeover Event and the face he made to me. I cannot put into words how shocked and disgusted I was, as well as two-faced that it was not from a constituent but rather a colleague.
- 10. Collazo: In the Code of Ethics, it states that No Student Government Agent shall engage in discrimination or harassment. In your perspective, did Chair Lipner discriminate against you because of your ethnicity as an Arab or more engage in discriminatory harassment.
- 11. Al-Qudah: As previously stated, I did not feel comfortable being in a conversation where Chair Lipner could explain his personal experience with Israel-Palestine so I do not know his personal beliefs on Arabs. However, I would say that it is more on the end of harassment. I want to put an end to it now so that it does not turn into a larger issue.
- 12. Gaudio: So, you mention that you see this as discrimination against your ethnicity as an Arab, do you believe this could be instead more oriented towards the professional scope of Arab Caucus rather than a personal or otherwise charged attack.
- 13. Al-Qudah: I believe it is important to note that this was the Caucus Takeover Event where I was tabling, and Chair Lipner went out of his way to strike up a conversation with me as Arab Caucus Chair where he pointed to the logo and made his comments concerning students assuming the worse about Arabic writing. I believe this to be a direct attack against not only the Arab Caucus and its scope but also inappropriate and raises sentiments towards the Arabic community in general.
- Issued (Chair Lipner)



1. Honorable Members of the LJR Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to address the claims brought forward. I want to emphasize that my goal here is not to challenge Chair Al-Qudah personally or question the importance of the Arab Caucus. Instead, I am here to first, refute the claims made against me, then, clarify the intent behind my actions, and finally, demonstrate that these allegations do not meet the standards required under Chapter 905.1.A of the Student Body Statutes. As the Sustainability Caucus Chair, I am deeply committed to fostering inclusivity, collaboration, and addressing the social dimensions of sustainability as outlined in our mission statement. My work focuses on combating systemic inequalities and promoting understanding across diverse communities. This commitment is not just professional, it's personal. These principles guided my decision to engage with Senate to begin with, and get involved with various underrepresented caucuses, including the Military/Veterans, Disability, and Arab Caucuses. To support this commitment, I provided this committee with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to highlight how sustainability intersects with equity, diversity, and inclusion. This commitment to inclusivity and understanding is deeply rooted in my family history. Chair Al-Qudah referenced my remarks about my family's background in the original notice of censure, so I believe it's important to clarify the context which I never got the opportunity to do with Chair Al'Qudah directly. My grandmother was born in Haifa in 1936 prior to the formation of the State of Israel, with a Palestinian birth certificate, to my great-grandfather and grandmother, Eastern-European Jewish immigrants fleeing xenophobia and economic instability. My grandfather worked his way up to become the Harbormaster of Haifa's port, and through his passion for his community, sought to be elected to a seat in the Knesset (Israel's legislative body). His platform included advocating for a shared-state solution between Jews and Palestinian Arabs. Tragically, this belief in peaceful coexistence led to his assassination by radicals opposed to that vision, before elections were held. My family left the region following this to avoid further political unrest, and my grandmother immigrated to the United States at 18 seeking safety and a future free from violence. This history has shaped my belief in dialogue, understanding, and bridging divides. My actions throughout this situation stem from that belief of coexistence, and never from hostility. I hope this context helps the



UCF Student Government LJR Committee Meeting SG Conference Room 02/19/2024 1:00 PM

committee and Chair Al-Qudah understand that my intentions were rooted in fostering inclusivity and preventing unnecessary tension within the student body. The issuer claims that my conduct constitutes "repeated disruptive behavior" under Chapter 905.1.A. I respectfully disagree with that characterization. I will outline the events in question to provide an accurate account. My initial inquiry stemmed from a concern raised by a student leader in a casual conversation. As a member of Student Government, I believed it was my responsibility to relay that concern to Chair Al-Qudah to prevent further potential misunderstandings. In my message, I clearly stated that I was personally ambivalent about the matter and sought only to pass along the feedback. Chair Al-Qudah responded with a comprehensive and thoughtful explanation, which I fully accepted. I expressed in person that her reasoning clarified the issue and resolved any concerns I had. I assured her I would relay the key points to the student who initially expressed the concern. At no point did I challenge her explanation or attempt to press the issue further. In fact, after she requested that we not revisit the matter (albeit indirectly by avoiding me), I honored that boundary and did not pursue further discussion. The issuer's statement describes our interaction at the Caucus Takeover Event as targeted and provocative. I believe that interpretation misrepresents the situation. I visited every caucus table at the event with the same goal: to engage with student leaders, learn about their work, and show support. My approach to the Arab Caucus table was no different. My original comment about being worried about the Arab caucus's attendance was genuine and was paired with an offer to reach out to me if there is any situation where I could be of assistance to the caucus. When I commented on the Arab Caucus logo, I intended to compliment the design. My remark about "treading a fine line" was not directed at Chair Al-Qudah personally, nor was it meant to imply anything negative about Arab identity. Rather, it was an acknowledgment that some, emphasis on some, individuals on our campus hold biases that we must sometimes navigate as student leaders. In hindsight, I understand how these comments could have been misinterpreted, and I regret that it caused such a level of discomfort. If my words or presence made Chair Al-Qudah uncomfortable, I sincerely apologize. That was never my intention. My visit to the table was consistent with my interactions at every other caucus table and aimed at fostering connection, not confrontation. I truly wish that if there had been lingering



concerns about that interaction, they had been brought to me for clarification sooner. Finally, I want to address the crux of this hearing: whether my actions meet the criteria for censure under Chapter 905.1.A, which pertains to "repeated disruptive behavior." For a censure to have merit under this statute, there must be evidence of ongoing conduct that disrupts the operations of Student Government. That standard is not met in this case. My inquiry about the caucus name involved two simultaneous Teams messages and one brief in-person conversation, totaling less than five minutes. My interaction at the Caucus Takeover Event was a single, isolated engagement, consistent with my outreach to other caucuses. There was no pattern of repeated behavior. In addition, at no point did my actions hinder the operations of the Arab Caucus or Student Government. While I acknowledge that discomfort can arise from miscommunications, such instances do not constitute disruptive behavior under our statutes. As established in previous Attorney General opinions, censures must be grounded in clear, documented violations of Student Government regulations, not personal disagreements or isolated incidents. While I understand that my words may have been received differently than intended, that does not meet the threshold of a statutory violation warranting censure. In closing, I want to reiterate my respect for Chair Al-Qudah and the important work of the Arab Caucus. I deeply regret that my actions were perceived in a way that caused discomfort. This experience has been a valuable reminder of the importance of careful communication, especially when discussing sensitive matters. Moving forward, I am committed to being even more mindful in my interactions. However, the purpose of this hearing is to determine whether the claim against me has merit under the Student Body Statutes, not to mediate interpersonal misunderstandings. Based on the facts, the documented communications, and the standards set forth in Chapter 905.1.A, I believe it is clear that the claim does not meet the necessary criteria. As such, I respectfully urge the Committee to find that this claim lacks merit and dismiss the censure accordingly. Thank you for your time and consideration.

- Questioning
 - 1. Benwick: In regard to the initial Teams message, why didn't you seek advisement from the Student Government Advisor in terms of wording to ensure that it did not have a negative connotation?



BRANCH

- 2. Lipner: If I were to do this again, I probably would, I did not think of it at the nor consider it a discussion of enough importance to warrant that. I wanted to discuss this with the Chair directly to ensure that I would not be ostracized within the Caucus or cause discomfort.
- 3. Collazo: In the begining of your speech, you spoke about your background to the committee. Could you provide clarification as to the relevance of you providing yourb ackground?
- 4. Lipner: I specifically mentioned my Palestinian heritage as in the original Censure topic, I found it to be a topic of particular pain and wanted to show that my comments were from a personal cultural background rather than of hate.
- 5. Collazo: In your provided documents, you included a statement of events but it appears to be Al-Qudah's with you providing amendments. Could you clarify as to why you didn't include your own Statement of Events rather than modifying Chair Al-Qudah's?
- 6. Lipner: When I read the original Statement of Events, it felt unbiased and so I went this route to make distinctions I wanted to make clear while making it easier for the committee to identify.
- 7. Benwick: You said that the Statement of Events felt relatively unbiased, yet you said they came from a personal standpoint. Could you clarify?
- 8. Lipner: I felt that Chari Al-Qudah wrote this in the most unbiased way possible, but parts of it were fed from misinformation, and so I wanted to make what I felt diverged clear.
- 9. Collazo: You also included a GIS project and United Nations link to its goal. Could you elaborate as to their relevance?
- 10. Lipner: The project should have been removed, the original plan was for it to provide a history of Gaza before I made amendments to my speech. The UN link was to supplement my position as Sustainability Caucus Chair and the goals.
- 11. Collazo: Chair Al-Qudah is alleging that your repeated disruptive behavior violates the Code of Ethics by engaging in discriminatory harassment. Do you feel as though the statements you make violate our Code of Ethics?
- 12. Lipner: I believe the comments absolutely would as documented, however these are not the comments I made or were misunderstood.
- 13. Benwick: If the words were not the ones provided, could you provide them?



BRANCH

UCF Student Government LJR Committee Meeting SG Conference Room 02/19/2024 1:00 PM

- 14. Lipner: They are included in my Statement of Events. As an example, I did not make the "fine line" comment. I also did not say that students may assume the worse, I said that SOME students may assume the worst due to some students having racist beliefs which we must operate around as student leaders. This was in regards to the Arabic writing in the logo and was an attempt to show solidarity.
- 15. Benwick: The Caucuses are meant to represent personal interests. The Arab Caucus spells out it stands for Arabs, and so I am wondering why that question was asked or suggesting that it should be changed when the point is that it is written to help break that stereotype and make it more personal.
- 16. Lipner: I never intended to question the logo at all, there was never any concern and we had a giggle moment when I asked what it meant. I have dealt with students that have been subject to gross discrimination and it is something that we must be careful of, especially as parts of minority groups. It is unfortunately a fact of life hence why I chose the phrasing I did.
- 17. Gaudio: With regards to Collazo's earlier question on violating the Code of Ethics, you said that they would violate Title XI as document, but with context that they would no longer be in violation of that, so could you elaborate more on that point?
- 18. Lipner: While Title XI was not listed in the original censure, I will answer regardless. What she alleges is horrifying and haunted me due to this has made her feel and would never intentionally do. I believe that if this were the actual series of events that it would be a violation, but I see this as a result of miscommunication and assumptions based on misheard statements
- 19. We are mentioning Title XI because of updated documentation I was sent.
- 20. Collazo: I believe the intention is she wanted to choose something from within the Title IX and so her decision was repetitive behavior. She is describing the behavior as harassment, I do not believe it was necessary to include it in the original censure.
- 21. Collazo: In the beginning, you included information as to your background and grandmother's Palestinian heritage. Do you want the committee to take that into account when making our decision? I did not get the clarification I was looking for earlier.
- 22. Lipner: Chair Al-Qudah brought up the comments and I wanted to confront them directly, it is up to you as a committee if you take them into



consideration. I just wanted to show this was coming from a place of coexistence rather than hostility.

- 23. Benwick: MTD
- Debate

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- Benwick: I will be voting in favor as I do believe this censure contains merit. I believe the repeated violations are completely listed out in the Code of Ethics in 1100.6, where it also illustrates organization affiliation. I believe each account has violated a separate time by violating the organizational affiliation and national affiliation. I also will be voting in favor that this does have merit as I believe that the issued did not provide enough clear evidence that shows opposition to the statements made by the issuer. They seem supplemental rather than being on strong ground.
- 2. Gaudio: I am inclined to be voting against this particular censure, as I do not believe the actions fall under "repeated" disruptive behavior, the concerns seem to primarily lie in violations of Title XI, and so I would like to illustrate that if the censure was before us with regards to that topic, I would be voting in favor, but I will probably be voting against this one on procedural grounds.
- 3. Collazo: Just reviewing the statements and evidence provided, I do think that it was concerning that we received a statement of events from Chair Al-Qudah but not Chair Lipner. I understand his intentions with regards to just modifying Chari Al-Qudahs statement of events, however the language of it was also Al-Qudahs. In statutes, it says to provide evidence of inaccuracies in the statement and so I would have preferred to see his entire perspective as that would change the way I'm thinking about this. All I have is Chair Al-Qudah's perspective and how she felt rather than Chair Lipner's in regards to a statement. I know he mentioned his perspective, but it was not clarifying enough to me. In addition, in Black's Law Dictionary, it states a disruption is the act of causing annoyance or disquiet, or interfering with a person's pursuit of a lawful occupation. In regards to Black's Law, annoyance has many synonyms including agitation or discomfort. In regards to all that, I do believe the censure does have merit. I do believe there is a repetitive disruptive behavior and that disruptive behavior is the discriminatory harassment that Chair Al-Qudah is alleging. I do not believe it should have been included, I just think that this is being used in support. Additionally, I believe that the statement in regards to the comment Chair



Lipner made involving "assuming the worst", I believe it plays into a harmful stereotyping of that community and would definitely not have suggested saying that about all students. I certainly don't have that perspective, and see this as unwelcome conduct by the individual. While I do understand his perspective in wanting Chair Al-Qudah to reach out and clarified, however I do not think that should be a responsibility placed on Chair Al-Qudah as she was experiencing discomfort and did not want to engage, which is within her rights. I believe she took the necessary steps based on her experiences and given that, I believe the censure has merit.

- 4. Gaudio: After hearing DLEG Collazo's thoughts on the matter and the definition provided by the Law Dictionary, I am inclined to change my position and will most likely be voting in favor myself now.
- 5. Benwick: MTV
- Vote

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- 1. 5-0-1, LJR Committee finds the merit of censure has merit
- b. Bills
 - <u>Internal Bill 56-30</u> [Updates to Title III: Changing Orientation Requirements] [Senator Borges]: **Postponed until next LJR meeting**
 - 1. Speech
 - a.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a. 3. Debate
 - a.
 - 4. Vote
 - a.
 - <u>Internal Bill 56-31</u> [Updates to Title V] [DLEG Collazo]: **Postponed until next** LJR meeting
 - 1. Speech
 - a.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a.
 - 3. Debate
 - a.
 - 4. Vote
 - a.



- c. Resolutions
 - None.
- d. Absences (Supporting Documentation): S-Q-D (5-5-5)
 - Rajan Jinadra
 - 1. Speech
 - a. I am Senator Jinadra, college of Science seat#10, I have a Calc 3 exam on 2/6/2025, from 8:00 pm onwards, therefore, I won't be able to attend the senate meeting. I am unaware of how to apply for an excused absence, so I felt reaching out was the best idea.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a. Benwick: MTD
 - 3. Debate
 - a. Benwick: Sounds like he already did his test and hopefully he passed. MTV
 - 4. Vote
 - a. 5-0-1
 - Katrina Gumerov
 - 1. Speech
 - a. I have my internship at Advent under the Chaplaincy department on the same day and time. I have to travel to downtown orlando to do my internship and it ends at 12 while my dean meeting starts at 11. Including travel time it would just not be possible for me to make it back in time. My internship day is Monday from 7:00 am to 12:00 pm every week and I cannot miss a week. I will provide my weekly reflections from my internship coursework as proof and then when I go in I will ask my supervisor for a other documentation and submit it later if that is possible.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a. Trejo-Hernandez: MTD
 - 3. Debate
 - **a**. Richmond: I feel like this is a fine line but I will be voting in favor.
 - b. Benwick: Gumerov will be missed, as long as this isn't repeated it'll be fine.
 - c. Trejo-Hernandez: MTV
 - 4. Vote



UCF Student Government LJR Committee Meeting SG Conference Room 02/19/2024 1:00 PM

- a. 5-0-1
- Laurel Richmond

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- 1. Speech
 - a. I was very tired, I figured that my appointment would not take as long as it did and I wanted to take advantage of my warranty. I would rather have been at Senate, and it ended up taking much longer than needed. I didn't get home until 11 as they also had to take my car in for brakes.
- 2. Questioning
 - a. MTD
- 3. Debate
 - a. Gaudio: I'm so sorry.
 - b. Benwick: MTV
- 4. Vote
 - a. 4-0-2, absence is approved
- e. Blanket Excuse
 - Hunter Thoss
 - 1. Speech
 - a. Sorry I'm not there because you guys are reading at around 1:30(we are not). As you're hearing this I'm probably working, but to get into why I'm requesting this blanket excuse is because on Fridays I have work at 7:00AM, and I have to wake up around 5:45 to be there on time. Going to work on 4-5 hours of sleep is terrible and messes with my Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays, so I'm requesting a blanket excuse so I can get those extra 3 hours of sleep while still being an active member of Senate. If I don't get this blanket excuse, I'm probably going to have to resign from Senate as it was directly impacting my health. I have been having headaches and throwing up due to being sick from not having enough sleep, and would really appreciate this.
 - 2. Questioning
 - a. Trejo-Hernandez: Are blanket excuses for just this session?
 - b. Courts: This is for final roll call for the rest of the session.
 - c. Richmond: What time did he list?
 - d. Courts: 10PM
 - e. Richmond: Is this for his job or an internship?



- f. Courts: This is so he can wake up for his job the next day
- g. Benwick: MTD
- 3. Debate

BRANCH

- a. Collazo: I deeply sympathize with Senator Thoss, unfortunately I'm not inclined to agree with this blanket excuse as Senator Thoss has been with us since Fall and he understands the commitment of being a Senator including staying in the meetings. I also found myself in the same boat when I worked and had to wake up at 6 having gone to bed at 1-2AM, however it is a decision I made to be committed and show up for the entire duration. I also do not want to appear as though we don't want Senators to have a work-life balance, but I think we have all committed ourselves so I will not be voting in favor.
- b. Richmond: Surprisingly I oppose this as while I also hate going until midnight and waking up early, I think that the appropriate resolution would be to amend the meeting times. Those last two hours are usually the most impactful and important.
- c. Benwick: I am rather indifferent from having been in this position myself having to get up at 4:30 on Fridays opening at my work. I'm not sure how to feel, I won't be abstaining but I do not feel swayed in either direction.
- d. Gaudio: I do echo the sentiment that a more appropriate resolution would be to lay down a meeting end time before the Union closing, however I have also seen the very real impacts that this has had on Senator Thoss and he is a welcome member of this body that has put in a lot of work into it, and I don't want him to have to resign over something like this. And so, I will most assuredly be voting in favor especially until we find a way to resolve the midnight meeting problem.
- e. Trejo-Hernandez: I am more inclined to vote in favor as it is a known issue that Senate meetings go late, it is a concern echoed by both people who are in Senate and interested in it, and Students need to work in order to go to school and be part of this SG. We have people who have to commute over an hour and we must be cognizant of this. We want the perspective of people from all walks of life and we should be accommodating for this.



f. Benwick: MTV

4. Vote

a. 4-1-1

11. Miscellaneous Business-

a. None

12. Member Discussion:

- a. Statutes and Rules
 - Prospective Title III
 - Courts: We will be discussing these when we caucus tomorrow, the only thing I would like to say is good work!
- 13. Final Roll Call: 5/6 (4)
- 14. Adjournment: 2:19 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

MTIF – Move to Informal

 $MTF-Move \ to \ Formal$

PP - Postpone

PPI - Postpone Indefinitely

GC - General Consent