

MEETING AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order: 1:04 PM
- 2. Roll Call & Verification of Quorum: 6/7 (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	E	Е
Senator Benwick	sga_sci7@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Trejo-Hernandez	sga_ecs1@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Jolicoeur	sga_ba5@ucf.edu	Р	Р
ELA Richmond	sgaela@ucf.edu	Е	Е
Pro Tempore Representative Collazo	sga_dleg@ucf.edu	Р	Р

- 3. Approval of the Minutes: <u>02.19.25</u> Approved by GC
- 4. Approval of the Agenda: Approved by GC
- 5. Announcements from the Chair Courts
 - i. Hey guys!! Unfortunately, the cards and universe are telling me that today's meeting is going to be pretty long, but I think that if we all stay on topic, we can get through it.
 - ii. We are seeing 5 bills, 13 absences, a blanket excuse, and splitting up the title three bills so that they can be submitted to the pro temp's office. We also really need to talk about title ix today, so we are booked and busy.
 - iii. In other news, I am very proud of all of you in regards to the censure process last week. We really were going off of nothing, and we all did great. Love my committee for real for real.
- 6. Announcements from the Vice Chair Gaudio-



- i. I'll keep it quick. Just wanted to say that y'all are the best by always being diligent and reading before the committee meeting and being generally on top of things. A big HELLO and WELCOME to our new addition to the committee, and BIG NEWS from me personally!
- 7. Announcements from Committee Members-
 - LJR (GAP) Rep: Hi guys! Last week, we continued discussing our DATC research and writing legislative briefs. I'm done with mine, granted I only had 2 but still whoop, whoop! We also discussed updates to statutes affecting GAP, such as amendments that would ensure the Chair and Vice-Chair are guaranteed a DATC seat, and that the Chair gets to advise on the selection process for agents/students going to the event. That's all from me.
 - ii. LJR (E&A) Rep: Title VI updates, didn't see any confirmations. We discussed the special election bill.
 - iii. LJR (SBA) Rep: SBA looked further into updating the Senate Rules to clarify what SBA does so that it's codified in stone for future Chairs, not much news beyond that.
- 8. Announcements from Non-Committee Members
 - i. None.
- 9. Old Business- S-Q-D: 5-5-5
 - i. Bills
 - i. <u>Internal Bill 56-30</u> [Updates to Title III: Changing Orientation Requirements] [Senator Borges]
 - i. Speech
 - (a)
 - ii. Questioning
 - (a) Gaudio: Would this include the present session of the appointment?
 - (i) Benwick: I believe it would.
 - (b) Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - (a) Benwick: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - (a) 4-1-1
 - ii. Internal Bill 56-31 [Updates to Title V] [DLEG Collazo]
 - i. Speech
 - (a) We are very familiar with this bill, it had to be pushed back due to the censure. As you can see, I made some additional amendments just sot hat it does not enroach on the current duties of the Justices. As it stands, it says that no Justice of the Judicial Council may provide advice on matters related to the Student Government Constitution or Statutes outside of official Judicial proceedings or



LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

meetings. In addition, just as they are prohibited from serving as advisors in front of the Judicial Council. The other amendments for judicial council are for simplicity. In addition, it says that justices have a working understanding of the overarching documents and must complete annual training by the Chief Justice guided by the Student Government Advisor. As stated previously, we had several members of the Senate body with concerns involving the previous Judicial Review with regards to an internal bill and the part the Chief Justice played into that. The question was if they served as an advisor in place of the Judicial Advisor, and interpretations made which falls under the Attorney General. The Judicial Council gets final say, and so if they are interpreting as individuals without going through a hearing, then the Judicial Council becomes less of a Council and more as another 14 Attorney Generals. In addition, many Justices had trouble naming parts of the Election Statutes during questions earlier in the semester, which is very concerning coming from the individuals who are supposed to be interpreting these documents. If they aren't required to have that working understanding, then how can we hold them accountable? Senators must be familiar with these documents. I believe that this is a fair standard to enforce upon the Council and provide a better division between the roles of the Judicial Council and the Attorney General.

- ii. Questioning
 - (a) Benwick: MTD
- iii. Debate
 - (a) Benwick: I will be voting in favor, as I believe that it is very important that these agents be familiar with the documents they are working with. The Judicial Branch not being required to know these documents is questionable, and ought to be enforced.
 - (b) Collazo: Motion to see amendments as a block.
 - (i) Speech
 - 1. Collazo: These amendments align with those that I gave in my speech and align with the current language.
 - (ii) Questioning
 - 1. Trejo-Hernandez: MTD



- (iii) Speech
 - 1. Benwick: MTV
- (iv) Vote
 - 1. 5-0-1, amendments pass
- (c) Trejo-Hernandez: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - (a) 5-0-1, bill passes First Reading
- ii. Resolutions
 - 1. None.

BRANCH

- iii. Absences
 - 1. None
- iv. Blanket Excuse
 - 1. None.
- 10. New Business
 - i. Bills
 - 1. Internal Bill 56-33 [Updates to Title XIV and II] [Pro Tempore Morissette]
 - i. Speech
 - i. This makes several changes to how caucus appointments will be made as they are being kept outside of Title III. The first one being the Chair can remove any member of their caucus, and the Vice President now appoints members of Student Government Agencies to caucuses. The Election Commissioners will also eb able to resign themselves, but must still submit their resignations to the Supervisor of Elections. This also makes all Student Government agents include people working in OSI, rather than just people working in the office or leadership. It also makes caucus meetings in line with Title XII rather than Sunshine Law.
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Trejo-Hernandez: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - Collazo: I wrote this bill with the Pro Tempore to help expand who can be a member of a caucus. In my discussions with the OSI Director, he stated that caucuses were originally created for the purpose of advocacy and to connect to the student body. I think it is only fair that our Agencies are able to sit on these, especially members of the Multicultural Center. Currently, only the student



BRANCH

directors of the agencies are considered members of the agencies, which I do not believe is fair and hope that this will encompass more people. Hopefully this will also allow us to have an outreach project with these agencies through expanding that definition to allow more people to sit on these caucuses because it is a disservice to not have a true connection with them beyond the A&SF board, which is a tangential connection at best. I think this will also be seen favorably with Dr. Frame as she has also been suggesting that while programming is good, too much can be bad, and that we should be doing programming in collaboration with the agencies we already have present.

- ii. Courts: When we talk about Student Government Agencies, who are we referring to?
- iii. Morissette: The executive board would be able to sit on a caucus.
- iv. Collazo: A discussion will need to be had with them to lay down who would qualify as being under that agency due to their extent.
- v. Morisette: I think MSC would be the only issue, as they work in tandem with the RSOs but have a very distinct executive board.
- vi. Courts: I yield the chair, motion to see my amendment.
 - i. Speech:
 - Courts: I just changed the part where it says "Sunshine Law" to "Title XII", I am tired of Statutes saying we are under Sunshine Law when that only applies to fiscal.
 - ii. Questioning
 - 1. Collazo: MTD
 - iii. Debate

iv. Vote

1. Benwick: MTV

1. 5-0-1

```
vii.
```

iv. Vote

i. 5-0-1

 Internal Bill 56-34 [Updates to Title XIV: The Student Government Caucuses] [Chair Varela]

 Speech




- This bill is pretty simple, it is a change to how caucus ex-oficio seats work. It will remove the limit on them to streamline the election process, as a caucus chair I realize that the allotted seats was not enough to cover the student groups that our caucus serves, as my caucus represents transfer students, Downtown students, Rosen students, and Lake Nona students. Three seats is not enough to represent all of these students, especially the subgroups within all of these campuses. I am unsure if other caucuses have this same issue, but I do not think we should be arbitrarily limiting the number of ex-officio seats that may be present on a caucus. I also wanted to get rid of the rotating door of ex-officio seats, as I find it quite difficult to manage and fairly pointless.
- ii. Questioning

BRANCH

- i. Courts: For 1401.3.E, it says the number of ex-officio seats shall not exceed the number of Student Government Agents on the caucus, but it also says the Caucus Leadership Committee may expand the number of seats by a majority vote. What do you mean the Committee can expand the number?
- Varela: Let's say the Arab Caucus has only 3 members and wants a fourth ex-officio seat. They would be able to go to the Caucus Leadership Committee to expand their number of seats to 4.
- iii. Jolicoeur: MTD
- iii. Debate
 - i. Collazo: I will be voting in favor as I was reviewing this bill and revising it with Chair Varela. I believe that this bill is good and that the only note I would like to make is I am the one who put in the Caucus Leadership Committee may expand the number of seats, as I shared with Chair Varela that I don't believe it is fair that if a caucus only has one or two Student Government agents and wants to have more seats, I don't think they should be admitted unilaterally based off of my caucus experience
 - Benwick: I think this is a really good bill, I am not in any caucuses so I see this from an outside perspective where caucuses have definitely been treated as a red-headed stepchild by being outside of Senate. This would help to make them the blonde-headed stepchild and expand engagement.



BRANCH



- iii. Trejo-Hernandez: As a member of a caucus that is very small, I agree mostly because the caucus can be so generalized so having more seats lets you gather more perspectives.
- iv. Courts: Motion to see my amendment
 - i. Speech
 - Courts: I just added that the number of ex-oficio seats may not exceed the number of Student Government agents unless otherwise stipulated to prevent the self-contradiction in the bill.
 - ii. Questioning
 - 1. Varela: Would this be through majority vote?
 - 2. Courts: Yes, the actual method is unchanged.
 - 3. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - 1. Benwick: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - 1. 5-0-1, amendments pass
- v. Collazo: Motion to see my amendment
 - i. Speech
 - 1. Collazo: I think this one is fairly self-explanatory, since we are removing everything involving term limits, we have to put that back in.
 - ii. Questioning
 - 1. Jolicoeur: How long did seats last?
 - 2. Collazo: It would depend on how many RSOs are in the caucus. There was a permanent seat and then non-permanent seats.
 - 3. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Speech
 - 1. Jolicoeur: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - 1. 5-0-1, amendment passes
- vi. Trejo-Hernandes: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1



3. <u>Internal Bill 56-35</u> [Updates to Title XIV: The Student Government Caucuses] [Chair Varela]

i. Speech i.

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- Varela: This is a bill that would make the ICTC a permanent caucus. Currently is an ad hoc caucus which will expire at the end of the year. I believe it is necessary we continue our work due to serving as a forum for advocating for Lake Nona, Downtown, Rosen, and transfer students, which is a very wide body. I have already seen a change where we are now discussing expanding initiatives to other campuses, so the presence of mind that we are advocating for these other caucuses has been good. There has also been much more outreach for transfer students since becoming a caucus and drastically increasing the number of events aimed at these students, a very important demographic due to how much of the student body they compose. We also serve a very important role in the renovations of the Rosen campus as we serve as the voice of students and ensure that concerns such as dining are heard. We have also been collaborating with the executive branch to oversee the transition of the nursing program from the Connect campuses to the Lake Nona campus. This is a multi-year endeavor, so for the caucus to be dissolved would be a major harm to these efforts. We have also been working hard with the registrar's office to have more transparency with transfer students as to why they were denied. This is just a small amount of what we have addressed, and there are many more issues with which we as a caucus must continue to address.
- ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: MTD
- iii. Debate
 - i. Jolicoeur: As a transfer student myself starting last semester, before I was aware of the existence of this caucus, coming into Student Government was one of the issues that I wanted to pursue. Upon discovering this caucus already existed, I became very excited to work with this caucus and will absolutely be voting in favor, as I was very surprised this caucus did not exist prior and would love to see this caucus continue to exist.



- ii. Gaudio: I have seen the work that Chair Varela has done and I think that expanding the caucuses beyond just ethnic groups and into demographics such as a transfer students is a noble endeavor that frankly is what we are all here for and allowing these students to have that representation finally especially when it's so hard for these groups to come together by their nature as new students who do not really know the ins and outs of the university, that there's no reason not to allow this to continue to exist into the foreseeable future.
- iii. Benwick: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1, passes on First Reading
- ii. Resolutions

BRANCH

- 1. <u>Resolution 56-17</u> [Updates to Senate Rule 4: The Business of the Senate] [Chair Varela]
 - i. Speech
 - i. Seen as a block with Internal Bill 56-35
 - ii. Questioning
 - i.
 - iii. Debate
 - i.
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1, passes on First Reading
- iii. Absences (Supporting Documentation):
 - 1. Tyler Borges
 - i. Speech
 - i. I have to work at 5:30 AM Friday and need more than 4 hours of sleep.
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Collazo: I will not be voting in favor, I sympathize with this Senator but this is a commitment we all have made.
 - Benwick: I do agree, I will be voting in favor but this is a pattern I am noting and I recommend that we send out an announcement in our LJR committee report mentioning this.



- iii. Courts: I want you all to remember that we approved a blanket excuse for someone due to having work.
- iv. Benwick: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 3-2-1, absence is approved
- 2. Grace Rudie

BRANCH

- i. Speech
 - i. I will need to be attending a special one time meeting for my RSO, Alpha Sigma Kappa: Women in Technical Studies. It is a mixer that ends at 8:30, so I will only be absent for initial roll call.
- ii. Questioning i. Benw
 - Benwick: MTD
- iii. Debate
 - i. Benwick: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 4-0-2, absence is approved
- 3. Ella Widerburg
 - i. Speech
 - i. I unfortunately had to be absent for last week's meeting due to having a physics exam early the next morning. I had to miss senate in order to study, as I hadn't had much other time to do so previously in the week. Thank you for your consideration!
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Trejo-Hernandez: Did she not say when her class time was?
 - ii. Courts: It was not included.
 - iii. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Benwick: I will be voting in favor as ordinarily whenever there is not a time, I would be voting in negation, however Widerburg is very involved and helpful on the Senate floor. So long as this is not a pattern, we would be smart to approve it.
 - ii. Trejo-Hernandez: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1
- 4. Kamalakannan Ravi
 - i. Speech



LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

- i. Hello there, I have a few interviews lined up and will be preparing for them. Thus, I request an absence from the meeting today. Thank you for your support and understanding.
- ii. Questioning
 - i. Trejo-Hernandez: MTD
- iii. Debate
 - Benwick: I don't want to be the one in negation, but I am going to. Of all the absence requests he has submitted, only one has had documentation. I understand issues, but at some point you have to submit documentation so we know, particularly large meetings where we are seeing important business such as disciplinary actions.
 - ii. Trejo-Hernandez: I am conflicted, as while it is very tough and takes a lot of time to do interviews, but at the same time I would prefer he had documentation such as emails or a schedule.
 - Gaudio: I have been definitely noticing a pattern with his absence requestss that have already been echoed and I think that he just doesn't have the time to commit to this.
 - iv. Benwick: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 0-5-1, absence is not approved by LJR.
- 5. Zachary Gaudio
 - i. Speech
 - i. I do have a speech that I posted however I didn't end up being late, sent this as a curtesy
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Trejo-Hernandez: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 3-0-2, absence is approved
- 6. Annia-Gabrielle Beneche
 - i. Speech
 - i. I'm sorry but I haven't had a lot of sleep lately. I've been working nonstop this week and with some personal issues regarding my dad's cancer and treatment it has just not been the best week I just lowkey wanna sit and brain rot. I know that's not the most valid



UCF Student Government LJR Committee Meeting Charge on Chamber 02/19/2024 1:00 PM

excuse but guys I'm going through it and I please encourage you to accept my plea. PLEASE!! (crying emoji)

ii. Questioning

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- i. Trejo-Hernandez: Do we have a mental health absence precedent?
- ii. Courts: We do not simply because the assumption was made that if someone needs that, then once or twice it should be fine but after that it needs to be a conversation.
- iii. Jolicoeur: Is this the first request for this?
- iv. Courts: Yes
- v. Trejo-Hernandez: MTD
- iii. Debate

i.

- Collazo: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1, absence is approved
- 7. Isha Patel
 - i. Speech
 - i. I was taking an organic chemistry exam, which caused me to miss the initial roll call. I'm including the exam's date and time in my professor's announcement.
 - ii. Questioning i. Colli
 - Collazo: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Gaudio: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1, absence is approved
- 8. Adam Caringal
 - i. Speech
 - i. I had a last-minute flight scheduled last night to go to Maryland for the weekend to help my family move and do some harder chore tasks as my dad is out of town.
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Jolicoeur: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1, absence is approved



LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

- 9. Laurel Richmond
 - i. Speech

i.

- As many of you know, on February 15th, I was in a car accident that resulted in me cracking 3 ribs. Being hard-headed, I did not want a scan on my head (partially out of fear of what would be found), but after more time, it became apparent that I had a concussion. I am seeing a doctor on either Wednesday or Friday to confirm my suspicions. Although I don't have proof yet that I have a concussion, my symptoms of extreme tiredness, mind fog, headaches, and disorientation made it impossible for me to attend Senate on Thursday. I have been diagnosed with epilepsy since the summer of 2018 (if you would like that documentation, I can find it) and, as a result, take 1000mg of Keppra 2xs a day. This diagnosis requires me to listen to my head, and I did not feel comfortable attending Senate in my current state on Thursday and ultimately fell asleep at 6pm and did not wake up until 6am. I have attached my call log showing my call to 911 on February 15th. Additionally, on February 21st I left for Atlanta to attend Regionals for Mock Trial. This was an extracurricular activity that had been pre-planned.
- ii. Questioning
 - i. Jolicoeur: MTD, absence is approved
- iii. Debate
 - Benwick: I will be voting in favor not because of everything ELA Richmond provided(but also because of everything), while I don't encourage everyone to not show up and take that excused, ELA Richmond still showed up to last week's LJR committee meeting despite all this. This is a testament to her character and why we should all be in favor.
 - ii. Collazo: I am really confused, because she went to attend a regionals despite all this but didn't want to attend Senate. I deeply sympathize having been in a car accident before, but to then say that they went to a regional conference but can't go to Senate is a bit odd. If the priority is health, then I am not sure why the Senator went to the conference rather than prioritizing their personal health. That is my only concern, I was into the story until that last bit.



- iii. Jolicoeur: I will be voting in favor of this excused absence, regarding everything that was provided, I do not know them personally but I do try to think the best of people. I will take them at their word and believe that is reason enough to excuse this absence. When it comes to their attending of the regional conference, I can sympathize with prioritizing the thing that is going to benefit you the most and how this could be very important for their future career, especially if it is a regional that could be put onto a resume. MTV
- iv. Vote

BRANCH

- i. 4-1-1, absence is approved
- 10. Katrina Gumerov
 - i. Speech
 - I have the privilege of being the Project Lead for my project in a program called ProjectLaunch which is held through the RSO KnightHacks. Every week we have lab hours in which KnightHacks rents a room to provide a space for project members to work on their projects. This has been the only way I get all my team members together to work. This week the lab hours are on a Thursday from 5:00 pm- to 7:20 pm. It will take me some time to walk over as well so I will definitely only be able to join the meeting halfway through. This time is vitally important to my project's progress and success.
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Gaudio: I have been hearing a lot about this project from Senator Gumerov and it is a wonderful project that they're doing and I don't think there's any reason to vote against, especially considering this is just for Initial Roll Call.
 - ii. Benwick: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 4-0-2, absence is approved
- 11. Meriam Neguib
 - i. Speech



- i. Hi guys, I hope you had a wonderful weekend. Sorry I couldn't be here today. I was not feeling well last week. I had really bad headaches and I could not drive. I have a medical condition of excess cerebral fluid in my brain. This causes intense pain and headaches. I do receive treatment but I have days where I get really bad headaches and last Thursday was one of them. I have submitted an MRI test indication for documentation purposes. Other documents contain personal information that I am not able to submit.
- ii. Questioning i. Coll
 - Collazo: MTD
- iii. Debate

BRANCH

- i. Benwick: I will be voting in favor however I am also noticing a pattern with Senator Naguib and their absences. MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1
- 12. Khushi Chauhan
 - i. Speech
 - i. I need a mental health day. I have been really really busy these past few weeks. I have had exams to study for on top of my officer position duties in the clubs I am a part of, volunteering, my internship, research, SG, etc. I haven't had a full day to relax or get a good night's sleep. It's been back-to-back with something every day including the weekends. I was planning on going back to my hometown on Thursday and just taking a mental health break to avoid burning out. I haven't missed a full senate meeting this semester, but I feel I need a break so I plan on not attending this Thursday.
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Trejo-Hernandez: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Gaudio: MTV
 - iv. Vote
 - i. 4-0-2
- 13. Bobby Escobar
 - i. Speech



- i. Good afternoon, from March 5th to March 6th I will be attending the Earth Advocacy day with CLEO to be lobbying representatives in Tallahassee for climate action. As we will be arriving in the middle of the Senate meeting, I will be exhausted from all the walking and talking. I have already received excusal from classes from the professor over the RSO.
- ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: MTD
- iii. Debate
 - i. Jolicoeur: MTV
- iv. Vote
 - i. 5-0-1
- iv. Blanket Excuse

BRANCH

- 1. Nathan Rickett
 - i. Speech
 - i. Good Afternoon,I am currently seeking a blanket absence approval for Senate. I am currently a graduate student who resides on campus at Rose College Apartments. I rely on the Rosen College shuttle for transportation to and from both UCF Main Campus and the Rosen Campus. The last shuttle leaves campus at 9:15PM. I will be requesting a timeframe 20 minutes prior to the shuttle leaving. I am sending you supporting evidence of my housing status. If you have questions or concerns please let me know.
 - ii. Questioning
 - i. Benwick: With Senator Rickett leaving at 8:55, won't he be missing 75% of the votes every single night?
 - ii. Courts: You only get a half absence if you're present for both final and initial roll call. If you have a half absence, the voting record doesn't count.
 - iii. Benwick: MTD
 - iii. Debate
 - i. Gaudio: I will be voting inf avor of this blanket excuse, I have had many discussions with Senator Rickett, I am in E&A with him and he is an incredible voice to have around and while Senator Benwick brings up the extremely valid concern that he will be missing quite a



fair bit of the meeting, his presence in committee, the caucuses he's in and everything else he does outside of those meetings will still ensure that he's having that voice and being a contributing member. Collazo: MTV

- 11. Miscellaneous Business
 - i. None
- 12. Member Discussion- MTIF: Approved by GC
 - i. Statutes and Rules

LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

- 1. Prospective Title III
- 2. Title IX
 - i. Non-Compliances:
 - ii. Statute doesn't illustrate how a committee can adopt a noncompliance
 - iii. The powers of the LJR committee in extent of penal actions are not clarified(example, can LJR remove election commissioners or can only E&A as under Title VI?)
 - iv. Rewrite penal action section entirely to make it more clear that penal actions do NOT have to follow tier system
 - v. Censures:
 - vi. It is never stated WHEN in the Senate meeting a censure will be heard beyond Miscellaneous Business. Should be the first thing heard in a meeting after announcements, LJR should get an announcement separate from committee announcements pertaining specifically to the censure at the beginning of the Senate meeting so attempts to overrule an LJR denial can be seen at the beginning of the meeting rather than all the way in Internal Committee reports.
 - vii. Timelines and what is considered germane for speeches and questioning for both LJR and on the floor are unclear
 - viii. Nothing is laid out in the statutes concerning submission of evidence. As it stands, the Chair can admit new evidence which was not seen in the LJR Committee, and it is never stated when evidence must be submitted to LJR either.
 - ix. There is no procedure for recommending a penal action.



- x. Rewrite penal action section entirely to make it more clear that penal actions do NOT have to follow tier system or follow what's laid out
- xi. Further elaboration on the process and what everything actually means(LJR DECIDES ON MERIT, FLOOR DECIDES ON IF CENSURE SHOULD BE ISSUED, PENAL ACTION DISCUSSION FOLLOWS IF ISSUED)
- ii. MTF: Approved by GC
- 13. Final Roll Call: 6/7 (4)
- 14. Adjournment: 2:2\48 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 Informal PP - Postpone PPI - Postpone Indefinitely GC - General Consent