

# **MEETING AGENDA**

- 1. Call to Order: 11:01 AM
- 2. Roll Call & Verification of Quorum: 6/10

Name	Email	Initial	Final
Chair Urea	sga_ljr@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Vice-Chair McClellan	sga_ba5@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Galloway	sga_grst3@ucf.edu	Р	А
Senator Huerta	sga_sci7@ucf.edu	E	Е
Senator Martin	sga_sci10@ucf.edu	E	Е
Senator Tache	sgsci13@ucf.edu	А	А
Senator Yalamanchili	sgamed3@ucf.edu	P (11:12AM )	Ρ
Senator Patel	sga_med2@ucf.edu	P (11:09AM )	Р
Senator Cox	sga_ugst1@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Nguyen	sgaecs6@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Pro-Tempore Representative	sga_pro@ucf.edu	Р	Р



- 3. Approval of the Minutes: Approved by GC
- 4. Approval of the Agenda: Amendment to the Agenda Approved by GC and approved by GC
- 5. Announcements from the Chair
  - a. Hey everyone! I am finally back. Unfortunately, I have had a lot of unexpected events going on in my life. Hopefully, I mean it now when I say things should be smooth sailing from here on out (lol).
  - b. Also shoutout Vihan for being our GAP rep!!!! \*snaps for king\*
  - c. Lastly, If you don't text me and miss meetings..... You will be dismissed. Since we did not meet quorum while I was gone.
- 6. Announcements from the Vice Chair
  - a. Welcome back Chair Urea, we managed to come out the other side still intact. Unfortunately we have lost two committee members due to senate resignations, but never fear we still are the best committee!
  - b. I hope that everyone has had a chance to look over the agenda and knows what we will be looking at and are familiar with the bills and resolution.
- 7. Announcements from Committee Members
  - a. E&A Representative Senator Patel
    - i. We saw 3 justices, and Vihan
  - b. GAP Representative Senator Yalamanchili
    - i. None
  - c. SBA Representative-
  - d. Pro-Temps Office
    - i. Everyone now has completed the New Senate Orientation!
    - ii. Legislation workshops:
      - 1. Thursday, June 9th at 1 pm
      - 2. Monday, June 13th at 2 pm
    - iii. Working on planning Fiscal and Robert's Rules workshops for this semester
      - Committee chairs: please reach out to PT Ciresi and/or DLeg Wangen if you would like any of these 3 workshops run within your committee and we can get that scheduled
    - iv. Legislation is due on Wednesday at 5pm! Please ensure any legislation is being submitted to both Pro Temp Ciresi and DLeg Wangen!



- v. Please fill out the Involvement Tracker
  - 1. This is not just for being in Senate, this is for attending events, whether SG or otherwise, writing legislation, and other involvement that goes beyond simply being a sitting senator or completing the duties of any position you hold within Senate. We're looking to recognize involvement going beyond the basic requirements.
- vi. If you have any questions, feel free to reach out to me or anyone else in PT's Office!
  - 1. Workshops will be hybrid and an Outlook invite
  - 2. Fiscal, legislation, and VC and Chair workshops
- 8. Announcements from Non-Committee Members
  - a. None
- 9. Old Business
  - a. Bills
    - i. None.
  - b. Resolutions
    - i. None.
  - c. Absences
    - i. None.
  - d. Blanket Excuses
    - i. None.
- 10. New Business
  - a. Bills
    - i. <u>Internal Bill 54-06</u> [Updates to Title IV: Correcting Verbiage to Reduce Interpretation][Chair Borges]
      - 1. Speech
        - a. None
      - 2. Questioning
        - a. None
      - 3. Debate
        - a. Cox- This seems to make things more clear and would probably be good
        - b. Brodie- I think that clearly there was a concer that should be addressed. My only challenge is that there is never going to



be a meeting the week after swearing in so the president can speak at commencement so the A section will always take effect but this change would take effect before they take office. I have questions on the ability to mandate things to people not in office. Maybe it would be fine to mandate a president elect

- c. Wangen- The president elect is not yet a SG agent assuming they weren't in a prior position. Would sitting on the budget committee make them an agent?
- d. Brodie- we changed the election timeline and the budget committee timeline so they technically don't have a seat on it. But does having a seat make them an agent? I do not feel comfortable to mandate things a month before taking office
- e. Urea- you can vote differently here than on the senate floor
- f. McClellan- Is there anything addressing this?
- g. AG Moore- there is nothing addressing the grey area, to my understanding there isn't
- 4. Voting 4-1-2 Approved
- ii. <u>Internal Bill 54-07</u> [Update to Title IV: Clarifying the Role of the Attorney General][Chair Cox]
  - 1. Speech
    - a. Cox- Just to be totally transparent, this issue did come to my attention because of the censure I filed against former Senator Ferguson which was invalidated by former Attorney General Soto. Speaker Custis and Chair Urea were kind enough to speak to like, the actual university lawyers to see if there was a way to override it, and Chair Urea informed me that their advice was that the Attorney General does have the ability to invalidate censures but only because they have been able to do it in the past, setting a precedent.



**UCF Student Government** 

LJR Committee Meeting Charge on Chamber 06/08/22 11:00 AM

Looking at the statutes more closely, as you can see, there is nothing that explicitly says or even implies that they are allowed to do this. Which is why I began writing this legislation. In the spirit of Checks and Balances. I don't think we should be in the habit of giving positions more power than they are meant to have. As it is currently, if we allow the precedent to move forward, there is no checks and balances to allow the Senate to overrule the Attorney General like we can with exec, and like exec can do with us. This just gives complete power to the Attorney General to decide what is and isn't valid and there's nothing we can do, which also just makes me extremely concerned for in the future if there is ever a corrupt Attorney General, like, imagine what they could do with this precedent.

Now, looking at the current statutes, it does explicitly say that the Attorney General can give opinions and recommendations. A recommendation is a recommendation, but I realize that "opinion" might be kinda confusing for those of us who are familiar with courts. So, opinions are what accompanies a judge's verdict, and like explains why they think the way they do. But it's not the \*verdict\*. The



verdict is what makes the actual decision, and nowhere in the statutes does it say the Attorney General can give verdict on legislation or a censure or anything that has been proposed, by the Senate. So, that's why I think this legislation is in our best interests, because it clears things up.

- 2. Questioning
  - a. McClellan- do you think that this is necessary since an AG would have to tie back their reasoning to statutes
  - b. Cox- law and legislation is always up to interpretation, there is alway conflict. If the AG wants to get rid of something, they can take something that has been overruled, picking and choosing.
  - c. McClellan- do you think that this would disrupt checks and balances
  - d. Cox- Exec can veto anything we do and there are appeal processes for censure. It is possible for the senate to overrule but it is hard. I do not think this destroy checks and balances
  - e. Wangen- Would to judicial council be able to overrule a censure
  - f. Brodie- I believe there is an appeal process and the Judicial council can overturn a censure
- 3. Debate
  - a. Yalamanchili: Does not believe this bill would harm checks and balances. The executive branch is to enforce legislative acts, not to have judicial power. They should not be given the ability to overrule the legislature. That is the power of the courts. An attorney general should not be able to overrule the decision of the democratically-elected Student Body Senate. The Judicial Council could override an improperly filed censure. This is an example of executive overreach
  - b. Wangen- move to see all amendments as a block
    i. Speech



- Technical, and wording changes. Adding a necessary part and adds impeachment, past AGs have invalidated impeachment affidavits and that is not allowed
- ii. Debate on motion to allow non committee member to speak
  - Patel- should allow AG to speak, I trust she won't abuse power and can only provide info and her input
  - Yalamanchili- I favor the objection, I do not believe the inputs of the AG are needed and are not the most proper thing to do, this bill is about AG powers
  - Cox- I made the objection for the same reason I will abstain as it is not proper to speak on things affecting
  - 4. Nguyen- we need to hear both sides
  - 5. Wangen- did you get the opinion of the AG before submitting
  - 6. Cox- no
  - Wangen- I think we should let AG Moore speak, we try to get both sides when amending their position
  - Patel- this is just to hear input, she's not making an amendment, we should just hear what she has to say
  - Yalamanchili- I understand the POV that the AG has the right to speak on matters affecting her but not in an internal committee meeting, I think AG Moore's opinions should be given to the senate floor.
  - 10. Wangen- MTV
  - 11. Voting 4-2-1 Approved
- iii. AG Moore- Providing info. I would just like to provide some information about this Bill as it relates to



LEGISLATIVE

BRANCH

UCF Student Government LJR Committee Meeting Charge on Chamber 06/08/22 11:00 AM

Statutes and the implications that would follow if adopted. Throughout Title IX, the power exists to allow the AG to speak about the censure and its relevance under statutes, to provide clarification on what statutes say, which if needed, implies that power to void a censure that is not grounded in statutes. Otherwise, the opinion of the AG in those cases and others would be effectively useless if the AG cannot stop a censure that is not properly rooted in the governing documents, and then it proceeds on pretenses it shouldn't. If the AG does not have the power then the opinion would be useless. The AG needs to have the power in the opinion. This would remove checks and balances if this is removed and if this is done then the LJR committee and Legislative Branch would have less checks. This power is established through precedent and implicit in Statutes to ensure that Statutes and Senate Rules are not violated. There is the power to find if documents are filed correctly or not which is a power. You cannot be censured if the SG agent violated no SG statutes. The AG is the one designated to interpret the Statutes and Senate Rules, censures come from these same statutes and rules. so if the AG can't do this, they can't check to make sure a Statute is properly cited or being pulled from/cited at all to censure someone. Additionally, precedent has long-established this ability and it has been properly utilized to ensure that the statutes and rules aren't bent improperly. This was exercised by Attorney General Soto, Tuley, and Hill-to name a few. The power to find that documents were filed inadequately and must be refiled is implicit within the ability to issue opinions on SG governing documents. And opinions, which are not verdicts, do have holdings, and holdings carry their own merit.



- iv. Cox- This would not remove the power to give the opinion but says that the option cannot override senate. I don't know if you understood the speech. I sent is to VC McClellan to add to minutes
- v. Yalamanchili- I disagree, right now on precedent statutes are not clear but it is an invalid implied power and should not be had. The AG at state government and federal level do not hold this power and it can be argued that in this bill it might erode checks and balances. The ability to interpret if something is constitutional lies with the courts, the judicial branch can overrule a censure if the protocols were not properly followed. It is with senate's power to change the statutes if they find them inadequate. It is a democratic process and to clarify such statutes to say the AG cannot do that is valid. It is done so by an elected body and make the decision making more democratic, the AG cannot override actions of the legislature. I welcome the AG to educate us on the Statutes and give options, however the power for the AG to do this is dependent on good faith and I have confidence that the AG has good fairytale but for the future to prevent abuse in the future it is a good idea, and would establish the idea that senate hold exec accountable and is just as easy to hold exec accountable as it is to hold senators accountable. Exec is somewhat not able to be held accountable.
- vi. Wangen- so you refer to the power to determine are improperly filed, where is that.
- vii. AG Moore- The power is implicit in Statutes, but is explicit in past AG opinions and their actions. I think that the AG's job is not just to see if the issue goes against Statutes, but to ensure that censures are filed correctly.



- viii. Cox- everything AG Moore said is from assumed powers and the precedent.
- ix. McClellan- this is an appropriate power and if the censure was struck down
- x. AG Moore- The job of the AG of Florida and AG of the U.S. are very different jobs than the SG AG, it's not synonymous. There are already statutory provisions in place for dealing with corruption. Regardless, this Bill would allow the AG to still give an opinion, but the weight of that opinion would be nothing should the AG not be able to say that the censure in question is not a) filed adequately and procedurally properly or b) that the censure is not based on our statutes and rules. A SG Agent cannot be censured if it is not alleged that they violated any Student Body Regulations...The AG's job is to oversee and regulate this. This Bill would eradicate that ability.
- 4. Voting 3-3-1 denied by committee but will be seen by the floor
- iii. <u>Internal Bill 54-08</u> [Updates to Title III: The Legislative Branch][ELA Galloway]
  - 1. Speech
    - a. I am working with the football team. Have to go fast. This legislation will eliminate summer dean meetings. Summer should be optional since we have both mandatory fall and spring meetings. Deans and senators are very busy during the summer. It used to not be a requirement and was first enacted last year. It is not effective and should only be optional.
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. None
  - 3. Debate
    - a. McClellan: Technical amendment
  - 4. Voting 6-0-0 approved
- b. Resolutions
  - i. EResolution 54-XX [Updates to Senate Rule 3]



- 1. Speech
  - a. Update to senate rule 3, update to behavioral standards, tweaks to make them more enforceable
- 2. Questioning
  - a. Cox- Could you give us the link in the zoom
  - b. Urea- linked in minutes
- 3. Debate
  - a. Yalamanchili- I would like to say I completely agree, we have had enough drama with senators speaking ill of other senators. I have disagreed myself with other, but we have to assume that we all a re acting in good faith and not commit ad hominem and attack their character. It is not proper to profane, attack or disrespect others. Personal views are done respectfully and outside senate. We should have a good working relationship. It is a commonsense measure
  - b. Cox- almost exactly the same thoughts, this is good and cannot believe it wasn't there already
- 4. Voting 7-0-0 approved
- c. Absences
  - i. Jason Tache- Whole Meeting 05/24
    - 1. Speech
      - a. Woke up late and was unaware of the special session
    - 2. Questioning
      - a. Patel- was he emailed about the special session?
      - b. Urea- Yes, on Friday to every senator's outlook email
      - c. Cox- POI, Personal information was given
      - d. Wangen- this is debate
    - 3. Debate
      - a. Yalamanchili- I initially planned to vote in favor of the other request by Tache, but I voted against it in the end. We should follow the special session becuase it was last minute and catch people off guard. I can understand why Jason would have a hard time after the break up and surely it is not easy and if he was unreadchable it is not his own fault and people



do need time. We should excuse this request because we have excused all others.

- b. Cox- The precedent we have set for being lienient on special session says we should accept it and we should accept based on mental health.
- c. Patel- I think we are being too personally biased. We have approved most requests but it was for work and class and things of that nature. As far as I know Tache slept in, and as far as his personal issues go, trust me I understand. We do need to be held accountable and the GroupMe is very active, it is our responsibility to stay in touch. We have two unexcused absences for personal reasons just like this. If he still skips half a meeting for personal time off, he would not be dismissed. He still has room and will be fine.
- d. Wangen- the 1.5 is 1.5 if he is unexcused
- e. McClellan- my bad if I mislead
- f. Urea- he won't be dismissed
- 4. Voting 2-3-2 denied
- ii. Jason Tache Whole Meeting 05/26
  - 1. Speech
    - a. Friend's birthday, wasn't intending to request an excuse, but missed the special session as well
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. Wangen: Is this for the 24th or 26th? Becuase the 26th was the special session
      - i. 26th
    - b. Patel: By statute is that legally excusable?
    - c. Urea: no I do not think so
    - d. Cox: Precedent has been giving leeway for the special session
    - e. Cox- full transparency I was the one to tell Jason to submit a second one. He was asking for the special session built it wasn't for the special session, so it is my fault it was confusing. I think his thought process was that he missed it

This meeting is held in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act. Funded by the Activity and Service Fee through the UCF Student Government.

Chair Urea sga\_ljr@ucf.edu



and was not able to make it and wanted the excuse to be taken into consideration.

- f. Urea- do you know why he missed the Thursday?
- g. Cox- His friend's birthday. I can confirm he was unreachable because of a breakup and never say the special session announcement.
- h. Yalamanchili- are we in debate.
- i. Urea- No
- j. Patel- he missed Tuesday because he slept in. Did he miss the 26th meeting?
- k. Urea- both at the same time after.
- 3. Debate
  - a. Yalamanchili- We have been pretty lenient and if a particular senator were to have these incidents repeatedly then it is another story. It was not a good time for him and I support excusing his absence request. He is a very valuable senator and I think we should approve.
  - b. Wangen- This is the Thursday one and is not the one for the special session and we have not been lenient. He even acknowledged being absent and was going to take the un excused.
  - c. Cox- we have been kind of harsh on people requesting excuses for vacation so I do think we should vote no on this one. It was for his friends birthday and get to the other one when we do.
  - d. Patel- correct me with I am wrong.
  - e. Urea- you are.
  - f. Patel- in terms of leniency people get excuses for jobs because that is necessary for them to survive and pay their bills, but we have not been accepting excuses for vacations like how we did with Saucedo's vacation trip that was planned months in advance. We should not accept this because it's more of a personal trip. And for reference, I've also missed a close friend of mines' birthday because of senate, and it sucked but it was an obligation that needs to be faced.



- g. Cox- what is Tache's attendance count
- h. McClellan- 1.5
- i. Urea- 1.5 and I do not want to set a precedent to excuse everyone.
- 4. Voting 0-7-0 Denied
- iii. Thomas Cura Whole Meeting 06/09
  - 1. Speech
    - a. He is going to Bermuda and will be at sea and not have WiFi he has a negative Covid test as proof
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. None
  - 3. Debate
    - a. Cox- this is for vacation, we should deny it based on precedent
    - Yalamanchili- I agree, we set a precedent to deny personal and vacation requests. I am pretty sure that people can indeed attend senate online because we are doing hybrid and can get internet on a cruise ship. I do not know how his timing work but we should deny
    - c. Wangen- we cannot approve it because we saw it already
    - d. McClellan- Not exactly
    - e. Cox- we are talking about a free cruise so he wouldn't lose money to not go on the cruise
  - 4. Voting 0-7-0 denied
- iv. Hannah Huerta Whole Meeting 06/09
  - 1. Speech
    - a. I am still out ion Costa Rica and will be at her Grandma that does not believe in. Wi-Fi
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. Wangen- is there a reason anyone knows why she didn't get a sign over
      - i. No
  - 3. Debate
    - a. Cox- I know that she is seeing family but this counts as vacation and we have not been approving these



- b. Nguyen- is this first time she requested
- c. Wangen- we have approved the first two she put
- d. Nguyen- then shouldn't we approve this?
- e. Yalamanchili- what Senator Cox said
- 4. Voting 0-5-2 Denied
- v. Stefania Salerno Whole Meeting 06/02
  - 1. Speech
    - a. Conference June 1st-6th, this is offered through UCF because she works for MASS
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. None
  - 3. Debate
    - a. Cox- I remember my first session I got excused because I was going to a convention so we should approve
  - 4. Voting 7-0-0 Approved
- vi. Brianna Urea Whole Meeting 6/2
  - 1. Speech
    - a. Friend unexpectedly passed away. Also, for 6/2, not 5/2
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. None
  - 3. Debate
    - a. Cox: Move to amend to 6/2
    - b. Yalamanchili: Think we should excuse, is more than a vacation, should allow time to grieve with family. Should not be inconsiderate towards people
    - c. Nyugen: Should approve
  - 4. Voting 6-0-1 Approved
- vii. Zykeria Rolle- Whole Meeting 06/09
  - 1. Speech
    - a. I am going on a family trip to Arizona for my Grandpa's funeral
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. None
  - 3. Debate



- a. Yalamanchili- This is one of those were people need to take time off for their families this is not a typical family trip. Senator Salerno should go.
- b. McClellan- It is for Rolle
- 4. Voting 7-0-0 approved
- viii. Brian Nguyen- Whole Meeting 05/19
  - 1. Speech
    - a. It was the first meeting and it was the day my lease started so I was busy moving and did not have time to make it
  - 2. Questioning
    - a. Cox- why couldn't you take a break?
    - b. Nguyen- I had two days to move without a charge so I had no sleep that night and was focusing on moving. I had no other help.
  - 3. Debate
    - Yalamanchili- I think the reason is fair and just and valid, he had to move out in a limited amount of time we should approve
    - b. Cox- I have moved so many times and times under a time crunch and two days is pretty good. I am not really sure why Nguyen couldn't go. Maybe that is just me.
  - 4. Voting 2-2-3 recount needed 2-3-2 Denied
- d. Blanket Excuses
  - i. Sebastion Simko- Initial Roll Call 6/1-7/8
    - 1. Speech
      - a. Due to undergrad research needs to be late
    - 2. Questioning
      - a. McClellan- whole or late
      - b. Urea-late
    - 3. Debate
      - a. Patel- it is academic so it is standard
    - 4. Voting 7-0-0 approved
    - 5. Move to go back to New business, amended to go to Internal Bill 54-06 Approved by GC



11. Member Discussion-

#### a. None

## 12. Miscellaneous Business-

## a. Precedent sheet

- i. This was from last session and I think this would be really good to have this year.
- ii. McClellan- we can add things at any time
- iii. Wangen- think about UCF required not for academic reasons, RSO events and such, LJR in the past excused a lot of things like that.
- iv. Yalamanchili- regarding UCF events not required for academics, there are many RSOs that are not or tote the line and I was told that people what obligations might not be excused. If the chair could be more amenable to edit that
- v. Urea- should I put non-UCF events?
- vi. McClellan- we can clarify that we would accept certain events and deny others and it is up to committee on that point
- vii. Urea- I put non UCF events non academic would be decided by committee
- viii. Cox- Grammar stuff
- ix. Urea- my grammar has been destroyed by texting and spellcheck
- x. Yalamanchili- you could say non UCF academic events will be decided case by case
- xi. Cox- More grammar fixes
- b. Review of the Constitution? PP
- 13. Final Roll Call: 7/10
- 14. Adjournment: 12:55 PM

#### Key:

P - Present A - Absent MTD - Move to Debate MTV - Move to Vote MTA- Move to Amend PP - Postpone



**UCF Student Government** 

LJR Committee Meeting Charge on Chamber 06/08/22 11:00 AM

PPI - Postpone Indefinitely GC - General Consent

> This meeting is held in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act. Funded by the Activity and Service Fee through the UCF Student Government.

> > Chair Urea sga\_ljr@ucf.edu

Page 18