

## **MEETING AGENDA**

- 1. Call to Order: 3:09 PM
- 2. Roll Call & Verification of Quorum: 12/11 (6)

Name	Email	Initial	Final
Chair Escobar	sga_ea@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Vice Chair Chau	sgacie1@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Rodriguez	sgachps4@ucf.edu	Е	Е
Senator Matthews	<u>sga_sci7@ucf.edu</u>	Р	Р
Senator Rickett	sga_grst4@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Roehrkasse	sgaecs10@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Beneche	<u>sga_sci2@ucf.edu</u>	Р	Р
Senator Trejo-Hernandez	sgaecs13@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Gaudio	sga_ecs3@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Metellus	sgaecs8@ucf.edu	Р	Р
Senator Lipner	<u>sga_ugst1@ucf.edu</u>	Р	Р
Pro Tempore Representative Hameed	sga_pro@ucf.edu	Р	Р
LJR Representative Sherman	sgacie3@ucf.edu	Р	Р

- 3. Approval of the Minutes: <u>07.02.25</u>
  - a. Approved by GC.
- 4. Approval of the Agenda:



- a. Approved by GC.
- 5. Announcements from the Chair
  - a. Escobar: Good afternoon committee, thank you for being here. Not much business today, we are continuing discussion on Title VI.
- 6. Announcements from the Vice Chair
  - a. Chau: Pro Temp Hameed and I had a discussion with Shane about Internal Bill 57-01 in the Pro Temp's office. There was some speculation and discussion on why Dr. Frame vetoed the initial Bill- (specifically with the current state of politics making it difficult to show approval). Additionally, both Shane and Brodie believed that there wasn't a need to have it integrated as a Bill because we are able to provide name changes regardless, have it rejected once again, and put attention on a function that could possibly be removed in the future. I just wanted to update everyone on this conversation!
    - i. Gaudio: Was Senator Lipner included in these conversations?
      - 1. No, this is because Shane came by E&A casually while Pro Temp Hameed and I were in the office discussing other business- Pro Temp Hameed brought it up casually and that began the entire discussion.
      - 2. Hameed: He came by casually and I emailed him about it before, so I brought it up. If it was a structured meeting, I would have most definitely invited Senator Lipner to these conversations.
      - 3. Rickett: Can you refresh my memory on why the bill was rejected and what the bill is about?
        - a. Escobar: The bill that we handled last year, it's a provision where a student could alter their name when putting such on the ballot with the SG Supervisor of Elections.
      - 4. Rickett: Was my point from the previous session specifically brought up? Do you remember that?
        - a. Escobar: I can link Dr. Frame's memorandum in the agenda for full context. It's also important documents in the E&A channel.
          i. Veto Memo 4.16.25.docx
    - ii. Beneche: Could I get some clarification on why Dr. Frame rejected it?
      - 1. I do apologize, but in the conversation, there were only speculations on why Dr. Frame rejected it. One of the speculations was that she may have felt apprehensive signing a bill that may impact her position because of the current political climate.
    - iii. Beneche: I had this explained to me numerous times, but why did it get vetoed? It was a one-line addition, putting it into stone on what we already do. If you could have a talk with Dr. Frame that would be appreciated.



- 1. Once again, I do not have exact context on the situation because I was not in the previous session. But, I am most definitely willing to talk to Dr. Frame and invite whoever is interested to have this conversation and get further clarification.
- 2. Escobar: Based on the memorandum- we can see that with initial wording it was vetoed, that is why we are introducing new legislation to go back to see what we can change- which is what Senator Lipner has done with this piece of legislation.
- iv. Lipner: Motion to move to member discussion.
- 7. Announcements from Committee Members
  - a. None.
- 8. Announcements from Non-Committee Members
- 9. Supervisor Presley: Good afternoon E&A! If you weren't at Senate last week, I am Amarah Presley and I am the Supervisor of Elections. Today, I am here to share what Assistant Supervisor Collazo and I are working on as we get things sorted for the commission this year. As mentioned in Senate, our goals for the commission are to provide full transparency to the other branches and work alongside them, utilize the Elections Rules of Procedures to officially establish commission expectations and committees, emphasize Title VI education and practice at the forefront of the semester and use the latter to prepare for potential violation hearings we may face, and lastly enter the election period as a strong, united, and professional front. Regarding things that are currently being worked on, name tag orders were placed for the commission, polos are currently in progress (waiting to hear back on a quote from DBQ), and website updates have been sent in as well, which will include the minutes from last year. The Election Commission's leadership retreat will take place on Monday, July 21. Here, we will: set expectations and rules (i.e. attendance policy, email and teams etiquette, and office hour minimums), explain Robert's Rules and Procedures, and introduce committees and appoint commissioners. Our second meeting will take place on Wednesday, August 6 from 1:00-4:00p in the SG Conference Room. In this meeting, we will elect chairs for each of the committees, vote on an election tabling theme, and have our first EC social of the year-planned by Andrew and me. In E&A today, I wanted to specifically talk about one of the committees we'll be implementing called the "Legislative, Precedent, & Rules Committee". This committee will act as a spectating liaison between Senate E&A and the Election Commission. Furthermore, they will develop the Elections Rules of Procedures, advocate for the Election Commission in E&A debate periods for any and all Election Rules of Procedures and Statute implementations, and maintain records of violation hearing decisions and analyze them for precedence to ensure all hearing sanctions are made on equal terms. We believe that this is an important addition to the Election Commission for several reasons. As much as it is our responsibility to market the election through tablings and events, it is also our duty to perform in accordance with Title VI. This committee will help the commission remain up-to-date with any and all Title VI changes decided upon in E&A,



keeping our knowledge of the statutes fresh, and ensure that our command of Title VI is not excessive or unnecessarily cruel, implementing our own set of checks and balances within the commission to prevent issues that occurred the last election cycle. Additionally, this committee will have a chair for E&A to communicate with throughout the term in the case that the Supervisor and Assistant are not available. As this committee is a new idea and will collaborate with E&A, we welcome any feedback or suggestions to help improve the committee's grounds. Thank you!

- a. Gaudio: I got an email from the Assistant Supervisor on Monday that talked about the minutes last year and how they will not be published later than two weeks from this Tuesday. He specified they were the minutes from last year and this year, and I want to ask about previous years as well. The last minutes uploaded were from 2020 and there is a jump from 2020 to 2024.
  - i. Presley: From what we saw, minutes were in google drive. That's a part of the website updates that we are sending. From 2020-2024 they seem to be lost and missing however we are still trying to find them- the team folders from 2023 before I was even in the Commission are a bit of a mess.
- b. Lipner: For the Legislative, Precedent, and Rules Committee, it will focus on the violation hearings?
  - i. Some of the decisions we made were unnecessary and cruel- dependent on biased standpoints. This is what this committee is for- ensuring that the punishment matches the consequences, setting the grounds on how the violation hearings will play out to use what has played out in the past and growing on that.
- c. Lipner: Do you know that there is active discussion in hearings like a guidebook, what would the process/impact look like?
  - i. A guidebook, the entire Committee is involved- they will look at the guidebook of all the violation hearings we had in the past and use that as judgement to apply punishment.
- d. Gaudio: You have a lot of set dates, do you have access to calendar?
  - i. Yes I do. The only one that is not on the calendar is the July 26<sup>th</sup> retreat.
- e. Chair Escobar: Motion to move back to member discussion.
- 10. Old Business
  - a. None.
- 11. New Business
  - a. None.
- 12. Member Discussion
  - a. Chair Escobar: Internal Bill 57-01 [Updates to Title VI Name Change in Elections].docx
    - i. Lipner: I am frustrated because I feel like it was vetoed twice, I am frustrated with the second veto because I feel like it didn't have nuance. I feel like we could have made an amendment on the floor instead of vetoing it through the Pro Temp's



office. However, I wanted to introduce a few changes with Chair Escobar. I am adding a whereas clause to state where we are coming, getting approval from SG Supervisor of Elections or advisor, cleaning up Tier 2 change- which I think is why it was initially vetoed in the first place. In terms of the election process, our titles were misrepresenting it- changing the title while keeping the misrepresentation which is why it was vetoed by Dr. Frame. I believe changing it to legal instead of official/including UCF- ensures it is accurate and what UCF does for this new piece of legislation.

- ii. Chair Escobar: I added the whereas clause that was pointed out by Vice-Chair Chau, we have a provision that says without the approval of the SG Supervisor of Elections or Coordinator, we are keeping our Code of Ethics within the Title. There are multiple reasons to pass this piece of legislation.
- iii. Rickett: Had this Bill been enacted- we would fully support anyone being called their primary nickname. But not everyone is aware of the ulterior motives of someone changing their name which could be approved without doing research on the name- and we don't want to highlight something in an election. Someone can change their name to something nefarious.
  - Lipner: I understand that concern because students can take advantage of that leeway- but now we have statutes that focus on identity and fraud. We did heavily debate this in the previous session, but candidates cannot impersonate other political figures or align with political campaigns. Additionally, having the SG Supervisor of Elections or Coordinator, we have those safeguards in place to prevent that.
- iv. Escobar: Are we okay as a committee implementing these updates and changes?
- v. Lipner: I would like to talk more about Brodie and Shane about how they had a private discussion.
  - 1. Shane discussed how Brodie and himself did not understand why the internal bill needed to be passed because if we are already able to provide name ballot changes, there is no need to have it set in stone- he noted how this could possibly be removed as a function in the future if noticed.
- vi. Lipner: No worries, I'm trying to see from their perspective. Did they mean moving it to violations? Etc.
  - 1. Once again, all I just know is that Shane mentioned how they didn't find a point on why the internal bill was being written if we already have this as a function. He did not expand too much about this conversation and focused on how we should look over Title 6 to see if we truly need this bill.
- vii. Gaudio: We have had some discussion about this topic- it's been discussed already; it's already gone through the motions. They will probably notice ahead of time and



do something. We have already discussed what has been discussed; I don't think there is any merit in discussing it further.

- b. <u>TITLE VI Markup</u>
  - i. Chair Escobar: There are two definitions that I marked out- if someone wants to write a bill to remove them, that can be done.
    - 1. Gaudio: I think that one of these two definitions, one of these definitions, would have come in handy for legislation. It's still fine to keep them there even if it's not for Title 6.
  - ii. Chair Escobar: I think for conciseness, I think some things are repetitive and can be removed. If people can continue to overview and remove redundancies- I have come up with 4 sections that we could possibly split it into.
    - 1. Lipner: I think that some definitions could definitely be removed. They can be cluttering.
  - iii. Chair Escobar: Our definitions are for when they are found throughout the title; however, they are not. If someone wants to write a Bill, I am always encouraging committee members to do so.
  - iv. Rickett: What is the end state for all of this? What is the goal?
    - 1. Chair Escobar: An overhaul and make it more readable for anyoneespecially for candidates. Making sure it's organized, readable, and concise.
  - v. Gaudio: It's partially to make it more legible, additionally there will be a deeper dive- ex. For runoff elections, there are still several mentions of run-offs in Title 6. For the people here in the last session- there was going to be a run-off, we needed to check and find how the run-off would operate and whether it would be between the top 2. The organization was off enough to the point that the Supervisor of Elections was a bit confused. We should do a deeper dive and revise the sections as well.
  - vi. Chair Escobar: Motion to move to non-committee member announcements.
  - vii. Chair Escobar: For the outline, I want the Committee to see if we want to use sections or as a guide to reorder the Title.
    - 1. Lipner: I feel like the EC should go first because they are the overarching point of statutes and procedures, I am also hesitant to have the four sections listed.
      - a. Hameed: Sections as a whole would be helpful for candidates to read it. This will make it a lot clearer- especially for candidates because they will have it easier and see it first.
      - b. Chair Escobar: Having candidates see information upfront on what elections and campaigning looks like. But I see that EC should be first, so candidates are aware of it.

viii.Gaudio: Motion to allow a non-committee member to speak.



- ix. Grouse: When I first wanted to run, I looked at the beginning- it's nice to know everything, but it was most important knowing the ethics and violations so it's easier for candidates. It was difficult to read it at first, but I appreciate all of these changes to make it smoother for students.
  - 1. Lipner: When you were given materials in regard to candidacy, were there any supplemental documents you were given?
    - a. Grouse: Yes, we had a PowerPoint, but reading the statutes gave me more information- the PowerPoint presentation was basic and surface level. The statutes gave me a deeper understanding of the rules.
- x. Lipner: Motion to allow a non-committee member to speak.
- xi. Lipner: I want to hear your thoughts Presley about this topic as well.
  - Presley: I do believe that Title 6 is difficult to read and all over the place. While in hearings I would find things all over the place in different sections. To run for a position, candidates should have a solid understanding of Title 6 and their duties in SG. Our goal in Fall is to educate people about their responsibilities and have those informational sessions for candidates. I am not against rewriting it because it is redundant and having sections on what applies to EC and candidates would help readability- nonetheless candidates need to know the statutes.
- xii. Chair Escobar: I do like the committee within the EC as an idea; I don't think it needs to be accomplished this Summer or Fall but at least before the end of Fall. Working with EC on the overhaul and reworking of Title 6 and overhaul- we would be able to have all voices included, so we can work together to make Title 6 more readable, accessible to everyone.
- xiii.Lipner: You mentioned places in the chapters where things can be moved around and changed, or can you note them down for the future?
  - 1. Presley: Will have to note them down.
- xiv. Chair Escobar: I definitely will have assignments for people to work on revisions for Title 6 in the future.
- xv. Rickett: If we are serious about changing Title 6, we may have to also look at Title 10 as well- we need to meet the specific requirements as well. Candidates should also be looking at Title 10, and we don't want to completely contradict and overhaul it without looking at the other Title.
  - 1. Chair Escobar: It wouldn't be substantial changes to Title 6; it would be reordering and sectioning it for candidates. Students should already know both Titles, but I see your point.



- **a**. Gaudio: While discussing Title 10, I have actually submitted legislation for it.
- xvi. Lipner: I disagree that Title 6 doesn't need a rewrite, if we touch on it, we have to do a rewrite. It feels like it's built on its own sticks, thus if we resection it- it warrants a change of chapters, etc.
  - 1. Chair Escobar: I agree with you, however in terms of a rewrite- I mean adding things and I know we will have to make some edits and changes, but for this overhaul- I don't want someone to vote in negation because we have changed things substantially. But, for this reworking, it will be a focus on formatting.
  - 2. Lipner: I agree it makes sense; it's an internal consideration.
- xvii. Rickett: If we were to overhaul Title 6, it is important to let everyone know that it's happening, and we don't miss anything. But like Senator Gaudio said, if we have a bill touching up Title 10- we need to align our bills because our election is 7/8 months away; we don't want to have 2 pieces of legislation changing everything and being on the cuff of an SG election. Looking down the road a bit, is everything we are enacting, will it be posted for this election or for the next year.
  - 1. Chair Escobar: These changes will happen before the next election. Rewriting will not be in this overhaul, it will be through other pieces of legislation before this overhaul or separately- for example, LJR did an overhaul of Title 9 last session- it didn't have any substantial changes, only formatting changes.
- c. Gaudio: Allocating A&SF budgets for candidate campaigns, removing private contributions. Yesterday I was digging through the historical archives, back in the old days- campaigns used to use A&SF money. I would like to preface that elections were a lot more closed off, the only ones who ran for President were Senators. But it got me thinking of reading through Title 6- there are caps on how much you can spend, but the money is distributed privately. There are issues with what qualifies for materials for a campaign, ex. Using a whiteboard you already have for a campaign. We are college students that lack money to support and finance their campaigns- this inherently disadvantages those with income challenges which we should seek to address. I would get rid of private contributions for campaigns, allocating certain amounts of money for a campaign- that is the money that you get to work with. This is a far-out idea.
  - i. Hameed: Where would the money come from? How many tickets would you predict? It can be a sizable amount of change that could be taken away and given to people. It would have to be well justified.
    - 1. The money would come from- the A&SF. We had a non-reoccurring budget, our Comptroller said he is building up a base and seeing it as a

Chair Escobar: sga\_ea@ucf.edu



whole. A&SF could overview these budgets. For predictions on how much money, if we give EC a fluid amount of money that they need to hold for campaigns, if there is not enough as a non-reoccurring budget or for another event. If there is too much money, the caucus already shuffles money around- if it goes to another branch and holds onto the money in case, we are able to use it.

- ii. Hameed: Do you know why this was changed in the first place?
  - 1. I don't know why. But I will get back to that.
- iii. Rickett: As a previous Senator, one of the biggest differences in SG elections nowit used to be that people ran for individual seats rather than colleges. It's a great idea to ponder about- looking at the previous session and see how many seats are filled. Not every single Senator is going to spend money for campaigns- but making it free and fair for everyone (especially those who do not have disposable income) is a nice idea. It is unfair to have wealthy people automatically invest in their campaign while a regular college student cannot sustain that.
- iv. Vice-Chair Chau: I agree with this idea, but there are some concerns about how this would be overseen. For instance, would FAO, CRT, ORS overview it? Would EC or E&A handle the funding? I am just curious about the operations.
  - 1. Trejo-Hernandez: With the previous sessions, we are inclined to have CRT take over and get through all this. Or have the Supervisors have a committee for finance and oversee that.
    - a. Hameed: I don't know if Senators should overlook it because they can run for re-election, I think that the Commission should only have discretion over it.
    - b. Gaudio: The EC has the money account and what they have to work with, candidates already have to have materials approved through EC- especially with their new committee and just have that process run smoothly.
- v. Lipner: I feel like a majority of funds in this election in my time here at UCF was actually influential in what happened- I think the winners (through democracy) even further decreases the amount of merchandise utilized. I don't think you need to spend a dime for an election
  - 1. Gaudio: I disagree with that entire take; you could make an argument for the President of the U.S. if you know enough people- you need to network and get to know people. Putting signs, letting people know about- if the concern is about the amount of money. I think the concern about needing no money and having private contributions is something I cannot agree with.



- vi. Beneche: I agree with Senator Gaudio and some points that Senator Lipner brought up, you don't need money to campaign- networking is definitely needed, but you don't need to make merchandise- connections need to be made. Saying that we don't need any money, though, I disagree.
- vii. Chair Escobar: Having allocated funds for campaigns can be done, it can be nice for those who require those funds and possibly encourage the number of candidates interested. I'm interested to see what that would look like.
- viii. Lipner: I want to clarify that I believe that national elections versus UCF level- is different. I feel like we need to focus more on the fact that candidates who won are those who have voters that intentionally vote in the turnout. For example, in the presidential election from the previous session, the influencer Milkman and candidate Grose did not use money but instead had virality for a campaign. I am for a limit and even support making it restrictive, I believe that supplying A&SF funds and removing it from other entities who require it- is not advisable.
  - 1. Gaudio: I get what you are coming from, I am going to see if I can find campaign expense reports to see how much money candidates spent on, how many votes were cast, etc. I will end on that.
- ix. Chair Escobar: Motion to move to miscellaneous business.
- 13. Miscellaneous Business
  - a. Fall meeting time: <u>https://www.when2meet.com/?31252252-aOOAZ</u>
    - i. Lipner: What is the deadline for this?
      - 1. Chair Escobar: 2 weeks from now.
    - ii. Gaudio: Wednesday at 1 PM is already taken.
  - b. Icebreaker: Favorite music album and favorite song in said album?
  - c. Trejo Hernandez: Motion to adjourn meeting pending final rollcall.
- 14. Final Roll Call: Same as initial/11
- 15. Adjournment: 4:20 PM

## Key:

P - Present A - Absent MTD - Move to Debate MTV - Move to Vote MTA- Move to Amend PP - Postpone PPI - Postpone Indefinitely GC - General Consent

