

10-17-2011

Rules Committee Meeting Minutes 10/17/2011

University of South Florida. Student Government Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/sg_leg_pubs



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

University of South Florida. Student Government Senate, "Rules Committee Meeting Minutes 10/17/2011" (2011). *Legislative Branch Publications*. 198.
https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/sg_leg_pubs/198

This Senate Committee Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Government at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Legislative Branch Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.



University of South Florida
Student Government Fifty-Second Student Senate

FALL SESSION
October 17th 2011

Meeting called to order by Chairwoman Kiger at 6:43PM.

Kiger- First item on the agenda is roll call I'm here. Mr. Antar is unexcused. Mr. Saunders is present. Ms. Brinkworth is present. Mr. Berkowitz is present. Mr. Gao is present. Ms. Cao is present. Ms. Rustan is present. Ms. Toro is no longer a part of this committee. Mr. Kimble is excused. Mr. Shakir is not here either. And he is unexcused. Mr. Berkowitz?

Berkowitz- It says the 14th of October and that is 3 days ago.

Kiger- I'll change it. Next item on the agenda is additions/deletions to the orders of the day.

Motion to approve the agenda by Senator Brinkworth.

Kiger- Seeing none. The orders of the day have been accepted. Next item is open forum.

Open Forum

Saunders- This was an idea I spoke with Ms. Ruston and Mr. Shakir, basically the idea is how appropriations presents bills, we should be able to present rules bills and be the sponsor of the bill and as a member of rules go and talk about it. Give rules members the opportunity to learn in depth about the bills and that was a cool idea and I wanted Ms. Kiger's opinion about it.

Hassounah- You said JEC but what does JEC have to do about it? I mean I like it?

Saunders- It was just Ms. Toro's idea.

Kiger- Anyone else? I will consider your request, Mr. Saunders and let you know. It would depend on the bill of course. If it was something when we introduce college of medicine, not exactly. Next item on the agenda is new business and chapter 702. There were a couple amendments to this after I sent it out. This conflicted directly with one of the other clauses in the election timeline so that was stricken. This is the same. It removes the signature requirement from the documentation to candidacy which we saw as

a hindrance that kept them from running. Or if they didn't feel like they could walk up to someone in their class and ask and we removed that to increase the number of candidates. This is the same that was also stricken and put later into the timeline and then the amendments to the election timeline; we added 5PM on the last day of the business week just saying that it was 6 weeks prior to spring break. It just added this right here. And then this was just clarified to say shall be held the week prior to spring break instead of lasting a week. Ms. Brinkworth do you have a question?

Brinkworth- Are you up for questions now? I don't know if I agree with the removal of signatures. I heard your rationale, but...

Kiger- Initially it was.

Gao- The other rationale was because Ms. Judy had to go through all the names one by one to check if they were a student and that's a lot of work for her.

Kiger- Also, SGATO had to look up every signature for every person who put in their application for candidacy and that was an overwhelming amount of work and with the general election, that's everyone. This chapter was previously looking at putting in an actual time period for the election. So, we didn't present them at the same time but the other one has already been removed and gone through senate.

Brinkworth- I feel like it's a cop out, so people don't have to get a signature. I validate that it's a lot of work.

Gao- Originally for the signatures when we did the whole 50 signatures there was no difference between signatures with and signatures without.

Saunders- I like the idea of removing it from senate because the whole work issue, but I don't see the point of removing it for the presidential election. That's pre-campaigning and you don't have to check colleges, so I don't see that as being a burden. I think it should stay for presidential and removed for senate.

Gao- My personal opinion is that really it's just added work. You're going to talk to people either way. It just adds work for Judy and SGATO. 150 if you think about that is a low number. You might have 150 people in the Facebook group alone.

Kiger- And if you think about it the current president and vice president received thousands of votes. They had to have spoken to a lot of people. They meet people and talk to people and they have to otherwise they get the votes.

Saunders- If you get 150 signatures, it would be like 30 or 40 candidates running and that just seems pointless. It's like a declaration with intent. It's not a high bar. It wasn't hard to do but it stops at people who are doing this just for fun, coming in wasting time. It doesn't seem like SGATO and Judy would do a lot of work.

Berkowitz- Remove it and remove the work, it's not a difficult process.

Rustan- When I ran I had to get the 50 signatures. We went in there and handed them my paper. Because they were in the college of education, I got to run. However, it's still work that's pointless. They still have to go out and talk to people. It's just not going to happen. We can't even get people to vote not much vote for matt.

Saunders- You're talking about work that Ms. Judy had to do for the general election. If it's just presidential, it doesn't seem like work. If you don't have to check the signatures for colleges, then there's no work involved. They do those forward election checks. It just seems like it's a good unofficial intent to run like you're a serious candidate.

Gao- They still have to make sure they're USF students. That's a waste of time. More people to run is not a bad thing. Either way, you're saying one is a waste of time.

Berkowitz- I don't think people are going to run for 150 anyway.

Kiger- Most individuals will look at the presidential election as a serious thing. Not just anyone is going to run for it just because they feel like it. So. Any more questions, concerns, motions?

Motion to postpone by Senator Saunders.

Kiger- There is a motion to postpone, are there any objections? Seeing none, the bill has been postponed until next week. Next item on the agenda is review title seven. The first title in chapter 7 is chapter 700. Mr. Saunders would you like to present that chapter?

Saunders- I've been trying to relate the chapters to where they are within the title. 700.19 which is the definition of the ERC it says the commission is comprised of the assistant deputies. I'm not sure if there are 3 deputies of supervising of elections. Is that true or not?

Brinkworth do you have a point of information?

Brinkworth- There are 3 deputies, there always have been. It was Andrew Uhler, Bodden, the three were John Jack and what's his name, Brett...There were 3, there was always three.

Saunders- I don't know why it says so, it says four and it says three.

Kiger- It was probably just a mistake, so it needs to be updated.

Saunders- Oh the other thing I wanted to run by the committee was 700.37. Restricted areas. Is there like a I was just maybe worried about the use of the language physical. If there was a place on the web you weren't allowed to campaign say the oracle, those aren't physical locations.

Kiger- Mr. Saunders didn't you campaign in the oracle?

Saunders- In the Oracle, not the website.

Brinkworth- The physical location of website X qualifies under there.

Rustan- Doesn't the supervisor have to tell you what is restricted and what is not. Technically James Bodden can say you cannot advertise at X, Y and Z.

Saunders- It says you cannot campaign at the student government office and it extends to the student government website.

Hassounah- proviso limits A&S funds being able to go to internal and external, so if its USF SG property it's the same. So, no, you cannot publish stuff on the website and publishing comments to the website that's why it is disabled now.

Saunders- Would it be more prudent to remove the word physical?

Kiger- I don't think the website is a physical location, Mr. Saunders.

Hassounah- It does not exist. We don't have any intellectual copyrights. Our logo is not even a trademark.

Kiger- Mr. Saunders?

Saunders- I'm confused is that you are not in favor of just leaving it as it is.

Hassounah- I don't care. Who cares what the definition of physical is.

Saunders- That was it for now. I have to make sure every definition is fine.

Kiger- For future, have that done before you get here. Alright, Ms. Rustan with 701.

Rustan- I am a new senator and I happen to work with James Bodden with elections. What is bothering me is 701.6.4.

Kiger- Let me just pull that up.

Rustan- I can read that for you, or not because she has to type it. .6. Right there. So, my issue here is that it says student who have declared a major can only vote for two or more students in one college. That bothers me because they don't have a way of limiting that. So, essentially you can go and vote for arts and sciences and education. My amendment would be students who are undeclared have to vote for arts and sciences.

Gao- So, when they vote, they have the different colleges ballots. So, when they go back the other ballots don't appear anymore. So, they can only vote on one ballot.

Rustan- So, there my issue would be what stops them from changing their major from undeclared to the hot topic?

Hassounah- Once you're declared, you can't go to undeclared, you have to pick another major.

Rustan- My only other issue here was I don't know quite what number it was because I was talking to a couple senators and we were talking about making the supervisor of elections for a full term. Why aren't they hired for a year? Can't they be fired right after the week of election? Why do you get your position full time and they don't?

Kiger- Their position is no longer available. We don't have a need for the ERC after the general election. The supervisor of election would be reappointed the next term and they would be rehired and whether or not they were rehired would be...

Saunders- We doesn't have them regularly but they do happen.

Hassouneh- We kept them through May 7th and most of the time we knew we would have them expedited. It doesn't say that you have to keep five people on payroll if you need only one or two.

Rustan- 701.6.3 talks about polling stations. There's no requirement for interim or midterm elections and I guess that would be an issue.

Hassouneh- I have the rationale for that. So, typically before this year, the ERC did not get hired until October or November. 2 years ago we went to the system to have the midterm election. The default is the ERC fails on the floor in July and doesn't get appointed again and passes until November. The default is SGATO takes over the ERC rule. The problem is we don't have the staff or man power. We didn't put in statutes because in the event that SGATO does have to step in we're out of luck because we don't have a staff to run it.

Saunders- I have a comment to what Mr. Hassouneh said. There's provision in there that is activated. I think we should have a minimum mandatory for midterm.

Kiger- This clause applies to general election. By putting a clause in midterm, you limit who can run it. SGATO can run it. If you specify it can be run by the ERC, this chapter can run it. It pertains to the ERC.

Hassouneh- When that clause was written, there were still IP restriction, so if you were on campus, you can't just walk into a class and have everyone vote, because it was capped. Now that anyone can vote from anywhere, the need for a minimum for 5 polling stations isn't required. Your phone is a polling station.

Kiger- Moving on then. Ms. Brinkworth: 702.

Brinkworth- I had one to edit and a couple questions. I messed up the numbers really bad. Go away. I think this is 702.3...oh no, I don't know. It's underneath the campaign code of ethics; I screwed up all the numbers. It is...oh yeah you were there in code of ethics.

Kiger- There was a numbering issue with the actual chapter because we rewrote it and it hasn't been put into statutes yet.

Brinkworth- Oh okay. 702.3.4. I think this is a typo. I believe not should be stricken from that clause. I don't know if that's worthy of an amendment or if that's just... oops delete.

Kiger- It's a double negative.

Brinkworth- It's confusing.

Kiger- Would that be an amendment?

Hassouneh- Send it to our clerk and CC Rachel on it.

Rustan- Actually its right. It means you cannot withhold those documents. It means they are allowed to hold these.

Kiger- It begins with no and not. So, it's a double negative.

Rustan- Oh oh.

Brinkworth- So, then my other problem was based on the title of this chapter, it didn't actually talk at all about the eligibility to run just the process if you wanted to run and I didn't know if we needed to amend the title or add in "needs to be a USF student", you know that kind of stuff. I'm just generally speaking. I was waiting to find the part of qualifications for candidacy and that never occurred. I didn't know if it needed to be in there because it implies it is going to give you requirements for candidacy when it does not.

Kiger- Doesn't say it has to be a USF student.

Brinkworth- Or good academic standing. I thought we could add that in or amend the title.

Kiger- Mr. Hassouneh, is it not in the application? The requirements?

Hassouneh- You mean if you have to be registered and good academic standing. The rationale was that you had to qualify. If that's something you want to reiterate, but good luck with the wording but I don't see why you can't do that.

Brinkworth- My question would be what would be the more appropriate solution. Would it be better to add in those things or alter the title? This is a question for you Ms. Kiger.

Kiger- I'm trying to this of how you can reword the title.

Brinkworth- General election titles. More flowery than that.

Brinkworth- Generally you are talking about candidacy.

Hassouneh-All if says is you have to follow the regulations there to be a candidate. Usually the title is not the point of debate. It's usually the afterthought to the bill.

Kiger- I think it's okay. If you feel strongly about it you can come and work on amending it with me. Anything else for 702? No? Alright, then Mr. Berkowitz with 703. It's very similar to the elections besides the date and stuff. How long you can campaign for and with me I feel like if it's not broken you shouldn't

fix it. It seems to work. I couldn't find loopholes or problems, but I could be wrong. I don't see any fixing for this section.

Kiger- In your opinion what is your clause?

Berkowitz- The clause about you can't campaign for Tuesday and Wednesday. I found that difficult because they have to use the HYPE office. It's not just the Tuesday Wednesday. That's the most important I feel.

Kiger- Alright and Mr. Kimble is unable to make it so we will go through 704 when he returns. Which concludes our business. So, announcements?

Announcements

Kiger-Motions?

Motion to adjourn by Senator Brinkworth.

Kiger- Are there any objections? Seeing none.

Adjournment called by Chairwoman Kiger at 7:19PM.

Transcribed by Senate Secretary, Theresa Rivera.