

6-26-2013

## ROP minutes 6/26/2013

Brandon Telchi  
btelchi@usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/sg\\_jud\\_pubs](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/sg_jud_pubs)

---

### Scholar Commons Citation

Telchi, Brandon, "ROP minutes 6/26/2013" (2013). *Judicial Branch Publications*. Paper 24.  
[http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/sg\\_jud\\_pubs/24](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/sg_jud_pubs/24)

This Judicial Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Government at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Judicial Branch Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [scholarcommons@usf.edu](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).



## **ROP Revision Committee Agenda**

Wednesday, June 26, 2013

6:00 PM

- I. Attendance
  - a. Announce Absences
  - b. List Guests
- II. Additions/Deletions to Agenda
- III. Additions/Deletions to Minutes
  - a. ROP Committee meeting 06/12/2013
- IV. Open Forum
- V. Committee Member Reports
- VI. SGATO Report
- VII. Old Business
- VIII. New Business
  - a. Review of Chapters ii-12
- IX. Announcements
- X. Adjournment

*University of South Florida Government  
Supreme Court 2013-2014*

Bryan Buenaventura (BB): I call this committee meeting to order. The time is 6 o'clock pm. The day is June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013. In attendance is myself Bryan Buenaventura, Daniel Shapiro (DS), Sammy Hamed (SH), Corey McCance (CM), our clerk Brandon Telchi (BT), from SGATO we have Katherine Burkhard (KB), and excused is Michael Kalmowicz. Is there a motion to move into additions/deletions to the agenda?

SH: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, we are in additions/deletions to the agenda. Are there any additions or deletions to it? Is there a motion to approve the agenda as it is?

DS: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Is there a motion to move into additions/deletions to minutes?

DS: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, we are in additions/deletions to minutes. Brandon sent out our committee meeting minutes from the ROP meeting last time, June 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013. Is there a motion to approve these minutes?

SH: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, these minutes are approved. Thank you Brandon. Is there a motion to move into open forum?

DS: so moved

BB: any objections? Seeing none, we are in open forum. Does anyone have anything to say in open forum? Seeing none, is there a motion to move into committee member reports?

DS: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, does any member have anything to report as far as anything general in regards to ROPs or anything like that? Seeing none, is there a motion to move out of committee member reports and into SGATO report?

SH: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, Katherine, do you have anything to report for us?

KB: not this evening

BB: okay, thank you. Is there a motion to move into old business?

CM: so moved

*University of South Florida Government  
Supreme Court 2013-2014*

BB: any objections? Seeing none, we are in old business. There's no old business as of right now; is there a motion to close old business and move into new business?

SH: so moved

BB: okay, we are now in new business, and we're going to review chapters roman numeral II all the way through XII, and I believe Daniel Shapiro was assigned those sections so he's going to present to us his recommendations as well as everyone else here what they think of it, and I think the best way to talk about it, I think moving into an unmoderated caucus would be the best; so is there a motion to move into unmoderated caucus?

DS: so moved

BB: are there any objections to that? Seeing none, we are now in unmoderated caucus.

BB: we are now back from our unmoderated caucus, the time is 7:09pm. Everyone is present and accounted for who was here at the start of the meeting, and just to go through the things that we discussed during the unmoderated caucus. Justice Shapiro had came with his recommendations for ROP revisions and I'm just going to quickly go down the things that we discussed, again we are not voting on these things until the next general meeting, we are just making recommendations as of right now. So the things that we discussed is: changing the preamble, changing it from the original to a completely new one; changed minor things on 1.1; added to 2.1 the actual parts of the constitution; added as a definition resignation under duress, which is a justice shall not, shall be deemed to have resigned under duress if the motivation of the resignation could be reasonably be assumed to avoid eminent censure and or removal, a majority of the court shall be required to agree that the justice has resigned under duress; we also added a definition for super majority, a super majority shall vote shall be defined as a vote greater than or equal to 2/3 of those present at the meeting who have voting rights; we also added a definition for vote of confidence; we changed minor details in 4.1; minor details in 5.2 and 5.7, we added that it is recommended that justices should attempt to continue to do a ride along each semester to better familiarize with any changes regarding parking and transportation policy's; under 6.1 it now reads as if a confirmed justice nominee is not sworn during senate, the candidate shall be officially sworn in by the chief justice, or the next highest ranking, as a supreme court justice at the next general meeting of the supreme court, immediately following taking attendance for the said meeting; we added to, we added 7.3 to chapter 7, a justice who has resigned under duress shall forfeit their seniority and may not stand for court leadership until the annual term has been elapsed after their reappointment; we did minor changes to 8.1.2 and added with the advice and consent of the senate; added to 8.3, not allow the chief justice to arbitrarily restrict the voice or vote or any other privileges of any other justice; section 9 we changed, section 9.1 and as well as 10.1, we added a majority of a minimum of three votes of the justice present in order to become senior or ranking; 9.4 we added the senior justice shall be subject to a vote of confidence, just minor changes there; we added 9.7 the senior justice shall have supervisory authority over the branch structure; for 10.7 we added that the ranking justice shall ensure that trial procedure is clear and operates efficiently; in chapter 12 with regards to the judicial clerk, removed the part about the Oracle, and added that an ad-hoc committee will be formed to interview

*University of South Florida Government  
Supreme Court 2013-2014*

selected applicants to make a selection by simple majority vote in the event that a judicial clerk position is vacant. That concludes the recommendations that we've done. Does anyone have any questions or concerns with the recommendations that we've made today? Seeing none, is there a motion to move out of new business and into announcements?

SH: so moved

BB: are there any objections? Seeing none, we are now in announcements; does anyone have any announcements? Seeing none, is there a motion to close announcements and move into adjournment?

SH: so moved

BB: any objections? Seeing none, we are now adjourned at 7:15.