**Student Court of Justice**

Sunday, September 17, 2017

7:30 PM – Heine Room

Minutes

1. Call to Order at 7:35 p.m.
   1. Present: Chief Justice Melville, Senior Associate Justice Stirling, Senior Associate Justice McCormick, and Associate Justice Pacella
   2. Absent: Associate Justice Beah
2. Additions to and Approval of the Agenda
   1. None
3. Good News
   1. McCormick: Starbucks successfully prepared my order, unlike Caribou! Yay!
4. Reports
   1. Chief Justice Melville:
      1. All applicants of Student Court have been notified regarding their approval or denial for a meeting time.
      2. Chief Justice Melville has met with Mr. Jim Ross to configure the Homecoming Election.
      3. Mr. Ross will sit down with the Court regarding the election system in the spring.
      4. Send Chief Justice Melville a suggestion for new Justice orientation by Wednesday this week.
   2. Associate Justice Pacella – CSO Commission: We spent time looking at groups of students who want to create new organizations on campus. We did not approve one of the organizations due to an insufficient number of members.
5. Order of Business:
   1. Discussion on the Constitution and Code Review Committee
      1. October 1st, 2017 will be Senate’s first round of nominations.
      2. October 8th, 2017 will be when Senate votes on committee members.
      3. CCRC will operate from October 9th, 2017 to October 27th, 2017
         1. The Student Court will have three Justices on the Committee.
            1. It would be nice if Justices can consistently attend, but we can be flexible.
      4. The Student Senate will be voting on changes to the Code on November 5th, 2017.
         1. Because it is possible a lot of changes will be made to the governing documents, it is important the Student Court exerts a strong presence at this meeting.
      5. Let Chief Justice Melville know if you are interested in serving on this committee.
   2. Scrutinize Performance of Student Court Applications
      1. McCormick: The scenario question provided a lot of feedback for us to critique applications.
      2. Pacella: Overall, the application works. While some questions do not gather as much useful information about exceptional candidates, they help eliminate subpar applicants.
      3. Stirling: We should reword the question “What experiences have prepared you for this position” so that it is more directed to the actual activities of the Student Court.
      4. McCormick: Perhaps we can ask a question telling applicants to describe a situation when they used a few specific skills instead of keeping the question broad and vague.
      5. Melville: During the interview, I am going to ask some questions about objectivity, for example, so that we get an immediate response instead of a premeditated response.
      6. Stirling: We should make the optional question required to force applicants to consider what they want to do to improve the Student Court.
      7. Stirling: Some applicants did not answer both parts of the scenario question.
         1. Pacella: If you split the multipart questions into individual questions, we will receive complete answers.
      8. Melville: Now that we have a template for an application, someone else can devise the scenario question for the next round of applications.
      9. Stirling: On an unrelated note, we ought to have a mock trial like last year so that the new Justices can get used to how that works.
      10. Melville: We’ll get more feedback on the applications after new Justices are appointed.
   3. Discussion on How to Increase the Student Court’s Visibility
      1. Open Meetings
         1. Melville: This is included on the Rockpile because when I was writing the Student Court application, I was hoping to provide an opportunity for potential applicants to come to a meeting to see what the Student Court does. However, this was never done because we did not determine our meeting time until the applications became available.
         2. Melville: We can try executing this idea if we have another round of appointments next semester.
         3. McCormick: In the feedback I sent Melville, I said that we should include our meeting time information on our webpage.
      2. Dissemination of Information
         1. Melville: I wanted to bring this topic up in light of last year’s SSC-01-17, “Thomas Fyffe v Elijah Gill.” Last year, the Student Court failed to appropriately communicate updates during the Student Body Election to write-in candidates. Gill was never made aware he was not allowed to share anything related to the election after campaigning closed. How do we remedy this?
         2. Stirling: Sending all relevant parties an email would be the most efficient solution.
            1. Melville: Unfortunately, not all write-in candidates will have provided us their email.
         3. McCormick: Providing an update via List Serv would ensure all students receive pertinent information.
         4. Pacella: How was the information which led to SSC-01-17 distributed?
            1. Melville: Chief Justice Fyffe communicated the information during his weekly report to the Student Senate. This was never distributed beyond the Student Senate.
         5. Pacella: Can we create some sort of Facebook page where all election-related information is distributed?
            1. Stirling: We could use a number of social media platforms to accomplish this.
            2. Pacella: We can use list-serv, email, word-of-mouth, and social media to update everyone on what is happening. It is important we keep it consistent.
      3. Opportunities for the Student Court to engage with Student Government and the Student Body
         1. Stirling: Could we have a booth at the Involvement Expo?
            1. Melville: Student Government already has a booth. I do not want to separate us.
         2. Stirling: Could we participate in a Bison Pride Event?
            1. Melville: I will connect with Executive Commissioner Russell to see how the Student Court can be involved with this.
         3. Pacella: Can we participate in CSO Large Group?
            1. Melville: If we have a physical meeting semester, I will do this. Otherwise, we do have a slide in the online CSO Large Group Presentation.
         4. McCormick: We could go to one or two student organizations each semester to introduce ourselves.
            1. Pacella: This might not be the most efficient use of resources. If everyone did this, we would only get to 18 organizations.
            2. Stirling: We could put a letter in each organization’s mailbox.
            3. Pacella: If we use a letter, we should make it short and ask the President of each organization to read it at one of their meetings.
         5. McCormick: Poster in the union
            1. Melville: We can work with PR on this. There would be a lot of exposure. I think we can use poster space for free.
   4. Review and Revise Rules of the Court
      1. Melville: Over the next week, all Justices MUST look over the blue binder titled “Rules of the Student Court” so we can make edits, additions, and comments.
      2. Melville: I will email each of you a digital version of the file within the week.
      3. Melville: While I have not read the entirety of the binder recently, I am guessing it is incredibly dense. One of our goals will be to simplify the content so it is easier to read.
         1. Complete this assignment by September 24.
      4. McCormick: Can sections be assigned, like with the Book of Court Decisions?
         1. Melville: I would like each of us to have a general understanding of the entire document. But when we look at what revisions we want to make, we can assign things into sections.
   5. Book of Court Decisions
      1. Melville: I have finished creating a Table of Contents page and have highlighted most of the decisions the rest of the Justices categorized.
      2. Melville: The next step will involve having the Court write short descriptions for each decision to include on the Table of Contents. We will wait to assign these sections until new Justices are appointed, so that they have an opportunity to learn our history.
      3. The Student Court looked at a few of the decisions to finalize what categories they belong in.
   6. Rockpile Review and Delegation
      1. Melville: We have gotten a lot of work done on the Rockpile, and it is time to look at what projects we want to undertake next.
      2. Associate Justice Pacella will begin to compile what punishments the Student Court has administered in the past so that it can create “Sentencing Guidelines.” Pacella should have this completed in about two weeks.
      3. Senior Associate Justices McCormick and Stirling will begin to research the governing documents of other institutions so we can see if anyone has any good ideas.
6. Announcements and Comments
   1. Melville: If the Student Body President chooses to appoint any new Justices, they will be sworn in on September 24. It would be nice to have a strong Student Court presence at this meeting.
      1. Stirling and McCormick will plan on attending.
7. Review of Action Items
   1. Melville 🡪 Notify Justices of meeting times for the CCRC.
   2. Melville 🡪 Distribute electronic version of the Rules of the Court
   3. Justices 🡪 Read through the Rules of the Court by September 24.
   4. Justices 🡪 Send at least one suggestion for the new Justice orientation by Wednesday, September 20.
   5. Pacella 🡪 Compile a list of past punishments administered by the Student Court by September 30.
   6. Melville 🡪 Condense list of suggestions regarding the Court’s visibility into actionable items.
   7. Melville 🡪 Ensure there are enough tables for the Court at the Senate meeting.
   8. McCormick and Stirling 🡪 Begin researching the governance structure of other institutions.
8. Adjourn
   1. Melville: Seeks a motion to adjourn
   2. McCormick: So moved without objection
   3. Adjournment at 8:31 PM.