**Student Court of Justice**

Sunday, October 15, 2017

7:30 PM – Heine Room

Agenda

1. Call to Order
   1. Present: Melville, McCormick, Dunwoody, Pacella, Garrick, Stirling, Beah.
   2. Absent: None
2. Additions to and Approval of the Agenda
   1. Agenda- Addition
      1. Chief Justice Melville added item to the Section V. sub-section C.
   2. Agenda- Approved
3. Good News
4. Reports  
   a. Melville: Code Review Committee
   * 1. President or Senator recall by student body, committee changed the recall amount. from 10% to 5%. This is for accessibility for a recall of senators and president.
     2. NDSA Meeting: Discussed scandal and state art project.
     3. Morgan and Cale/Quinn will be at October 22 Student Senate meeting.
   1. McCormick: Research- Not many schools are similar to our government.
5. Order of Business:
   1. Student Court Appointments
      1. Melville: Additional round of appointments.
         1. McCormick: Asked Dunwoody and Garrick how they felt about the appointment process.
   2. Visibility of the Student Court
      1. McCormick: Moves to suspend meeting. Dunwoody Seconds. Passes.
      2. Suspended: 7:40 PM
      3. Resumed: 7:47 PM
      4. Melville: Emailed document concerning court involvement with the students, student organization, listserv, posters, mail in student organization’s mailbox.
      5. Stirling: Combining with the CJ Club for different events to get the Courts name out to the student body. Discussed further on CJ club and helping the club with events.
      6. Melville: Email the rest of court if any justices are interested in partnering with other clubs or organizations.
      7. Garrick: What is the purpose of the Poster?
      8. Melville: Any interest in pursuing actions with the poster?
         1. Beah and Garrick both show interest in the designing of a poster.
      9. Beah: Reaching out to teachers in the Pols or CJ class to further the visibility of the court.
   3. Rules of the Court
6. Appointment Review Committee
   * + 1. Melville: Discusses the Appointment Review Committee. The Student Senate has the power to consider all executive appointments, however, it currently does not have the tools to adequately perform this. ARC solves this.
       2. Pacella: The Code should require the committee chair to report the majority and dissenting opinions. Also, it is worth clarifying the number of Senators on the committee. 2-09-02.1, discussing the number of senators on the committee.
       3. Melville: I use words like “must” to indicate the minimum of 5 senators will prevail over the maximum of 1/5 the total number of Senators.
       4. Melville adds a section clarifying how the minimum of 5 senators shall prevail.
       5. Garrick: Length of review?
       6. Melville: Committee may have a 2-week window. We might need to alter the student body election code for the committee to fit effectively.
       7. Garrick: ARC could start before the end of the election.
       8. Melville: ARC members will come from the new class of Senators, so this will be impossible.
       9. Melville: Question – should ARC be required to submit a recommendation?
       10. Dunwoody: Beneficial to allow them to choose to submit the opinion.
       11. Melville: Committee rules are vague to allow them to successfully complete their duties. I want to give the committee as much leeway to do what it wants to do. It does not make sense for those with executive authority to decide every facet of how executives should be reviewed.
       12. Stirling: May struggle in the aspect of current Exec. Board reoccurring on the short list. Sometimes executives are reappointed between years, which could present difficulties.
       13. Pacella: Chief justice being on ARC is beneficial to provide feedback, to provide impartial knowledge.
       14. Pacella: Justices are meant to be impartial. Perhaps one or two Justices should be voting members.
       15. Melville: The purpose of the Chief Justice or their proxy on this committee is to serve as an impartial guide.
       16. Stirling: Agrees with Pacella.
       17. Beah: Asks questions about the role of the justice’s roles on the committee.
       18. Dunwoody: Agrees with Pacella and Stirling.
       19. McCormick: Also agrees.
       20. Melville: The purpose of the committee is to give Justices an opportunity to exercise their power to review executive applications.
       21. McCormick: Possible to have more justices be appointed?
       22. Stirling: We can test this committee through some sort of mock trial. We take an issue and have five of the Senators take a look at it. Then we can see how it affects everyone’s perceptions in the room.
       23. McCormick: We could take some of the Court applications, change their names, and use those.
       24. Melville: Mock issue or actual issue?
       25. Stirling: Actual issue, probably.
       26. Dunwoody: Will senate approve of this? Also, the Senate might benefit from having a diverse committee membership. Members should need to come from different colleges.
       27. Melville: Believes they will approve. Seeks feedback on diversity comment.
       28. McCormick: Believes diversity is key.
       29. Stirling: Sees the benefits but is it necessary?
       30. Dunwoody: Potential benefits of diversity. Increased impartiality. If a lot of senators come from a single college, there could be bias.
       31. McCormick: Further discusses possible bias in Nursing program organizations.
       32. Pacella: Downsides: Force less qualified members being appointed, representation by dept. isn’t very important.
       33. McCormick: Time commitments reflecting their qualifications with pharmacy, for example. Could apply to other programs.
       34. Stirling: Minimum of 3 college must be represented is an option.
       35. Melville: We should change the maximum number of members to 30%. 20% would likely maximize the committee at six members, if even.
       36. Garrick: Let review committee decide what to do about mandating committee diversity.
       37. Beah: Qualifications for senators. Some may be new or returning senators.
       38. Garrick: Non-binding recommendations from the committee could lead to a case of “rubber stamping”.
       39. Melville: ARC adds new element to the decision-making process, allows for more dialogue to occur.
       40. McCormick: Similar issue in other organization committee. Committee recommends, and the assembly can either accept or reject the recommendation.
       41. Garrick: Leave up to CCRC.
       42. Pacella: Time conflict while trying to submit opinions.
       43. McCormick: Setting minimum of submissions. Committee would have to recommend so many people.
       44. Dunwoody: Will look further into ABA review committee for judges to point committee into right direction.
       45. Stirling: Define the actions of 2-09-05.4
       46. Pacella: Do we want to look into creating a rule preventing the President from appointing individuals they are cohabitating with?
           1. McCormick: Comments on power dynamic, domestic abuse.
           2. Pacella: This could be difficult to pass in Senate.
           3. McCormick: Perhaps there is some component of the Student Code of Conduct that would prohibit this from happening.
           4. Garrick: The Student Court could submit a recommendation to the Student Senate to make this change.
           5. McCormick: Any change would require us to set very clear guidelines.
           6. Pacella: Consider setting rules that inhibit powerful members of co-habituating with insubordinate members.
   1. Taskforce Assignments
      1. Melville: no meeting next week so we should get a task force put together. Application, case procedure, court values, associate and assistant qualification and distinctions, references in the rules of the court are up-to-date. Most senior member will coordinate the meeting.
      2. Members of each task force: Senior members are **bolded.**
         1. Application review: Garrick and **McCormick**
         2. Case procedures: Pacella, McCormick, **Melville**
         3. Court values: **Stirling** and Dunwoody
         4. Associate and Assistant: Beah and **Melville**
         5. References: **Melville** and possibly McCormick. Tabled until later.
         6. Poster: Garrick and **Beah**.
7. Announcements and Comments
   1. No meeting next week.
   2. One-on-one meeting: Garrick and Dunwoody.
   3. Respond to the emergency poll meeting.
   4. Post-meeting social: Nov. 12th or Dec. 3rd. Check your schedules and let Melville know.
8. Review of Action Items
   1. Dunwoody 🡪 Ask instructor about ABA Committee.
   2. McCormick 🡪 Review Student Code of Conduct for Case of Cohabitation
   3. Taskforce Leaders 🡪 Mobilize Taskforce before next Court Meeting
   4. Justices 🡪 Review and Make Comments on Rules of the Court Google Doc
   5. Justices 🡪 Respond to Doodle Polls
9. Adjourn
   1. McCormick: Motion to Adjourn
   2. Dunwoody: Seconded. Passes
   3. Adjourned: 9:26 PM