

Attendees: Mike Stearney, Adrian Canilho-Burke, Nate Krueger, Chloe Hansen, Mark Olkowski

Call to Order 2:00pm

2.26.13 – Meeting has been established with Student Court to meet with the Governance committee; to discuss and analyze the role of Student Court.

The Student Court voiced an opinion about certain concerns:

- The Court wishes to first establish, in regards to the making of the constitution, that Student Court should not be attending the Executive Board meetings or the Senate meetings unless the Court is reporting, presenting, etc. on issues that concern the Court.
- In the constitution and in the Court Bylaws, there needs to be clarification on the Chief Justice and what the procedure is if there is an absence in of a Chief Justice on the Court.
- The Court and or SGA need to create a consistent, specific format for the referendums.
- There was a discussion on the original intent of the Student Court. Mike gave a little background history on the creation of SGA and the Student Court.
 - o SGA structure and lay out was based on the Federal Government, but there was a problem with RHAA in the constitution because it is unclear as to how they relate and fit into the SGA structure. However, RHAA presence in the larger picture was thought to be necessary. Which means the Court was put in place originally to serve as a body that could interpret or clarify wording in the Constitution and/or bylaws, run elections, and serve as an objective forum for individuals or groups who seek to contest SUFAC funding if needed.
- We then discussed where we thought Student Court and its purpose had started to stray:
 - o We came to the conclusion that when referendums were added to the elections it complicated the system and made it more difficult.
 - o We found that there are not as many appeals to the Student Court now when it comes to interpreting or clarifying wording of the Constitution.
 - o This led to the conclusion that Student Court would be useful in serving on more student committees, such as, the Appeals committees for the Dean of Students. This would also help students gain some sort of experience toward their major. Along with this is noted that Student Court would basically have the ‘right to refusal’ first when it comes to appeal hearings. This would allow for a set group of people to receive the correct training and a go up the learning curve, The University may find it worth their time to invest in the education of this group because generally, Court members serve for a longer period (typically, more than one academic year).
- Another point made was that SUFAC appeals should maybe be changed to the court and not to SUFAC again.
- Another major point discussed was the number of members that we have funding for currently and how many court members we should have. There is confusion about whether the budget (and the Constitution) was officially adjusted to reflect 3 justices vs. the original 5 Justices. r, It seems that the documentation has gone missing and we are going to work to find that.
- Finally, Student Court and the Governance Committee recognized that it is important that we work toward becoming a more tech. savvy organization.

The meeting was ended at 3:00pm