I. Call to Order
Chair Stelpflug called the meeting to order at 8:01 p.m.

II. Attendance
The following members were present: Brittany Clark, Andrew Lucas, Veeral Saraiya, Laura Tollini, Bennett Vass, Peter McClelland, Chair Stelpflug

The following members were absent: Elise Rosa

The following members arrived late: Adam Norris

III. New Business
Speaker Brady made a motion to reorder the agenda to hear SCR-95-017 before the election of the vice-chair. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

a. Resolutions
   i. SCR-95-017: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE APPOINTMENTS TO THE UNDERGRADUATE HONOR COURT

Chair Tilley explained the selection process for the appointments. He introduced the following individuals: Aanya Udyavar, Amber Pritchard, Anne Burke Baldridge, Basil Kazi, Bayly Hassell, Brandon Napier, Caroline Zullo, Carrie Parker, Catherine Wilson, Channing Mitzell, Christopher Jones, Cindy Velasquez, Debanjali Kundu, Ernest Thompson, Esteban Socarras, Hussein Ahmad, Imani Augustus, Isaac Warshauer, Jesse Crayle, John Raphael Rodrigo, Justin Reid, Lindsay Gorman, Mary Michael McDuff, Maxuel Lamb, Michael Jushchuk, Mijung Shim, Nicholas Gratto, Nicole Behnke, Pete Diaz, Peter Wu, Jane Jenkins, Safiya Ismail, Sarah Molina, Scott Morgan, Seth Barker, James (Thomas) Gooding, Tavia Gonzalez Pena, William Almquist, William Whitehurst, Jr.

He stood for queries about the selection process and new members. Representative Lucas asked what characteristic he used to narrow down to 39 candidates. Chair Tilley explained that it was primarily an awareness of the honor code, the purpose of an honor code, reasoning capabilities, and what sort of representation is brought in terms of the communities they’re appointed to.

Chair Brady made a motion to divide the highlighted names to be put on the general orders calendar and divide the question. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

A motion was made to reorder the agenda and place election of the vice-chair last. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

**ii. SCR-95-007: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT’S APPOINTMENT TO THE STUDENT UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING AWARDS**

Student Body President Lambden asked congress to report without prejudice because of a miscommunication.

Speaker Brady moved to report without prejudice. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

**iii. SCR-95-008A: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT’S APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT CONDUCT**

Student Body President Lambden asked for a motion to divide the bill to SCR-95-008A to include David Russell, who was absent, and asked that it be reported without prejudice.

Speaker Brady so moved. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

**iv. SCR-95-008B: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT’S APPOINTMENTS TO THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT CONDUCT**

President Lambden introduced the following individuals: David Khrakovsky, Anna Bobrow, and Alex Karsten.

Speaker Brady asked what qualified them for the job. It was explained that Khrakovsky is a returning member, and the other two came with high recommendations. All brought high logical reasoning and a willingness to listen objectively.

Representative McClelland moved to report favorably. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

**v. SCR-95-009: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT’S APPOINTMENTS TO THE STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR**

President Lambden introduced the following individuals: Ian Bolohan, Lauren Friedmann.
Representative McClelland asked what the priorities in advising the new chancellor were. Bolohan said that it was important to address the year’s challenges, maintain the previous administration, and to make changes necessary to meet students needs. The primary concern would be representing the student voice. Friedmann said that on SAC there was a sense that Thorp was out, so they were able to do a lot of valuable things. She wanted to make sure that the projects would continue and barriers would continue to be broken down.

Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek asked if SAC already had outreach meetings with students. Bolohan said that in SGA there is a lot of surveying on committee and organizations, but developing new ways to get in touch with students is important. Friedmann said that a lot of people were in tough with committees, but she’s also open to reaching out to diversity groups, such as the Campus Y.

Speaker Brady moved to report favorably. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

vi. SCR-95-010: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BOARD OF ELECTIONS CHAIRPERSON
President Lambden introduced Robert Windsor, a pre-med biology/history double major with a chemistry minor. He’s been on the board of elections for two years now and knows how the system works.

Chair Burney asked if he came across any problems in the last election. Windsor said that it was the first time the new point system was put in place and it was really good, but they are working out some problems.


vii. SCR-95-011: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE STUDENT SUPREME COURT
President Lambden introduced Nainisha Chintalapudi, having worked with her closely in mock trial.

Chair Burney asked what experience she had. She explained that she’d done mock trial in high school and had also worked with offices in Wake County. She explained to Representative McClelland that she was familiar with the student code, and she explained to Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek that it’s important to look at both sides of a story, keep an open mind, and listen to everything.


viii. SCR-95-012: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE STUDENT SUPREME COURT
Mary Ellen Goode joined the meeting via Skype. She said she was qualified because of her character, integrity, and her past endeavors. She is reserved, organized, and disciplined, all of which facilitate the ability to serve on student supreme court. She cares a lot about honor, is kind of serious, and personal responsibility is of the utmost importance. She stood for queries.

Chair Clark made a motion to report favorably. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

ix. SCR-95-013: A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SOLICITOR GENERAL
Raquel Dominguez introduced herself and explained that she’d represent student government if there were ever a lawsuit filed against them. She had a strong interest in law, has served on the attorney general staff, and is excited to work with the real judicial system.


IV. Election of the Vice-Chair
Speaker Brady nominated Representative McClelland. He accepted. Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek moved to close nominations. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

Speaker Brady moved to elect Representative McClelland by acclamation. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

Vice-Chair McClelland took the floor.

V. New Business (Revisited)
b. Bills
   i. SCB-95-004: A BILL TO CONDUCT ELECTIONS BY PREFERENTIAL BALLOT
Representative Ferguson presented the bill. He said this would change elections a little – runoff elections cost money, takes more time, and less voters show up to a second election because of voter fatigue. This bill would change the election to an instant runoff. This would only be for a student body president single-winner election, not multi-office elections.

Chair Clark asked why it was vetoed before. Representative Ferguson explained that the board of elections said the computer system is now capable of dealing with it – they couldn’t before. This is how NC State and Duke do elections.

Speaker Brady asked Windsor if that could be implemented this year. Windsor said that the system would be capable of handling this.
Speaker Brady voiced his concern that asking a student to rank the presidential nominees could skew the results. Chair Stelpflug said that the board of elections is given an extension of time they can request to implement the system.

Representative Ferguson said that if they can’t find a working computer system than they’re not going to be forced to do an instant runoff.

Speaker Brady moved to report favorably. Seconded – some objections.

Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek said that it sounded like a feasible bill – 1300 more people would’ve voted in the last election. Speaker Brady said that it would alter elections, but he didn’t think there was enough student input. President Lambden said that he didn’t think that students would be informed enough to use the new voting system. Representative Stelpflug suggested a possible referendum. Speaker Brady said that he’d be open to a referendum, but the biggest obstacle would be to educate the electorate. President Lambden said he believed it’d take up time and money.

Representative Ferguson said that he contacted every stakeholder he could think of, but he thought if NC State and Duke could implement it, Carolina shouldn’t have any problem figuring it out. He also said the DTH editorial had positive feedback.

Chair Stelpflug said at best, it could dramatically improve the system, and at worst it would only marginally improve it. In the runoff, Lamden only won by 3%, but he won by a large margin in the general election. He came close to losing because people didn’t show up to vote.

Speaker Brady said that assumed things that couldn’t be assumed. He said that an extra week of campaigning could make the difference.

He moved the previous question. Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek and Chair Clark objected. Speaker Brady withdrew.

Representative Saraiya asked if there would be a way to go through the ranking and then still have a runoff, in order to make a comparison. Speaker Guzek said that it’s a disservice to vote twice if they’re losing 1,000 voices in the process. He agrees students need to be educated, but he also thought Carolina students would be able to handle the system.

Representative Tollini asked if you ranked only two people, and those two people weren’t at the top, would that vote be counted? Representative Ferguson said votes still count, but if their votes aren’t in contention they don’t end up making a difference.

President Lambden said that he wasn’t going to speculate about his election, but that it’s absurd amount of time to be campaigning for four weeks, and he also
wouldn’t oppose a reduction in the amount of money that they’re allotted, so he would support a reduction in money and the campaigning period. He didn’t support this bill, however.

Chair Clark said that since the elections were online, she believed that students would be able to use their resources to get educated about the presidential candidates, and then make informed votes.

Representative Ferguson said that he encouraged congress to talk to constituents, and that students wouldn’t have to learn how to strategically vote. He believed that the board of elections would be able to handle the new system.

Chair Stelpflug said that the board of elections could be trusted to explain the process, and he doesn’t think it’s terrible complicated from a voter perspective, and that the website would provide instructions as well.


ii. SCB-95-005: A BILL TO REFORM THE INSTRUMENT OF STUDENT JUDICIAL GOVERNANCE

Representative Guzek presented, yielding time to Attorney General Sturkey. She said this is the biggest reform in the honor system in a long time. They worked with administrators and students and they know that change will happen. Chair Tilley also presented the bill, giving background about the reform efforts. The last four years have involved dialogues, and the goal is the protection of due process rights for all students.

The first of the proposals involved reducing the burden of proof to clear and convincing evidence. The second is to replace the usual sanction of suspension and a failing grade with a minimum sanction of a warning letter and a failing grade (as well as adding a table of levels of sanctions. They also want to add a faculty member to the hearing panel.

Representative Saraiya asked for an example to distinguish between clear and convincing vs. beyond a reasonable doubt. Chair Tilley said that in general, the statistics from case tracking showed that 95% of the cases concerning plagiarism went guilty, but 50% that involved cheating were found to be guilty. Many students say they knew the student was guilty, but they didn’t feel like they could say “beyond a reasonable doubt,” which they considered to be video footage.

Chair Tilley explained that the burden of proof isn’t low, however, due process is different than the judicial system. Representative McClelland asked what an example of clear and convincing evidence would be. Chair Tilley said he can’t speak to specific cases, but possibly a witness could be considered clear and convincing.
The dean of the law school voiced his support for the bill, further explaining the difference between clear and convincing and beyond a reasonable doubt.

Representative Tollini asked if the different was just how people interpret the phrase, and the dean agreed. He said that many people push beyond a reasonable doubt to mean ANY doubt, and that’s not fair for due process. The attorney general explained that people would be trained on the new language.

Representative McClelland said that a better solution would be to educate the members on the honor court on what beyond a reasonable doubt means, rather than lowering the standard itself. Chair Tilley said that the court members interpret what the community decides, and they want to ensure minimum inconsistencies. The attorney general said that general community consensus is the standard she wants everybody to be held accountable to.

Dean Meyers explained that faculty would serve on hearing panels, not be involved in the sanctioning process, to uphold the academic integrity for the entire committee, including faculty. This would create a more directly educational alternative process for minor academic isolations, minimize the adversarial nature of the honor system, and process minor violations.

Representative McClelland objected to lowering the burden of proof. He said it’s not criminal law, but it is a suspension and a mark on the transcript, so he would prefer having a higher burden of proof.

Representative Lucas said that the worry would be logistically how it would work having a faculty member sitting there.

Chair Tilley told Representative McClelland that lowering the burden of proof would allowed for investigation to happen.

Representative McClelland said that if more cases are brought and the lower standard of proof found more people guilty, wouldn’t that just exacerbate the problem? President Lambden said that he supported the combination of lowering the burden of proof and lowering the usual sanction. He said the honor court needed to promote faculty buy-in and hold us to a higher academic standard, which is what lowering the burden of proof does.

Representative Saraiya asked what safeguards were in place to prevent students trying to target another student? Chair Tilley explained that there would also have to be evidence showing the student was guilty.

Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek echoed the comments that President Lambden said.
Dean Meyers said that he was a huge proponent of the students, and allowed faculty in would let the faculty see how awesome the students are, as opposed to honor court saying “I can't tell you what happened, but trust me.”

Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek moved to report favorably. Seconded. Representative McClelland wanted to report without prejudice, but Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek refused to withdraw. The motion passed – Representative McClelland and Saraiya opposed.

iii. SCB-95-006: A BILL TO ESTABLISH LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANTS
Speaker Brady took the floor. He explained the bill would establish the ability of Speaker Pro Tempore and Committee Chairs to appoint legislative assistants, similar to the executive branch assistants. They're purposely vague of duties, but they'd be responsible for completing legislative tasks, and they won't be paid. This would also open up another opportunity for somebody to get involved in congress behind legislative sessions.

Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek asked if he had plans to nominate an assistant for himself. He said he didn't have one in mind immediately.

Representative McClelland moved to report favorably. Seconded. Consent. No objections – the motion passed.

VI. Adjournment
Speaker Pro Tempore Guzek motioned to adjourn. Seconded. Consent. No objections -- the meeting was adjourned at 9:54.