Chair Henson calls meeting to order.

Potential VP Kendrick makes initial remarks during confirmation hearing, floor opened up for questions. Emphasis on efficiency of external appointments. Question asked on condition of flux in campus leadership, responds that she would be happy to work with any interim/new chancellor to ensure that progress continues on things like revising the general education requirements. Question asked on outreach for student government positions, responded that external appointments are a challenge to fill but that progress is being made to fill those positions by spreading applications to leaders of student organizations. Question asked on her greatest weakness, responded that dyslexia was hers, but it ensured that she proofread everything. Deliberation begins, established that she may not have been the top choice but that she was a very close second. Previous candidate says that she seemed like a good choice for the spot, and Chair Henson states that as far as qualifications go any one of the three candidates seemed like a valid choice. Agreed that this is a decision that should go before the whole Senate. Nominee passed without prejudice.

Nicholas Sengstaken brought forth to be Chief of Staff. Wants to bring an activist’s point of view to the office. Worked with NCPIRG extensively, going to bring some of those techniques to his office. Ensuring that there is at least some outreach to increase awareness of the things that student government brings to the table. Weakness is apparently an inability to hold himself back, question posed on what projects he is on right now, says that applications are a BIG part of current meetings. Visibility and awareness is also a very large problem for student government, and they are more than ready to improve this knowledge. Served with current administration, determined that there was a lack of trust between the branches of student government as well. Also would be able to leverage connections within student life and other organizations by using prior connections. Agrees that it is a problem, and they are poised to fix it this semester. Discussion entered by committee. Impressed that he is a triple major with other involvement, and his “hit the ground running” attitude is very welcome. Member that knows Nicholas says that he is very deliberate with his actions, making him a good candidate for a metric heavy position like chief of staff. He has a specific plan that runs deeper than talking points, a very good applicant. Discussion closed. Agreed that there is really no need to send him in front of full Senate, clear motion to pass favorably.

New candidate comes in, Ariel Freedman. Put forth as potential director of State and External Affairs. Brings in a resume and a 5 – year timeline. Acknowledges that the plan is vague, but it is intentional thanks to turnover and the potential for continuing administrations to keep the plan running. She would like to see more experience when it comes to lobbying and policy, but it would be nice to get younger students involved so they can begin to get experience. Leadership style is very involved, wants to ensure that conversations are had for every decision that can affect others. Asked how she will navigate the partisan side of the job. Says that she will personally try to be as bipartisan as possible, but also acknowledges that UNC has a mostly liberal name. Also says that she will emphasize conversations above all. Felt that there was a great lack of communication in the prior administration as far as projects went. Discussion begins. Ariel was the favorite as far as the prior committee was concerned. Also provided a concrete plan for student government outreach. Also appreciated the way that she looked beyond her present term, preventing a cycle of unraveling previous admins. Motion to pass favorably succeeds.

Nominee for treasurer comes in. President states that he is EXTREMELY qualified for the position of treasurer. Good knowledge of the process that fees can be implemented through, also emphasizes that he is happy to work with administrators to find how to better serve the student body. Biggest weakness is a demanding leadership style/perfectionism. Clearly very deep into finance from his resume. Discussion begins. Agreed that he is very qualified for the position, not much to debate. Discussion ends. Motion to pass favorably succeeds.

Honor Court Chair nominee comes in (Gabriela de Jesus), introduces herself. Seen nearly every sort of case, very experienced. Breaks her goals down into internal and external. External is emphasizing that the honor court is important and improving the relationship with the students. Many misconceptions about the way the court is ran, wants to smooth those out. Internally wants to cultivate easier transitions for members of the court to move into vice chair positions and eventually chairs. Says that the current chair may have had a problem of keeping up rationales, which became an issue because of the number of people in the process and the ways that they were edited. Wants to improve relationship between Honor Court chairs and the lower members. Discussion begins. Definite negative comments from honor court members. Scathing reviews from her members, big contrast from her speech in front of the committee. BIG concerns of bias from members of the court. Extreme distaste for the nominees. Motion put forth to reject the nominee. Motion passes. Disgust that the previous speaker didn’t pass word on that the candidates didn’t go forth before a committee.

Will not be able to hear from the Attorney General because no committee came together to review her nomination.

Abbet Gaddy is tapped for outreach coordinator for the Honor Court. Served as officer for student outreach, worked closely with prior outreach coordinator. Knows how to market the Honor System. Worked in and around with the Honor System and has lots of experience with the prior staff. Asked about her prior postings on social media in retaliation for someone’s political opinions that were published in Vanity Fair. Responds that she believes that it is irrelevant to the honor system because she keeps her political views separately from the honor system. Believes that her social media presence should be separate from her professional life. Questions begin to mount about how her political stance may affect her roles. Line of questioning eventually turns from politics to her plans for outreach for the Honor Court. Responds that time used during admitted student day could be very important in teaching new students about what is and what is not against the honor code. Desire to humanize the honor court, and possibly introduce students to the system before they have to interact with it in a negative manner. Wants to increase the number of outreach members from last year. Asked how she would assemble that team, responds that she would work inside the staff to find competent members. Gives a fairly choppy answer to this question. Discussion opens. Debate begins asking if we can fail nominees. Previous nominee reported as unfavorable. Chaos ensues as the group tries to determine if we can fail a nominee. Says that the committee cannot fail the nominee outright, but unfavorable passing might not be a fun road to go down because the nominee will be dragged in front of full Senate. Honor Court Chair nominee outright fails. Committee decides to go ahead and discuss the honor court outreach coordinator. Motion goes forth to pass unfavorably. Motion passes.

Steven begins to read off emails, apparently the first notification that she received was the email to come to committee. Ceremonial dropping of the ball at all levels, including by Mary Beth. Clarified that we are able to hear the Attorney General. Steven accepts responsibility for the last nominee and the administrative dumpster fire that has occurred.

Attorney General nominee comes in, (not sure how to spell name) not given instructions for any process tonight. Begins to speak, works as a career peer and has been involved in Honor Court defense for a lengthy period. Done numerous law internships and shadowed a district court judge. Extensive experience with the honor system and the law. Wants to revamp the online processes used to keep up with cases. Wants to consider feedback more often. Greater diversity and inclusion efforts can be implemented to help gain a broader perspective for the honor system. Ideal candidate is someone who is empathetic and has the capacity to improve. Knows what they can teach, but is also conscious of what they cannot teach. When asked about shortcomings of previous attorney general, actually takes a moment to think. States that deciding what violations to charge on social issues and protests was one of the harder decisions to make, and outreach could help this by determining what the University considers as integrity and if standards are being met as far as the University and faculty. Been on staff for a long time, excited for professional development inside the system. All members seem to appreciate her confidence under fire and her improvisation for the meeting. Motion to pass without prejudice. Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned at 10:09.