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WHEREAS it the responsibility of the GSC to review all proposed judicial changes, and veto those that are not in the interests of the graduate population, and

WHEREAS the GSC By-Laws do not presently contain a formal mechanism for reviewing proposed judicial changes, and

WHEREAS it will make life easier on everyone if such a review procedure is specified,

THEREFORE let it be approved by the Graduate Student Council of Stanford University

THAT the following be added as Article IV of the GSC By-Laws:

Article IV: Proposed Judicial Changes

Section 1: Review of Draft and Proposed Judicial Changes

A. Proposed judicial changes shall consist of the following:

1. Amendments to the Judicial Charter, which require GSC approval.
2. New or modified Judicial Board By-Laws, which may be vetoed by the GSC.
3. New or modified provisions of the Student Conduct Penalty Code, which may be vetoed by the GSC.
4. Any other changes related to the University judicial process, which require the approval of, or may be vetoed by, the GSC.

B. Draft judicial changes shall consist of non-finalized versions of any potential proposed judicial change, i.e. those which have not yet been formally approved by the relevant judicial body.

C. Judicial Review Committee

1. Upon receipt of a notice of a draft or proposed judicial change, the GSC Chair shall form a Judicial Review Committee, hereafter referred to as a JRC. The JRC shall consist of all GSC members interested in reviewing the judicial changes.
2. The JRC shall select its own Chair and determine its own procedures.
3. The JRC is encouraged to contact the judicial body proposing the judicial changes to discuss any concerns that arise, particularly if it plans to recommend that the judicial changes be rejected. In the latter case, the JRC is encouraged to work with the relevant judicial body to develop mutually acceptable revisions of the judicial changes.
4. The JRC shall report back to the GSC in a timely manner with its recommendations for the judicial changes, along with the reasons for the recommendations. If the JRC recommends that a judicial change should be vetoed, the recommendation should include a description of the modifications that would be required for the JRC to recommend approval.

Section 2: Consideration of Draft and Proposed Judicial Changes

A. The GSC shall consider the JRC’s recommendations, in the form of a bill that lists each judicial change as a separate item. This bill must be previous-noticed and contain the complete text of the JRC’s recommendations.
B. Failure to consider a given judicial change bill shall not be equivalent to approval of that bill, or of any of the judicial changes in it.
C. Each proposed judicial changes may be approved or vetoed.
D. Draft judicial changes may be provisionally approved or vetoed. Such action shall serve only to indicate to the relevant judicial body the GSC’s position on the current language of the judicial change.
E. A provisional approval/veto of a draft judicial change binds the GSC as to eventual approval or rejection of the corresponding proposed judicial change only if the language of the proposed judicial change is identical to the corresponding draft judicial change.