Student Senate Special Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, April 6, 2010

1. Dean Modeste Presentation [Executive Session].

2. Roll call at 9:49 pm.

3. Officer's Reports.
   a. President.
      i. Admitted students' week this week. Thursday evening event, looking for volunteers to host students and pass out drink tickets at Pourhouse!
      ii. About 50% response rate for the survey right now, but encourage more people to fill it out if possible. 7 people will get $50 gift certificates for a restaurant of their choice.
      iii. Princeton professor's survey opportunity to get student feedback about interests.
      iv. Election schedule: candidate statements are due this Sunday at 9 pm. Electronic copy of 1 page candidacy form and two physical copies to the Senate mailbox. E-board elections the following week.
      v. Senate celebration this Friday evening. Outdoor picnic!
   b. Vice President.
      i. Nothing to report, but took straw poll on Barrister's (whether to go back to Pier 60).
   c. Treasurer.
      i. Passed a resolution allocating $105 to fund Outlaws for Blood Drive tabling.
   d. Secretary.
      i. Talked about the Blood Drive.
      ii. New web site!
   e. Parliamentarian.
      i. Gearing up for elections, run by SurveyMonkey.

4. Committee Reports.
   a. Graduation.
      i. Grad Ball tickets now on sale! $85, can pay online by credit card or pay at the table in JG lobby.
   b. IT.
      i. Asked about the wireless situation.
   c. Housing.
      i. Nothing new to report.
   d. Diversity Council.
      i. Holding an admitted students event, having representations from the different identity and religious groups to speak.
   e. Faculty Committees.
      i. None.

5. Recognition.
   a. Empowering Women of Color.
      i. Guest speaker presentation about the mission and goal of the group.
      ii. Q&A session.
1. Ravi asked why they didn't wait until the recognition process next semester. Group wanted to hit the ground running, get organized during the summer.
2. Nona asked what specific issues were different for women of color instead of women generally. Group said that they'd be welcoming for everyone.
3. Eric asked how the group differed from other groups, having them as a subset of the Women's Group or someone else. Group said that they considered this, but that CLWA was too broad and too big to adequately address their needs. Unique issues.
4. Leslieann suggested that a subcommittee of CLWA and would have lots of resources to support them. Group said that they didn't want to rank their issues and risk having their agenda subsumed under another group that might not adequately represent their interests.

iii. Debate.
   1. Ron said that he thought this was a good purpose, CLWA might be too broad to address their concerns.
   2. Nona supported the Recognition Committee's decision.
   3. Erol disagreed with the deference point, thought the merits should be discussed before the full Senate.

iv. Vote to recognize the group. 26-2 in favor. 38 present.

   i. Presentation by the group and its sponsors, Lisa Giunta.
   ii. Q&A session.
      1. Ron asked how many people were currently involved. Lisa said a little over 20 people, just through word of mouth.
      2. Leslieann asked if they had talked with the Military Association about joining them, or ways to distinguish this new group. Lisa said that they had consulted with them, but the Military Association would be both over and underinclusive. But would look forward to co-sponsoring events with them.

iii. Debate.
   1. Motion to call the question. Call for consent. No opposition. Group is recognized.

   a. 1 technical amendment. Previous requirement that there be 3 members from each class on the Budget Committee. Because there will only be 12 Senators from each class instead of 15 Senators, reducing that requirement to 2 senators from each class. Requires 2/3rds vote to pass by-law amendments.
   b. Q&A.
      i. Art asked whether he thought that 7 members would be enough to make budget decisions. Suggested that the minimum of 7 members be set higher to the current 9 member requirement.
   c. Debate.
      i. Nona reminded people that it was difficult getting people to join Budget Committee in the first place, and maybe a reduction in the minimum would be better.
      ii. Art thought that 7 was too few.
      iii. Ron supported that sentiment.
      iv. Amaris thought that 7 would be better because there was a lot of scheduling issues.
Shana asked how many people were currently on the committee. Gillian said 14 people. Made the motion to change the requirement for 2 people from each class, while keeping the minimum at 9.

1. Q&A on the amendment.
   a. Gillian asked whether the sponsors had considered the new groups added this year and the bigger workload with a smaller committee. Ben said yes.
   b. Oscar asked whether the 9 person number was firm or whether they would go higher. Shana and Art thought that it made sense given the reduction in the size of the Senate made sense.

2. Debate.
   a. Ben said it would be a friendly amendment if the sponsor changed the minimum to 8.
   b. Motion to call the question. Did not pass.
   c. Gillian said that an increased workload would hamper liaison's ability to meet with each group.
   d. Mia said that she supported raising it to 9, a more reasonable number than 7.
   e. Ron agreed.
   f. Oscar said that having only 7 people decide student group allocations might be too low.
   g. Camilo asked about increasing LLM representation to 2, would save the point for later.
   h. Ben said that the struggle last fall would be solved by lowering the requirement.
   i. Motion to extend debate. Does not pass.
   j. Motion to call the question. 24 in favor, 8 against, 2 abstained. Amendment passes.

vi. Motion from Camilo to increase the LLM representation to 2. Sponsors said the amendment was not friendly.

1. Q&A.
   a. Tony asked how many current LLMs were interested in being on the budget committee.
   b. Amaris and Nona asked how it was proportional. Camilo brought up the size of the LLM class.

2. Debate.
   a. Gillian said that the increase in minimum was used to force people to join, but this would not impact how many people actually served on the committee.
   b. Dave said the proportion shouldn't be in terms of class size, but on the number of LLM senators.
   c. Art said that Camilo said that had great points in that LLMs should have a voice, but this was not how to do it.
   d. Motion to call the question. Passed.
   e. Vote on the amendment. 6-24-1. Does not pass.

vii. Motion to call the question.

viii. Vote on amended resolution. 29-3-1.

7. Recommendations for the 2010-11 Senate.
a. Non-binding resolutions on next year's Senate. Gradman said that these proposals had not been in the by-laws because the committee didn't want to bind next year's senate. But still wanted it on record so that next year's Senate would know about these issues.

b. Ben presented the three proposals.

i. Automatic core funding. Concerns that the issues cause problems with the flexibility of the budget and recognition process. Recommended that next year's Senate replaced core funding with need-based funding.
   1. Q&A.
      a. No questions.
   2. Debate.
      a. Motion to call the question. Did not pass.
      3. Hand vote. Everyone present but 1 no vote, and 1 abstention.

ii. Establishment of third (late spring) recognition cycle. Also urges next year's Senate to give full deference to the committee's recommendation.
   1. Q&A.
      a. None.
   2. Debate.
      a. Austin thought the urging of deference was unnecessary. Motion to amend to take out that language. Erol seconded.
         i. Q&A.
            1. Erol asked whether absolute deference was wise.
            2. Mia asked whether the amendment's sponsors thought the proposal required absolute deference.
   ii. Debate.
       1. Motion to call the question. Passes.
   iii. Vote on whether to accept the amendment. 4-24-2.
      Does not pass.
   3. Motion to call the question. Passes.

iii. Committee Reform. Urges next Senate to reconsider the committee structure to move things along. Would redirect issues more to committees instead of before the full Senate at first. Would then pass along recommendations after considering the substantive issues.
   1. Oscar asked whether the issue could still reach the full Senate even if a committee rejected it. Ben said that there were safety valves, to prevent an issue for being sent to its death if it went to a committee and was rejected.
   2. Debate.
      a. Ron that these provisions might cause some problems.
      b. Nona pointed out that the details and provisions were non-binding and could be worked out next year.
      c. Motion to call the question.


a. Njoya wanted to introduce a resolution concerning the Immigration Clinic issue presented last week. Need a majority to get an issue on the agenda. Passed by majority vote.
   i. Njoya described the resolution in accordance with what was presented last week.
   ii. Q&A.
      1. Eric asked if there had a faculty sponsor. Njoya said that most faculty backed the project, and Mary Zulack was the point person.
iii. Debate.
   1. Motion to call the question. Passes.
   2. Vote. Call for consent, no objections. Resolution passes.

b. Leslieann asked about getting the administration to set up a 3L meeting to talk about the bar and insurance information for graduates.
   i. Ben said that the Handbook has most of this information. Could send out a reminder to the student body to read the information.
   ii. Jean commented that the school didn't remind people about the bar or MPRE.

c. Ron wanted to introduce a non-binding resolution getting the law school to recognize Election Day as a holiday.
   i. Yael said that the University Senate was currently considering the issue and it might be prudent to wait.
   ii. Vote to add the resolution to the agenda. Did not pass.

9. Announcements.
   a. Oscar thanked everyone that helped with the Blood Drive today.
   b. Jessica thanked the full Senate!

10. Adjournment at 11:18 p.m.