I. Call to Order 9:15 p.m. – roll taken, 42 present

II. Officer Reports

 a. President’s Report
   i. Charles Wolf appointed head chair the housing committee.
   ii. Rex Chatterjee appointed head of the newsletter committee.
   iii. There’s now a clock in the lobby of the law school, thanks to the Student Senate
       1. The Senate can accomplish great “little” things. Examples – i.e. the lobby
          and Lenfest Café (but not the color scheme)
   iv. Basecamp participation
   v. Call for volunteers to sit for office hours.
      1. Steven Wu
      2. Eric Lindemann
      3. Meredith Uhl
      4. Andrew McCormick
      5. Eric Wolkoff
      6. Kathrin Schweisinger
      7. Scott McJanett
      8. Brittany Schoepf
      9. Kevin Boremund
     10. Kahlil Williams
     11. Charles Wolf
     12. Dan Shin
     13. Jessica Isokawa
     14. L. David Peters
   vi. Next meeting Monday, October 6 – Dean MGK will speak. Dean Schizer will
       attend another meeting. Please refrain from using laptops.
   vii. Following meeting will be Monday, October 20 (tentative)
   viii. Thank you to the budget committee for student group allocations and student
        group recognition committee.

 b. Vice President
   i. Social committee will meet after this general meeting to decide on a regular
      meeting time. Everyone is welcome to serve on the committee.

c. Treasurer
   i. Budget committee met for 16 hours this weekend and held a very efficient
      meeting – ended up less than $4000 over budget.

d. Secretary
   i. Community Action committee will meet in the next two weeks.

 e. Parliamentarian

III. Committee Reports

 a. Graduation
   i. Had a productive brainstorming session.
   ii. Call for volunteers

 b. University Senate
   i. First plenary meeting last week. Discussed ROTC. Attempting to put together a
      university wide survey.
   ii. Manhattanville developments. Potential coordination with SIPA.
   iii. President followup on ROTC: group was created on Basecamp to discuss
        possible student senate action. Call for volunteers, email the e-board.

IV. Recognition of New Student Groups

 a. Recognition Chair report: twelve groups revised their Constitutions since last spring.
    Eleven new groups.
 b. Revised groups: ALSA, BLSA, CalSoc, CLABLA, Devinimus, Entertainment and Sports,
    Harlem Tutorial Project, HSLI, Law Revue, Outlaws, Society of Law Society and Tech,
    Tenants’ Rights Project all submitted new Constitutions.
i. Some technical changes. DeVinimus rewrote their constitution.
ii. BLSA’s approval is contingent upon the group revising its non-discrimination
    statement during the 2008-2009 school year.
iii. Call for question and answer (none)
iv. Call for debate (none)
v. Vote on revised groups
    1. Call for consent (Shin) – no objections.
    2. Student group revised constitutions approved as a group.
    3. new Constitutions will be posted on the G-drive

c. Eleven groups applied for Senate recognition.
i. Beltway Bound
ii. Building a Better Legal Profession
iii. Columbia Gastronomy Society
iv. Columbia International Arbitration Association
v. Columbia Law School Military Association
vi. Columbia Law School Whisky Society - withdrawn
vii. InSITE
viii. Intra Vivos Social Club
ix. Law Students for Social Enterprise
x. Universities Allied for Essential Medicines
xi. Yoga Club

d. Motion to consider Intra Vivos recognition separately.
i. Question and answer period.
    1. Request for explanation of student groups. Liaison explains
       a. Beltway Bound – help CLS students interested in working in
          Washington DC
       b. Building a Better Legal Profession – seeks to improve conditions
          in the legal industry, maternity leave, law firm work policies.
       c. CGS – group for those interested in the culinary arts, meet with
          chefs, visits to restaurants, cheese tastings.
       d. CIAA – Large LLM population. Discussion forum for
          International Arbitration, distinct from the moot court student
          groups.
       e. CLS Military Association – for those interested
       f. InSITE: Joint activity between CLS, Columbia Business School,
          and NYU Business School
       g. Intra Vivos - well rounded well raised individual in a NYC
          setting. Etiquette lessons, networking, young professional
          lessons.
       h. Law Students for Social Enterprise – for those interested in
          working for the public good from the private sector.
       i. Universities Allied for Essential Medicines – ensuring
          biomedical end products are made more accessible in poor
          countries, increase resources directed toward resources on
          diseases
       j. Yoga Club – law students practicing yoga once a week. A
          member is a certified instructor.
    2. Criteria committee uses in considering the groups.
       a. Section 6 of the By Laws. Consider the Constitutions, name,
          coherent purpose, procedural requirements, beneficial purpose
          (making sure it doesn’t overlap with a current group), checking
          for prohibited activities, all law students have to be eligible.
ii. Motion to consider Intra Vivos separately accepted. (Lear)
iii. Motion to consider InSITE separately. (Shin). Accepted.
iv. Motion to consider UAEM separately (Grewe). Accepted.
v. Motion to consider Yoga Club separately. Accepted.
vi. Motion to consider Gastronomy separately. Accepted.
vii. Decision to consider each student group separately.
e. Beltway Bound
   i. Question and Answer period.
      1. Question about non-discrimination policy – the group never got back to
         their liaison on revising it. (Goldberg) Missing disability, political
         expression.
         a. Option to recognize the group conditionally (Schweisinger)
         b. Parliamentarian clarification on non-discrimination clauses: All
            student groups need to have a non-discrimination clause.
            Groups have to take the language verbatim or incorporate the
            bylaw section by reference.
      2. Why do we need to redebate groups already discussed by the committee?
         (Lear)
         a. It was approved by the recognition committee conditionally
            (Goldberg) and they didn’t, therefore it’s appropriate to
            reconsider.
   ii. Debate
      1. Motion to conditionally approve Beltway Bound (Schweisinger) – second
         (many)
   iii. Vote to approve
      1. Call for consent – no objections – approved conditionally
f. Building a Better Legal Profession
   i. Question and Answer period
      1. What kind of activities does this group have planned (Shin)
         a. Attempt to gather information about law firms i.e. the average
            billable hours, encourage firms to support balanced lives
            (Pagano Filho)
         b. This will be a branch of a national organization that this group
            can work with. (Grewe)
   ii. Debate (none)
   iii. Vote
      1. Call for consent – no objections – approved for new student group
         recognition.
g. Columbia Gastronomy Society
   i. Question and Answer Period
      1. Can we recognize them but condition their spending? (Wu)
         a. Yes, that’s why we have a recognition and budget committee.
            We rely on the budget committee to ensure that money is not
            misspent (Miller).
      2. How many members do they currently have? (Wolkoff)
         a. Seven dues paying members (Kahlil). The minimum.
      3. What is the stated mission? (Batra)
         a. Brickner reads the statement – foster understanding of food.
      4. Is the idea to be like Devinimus? (Leavitt)
         a. Yes (Wolf). They have events planned with other groups.
   ii. Debate
      1. Won’t vote against approving them, but general concern that Student
         Senate approves too many food/drinking clubs and we’re exhausting
         the need for them on campus. (Wolkoff)
      2. There isn’t a group on campus yet that focuses on food and not drinking.
         (Shin)
      3. All these groups will demand high membership fees so they’ll die out
         when there’s on interest – self regulating (Schweisinger)
      4. They also focus on preparation (Wolf).
   iii. Vote
      1. Call for consent – no objections – approved.
h. Columbia International Arbitration Association
   i. Question and Answer Period.
      1. What are the group’s activities? (Shin)
a. Gather people interested in international arbitration, a growing field of law.
   b. Arthur Frontie, LLM(sp?) founder of the club speaks to its purpose: the moot court programs don’t plan events, the group wants to get more people involved.

ii. Debate
   1. LDP: Was approached by many students who support this organization. Similar to how there are interest groups for certain groups of law (i.e. real estate or private equity). There’s a lot of JD interest in this area, not just LLM interest. Good way to be up on emerging trends of the law.
   2. Support from Gillian, the group’s liaison.

iii. Vote
   1. Call for consent – no objections – approved.

i. CLS Military Association
   i. Question and Answer Period
   ii. Debate
      1. Move to call the Question (Lear) – no objections
   iii. Vote
      1. Call for consent (Schweisinger) – no objections – approved.

j. InSITE:
   i. Question and Answer Period
      1. Are only a small number of people involved? (Shin)
         a. Schweisinger – from the Constitution it’s unclear. There are 40 members in the program.
      2. Why do we need to recognize them if it’s an inter-school activity? (Shin)
         a. The group tried to push with student services last year. We pushed them to get recognized here. The main resource they need is an email address. (Schweisinger) Unknown if they requested funding.
   ii. Debate
      1. It’s limited, there are only a handful of CLS students involved, it’s unclear what their value is to the entire school (Shin).
      2. Clarification – this is the first time they’ve sought recognition (Schweisinger). Encourages their approval because it stresses an important aspect of the law school, very business-minded. We recognize lots of small groups.
      3. Funding – they have $300 core funding only. We shouldn’t not recognize them because of their size – there are lots of small student groups (LDP).
      4. Events are open to the entire school? (Shin) Yes. (LDP) Otherwise they wouldn’t be eligible for funding.
      5. Schweisinger clarifies that you have to try out for a position in the club.
   iii. Vote
      1. Call for consent – no objections – approved.

k. Intra Vivos Social Club
   i. Question and Answer
      1. Request to hear the mission statement. Request to it be summarized because it’s two pages. (Lear)
         a. Parliamentarian summarization: build professional skills, encourage work-life balance and community. Have social events, develop and maintain relationships, encouraging a well developed personal life, plan inclusive events to improve vital personal connections between young lawyers.
      2. There’s a lot of overlap with the Social Committee – how does it work if a group wants to work with Social Committee? (Louie)
         a. VP met with a leader of the organization and is enthusiastic about them contributing to the social committee’s attempts to build community. Right now they have core funding and
funding for one event. Most of the funding will come through joint events with the social committee and Will wants to get them involved.

3. Extension of Q&A. (non)

ii. Debate

1. Group has merit despite its overlap with the social committee. Attempt to get CLS students involved with the larger NYC community. They’ve been allocated for funding a concert at Webster Hall and doing things like this will benefit the entire community. (Uhl)

iii. Vote

1. Call for consent – no objections – approved.

l. Law Students for Social Enterprise

i. Q&A (none)

ii. Debate (non)


m. Universities Allied for Essential Medicines

i. Question and Answer Period

1. What is this group’s association with the law school? (Greiwe)
   a. There’s a university chapter but they deal more with policy issues. This group feels approaching it from a legal standpoint will be beneficial. There’s an articulate purpose. The leader wants to work with professors and complement the university chapter’s scientific basis. (Fogam)

2. Has the leader met with the university chapter? (Greiwe) Are they not receptive to incorporating a legal perspective?
   a. Leader was a member of the university chapter and felt they weren’t particularly receptive (Fogam).

3. If this is a national group, do the have a legal aspect in any of the chapters? (Crawford) – the question was already answered.

ii. Debate

1. Shin attended this group’s meetings as a 1L. It’s a group with an interdisciplinary focus. Involves providing affordable medicines internationally. (Shin)


n. Yoga Club

i. Question and Answer

1. How many members does this group have? Is the teacher a law student? How do they distinguish themselves from more general fitness groups? (Patrick)
   a. Instructor is a 1L. Membership is well above the minimum (Brickner).
   b. Membership is about 30 so far but there’s a lot of interest. (Gillian)

2. Do they take all levels of people? (Miller)
   a. Yes. (Gillian)

ii. Debate

1. Motion to call the question – no objections.


o. All groups were approved.

p. Motion to approve all groups conditional upon them being in line with non-discrimination policies (Brickner). Call for consent – no objections – approved.

V. Fiscal Year 2009 Budget

a. Presentation (Treasurer)

i. Overview of changes

1. Revenues increased because of the increased student activities fee.
2. Ticket sales similar numbers from last year.
   a. Offset of $3000 from revenue from grad ball sales because of the grad ball public interest subsidy.
b. 15,000 income from barrister ball tickets.

c. Crush quiz revenues bring in $150.

3. Expenses
   a. Administrative fees went up slightly, we’re not quite sure why, perhaps attached to the increased student activity fee.
   b. Student group allocations stayed roughly the same – slightly more allocated in the fall because of increases in the fall.
   c. Capital allocation is new and approved.
   d. Social committee increase.
   e. Grad committee increase.
   f. General fund is slightly smaller. Money was moved from the general fund to the grad committee and social committee.
   g. Unanticipated expenses is what used to be kept in the budget as a surplus.

b. Question and Answer Period:
   i. Why doesn’t the # for event allocations match the number on the spreadsheet with the line items? (Shin)
      1. Probably because you’re looking at old documents.
   ii. Many line items could be classified as capital allocations, has that been taken into account? (Shin)
      1. Yes (LDP)
   iii. Are the grad ball expenses in line with past years? (Shin)
      1. It’s an increase from $52,000 to $54,000. (LDP)

c. Debate:
   i. There’s a lower buffer than usual. If groups start up mid-year we might not have enough to fund them because money is allocated from the outset. (Shin)
      Referring to ad hoc fund pool.
   ii. The ad-hoc buffer is lower because the budget committee wanted groups to plan ahead. The amount left over is consistent with previous years and the budget committee funded events with relatively little planning (Lear).
   iii. How fungible? (Shin))
      1. If something has been overallocated, it can be revised mid-year (LDP).
      2. This is in line with general funding in the past. (LDP)
   iv. The Senate approves the budget but the treasurer does have flexibility throughout the year if unanticipated expenses come up. Necessity of maneuverability. The treasurer will then notify the Senate. (Miller)

d. Vote to approve the estimated budget for the Fiscal Year 2009 Budget.
   i. Motion to approve (Crawford). Second (Batra).
   ii. Vote: 39-0-3
   iii. Budget accepted.

VI. Student group allocations:
   a. Presentation: (Treasurer)
      i. Spreadsheet went out as a PDF. Budget committee approved each event on a line-item basis.
      ii. There is an appeals process. Groups can appeal within a week. Budget committee will consider the appeal (accept/reject) before presenting to the Senate. Typically there are only 1-2 appeals per year.

b. Question and Answer
   i. If we want to debate a specific allocation when do we do that? (Eric)
      1. During the debate period you can make an amendment. (President)
   ii. Can the capital expenditures be explained? (Sparks)
      1. Made similar to event decisions. More conservative on capital allocations. Goal was to get through the budget. The discussion was similar but came from a different pool of money. Different capital expenses weren’t approval but seemed necessary to the student groups so they will work with student services. (LDP)
   iii. Can allocations can be increased for one or more specific groups without reducing the allocations for the other groups? (Hiram)
1. Yes, a vote to amend for more funds doesn’t have to mean a reduction in funds for another group. (Miller)
2. The budget can be amended up to the limit we just approved but not individual line items so that the expenses are more than 82,000. (LDP)
3. The approved budget is only conditional so that’s not entirely correct. (Miller)

iv. Question about CIAA and CLABLA Board of Advisors Reception. What does that entail? (Shin)
   1. Board of Advisors Reception is a networking opportunity—practitioners beyond the board of advisors. Opportunity for 60+ law students to mingle with practitioners in an informal setting. Open to the entire school. (LDP)

v. What does it mean amount requested and then a dash? (LDP)
   1. It means they didn’t request money but are just cosponsoring.

vi. Point of information: People should ask questions rather than make amendments in the debate session because the budget committee can present a well-thought-out rationale. (Lear)

vii. IVSC requested $40 for a concert and was funded $300. Request for explanation. (Batra)
   1. The group wasn’t funded for any of its other events and all their resources are pulled into the one event. (Uhl—liaison)
   2. Last year liaisons were encouraged to come up with recommendations. This year liaisons were encouraged to whittle down group requests to be consistent with last year. Goal was managing expectations and more events were funded fully. (LDP)

viii. YJA – Wants an explanation for the Education Advocacy Project Training – they requested $150 and were funded $100. Line 866-867. (Sparks)
   1. Would require going back to look at the request forms. (LDP)
   2. The event is co-sponsored and the rest of the money is with another group. (Lear)

ix. Film screening by CJAN was funded $75 rather than $150 like all the other groups. Why? (Batra)
   1. Cosponsorship consideration (Uhl)
   2. No snacks requested (Crawrod)
   3. They didn’t specify that they were serving dinner (Goldberg)
   4. Shouldn’t we have assumed they wanted to serve dinner because of the amount requested? (Batra)
      a. We don’t fund based on what groups request because they’re often ill-informed requests. (Lear)

x. CLABLA questions – why wasn’t the web site funded and why was only $250 given to the panel on Latin America Capital Markets? (Hiram)
   1. Web sites were generally not funded (Crawford).
   2. The committee set standards—the $250 was the amount agreed upon for evening panels and dinners. Unless there was an overriding reason, the budget committee funded evening events at $250. (LDP). This year there were more group than in the past so groups were funded less.
   3. CLABLA requested less money then last year and they requested items that Senate doesn’t typically fund (Dubin). For example, the room fee covered by student services, security fees,

   1. They are two distinct events with a workshop component (Lear)

xii. What are the guidelines for happy hours in relation to TVSO in particular? (Chu)
   1. TVSO was funded generously last year and the Senate encourages this sort of integration but they were funded less this year.

xiii. Motion to extend Q&A by five minutes (Shin) – seconded – call for consent – no objections.

xiv. Happy hours were generally funded $150. (Lear)

xv. Question about Columbia Card Club and the $200 for poker chips (Wolkoff).
1. It was a capital expense. Card club finds that when they have a Texas Hold 'Em Club they've always been oversubscribed by at least 20 people. They have to cut people off because of the number of chips they have. (Pete)

xvi. Question about Cal Soc Six Panel Practice Groups? They get over $1000 funding. (Shin)
   1. Funded at the minimum ($150/lunch) they’re popular events and good networking opportunities. CalSoc was very reasonable about their budget requests this year. Firms target different practice areas. (ShiN)
   2. Don’t the firms normally fund the lunch? (ShiN)
      a. Probably will get additional funding but CalSoc events are expensive.
   3. Are these panels scheduled for after Nov. 1 and in compliance with NALP guidelines? (Sparks)
      a. Not sure, but they’re not official recruiting events. (Lear)
      b. They’re not recruiting events but are aimed at introducing students to different practice groups. (Bolar)

xvii. Did budget committee come up with a policy on Devinimus? (Batra)
   1. It’s paid membership but anyone can go if they pay the per event entrance fee. (LDP)

xviii. Motion to extend Q&A by five minutes (Crawford) – second (Shin) – call for consent – no objections – approved.

xix. Film screenings are generally disfavored. Why are three approved for SALDF? (Shin)
   1. There’s no policy – formal or informal – discouraging film screenings. (Lear)
   2. Last year many film screenings were funded. (Miller)

   c. Debate
      i. Motion to amend: Move to reduce Alpine Society core funding from $300 to $0 because they’re not a recognized student group. (Kathrin)
         1. Friendly (LDP)
         2. If a group is recognized mid-semester it will get core-funding. Some groups didn’t submit recognition materials.
         3. Pete (Alpine Society’s liason) said they didn’t want core funding.
         4. Alpine Society core funding reduced to $0.
      ii. Motion to amend: Line 371 Audio Boom Kit motion to increase allocation to $300 from capital expense pool. (Sparks)
         1. Not friendly (LDP)
         2. Question and Answer:
            a. How are the microphones used last year not adequate? (Uhl)
               i. The microphones used for live performance belong to Lerner Hall. The microphone fund requested is for multimedia.
            b. Has the group received any other large capital expenses? (Lear)
               i. $1000 for a keyboard last year. (Sparks)
            c. Why is Law Revue setting up a video production company?
               i. There is zero video equipment that Law Revue owns. They can do videos because someone personally invests a lot. There’s no software for production. (Sparks)
               d. Motion to extend Q&A by two minutes – Accepted.
            e. LDP has experience with technology. He’s worried there will be compatibility issues between audio equipment and video equipment they may purchase in the future.
               i. The idea is to get a camera that will be property of Law Revue (they will pursue Arts Initiative and university funding).
      3. Debate
a. Law Revue does an excellent job on campus. Lots of students attend and it involves the entire community. (Wolkoff)
b. Law Revue does do a great job but it’s an amateur group and doesn’t need professional audio equipment, it’s adequate. (Uhl)
c. The budget committee debated this effectively. This group already gets $2000 which is as much as any enormous event on campus. This is a gimmie and they want money for fun electronics. We’re allocating student money. (Lear)
d. Law Revue is something everyone has a chance to experience, as few as 450 do every semester. They are amateur but doesn’t suggest they should have to use amateur equipment. This expense will last throughout the years.
e. Motion to extend debate by two minutes (LDP) – Accepted.
f. Concern about funding a capital expenditure that is not fully paid for. Often a capital expense depends upon a group having the necessary funding in place. Law Revue needs another $900 to buy the boom kit and could come back for ad hoc funding later. (LDP)
g. How often is the audio boom kit used? (Mike)
   i. 2-5 sketches are videotaped and are used to put on a show every semester. (Sparks)

4. Vote to increase Audio Boom Kit allocation to $300.
   a. 22 needed to pass.
   b. Amendment fails. 14-24-4

iii. Motion to reduce Columbia Card Club Poker Chip allocation from $200 to $75. (Wolkoff)
   1. Not friendly (LDP)
   2. Question and Answer
      a. How was the figure of $75 arrived at? (Shin)
         i. Clay chips aren’t necessary. The group can get cheaper chips.
         ii. Searches online yield the possibility of buying chips for two cents each. (Wu)
      b. Are they currently using nicer chips and are they trying to keep consistency? (Lear)
         i. Unknown, but it’s possible to play poker with pieces of paper. (Wolkoff)
         ii. They play with plastic chips. (Wu)

3. Debate:
   a. No problem with revising, but feels they probably thought through the $200. (Pete)
   b. This is the only request of this group beyond core funding and their mission is to facilitate card playing. Clay chips are nicer to play with and are a necessity. (LDP)
   c. You can buy a set of 1000 clay chips for $75 on ebay. (Lauren)
   d. If we’re going to dicker around with $200 requests people should sign up for the budget committee (Lear).
   e. Motion to amend the amendment: increase allocation from $75 to $100 (Pete)
      i. Friendly (Wolkoff)

4. Vote to change allocation to $100: Passes 34-7-3

iv. Motion to amend CJAN Film Screening of Hard Road Home (Line 201) change allocation to $150. (Batra) Spoke with the president and it was just an error in specifying the details of the event on the form.
   1. Friendly (LDP).

v. Motion to amend: Reduce DeVinimus Pinot Noir tasting from $350 to $0. (Shin)
   1. Not friendly (LDP)
   2. No second. Motion not considered.

VII. New Business

VIII. Announcements
a. University Senate additional reports:
   i. New funding source – a co-sponsorship fund. If there’s a group that’s planning an event that involves multiple Columbia schools and alumni then you can apply to this fund.

b. Social committee may not actually meet tonight.

c. LDP wants to see the budget committee for 5 minutes after the meeting.

d. Call for volunteers interested in running the blood drive. (Lear)
   i. Will it be run by the same group as in the past? (The American Red Cross?)
      1. LDP doesn’t like the group that ran it last year.

e. Recognition committee will meet after the meeting.

f. Motion to adjourn.

IX. Adjourn 11:15 p.m.