
SG Seventh General Session

Tuesday, November 24, 2009

12:30 pm – 1:30 pm | Room 320

Attendance: All Members were present except for Morgan Hollister (1L) and Becca Olson (2L), both of whose absences were excused in advance. In addition, Director of Student Activities Charles Johnson was in attendance.

12:30 Session called to order, President Elette Fortune presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AGENDA

- Steven Beard moved to amend the agenda to include in today's agenda the three written resolutions that Steven has proposed: (1) a resolution proposing a specific student-events listserv use policy to recommend for adoption by the law school administration; (2) a resolution proposing more specific requirements for notice of SG Sessions and the distribution of SG Session minutes; and (3) a resolution regarding AGAPE's decision not to support the student organization's decision not to stand with other student organizations to volunteer to make use of its bulletin board space for public messaging against violence against transgender hate crimes.
- Jamaal Bailey moved to discuss resolutions (1) & (2) concurrently with Robin Gordon Leavitt's resolution on SG's role as disseminator of information; motion seconded but defeated.
- Vote on Steven's amendment: 6 Ayes, 3 Nays, 8 abstentions. Motion carried.
- **Vote on agenda with Steven's proposed amendment: 6 Ayes, 3 Nays, 8 abstentions. Amended agenda approved.**

APPROVED AGENDA:

- (1) Approval of proposed agenda.
- (2) Casey Bryant's report on Appointments Committee meeting and non-confidential information from Personnel & Budget Committee meeting [Note: postponed until Casey's arrival; resumed and reported in Item 5].
- (3) Robin Gordon Leavitt's resolution on SG's role with respect to new building planning activities as one of sharing information with the CUNY Law student body.
- (4) Steven Beard's resolution regarding meeting notices and the distribution of minutes.
- (5) *Resumed*: Casey Bryant's report.
- (6) Stephan Edel's resolution on slowing down the move.
- (7) Stephan Edel's proposed editorial policy for the website.
- (8) [Motion to adjourn today's Session at 1:30 instead of 1:10.]
- (9) Steven Beard's resolution on recommended use policy of the Student-Events listserv.
- (10) Steven Beard's resolution concerning AGAPE.
- (11) Katie Bruggeman's resignation from office of Vice President and from her 2L SG seat.
- (12) *Resumed*: Steven Beard's resolution regarding meeting notices and the distribution of minutes.

2. CASEY BRYANT'S REPORT ON (1) APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING AND (2) NON-CONFIDENTIAL INFO FROM PERSONNEL & BUDGET MEETING

- Casey was delayed and not present at the time this agenda item came up.
- Presiding officer Elette Fortune decided, without objection from the floor, to postpone Casey Bryant's report backs until she arrives at the meeting.

3. ROBIN GORDON LEAVITT'S RESOLUTION ON SG'S ROLE WITH RESPECT TO NEW BUILDING PLANNING ACTIVITIES AS ONE OF SHARING INFORMATION WITH THE CUNY LAW STUDENT BODY

- The resolution was drafted and sponsored by Robin Gordon Leavitt, in accordance with discussions from SG Retreat Session on 10/28.
- The resolution would bind SG to adopt the task of compiling and distributing to the student body all relevant information regarding the new building and planning activities related to it.
- There was some confusion as to whether Steven's resolution regarding distribution of minutes, if adopted, would be in conflict with Robin's resolution. Steven and Stephan clarified that these two resolutions are not in conflict, as Steven's resolution concerns specifically SG Session minutes, whereas Robin's resolution concerns documents coming via the Building Committee and other written information concerning both the new building and related planning activities.
- Elette clarified that the two resolutions are not being considered together and that we will discuss and vote on each resolution separately.
- Paula Segal suggested amending paragraph 5 in a manner that that would avoid suggesting that SG's information-distribution role would be its only or predominant role with regard to new building matters. Bright Limm, who was manning the SMART Board, offered an amendment to change "the Student Government's role" in paragraph 5 to "one of the roles of the Student Government" and also suggested several stylistic, grammatical, and other non-substantive changes. [Note: these amendments are identified in the copy of the adopted resolution below; new language is in **bold** and deleted language has been ~~struck through~~]; Robin adopted these amendments as a friendly amendments.
- **Vote on Robin's resolution with friendly amendments: 15 Ayes, 0 Nays, 3 abstentions. Resolution adopted.**

TEXT OF THE ADOPTED RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, The Student Government ~~Association~~, is a body elected by students to advance their interests;

WHEREAS, Information about the new building is being dispersed through the various committee meetings, staff and faculty meetings, Deans' Forums, circulated memos and other decentralized channels, effectively inaccessible to most students, many of whom report that they don't have enough information to formulate opinions;

WHEREAS, General availability of such information is necessary for students to participate in ongoing discussions and provide input on the new building; **and**

WHEREAS, The Student Government ~~Association~~ has an established role as intermediary ~~between~~ **among** students, student groups, and the administration;

Let it therefore be RESOLVED that **one of the roles of** the Student Government's ~~role~~ with regards to the new building should be as the conduit transmitting relevant information, including minutes, survey results, and memos, from the administration, faculty and staff, and committees, to the student body, via the website and any other future publications as appropriate;

Let it be further RESOLVED that our role as disseminators of information should not preclude our taking a stance on any issues surrounding the new building, but rather serve to promote the engagement of fellow students on these important issues; **and**

Let it be finally RESOLVED that the SGA should appoint a member to oversee the collection of such information.

4. STEVEN BEARD'S RESOLUTION REGARDING MEETING NOTICES AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF MINUTES

- The resolution was drafted and sponsored by Steven Beard.
- The resolution would require (1) the SG Secretary and the SG Office and Records Management Committee (a) to email the entire student body about the dates, times, and a tentative agenda of an upcoming regular meeting no later than 5 days prior to the meeting and (b) to email the minutes of meetings to the student body no later than 7 days after a regular, special, or emergency meeting; and (2) the SG Vice President and the SG Communications Committee (a) to ensure that the dates, times, room, minutes, agenda, and any other important information from each Student Government meeting is available on the website once its available; (b) to work with the Secretary and the Office and Records Management Committee to ensure all relevant records, including the SG Constitution, and the dates, times, room, minutes, agenda, and any other important information from each Student Government meeting, are publicly available on our website when the website becomes available.
- Bright noted that because the SG currently meets only once every two weeks, if the resolution were adopted as-is, then a draft (i.e., unapproved) version of the minutes would have to be circulated. He added that there are trade-offs with both the option of circulating an unapproved version sooner and the option of circulating an approved version later. Finally, he offered an amendment that approved minutes be circulated by email within 7 days after their approval (at the subsequent SG Session), and that, as an informal practice, the Secretary and Office & Records Management Committee would make available draft minutes to anyone upon request before the draft version has been approved. Steven accepted the amendment as a friendly amendment.
- Several Members commented that notice of upcoming General Sessions, and that additional notice by email would not be practical and/or useful and/or welcome.
- [Which Member?] offered the amendment to change the email notice provision from 5 days prior to the meeting to 3 days, reasoning that 3 days is close enough to the date of the meeting to serve as a useful reminder and still gives the SG General Body time to submit agenda items (and the President to set) the proposed agenda before sending it out to the student body at large. Steven accepted the amendment as a friendly amendment.
- Mike Rivadeneyra moved to postpone the vote until after holding the discussion and vote on Steven's resolution about the student-events listserv. Motion seconded. Vote on motion: 16 Ayes, 1 Nay, 4 abstentions. Motion carried.
- [The vote on this resolution was thus postponed until after until after discussion and vote on Steven's resolution about the student-events listserv; the record of the vote and text of the adopted resolution is described in Agenda Item 12.]

5. **RESUMED: CASEY BRYANT'S REPORT ON (1) APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING AND (2) NON-CONFIDENTIAL INFO FROM PERSONNEL & BUDGET MEETING**

- Casey Bryant, who sits on the Appointments Committee as a voting member and on the Personnel & Budget Committee as a non-voting member, reported the following.
- The Appointments Committee is reviewing applications for a new full-time seminar teacher who can be an “all-around” player who teaches other subjects as needed. In particular, they want someone who can also teach UCC.
- Florence Kerner is applying, and it appears that to some degree the position has even been designed for her.
- Her line/position is a substitute line. That line will have expired in December.
- The Appointments Committee is also looking for a replacement for Wendy Bach in the elder law clinic (who is shifting from the clinic to non-clinic teaching and EJP).
- Finally, the Appointments Committee is also looking for a replacement for Rhonda Copelon in the IWHR clinic. Rhonda was the director of that clinic and tenured; not entirely clear whether the replacement would be as well. Rhonda is retiring at the end of the year, so there is not such a rush to find that replacement.
- The P&B Committee has reviewed Carmen Huertas, who directs the CED Clinic, and other instructors.
- On Dec 9 & 10th there will be in-house interviews for the seminar instructor position with the committee, faculty, and students. The Appointments Committee was not totally thrilled with the idea of making time specifically for interaction with students, but ultimately agreed to make that time available. We can express that this is why they should or shouldn't hire this person.
- Can people here commit to meet with the applicants and give feedback?
- Volunteers: Casey, Patrick, Bright, Mike R., and Robin.
- Casey also noted that she may collect anonymous feedback.

6. **STEPHAN EDEL'S RESOLUTION ON SLOWING DOWN THE MOVE**

- The resolution was drafted and sponsored by Stephan Edel.
- The resolution would (1) commit the SG to the statement that the purchase of 2 Court Square under certain current circumstances (articulated in the preamble) would be detrimental to the mission of the law school and (2) commit the SG to requesting the law school administration to reconsider its position on the new building and request that the CUNY central administration slow down the process and renegotiate the purchase price.
- Stephan moved for up-and-down vote. Motion was seconded and carried. [Tally?]
- Paula suggested voting clause-by-clause, but this suggestion was out of order as the resolution had already been called to an up-and-down vote.
- There was some confusion as to several rules of parliamentary procedure, which surfaced because several Members expressed ambivalence about voting on the resolution as currently written (i.e., without any amendments).
- Stephan explained that those who want to amend or modify can vote against it or abstain on this vote, and another resolution can be adopted later which amends, or even repeals, this resolution.
- **Vote on Stephan's resolution (unamended): 9 Ayes, 0 Nays, 11 abstentions. Resolution adopted.**

- The resolution was adopted, though several Members expressed concern afterward that they were unclear about the consequences of abstention, and specifically that a motion could be carried even with many abstentions.
- Several Members asked whether this resolution was validly adopted and could be circulated. Bright stated that it depends on whether the SG counts as a “public body” within the meaning of the NY State Open Meetings Law [and Section 41 of the General Construction Law, which defines “quorum” and the standard for carrying motions], to which public bodies are subject. If it does, then the resolution was not validly adopted because all motions have to be carried by a majority of the whole number of Members of the body (including Membership positions that are currently vacant), and not based on a majority of the Members present at the Session. For the SG, this would mean that all motions have to be carried by at least 13 votes. If, on the other hand, the SG does not count as a “public body” within the meaning of the Open Meetings Law [and General Construction Law], then the SG’s own definition of quorum and standard for carrying motions applies, meaning that 9 vote would suffice. He recently asked Dave Fields (University Dean and Special Counsel to the Chancellor) whether the SG is subject to the NY State Open Meetings Law. Mr. Fields’ reply was that the SG probably is not subject to the Open Meetings Law essentially because the CUNY Law’s SG does not allocate student activities fees. Accordingly, if Mr. Fields is correct, then the resolution was validly adopted, and the resolution may be circulated as the official position of the SG.
- Bright also stated that, while he appreciates the need and urgency felt by Members for the SG to officially adopt some position on the new building negotiation process before the semester is over, and that this sense of urgency is why many (including himself) chose to abstain rather than to vote nay, he disagrees with some of the contents of the adopted resolution, knows that others do as well, and will draft another resolution on similar subject matter to be voted on at the next Session which would replace the current resolution.
- Stephan suggested that we try to further discuss and address these confusions before circulation.

TEXT OF THE ADOPTED RESOLUTION:

Proposed on this the Twenty Fourth Day of November, Two Thousand and Nine:

- Whereas, the decision to move to 2 Court House Square is a major decision facing this community and impacting on all of its students, as well as other community members, Student Government needs to be involved in the decisions that effect this community, and
- Whereas, Student Government is the group formed to represent the interests of students, Student Government feels it necessary to protect the vital sense of community that keeps our school running. Including, what little is left of the trust and solidarity that had historically existed among students, and between students and staff, and
- Whereas, the administration has failed to include Student Government, or other students in a substantive way, the Faculty as a whole, as well, apparently, as any representative of the Staff or their collective bargaining representatives in decisions that will have a lasting impact on all of us as community members and

- Whereas, the impact of the procedure so far has been to exclude as far as possible, and further marginalize and divide students, faculty, and most of all staff, and that such procedural decisions are counter to the spirit of the mission for which this school was created, and
- Whereas, there are still serious outstanding questions about the costs and value of this particular location and how well it fits with our mission and values, and therefore what the impact of this move will be on the institution and its character, and
- Whereas, While the current price may or may not be less than estimated allocation to construct a new building, analysis indicate that the square foot cost is not slightly but several times the market rate for comparable space, as well as being generally poorly suited to our needs without substantial renovation that the school cannot currently guarantee will be affordable, and
- Whereas, the planning of the renovation seems to be rushed and some of these concerns both as to the cost and arrangement for purchase of the site as well as the arrangement of space and cost of renovation need to be determined before the site is purchased, and
- Whereas, there seems very substantial concern that the move will negatively impact staff who are a vital part of this community, because: Staff has been left out of key decisions and forgotten or ignored in others, some have obligations that would prevent them from making the move, others could not balance the increased commute time with other commitments, the move would certainly change their conditions of employment, the new building will not necessarily have the same need for staff as our current location, and the relationship between the Law School and other tenants may require us to have centralized services that prevent us from bringing keeping all the same staff, and
- Whereas, despite their assurances to the contrary Dean Anderson and the Law School Administration are unable legally to ensure that staff will all retain their position, if their position is maintained in the new building, or be able to retain their current salary and benefits if they or are able to transfer to another campus of CUNY, and
- Whereas, This is especially grievous given that: many of our staff have been here a long time and provide important continuity of vision as well as expertise and support to our community, many work long hours while accepting part time salaries because they support the mission of the school, and that for at least some students providing a decent work environment for the staff as workers and community members is at the core of the motto “Law in the service of human need”, and
- Whereas, The Site of , ownership of, and co-tenants at 2 Court House Square raise serious concerns about the symbolic and substantive implications of the move. In that the purchase of the building is supporting or even bailing out a bank that is centrally involved in the poor behavior that lead to the current financial crisis. Additionally, the move puts the Law School into the position of fitting into a pattern of displacement and gentrification that may be contrary to the mission of the school to serve the broader New York community especially those without access to the legal profession, and
- Whereas, The new location will reduce the transit time into Manhattan as well as the other boroughs, the choice to locate the school in Long Island City is not a bad one it is

central and well served by trains. However, CUNY Law school's current location is less than 6 miles from the majority of Queens Courts, various Queens based Legal Services organizations, and only a short bus ride from some of the poorest communities in the city. There are other locations that could have achieved the desired result. For example, Jamaica Queens. We could and should reach out to the local community and those resources close at hand, as well as those non-profits located in Manhattan, and

Whereas, one of the selling points of this building is that it is a “Green Building” with LEED Gold Certification, but renovations may well mean changing the layout and compromising that status, and that unlike the current building it provides no outside space, nor access to substantial local green space, and

Resolved, We as a unified Student Government think that the purchase of 2 Court House Square under the terms that have been set forth will be detrimental to the mission of CUNY School of Law. We further affirm that the actions and decision, both substantive and procedural, made by this administration to segment and exclude the community (Faculty, Staff and Students) has seriously harmed our community. We as Student Government request that the CUNY Law School Administration reconsider their stance on the new building and request that CUNY Central slow down the process and renegotiate the purchase price.

7. STEPHAN EDEL’S PROPOSED EDITORIAL POLICY FOR THE WEBSITE

- Stephan drafted a proposed policy for editing the content of the upcoming website and for selecting the team of editors. Because he finished drafting it on the morning of today’s Session, people have not yet had a chance to read it, but he wanted to circulate it to Members at this Session so that we could begin discussing it, incorporate changes, and be prepared to vote on some version at the next Session. He asked Members to contact him with suggested changes.

TEXT OF THE PROPOSED EDITORIAL POLICY FOR THE WEBSITE [NOTE: THE POLICY WAS NOT CALLED TO A VOTE; RATHER IT WAS MERELY INTRODUCED AT TODAY’S SESSION]:

EDITORIAL POLICY FOR WEBSITE

“Congress shall make no law ...abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press....”

-- The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America

“The vigilant protection of constitutional freedoms is nowhere more vital than in the community of American schools.” -- *Tinker v. De Moines Independent Community School District*

A. EDITORIAL BOARD

1. The editor in chief shall be the Vice president of the SG as ex officio Chair of the Communications committee.
2. the editorial board decides on all major decisions that pertain directly to the website
3. the editorial board will consist of staff editors who may be either SG members or not, but must be CUNY Law school students.
4. no member of the editorial board shall have more than one vote on the board

5. all members of the editorial board will elect a replacement for board members who have resigned or been dismissed
6. all members of the editorial board are expected to contribute a reasonable amount of effort and time on the website.
7. The editorial board shall meet as often as required by the Communications Committee
8. The editorial board is a team, each member is expected to complete all assigned stories, pages, photos on or before deadline assigned, staff members including editors, may be dismissed if any of following violations occur:
 - a. continuously missed deadlines, without excuse
 - b. Plagiarism or Quote falsification
 - c. failing to attend editorial board meetings

B. EDITORIAL POLICY AS TO CONTENT

1. First and foremost the policy of the Website shall be to support the goal of creating a social justice focused accessible community in support of the Law school's mission of Law in the Service of Human need.
2. provide a portal to share information of interest to the CUNY law school Community
3. the school newspaper will strive to be accurate, fair, and responsible in its coverage of issues that affect the school community, and the goal of newspaper is to inform the whole school population as effectively and accurately as possible.
4. That preference shall be given to those issues that have a direct impact on the law school community, its alumni, and perspective students, as determined by the editorial board
5. There shall be no discriminatory content, no obscenity, no libelous or other illegal content
6. will serve the best interest of the students faculty and staff of CUNY Law School
7. only the editorial board may veto any material intended for publication, judged to be in violation of this editorial policy
8. this school newspaper will vigorously resist all attempts at censorship, particularly prepublication censorship.
9. The website has the right to publish all material retained through interview by a member of the publications staff
10. The editorial board shall determines content taking space on the site into consideration, and will highlight those materials it feels are most important based on the criteria set out here in.
11. letters to editor will be printed in the opinions section
12. All articles, columns, letters to the editor, and other contributions will be attributed to the author
13. reasonable effort shall be taken that the school newspaper will not accept advertising for products that are counter to the social justice mission of the law school

8. MOTION TO ADJOURN TODAY'S SESSION AT 1:30 INSTEAD OF 1:10

- Bright recognized by presiding officer in between agenda items so he could poll the Members present on their willingness to stay until 1:40 instead of the usual 1:10. [Note: This situation arose because this particular Tuesday was on a Thursday schedule, meaning that the Session took place during Student-Initiated Time, which ends at 1:45.] Casey suggested splitting the difference and ending at 1:30. Bright then moved to adjourn the meeting at 1:30. **Motion was seconded and carried.**

9. STEVEN BEARD'S RESOLUTION ON RECOMMENDED USE POLICY OF THE STUDENT-EVENT LISTSERV

- The resolution was drafted and sponsored by Steven Beard.
- The resolution would commit the SG to the position of supporting the Student-Events listserv use policy articulated in the resolution and to the task of urging Student Activities Director Charles Johnson to administer this policy.
- Presiding officer Elette began consideration of this agenda item with an explanation of the context in which Steven drafted this resolution, noting that the issue of what constitutes appropriate use of the Student-Events listserv arose in the wake of a heated discussion that took place over the studentorg-leaders listserv. More specifically, many student organizational leaders were offended and hurt or otherwise concerned about AGAPE's decision not to participate in the Transgender Day memorial observance, while others felt that the criticisms being lodged against AGAPE were themselves inappropriate. Moreover, this issue was also connected to the distinguishable but perhaps related issue of AGAPE's use of the Student-Events listserv to send multiple email announcements for each of its organizational meetings.
- With permission of the presiding officer, Suha called for a show of hands of those Members present who are on the studentorg-leaders listserv and were privy to the heated back-and-forth. Less than half of the Members present raised their hands.
- Charles Johnson explained the use of the Student-Events listserv and the rationale for their sending out a weekly email.
- Patrick Foster noted that there is an official policy for acceptable use of the email system in the Student Handbook.
- Bright noted that even if Steven's resolution is adopted, the policy would not have any binding effect on any student organization. Rather, the resolution would express the SG's preferred policy concerning use of the Student-Events listserv. However, if the resolution were adopted, then the SG could recommend to the administration – in particular, Deans Anderson, Burton, and Koster – that it adopt the recommended policy as official school policy. He added as a point of clarification that Charles Johnson does not have the authority to adopt the recommendations of the SG regarding use of the listserv, and that the resolution, at least as currently written, therefore would not in itself increase the likelihood that the proposed policy would be implemented.
- Katie Bruggeman stated that she felt such matters intended to be addressed by the resolution should instead be handled less formally, by encouraging people individually to use sound judgment in using the listserv and not by the SG's trying to regulate use in some representative capacity.
- [Which Member?] moved to read the resolution in full out loud and to make time for discussion prior to vote. Motion was seconded but defeated.
- [Which Member?] moved for an up-and-down vote on the resolution. Motion was seconded and carried.
- **Vote on Steven's resolution (unamended): 1 Aye, 18 Nays, 1 abstention. Resolution NOT adopted.**

TEXT OF RESOLUTION [NOTE: THE RESOLUTION WAS NOT ADOPTED]:

Whereas, students have expressed concern about the unnecessarily large amount of emails being received by particular groups via the Student Events Listserv,

Whereas, Student Government, as the representative body of the student population, has the

responsibility to voice the concerns of the student body and take all affirmative action necessary to relieve those concerns,

Let it be resolved, that student government calls on Student Activities Director Charles Johnson to limit the emails student groups can send through the Student Events Listserv to two per week. At least one email should contain a calendar or schedule of events for the upcoming week and if the group desires, the events of the following week,

Let it be further resolved, that following the adoption of this resolution, a copy of this resolution will be sent to Student Activities Director Charles Johnson and distributed to the student body at large. Student Government shall take all necessary action to lobby Charles Johnson to adhere to the terms of this resolution.

10. STEVEN BEARD'S RESOLUTION CONCERNING AGAPE

- The resolution was drafted and sponsored by Steven Beard.
- The resolution would commit the SG to express its disapproval, and to take measures to voice its disapproval, of AGAPE's refusal to participate in Transgender awareness week.
- Suha was recognized by the presiding officer at the start of this agenda item. Suha requested five minutes of discussion prior to vote on this resolution. Presiding officer Elette granted this request, without objection from the floor, permitting five minutes of discussion prior to the vote.
- Suha stated she will vote against this resolution. Essentially, this resolution looks like an attack on one organization, which in turn takes away from the issue of remembering those that were slain. The point of the memorial action was not to debate the scope and proprieties of free speech but to remember these people and the reasons for which they were subjected to violence.
- Katie said that we should let people know that the perceived attack on free speech is a problem.
- Bright suggested that, as a matter of parliamentary efficiency, it would be excellent if we could adopt a practice of showing agreement with what others have said not so much by taking floor time to echo another's comments but more so by quietly voicing agreement (e.g., "mm-hmm") or making visible affirmative gestures (e.g., clearly nodding, lightly clapping) while someone is saying things that one agrees with. This would give everyone a clearer sense of how people feel about a comment made without resorting to recognizing specific Members individually and then making time on the floor simply for verbal statements of agreement.
- Steven stated that for too long people have used religion to sanction homophobia and violence. This isn't an issue of free speech; its about pointing out that hypocrisy.
- Melinda asked: what would come out of adopting this resolution that is truly positive? At the end of the day, AGAPE has a right to join or not to join the memorial action.
- Latoya stated that it isn't / shouldn't be the SG role to pass this type of resolution.
- Mike Rivadeneyra agreed with Suha, stating that the adoption of the resolution would have the effect of creating more intolerance and anger. To bring some perspective, we should note that AGAPE's response was a better response than the decision by someone last year to tear down the Gaza memorial.
- Casey stated that maybe we should find ways to raise and address these sorts of issues in a manner other than by proposing resolutions. In particular, it is important to address these issues in a positive, constructive spirit.
- Time for discussion elapsed; presiding officer Elette called the resolution to a vote.

- **Vote on Steven's resolution (unamended): 1 Aye, 17 Nays, 3 abstentions. Resolution NOT adopted.**

TEXT OF RESOLUTION [NOTE: THE RESOLUTION WAS NOT ADOPTED]:

Whereas, Student Government, the representative body of the students of CUNY Law, disapproves of any violence occurring against any group of people,

Whereas, Student Government has the duty to represent all groups which may have representation of student government,

Whereas, AGAPE has both refused to participate in Transgender awareness week and has sought to limit the effectiveness of the anti-violence measures being taken by the student population,

Let it be Resolved, that Student Government expresses its disapproval of the conduct being taken by AGAPE,

Let it be further resolved, that Student Government shall take any necessary measures to voice its disapproval of AGAPE and their conduct.

11. KATIE BRUGGEMAN'S RESIGNATION FROM THE OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT AND FROM HER 2L SG SEAT

- Katie Bruggeman announced her resignation both from the Office of SG Vice President and from her seat as a 2L SG Member. She stated that she had decided to step down from SG in light of other competing commitments (including both academic and extracurricular), and in particular that she did not anticipate how much work would be required as ex-officio Chair of the Communications Committee in light of the announcement of the new building.
- Elette thanked Katie for her work and the body gave her a round of applause.
- Bright will follow up with Charles Johnson, who will contact the first-runner up in the 2L SG Member General Election last spring and offer that person to serve the remainder of Katie's term as SG Member.
- At the next Session the SG will elect a new Vice President.
- In the interim period between now and the special election, Stephan must act both as Secretary and acting Vice President. Stephan expressed hope that someone will be elected soon and asked for help from both the other officers and the SG Members in general in helping him to fulfill both of these duties.

12. RESUMED: STEVEN BEARD'S RESOLUTION REGARDING MEETING NOTICES AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF MINUTES

- Presiding officer Elette called an up-and-down vote.
- **Vote on resolution with friendly amendments: 9 Ayes, 7 Nays, 3 abstentions. Resolution adopted.**

TEXT OF THE ADOPTED RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, Student Government is the representative body of all students at CUNY Law;

WHEREAS, the student body at large is entitled to information related to Student Government, including but not limited to the dates, times, minutes, and agenda of each meeting of Student Government;

WHEREAS, Student Government has the capability of emailing the student body;

WHEREAS, Student Government will be setting up a website shortly to be regulated by the Vice President of Student Government in ~~their~~ his/her role as ex-officio Chair of the SG Communications Committee;

WHEREAS, the Secretary of Student Government, in ~~their~~ his/her capacity as ex-officio Chair of the SG Office and Records Management Committee, has the duty to ensure maintenance and proper distribution of all records pertaining to Student Government including its meetings;

Let it be RESOLVED, that Student Government shall take affirmative action in distributing all meeting dates, times, room, minutes, agenda, and any other important information from each Student Government meeting,

Let it be further RESOLVED, that the Secretary and the Office and Records Management Committee shall email the entire student body about the dates, times, and a tentative agenda of an upcoming regular meeting no later than ~~5-3~~ 3 days prior to the meeting. The minutes of said meeting shall be emailed to the body no later than 7 days after **the approval of the minutes** of a regular, special, or emergency meeting. The Secretary and the Office and Records Management Committee shall use its reasonable judgment in determining when to send out the agenda/date/time/room of an emergency meeting; and

Let it be further RESOLVED, that the Vice President and the Communications Committee shall ensure that the dates, times, room, minutes, agenda, and any other important information from each Student Government meeting is available on the website once its available. It shall work with the Secretary and the Office and Records Management Committee to ensure all relevant records, including our Constitution, and the dates, times, room, minutes, agenda, and any other important information from each Student Government meeting, are publicly available on our website when the website becomes available.

1:30 Session adjourned.