

## **Student government minutes**

**General Session - February 16<sup>th</sup> 2010.**

**12:40 room 320**

**1. No Quorum as of 12:45**

**2. Charles Johnson makes an announcement regarding 2L vacant seat**

- article 4 of the Student government handbook, regarding filling of vacant seats.
- There are additional people who had votes, beyond the list Charles initially provided.
- Nick Guarino is next on the list and will respond by Friday.
- If he doesn't respond by Friday then he will have declines and the last person on the list is Mike Moskowitz.

**3. Meeting Convened at 12:50 with Quorum**

**4. Agenda presented** by Bright Limm, approved without objection

**5. Bright Calls for the minutes to be approved**, prior to sending it out to the student body.

- Members asked to review minutes and the resolution as passed prior to voting on its adoption
- Aye 10, Nay 0, Abstain 1
- Minutes Approved.

**6. Dean Bilek Addresses the SG regarding the upcoming ABA site visit** as part of accreditation

- CUNY law is accredited by the ABA and AALS
- They review every 7 years, this year they will come Feb. 28<sup>th</sup> - 30<sup>th</sup>
- Self study is on reserve in the library: intended to be a searching document looking at how the ABA standards apply here. Designed to fulfill the ABA requirements.
- Students only meet with them in 135 on Monday, Tuesday they will meet with Student Leaders (SG officers and all club presidents) during the open time,
- reviewing students and teachers in class setting. (be aware that your conduct and attendance are looked at) they will drop in for only part of the class, sometimes only 5 minutes.
- Be honest, tell the truth → but put your best foot forward
- Bright asked if there are other non-officer SG members who wish to attend what

is the most members who can attend.

- Charles and Dean Bilek - There is a number they came up with to fit the room for Faculty is 30-35, so for the Tuesday event there can be 30-35 at a time.
- Bright noted that the self study is unusual in having student input into the process.
- Suha – should we send something out?
- Charles – We should wait to tell people?
- Suha- we should let people know so that its on people's radar even just a save the date details to follow.
- Melinda – maybe we should do it after they send it out there are two weeks
- Stephan Motion to send an email to the student body just informing them of the visits, and its importance, Seconded by Amy
  - Aye 11, Nay 0, abstentions 2

#### 7. Grade Appeals proposal by Mike Moskowitz

- Mike R. - we haven't really consulted with the student reps to the Academic Standing committee. Jessie Sribnik and Jennie Walner the Student reps to Academic Standing committee would like to have a stronger resolution,
- Bright do you know whether Jessie is working on her own proposal
- Mike R. they feel that it should be strong. But they cant be involved or would need to recuse themselves from voting on it. The two students are allies in making change, there are faculty allies if we can make a proposal for a meaningful change.
- Bright are there specific substantive comments
- Suha- - basically a good start, I don't like the article 78 piece. Litigation may not be the best strategy and strengthen the transparency piece. It doesn't run like other schools do.
- Bright conducting a straw poll – how many would support it as is. More people would vote nay as is.
- Bright – who would be willing to work on revising the draft.
- Steven – moves that this be tabled and moved to the academic Affairs committee, seconded by Amy,
- Bright before we vote it hasn't met yet Casey Bryant is the chair
- Bright, Michael R. and Alana volunteer to meet

#### 8. Steven reports on the Communication committee -

- committee met discussed the website, funding, administration, and the web developer who will work low-bono on getting it running soon.
- SG and school governance, polling/surveys, forums, announcements, calendar, columns/blogs, navigation, utilities, email newsletter function, terms of use.
- Funding issues: \$1200 pledged so far, about ½ faculty asked.
- \$2000- 2500 goal
- Proposed editorial policy, sent out Sunday, did people read it.
- Suha – why do we need a website? Why not use Calendar & Forum that we already have?
- Bright - that is a valid comment, to the extent that I have information, I have twice approached the administration and was told that there would not be any help from CUNY law staff to SG website, which is a resource issue, there is also a content issue. They won't let us expand anything
- Suha- we invest in it and how do we know that people will use it. Why is it more useful than Twen and Forum, what will it do to increase our ability to function
- Alana – It is a lot of resources to put to something that we have other free resources to accomplish
- Steven – we discussed the issues on committee, We have discusses whether people would use it there are many places to go to and it can be a place people start from with links to other places we already use, there is also the issue that funds have been raised with this as a goal specifically.
- Bright- there are free or low cost versions of these functions, we are hoping that functionality, independence, and user friendliness has not yet been offered. There is support and interest from many people. If it doesn't work it is a risk worth taking.
- Paula – we are focusing on infrastructure and not being concerned with Content, is it going to be an additional responsibility to fill it. What is going to be on it? There doesn't seem to be a plan? We should pay someone to update and make sure that events are up to date.
- Amanda - Isn't that the job of the communications committee? That is what I signed up to the committee for
- Alana - I don't feel that we need to pay someone to do that?
- Amy – it wouldn't be just the Communications Committee. Not just SG members but a broader editorial committee with 1L, 2L, and 3L members.

- Patrick – was there a resolution to create a website?
- Alana - can we get on the same page and figure out what was envisioned? I have programmers who would do it for a lot less.
- Nick – what about CUNY Academic Commons
- Bright – there was an interest in creating something and the committee was created to propose based on a decision we are covering some of the same ground that has been dealt with in past semesters we need to also give some weight to the discussions and efforts of the committee. Can other people provide other proposals and we can discuss them as alternatives to the committees proposals?
- Amy motions to table and set a time limit of 14 days for alternate proposals for feedback to the committee -
  - Aye Nay Abstentions - passed
  - Bright - Can we all have read to the proposals, committee report, and Patrick's email regarding CUNY Academic commons.

**9.** Adjourned 1:45