I. Call to Order and Roll

II. Officer Reports
   a. President’s Report
      i. Underground Keg email complaints
         1. Senate responded in a follow-up email
         2. President met with NALSA
         3. The Senate needs to hold itself to a high standard in advertising events
      ii. E-Board met with Marta today
         1. Discussed Barristers’ Ball
         2. Briefly mentioned survey
   b. Vice President’s Report
      i. Barristers’ Ball planning ongoing
         1. If you work for 90 minutes – 2 hours you can get a free ticket. (Limit to about 20)
            a. Social Committee members get preference
   c. Secretary’s Report
      i. Blood drive tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, April 14, volunteers needed.
   d. Treasurer’s Report
      i. Senate is under-budget at the moment
      ii. Some groups are about to make big ad-hoc requests
      iii. Clarification on ad-hoc requests
         1. Committee can approve requests that are under $500
         2. Over $500 requests get voted on by the full senate
   e. Parliamentarian’s Report
      i. Bylaws revisions will begin soon. Speak to Kevin Boroumand

III. Committee Reports
   a. Graduation
      i. Sweet Treats was a big success; $1000 of auction proceeds were collected
         1. Event was budgeted for $2000, came in under $900.
      ii. Ciao! New York program has also been successful – 3Ls and LLMs do events around the city (usually around 40 tickets)
      iii. Grad Bowl on April 4 or 5. Field Day. Women of JD class will compete against women of LLM class in a flag football game.

IV. Ellen Chapnick, Dean for Social Justice Program & Natasha Patel, Acting Dean of Career Services
   a. Ellen Chapnick Presentation
      i. Overview of Social Justice Program
         1. Career placement
         2. Mandatory pro-bono program
         3. Creates and supervises externships, National State Attorney General Programs, LLM programming
         4. Interstices between career services, curriculum, and SJP
            a. Recognition that students have complicated interests and will make career switches, therefore the public and private sectors shouldn’t be treated as unrelated.
            b. There will be joint programs.
            c. There was also a party!
      ii. Search ongoing for new Dean of Career Services as well as a head of Domestic and Pro Bono programs
         1. Student input will be gathered about candidates for both positions
   b. Natasha Patel Presentation
      i. Career services has an eye on the evolving market and is trying to keep on top of the changes. Working with 3Ls whose start dates have been delayed, helping 2Ls make sure they have a successful summer.
         1. Getting ready for EIP
         2. Meeting with employers
   c. Questions/Comments
      i. Senator comment: common law LLMs have not been well served by career services. The timing doesn’t work out well.
1. Career Services: LLMs don’t participate in the August recruitment programs because they haven’t even started at Columbia yet. Comparison to Harvard which has just switched to no longer include LLMs in their August recruitment.

2. Could LLMs who have graduated participate in August? No, because they’re alumni at that point.

3. Harvard system: LLMs went through recruitment in October. But now Harvard has moved their interview program to August, meaning the top 26 schools are all undergoing recruitment in August. (Harvard and Yale used to be later in September, with the downturn in the economy they’ve moved their program up)

4. Suggestion from a senator: give law firms the choice of whether or not they want to interview incoming LLMs.

5. Question about the distinction between LLMs and transfer students. Transfer students also haven’t taken a class at Columbia when they participate in EIP.
   a. This has just been the way it’s always been. Transfers get folded in immediately.
   b. Transfers have traditionally done very well at EIP.
   c. Changes to this system could be considered for Fall 2010 recruitment – will be something the new Dean will decide.

ii. Senator question: With Harvard moving their interview program earlier (and sometimes over 2 weeks) will there be any changes at Columbia’s EIP?
   1. Most schools are doing five days worth of interviewing for their fall recruitment. This will not impact Columbia.
   2. Will firms have problems doing as many interviews as the have in the past?
      a. Yes, it will put pressure on the firms to conduct as many interviews but EIP can’t be moved to an even earlier date. The down economy will also be a constraint.

iii. Senator expresses appreciation for the Dean’s visit.

iv. Senator concern about transparency- students feel they’re working really hard and it’s unclear what happens on the SJP and Career Services end to help us find jobs in this down economy. What changes, if any, are underway for transparency with job search process? Also, with the budget is being cut, what changes can we see in SJP and Career Services?
   1. Chapnick (SJP): There’s consolidation in public interest programming – rather than two deans there’s now one. Working to find more opportunities and identify students who are looking for clerkships.
      a. Also trying to provide more support services to students who have upcoming interviews. The office will set up mock interviews with similar employers.
   2. Patel (Career Services): There’s one fewer staff position in Career Services now. (Patel’s old position is now frozen)
      a. Recruiting transparency depends on the year in question.
      b. Off-cycle recruiting is a much more tailored search. Career Services is trying to increase the speed at which positions are posted.
      c. More programming encouraging people to think outside the box, i.e. today’s panel on the boutique law firm.
   3. There will be more entry level positions with the federal government. SJP/Career Services are trying to keep track of where CLS grads are in the administration.
   4. During EIP, SJP will have a representative there for people that are considering public interest jobs or want to try and split. It will help people figure out whether or not a big law firm job is actually right for them.

v. Senator follow-up question: After getting into CLS, what’s the added value that the career services office brings to that credential? What will career services tell people about how to add value to their CLS degree?
   1. Chapnick: The new Dean will have to do a lot of networking with law firms across the board. It’s been done in the past but not as well or effectively as it could have been. In the search, the school is looking for someone very energetic who can go out there and make friends. Also, the school needs someone who understands that people need a lot of information, not just the information you can find on firm websites.
      a. The idea is to move away from career services to professional development.
      b. More sophisticated information needs to be made available so that people get the right job.
      c. Also, trying to keep in mind that people may want to work at places that aren’t large law firms.
2. Patel: Increase the advising that Career Services provides so people don’t just bid on law firms based on the Vault Top 20 firms. Requires more one on one counseling.

vi. Senator comment: It would be great to see more advising. The problem isn’t getting a job interview, but knowing who to interview with. There’s a lack of advising going into EIP. There should be more information about the law firms out there.

vii. Senator concern: Lack of summer funding for public interest LLMs. LLMs can’t apply for the guaranteed summer funding. LLMs pay full tuition just like JDs but they don’t get to benefit from GSF. Also, the public interest job fair exemplifies the magnitude of the problem. This year there were 108 organizations there, a total of 17 were considering applications from LLMs. 3 of the 17 were hiring for next year and 14 were offering unpaid internships. LLMs in general need more help in securing public interest work. Both NYU and Harvard allow LLMs to compete with JDs for public interest funding.
   1. Chapnick: LLMs are treated like 3Ls and they’re graduates who aren’t eligible for GSF. Is interested to get more information about other schools and how they make it work.

viii. Senator comment: With regards to interview prep, it might be nice to have more opportunities to do mock interviews, and perhaps have those interviews taped. Also for jobs in the government, it’d be good if law students were more in tune with government election cycles. There could be more attention to policy positions.

ix. Senator question: Is the 1L on campus job process producing similar results to previous years?
   1. Patel: On campus portion is over, but Career Services is still able to help students find positions.
      a. There was a lower participation rate by employers this year compared to years past. Fewer law firms are hiring 1Ls. The banks also didn’t come to do 1L on-campus interviews.
      b. However, generally speaking, even though this year has seen less participation by employers, it’s typical for 1L job searches to continue through March.
      c. 1Ls should keep in mind that anything they do this summer is worthwhile. Working in a private sector law firm job is not the only way to set yourself up for success.
      d. Funding for public interest is out there and judicial clerkships are very valuable experiences. There are some general counsels that will hire interns.
      e. Lots of faculty hire research assistants. Particularly valuable if you want to clerk.

x. Steve Buchman and Sarah (another counselor) are always available to do mock interviews.

xi. Clarification that there are two full time counselors in Career Services.

xii. Senator question: Has there been any brainstorming on how to physically bring together SJP and Career Services?
   1. Chapnick: It would be great but there are just space constraints that can’t be worked around.

xiii. Senator question: For the mock interviews when outside lawyers come to campus, can there be more feedback on the quality of interviewers?
   1. Career Services advises the lawyers to give general advice, not nitpick. They’re prepared, but it’s inevitable that there are some lawyers who proceed differently.
   2. Career Services will consider an immediate survey/feedback function. It’s been requested through IT, which would be one way of collecting information.

xiv. Senator question: Does career services track 1L employment? What are the comparisons to last year? (How many are employed? How many are in firms?) 3L hiring is tracked, and it would be useful information for the 1Ls who are about to go into EIP next fall. Also, what’s the rationale behind not providing funding for persons working for judges?
   1. Patel is going to poll 1Ls tomorrow. Students will have to log into Symplicity to enter their information. The survey results are only as good as students are willing to sign in.
   2. 2Ls have been polled, only about half of them have responded.

xv. More surveying/polling/feedback would be helpful – from students after EIP, from alums. There’s a lot of self-reporting. However, Career Services hears more from unhappy alums.

xvi. Senator expresses that she had a great experience as a 1L at a GC office. Encourages Career Service to encourage these types of jobs.

V. Committee Reports cont.

a. Housing
   i. Working on better vending machines in Lenfest
   ii. Pursuing further information on online rent payment

b. Faculty Committees – none met – people should email the chairs of their faculty committee

c. University Senate
   i. Grad student attendance at the free basketball game was good – 90 attended.
1. All students used to have to pay
2. In the past the university hasn’t been good about enforcing the no-grad-student policy. One law student indicates that he has attended many sporting events as a grad student.

   ii. University Senate housing committee is considering a town hall meeting to hear the housing concerns of grad students.

   1. Straw poll to see whether UAH should talk to graduate students about housing: strong support

   iii. University Senate is looking for someone to chair the elections commission.

d. IT: Nothing to report
e. President’s Report addition: The next meeting will be held on Monday, March 9 at 9:15 p.m.

VI. Lenfest Café

   a. Dean MGK was supposed to visit tonight, but had a conflict.

   b. E-Board report:

      i. Budget cuts are being considered around the University. One of the things that has come to our attention is that the future of Lenfest Café may be under consideration. Universities are non-profits and lose money, subsidized by endowment and tuition. Lenfest Café is losing a substantial amount of money and has been for awhile.

      ii. Question about whether senators have recently made purchases in Lenfest Café:

         1. Hand raising indicates that very few purchases have been made (<10)

      iii. Senators interested in student amenities have been convened. They are exploring other options at the university level. If changes come to Lenfest Café we should see it as an opportunity for student input to shape its future.

         1. Requires looking at other food venues around the university.

      iv. Emphasize that we don’t know very much and all changes are uncertain. It will be something to consider down the line.

      v. Resolution on the agenda: 8 or 9 senators are interested in exploring dining options around campus.

         1. Question about involvement: if you are interested in getting involved, SAHSA is chaired by Yael Fischer.

VII. Student Survey Resolution

   a. Sponsor: Benjamin Brickner

   b. Most senators indicate that they were able to take the survey today.

   c. Presentation: Ben got a similar survey from the Kennedy School and thinks it would be a good way to get feedback from the student body.

      i. The idea is to create a launching point, begin a conversation with the student body in a comprehensive way. Hopefully won’t be the end of our investigation on student satisfaction.

      ii. Will be of value to this Senate and to the next Senate as well.

      iii. Has gotten input from many senators on structure and substance of questions.

      iv. Participation will be incentivized by restaurant gift certificates.

      v. Encourage friends and colleagues to fill out the survey.

      vi. Resolution is to resolve to send the survey out to the student body. The survey will be open for at least a week. The e-board is set to meet with Dean Schizer a week from tomorrow and will hopefully have a sense of the results.

   d. Question and Answer:

      i. What is expected participation? What level of participation do we feel we need to generate useful results?

         1. Expected participation is completely unknown. Senate election participation rate last fall was 25%. Presumably if it’s online and open for a week, we may get a higher participation rate.

         2. The sponsor will be happy if we get 1/3 of the student body to participate, obviously more would be better.

   e. Debate: Note that amendments are not being accepted. Email Ben with comments/mistakes.

      i. Question: can committee chairs add a question? Possibly. Speak with Ben afterwards.

      ii. Senator comment: If we get 1/3 participation point, the Senate should be proud of it. It will be very useful.

         1. Note that there will be some systematic bias.

      iii. The survey is really long, it’s too big to fail.

   f. Vote: Call for consent. No objections. Resolution passes unanimously.

   g. Additional questions will be at the discretion of the sponsor.

VIII. Resolution to Provide a Refrigerator for Student Use

   a. Sponsor: Brittany Schoepp
b. Presentation:
   i. MGK was able to convince Dean Moroni to pay for the cleaning of the fridge if the senate will pay for the fridge itself. The fridge will last for many years so it should be a good investment.
   ii. Biggest point of contention is the location: proposed location is WJWH basement. The area is owned by the law school. Lenfest Café is not a possibility because of contracts. Another alternative is to put the fridge by the vending machines in JG, but there are a lot of random people in the law school and items could be susceptible to theft. WJWH has less traffic by non-law students but is still convenient.
   iii. The labels on the sign that are listed in the resolution are not exhaustive.
   iv. It’s important to have a consistent record of our desire for a fridge.
   v. Max spoke with Garrett Bergen: refrigerator placement will require some negotiation with the business school.
      1. The space in the basement of WJWH could be improved to be more student-lounge like. Possibility of a microwave.
   vi. Max did initial research on potential costs of fridges.

c. Question & Answer
   i. Should the resolution be put on hold until we get the agreement of building services? No it’s not a block.

d. Debate
   i. Proposed Amendment: Adding language to the effect that the refrigerator is the property of the students of Columbia Law School purchased by the Student Senate
      1. Friendly amendment to the sponsor

e. Vote: Call for consent – no objections – passes unanimously
   i. E-Board and Brittany will work towards its realization with the administration.
   ii. Additional request made by a senator to make sure the refrigerator has a freezer.

IX. Spending resolution to appropriate funds.
a. Sponsor; The Executive Board
b. Procedural clarification: The resolution is a total spending bill but we’re going to consider each item individually. There will be presentation, Q&A, and debate as to each number figure.
   i. Call for non-number-figure resolutions. None.

c. Up to $350 to purchase seven $50 gift certificates to area restaurants that shall be awarded to randomly selected survey participants.
   i. Presentation: Prizes to incentivize participation in the survey.
   ii. Question & Answer
      1. Can Senators win the prize?
         a. Resolution made to exclude Senators. No objections. Included as a friendly amendment.
      2. Will prizes be randomly allocated? Yes, through a random number generator on Excel, similar to how meet sheet prizes were awarded.
   iii. Debate
      1. Dan Shin suggestion: consider adding language to make the prize figures contingent on participation rate.
         a. Such a resolution would not be friendly to the sponsor because students won’t be incentivized by seven prizes in the introductory email.
         b. Resolution sponsor response: It’s not necessary to specify the number of prizes.
         c. It would make the resolution unnecessarily complicated.
      2. $350 is a very reasonable amount to spend
      3. Money needs to be put back into the economy! We should encourage students to go out into the neighborhood to spend money in restaurants.
      4. Aversion to throwing away money if participation rates are very low.
      5. The cost of a safety valve would make a prize uncertain. Too great a disincentive.
      6. Suggestion that survey sponsors should consider giving prizes other than giving restaurant gift certificates.
      7. $350 is not too much to risk on certainty.
      8. The Senate routinely spends this amount on small groups of people through the budget process.
      9. This is a typical reward for a survey.
   iv. Vote
      1. Call for consent – no objections – resolution item passes unanimously.
      2. Point of information: This item of the resolution is enacted, irrespective of what happens to the other items in the spending bill.
d. Up to $200 to reimburse the Student Amenities Taskforce’s evaluation of Columbia’s eleven Dining Service facilities. Reimbursements will be limited to three students per facility and fifty percent of the total amount spent by each student.

   i. Presentation: Self explanatory, sponsor is happy to answer questions
   ii. Question & Answer
      1. Why? Allow students to try out different dining venues. There are many venues across campus and exploring them will be useful in putting together a coherent proposal to administrators.
      2. Note that this information was in an email
      3. Who would be eligible for the subsidy?
         a. Senators. The exploration could be costly and it will be time consuming.
   iii. Debate
      1. Expression of support
      2. Aversion to self dealing. If people want to sample the restaurants, they should do so on their own. Senators should devote their own resources. Clarification that senators will still provide their own resources, but it will be subsidized.
      3. We all have to eat, people will eat anyway.
      4. Eating at dining locations on campus can be very costly. A meal can cost $15.
      5. There are other ways to evaluate Columbia dining services in a more cost-effective way. There’s no need to explore dining halls that aren’t necessarily analogous to Lenfest Café. It’s a bit of a boondoggle.
      6. You can evaluate food by looking at it.
      7. The task force is operating on a condensed time frame, it’s asking a lot of them so we want to provide some sort of sweetener to ask senators to step up.
      8. Other dining venues are being explored because we’re exploring alternatives. It might also be grossly overpriced in other places.
      9. People can explore the dining facilities without eating the food.
      10. It’s a small amount of money for general research that will benefit a lot of people.
      11. Clarification from the treasurer about where the expenditure will come from:
         a. Treasurer: Funds will come out of the general fund which is $2000 per semester. Some has been spent (pizza at last meeting and the food at budget committee meetings).
         b. The fund covers bills like this.
      12. Motion to extend debate. Call for consent – no objections – time extended by 5 minutes.
      13. Point of information: If the amount is not passed, call for volunteers who will visit food venues without a subsidy.
         a. Five senators express interest.
         b. Yael, chair of the task force, suggests the item on the resolution be withdrawn.
      14. Perhaps the administration should help fund this. Also, note that a lot of the food is centrally made so the sushi, for instance, doesn’t need to be sampled at every location.
      15. $15/meal is expensive. Eating on campus is convenient and can be cheap. Having a subsidy is valuable because some people don’t spend $300/week on food.
      16. David Peters: Amendment proposed. Opens up the subsidy to all students who volunteer for the dining venue exploration.
         a. Not friendly to the sponsors.
         b. Presentation: Opening up the option to everyone.
         c. Question & Answer:
            i. Why couldn’t senators just volunteer for the task force? It’s open to new members.
            ii. Shouldn’t the change allow all students to sample the food?
            iii. Austin Thompson: Amendment to the Amendment – the food subsidy should be available to all students, not just senators.
               1. David Peters: friendly amendment
            iv. Subsidizing all students would just lead people who already eat around campus to continue doing so. But incentivizing these people could be good.
            v. Isn’t the point of this that it’s a project of the Senate? How does extending the proposal to all students improve the end product? It avoids the appearance of self dealing.
               1. Will lead to a broader sampling. There’s a limit of $200 because only interested students will go out, otherwise the subsidy will be minimal.
d. Debate
   i. Opposition, the amendment unfocuses the bill to try and tank it. We want people to turn in thorough reviews. We want to keep this inquiry focused.
   ii. Brickner Amendment to the Amendment: Up to $200 to reimburse “to reimburse the Student Amenities Taskforce’s evaluation...” “...SAHCSA shall explain the subsidy and call for volunteers.”
      1. Friendly
   iii. Students involved should be involved in an ongoing taskforce and they’ll require strict coordination and management
   iv. Motion to extend time two minutes. Seconded. Approved.
   v. Clarification from Yael that this is supposed to be senator exploration and then there would be town hall with all students. There may be merit from having students involved from the beginning but the idea is to have a small group devoted to performing alternatives.
   vi. We should just have the people who are willing to explore for free do it.

e. Vote on the amendment: 4 in favor. Amendment does not pass.
   i. Irresponsible to spend $200 when 5 people are willing to do it for free.
   ii. Question about who would participate in the task force if the subsidy is passed. About 9-10.
   iii. Does a review form need to be filled out? How ongoing is the process?
      a. Ongoing as long as the administration is open to input. Provides leverage.
   iv. There are other ways to gather information without an outlay of funding.
   v. The real goal is to find out about options and prices and it’s pretty easy to go in and do a study without actually buying everything in sight.
iv. Vote: (voice vote) – doesn’t pass.

e. Up to $1000 to purchase a refrigerator for student use.
   i. Presentation: See earlier
   ii. Question & Answers: none
   iii. Debate:
      1. The buyers should take care to investigate cheap options and going out of sale options.
      2. $1000 is a lot to spend on a fridge. Can we save whatever we don’t spend on ourselves? Substantive, not up for concern.
      3. Treasurer report: The fridge would be paid for by the general fund ($2000 for the semester) doesn’t qualify as an unanticipated expense.
iv. Vote: Call for consent – no objections – item passes unanimously. UP TO $1000 will be spent on a refrigerator.
   v. Senate expresses thanks to Brittany!

f. Vote on the entire resolution. Call for consent – no objections – resolution passes.

X. New Business (Adding to this agenda requires a 50% vote)

XI. Announcements
   a. Sign up for office hours.
   b. Bar Review this week on Thursday: Bar Revue band will be playing at Parlour. Max Miller will be singing.
   c. Barristers’ Ball Facebook invite is set up.
   d. Volunteer to take tickets at Barristers’ Ball. See Kahil or Meredith.
   e. March 9 is our next meeting. Let Jessica know if you have a pre-existing conflict by tomorrow at 10pm.
   f. Social Committee meeting after this meeting.

XII. Motion to adjourn 10:56 .m.