I. Call to order and roll
   a. 30 present, 28 voting
   b. New Business should be on the agenda
II. Amendments to the Senate By-Laws
   a. Introduction (Ben Brickner)
      i. This endeavor is the continuation of the larger project that the Senate began last fall to update the Constitution.
      ii. Objective is to now bring the bylaws up to date
      iii. Many senators lent their efforts to the project.
      iv. Goals
         1. Bringing the bylaws into practice with current Senate practice
         2. Increasing readability
         3. Instituting new policy changes
      v. Explanation of color coding in the bylaws packet
         1. Technical amendments will be considered as a package (Colorless)
         2. Conforming amendments also considered as a package (Yellow)
         3. Substantive Amendments (Green)
      vi. Changes requires a 2/3 vote and go into effect immediately
   b. Technical Amendments
      i. Introduction
      ii. Q&A (none)
      iii. Debate
      iv. Vote
         1. Call for consent – no objections – passes.
   c. Conforming Amendments
      i. Introduction
         1. Not substantive changes but brings the bylaws into current practice
            a. Section 1: Spring Senate: Spring Senate not required to consider substantive business during the summer
               i. The change makes it so the Senate doesn’t have to meet immediately after election (during exams)
            b. Section 2: Committee Reporting. Committee heads report at meetings and submit a report at the end of the year.
               i. Changes the bylaws so that committee heads need only submit a report annually, rather than twice a year.
            c. Section 2C3: Other funding requests/ad hoc
               i. For many years the committee has operated such that they can approve ad hoc requests under a certain amount. The change in the bylaws ratifies the long practice whereby the budget committee can approve ad hoc requests under $500 without getting full Senate approval.
            d. Section 2C4a: Grad-Committee Co-chairs
               i. Selection process delayed to April (same timing as Orientation co-chair selection)
               ii. Outgoing co-chairs report to incoming President and Treasurer on money matters to Committee Co-Chairs
            e. Section 2C4b Grad Committee Members
               i. Grad committee members not elected in the spring. They can’t be elected in the Spring when 1Ls and LLMs aren’t present. Must be put in place before Oct. 15.
            f. Section 4: Expenditures.
               i. Checks and spending clause deleted as irrelevant, private inurement clause enhanced.
            g. Section 6E3 Repossession of Funds
i. SAF funds used to repay debt of only the defunct org
ii. Other funds considered separately. At student services’ discretion, these funds may also be used to repay debt of the defunct organization
iii. Intent of this practice is to clearly separate SAF and other funds during repayment of debts.

ii. Questions (none)
iii. Debate
iv. Vote
1. Call for consent – no objections – conforming amendments incorporated into bylaws.
d. Substantive Amendments
i. Spring Senate (Section 1)
1. Introduction: Spring Senate includes only rising 2L and 3L senators. For them to meet the quorum is set as higher (2/3) – so 20 members will be required to conduct business rather than 16. This was in response to concerns that the Spring Senate is not representative.
   2. Question & Answer
      a. Question about what constitutes the Spring Senate?
         i. Defined in the Constitution. All senators elected in the Spring elections, only exists from April 15 (this year) to September (whenever 1L and LLMs are elected)
      b. Wasn’t the concern that the Spring Senate shouldn’t make any large decisions at all?
         i. The Spring Senate can make substantive decisions but it has to be a more extraordinary gathering to conduct business.
   3. Debate (none)
4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – amendment passes.
ii. Diversity Council (Section 2B)
1. Introduction by Adam Sparks
   a. Diversity Council was created one year ago today
   b. A number of events happened last academic year that threatened people’s sense that we were in an environment that respects diversity. People felt they couldn’t pursue redress after hate/bias incidents. The committee was formed to hear those complaints and concerns.
   c. Diversity Council met this year. They are finalizing committee-specific bylaws.
   d. Changes adds boilerplate structure
      i. Designed to be vague
      ii. Includes more information about how students are selected, terms of offices, and filling vacancies.
      iii. Timing is the same as graduation committee.
   2. Q&A (none)
3. Debate (none)
4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – amendment passes.
5. Additional technical change highlighted – the committee chairs are e-board members, it’s not specified in the bylaws because it’s in the Constitution.
iii. Ad Hoc Funding (Section 2C3i)
1. Introduction
   a. Gives e-board authority to approve an ad-hoc funding over twice the amount ($1000) that the budget committee and e-board can approve. Means that the Spring Senate won’t have to be convened.
   2. Question & Answer
      a. Who exactly would be needed to approve a request between $500-1000?
         i. First budget committee approval
      b. As it stands now, any request would need to go to the full Senate?
         i. The budget committee term continues until graduation and they will screen the requests first.
         ii. For a request over $1000, the whole Senate will need to be convened.
3. Debate
a. It’s a very good idea. When inviting people onto the budget committee next year it should be clarified that their term extends until graduation.
b. It’s a substantial amount of money.

4. Vote (hand vote)
a. 29-1-1 passes

iv. Graduation Committee Co Chairs (Section 2C4a)
  1. Introduction
     a. In the past the selection was made by the two outgoing co-chairs and the president.
        i. In effect, meant outgoing 3Ls were selecting graduation chairs.
     b. The idea is that members of the class for whom the chairs are selected should have a say in the co-chairs.
     c. Change brings the incoming senate president and treasurer into the process of selecting graduation co-chairs.
        i. 5-person selection committee, increased from 3. Increase from 0 members of the next graduating class to 2 members of the graduating class.
  2. Question & Answer
     a. What does advice and consent of the outgoing chairs and outgoing president mean?
        i. Majority of the five.
        ii. Craig (current grad-chair): Understanding that the three holdovers would agree by a majority vote who they would consent to.
     b. What’s the logic to outgoing chairs having any role at all?
     c. Graduation chair terms always continue through graduation
  3. Debate
     a. Amendment – Dan Shin Senate Confirmable Committee Chair Amendment
        i. Presentation (Jason Lear): Proposes to add that the Spring Senate shall hold a timely vote to confirm the nominees.
           1. The normal process to select new grad chairs could meet after the election of the 30 new Senators and new e-board.
           2. The idea is to get a broader group involved in the selection. The graduation committee has such a profound effect on the lives of the 3Ls and LLMs, there should be more transparency in the selection of that committee.
        ii. Question & Answer
           1. Could it be the Fall Senate?
           2. Would it be just the 2L and 3L senators or the whole Senate?
           3. The issue is how much authority to give to the Spring Senate.
           4. What majority are we talking about?
              a. Unclear, Jason is just presenting for Dan but the spirit is to encourage greater involvement in their selection.
           5. Spring Senate is defined, so it couldn’t be a more expansive notion of the Senate.
        iii. Debate
           1. Craig: Clarification that the Grad Committee does not select the graduation speaker, the administration has the most influential say.
              a. Selecting the next graduation chairs is a difficult job – outgoing chairs know the position intimately and are in the best position to select.
           2. Senator relays information from a discussion with Marta: graduation committee doesn’t really have much say in speaker.
           3. Concern about presenting a slate. If we want graduation committee co-chairs to be elected, they should be elected like other officers.
           4. Doing it in the Spring would require calling the Spring Senate into formal meeting.
           5. Doing it in the Fall would mean the graduation chair term is too brief.
           6. Friendly Amendment Proposal: Timely vote should not have to involve a formal meeting (perhaps a vote conducted over email).
              a. This might be possible under the current language of the statute.
b. Exceptional importance placed on the graduation committee warrants an exceptional process.

c. Language will be drafted

7. If it’s possible to make the selection process more representative, that’s good.

8. Informal vote is bad because then it’s debating the merits of people without the people actually there. It’s also bad because people will making uneducated decisions.

9. Selecting a graduation speaker is a very small part of the grad chair role.

10. While an informal vote is not optimal, it’s better than not having any confirmation at all. New Senators are actually in a good position to assess whether someone is able and appropriate for the role.

iv. New language inserted into the amendment: proposal is to add into the sentence “The Spring Senate shall then hold a timely vote to confirm these nominees” to “The Spring senate shall then hold a timely formal or informal majority vote to confirm these nominees”

1. Friendly amendment
2. Vote on amendment to the amendment (the confirmation step) – requires majority vote.
   a. Vote: 14-14-5
   b. Amendment to the amendment is NOT incorporated into the amendment package.

b. Debate returns to consideration of outgoing grad committee co-chairs and outgoing president with new president and treasurer.

c. Amendment proposed by Stephen Chu. Withdrawn.

d. “Advice and consent” is very unclear – it would be easier to specifically require, say, 4 out of 5 approves.

e. In principle it’s a good idea to give rising 3Ls more control.

f. It’s important that the graduation co-chairs, president, and treasurers all maintain a close relationship.

g. Amendment to the Amendment (Stephen Chu)
   i. Shall elect by a supermajority (4 out of 5 individuals) the two co-chairs
   ii. Idea is to remove the advice and consent language and give the outgoing 3Ls a chance to nominate individuals.
   iii. “Within fourteen days after new officers are elected, a four fifths majority of the incoming Senate President and incoming Treasurer, the outgoing Senate President and outgoing Co-chairs of the Graduation Committee, shall select two rising 3Ls…”

iv. Question and Answer
   1. Why don’t we just say “super majority”?
      a. Because then the original players could block the new players. (3/5)
      b. 2/3 would be functionally the same.

v. Debate
   1. Opposition to the amendment to the amendment. Doesn’t want to introduce something when the president and the treasurer might object to the selected graduation chairs.
      a. Max notes that no one on this year’s Senate had a role in the selection of this year’s grad chairs.
   2. Another senator expresses opposition that outgoing chairs should have a role.

vi. Vote: 4-22-5 the amendment to the amendment does not get incorporated.

h. Return to debate on the original language of the amendment.

i. Motion to call the question

4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – amendment incorporated into the bylaws.
v. Motion to bring business before the assembly. Change to the agenda requires 2/3 vote or 26, whichever is less. Jason Lear moves to have the Senate consider an amendment to the speaker section of the bylaws.
   1. Presentation: There’s lots of concern over the graduation speaker. It’s next in order of changes so it should be inserted now into the agenda.
   2. Amendment will be considered later in the agenda.

vi. Orientation Committee (Section 2C5)
   1. Presentation
      a. Bylaws were amended last year to create a newsletter committee and get rid of the orientation and admitted students committee.
      b. Change would eliminate the newsletter committee and reinstitute the orientation and admitted students committee.
      c. Orientation and Admitted Students Committee. Same mission, there will be two co-chairs (a 1L and a 2L). There can be additional members, but it’s not required.
      d. Within the 14 days, the incoming president with the advice and consent of the e-board will select a 3L chair. The language encourages the 2L chair to continue on as a 3L chair.
   2. Question & Answer
      a. Why was the entire section on the Orientation and Admitted Students Committee removed? Unknown.
   3. Debate
      a. Motion to amend (Rajiv Batra): wants to strike the language “To facilitate institutional continuity” because that will be done in practice. Seconded.
         i. Question & Answer
         ii. Debate
            1. It should stay there because it puts the 2L on notice to continue on in their 3L year. Important for institutional continuity. This doesn’t bind the Senate but facilitates the continuation. There are a lot of huge hurdles to overcome as co-chairs.
            2. Support for the amendment because if the 2L wants to continue on, it will be known to the e-board. This just adds a confusing clause.
            3. It doesn’t bind the selection of a 2L and 3L.
            4. The only reason someone won’t continue is because they don’t want to or they did a bad job (so they won’t want to) so it’s redundant.
            5. Institutional history: If this had been in place before, Dan and Kathrin would have been this year’s orientation co-chair, neither applied.
            6. All this does is put people on notice that the position is a continuing one.
            7. This doesn’t do a lot to encourage the 2L to stay on. We don’t need that and we don’t want to force a 2L to do something they don’t want to.
            8. Orientation chairs were traditionally always 2Ls.
            9. Meredith (this year’s graduation chair) says it’s important to put 2Ls on notice.
            10. Is there another way to establish institutional continuity without putting in this language?
                a. This year’s orientation co-chairs say no.
            11. Another senator expresses that this is redundant and unnecessary.
            12. Future Senates can figure this out.
            13. The bylaws don’t actually hold that much power in this respect. The e-board knows that institutional continuity is important. Some bashing of the bylaws.
            14. It’s unclear how considering the 2L chair first encourages institutional loyalty.
                a. It encourages institutional continuity because it’s never happened before.
                b. The 2L has never continued on as a 3L orientation chair.
                c. Therefore the 2L will be considered first.
            15. Motion to extend debate.
a. Senator expresses disgust that only three people have spoken on the issue.

16. The bylaws are not an idealistic document.

iii. Vote on amendment to the amendment striking the language “To facilitate institutional”
1. 17-13-2 the amendment passes and the language is truck form the amendment proposal.

b. Debate on the amendment (with changes) resumes

4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – amendment passes.

vii. Expenditures (Section 4)
1. Presentation
   a. Expenditure authorization. Original numbers were set in 1989 in the first version of the Senate bylaws. Allowed any individual executive board member to authorize expenditures up to $50, the executive board as a whole could authorize $50-100 and anything over $100 had to go to the full senate.
      i. The change adjusts the number in light of inflation.
      ii. Numbers are boosted, but somewhat less even given inflation.
      iii. Reporting requirements are incorporated. Individual e-board members can authorize $75 and have to report to the e-board. E-board can authorize $150 which then needs to get reported to the Senate.
   b. Question & Answer (none)
   c. Debate (none)
   d. Vote
      i. Call for consent – no objections – passes.

viii. Referenda and Elections (Section 5)
1. Presentation:
   a. Substantial rewrite because the previous language was cumbersome. Most changes do not change substance, except those that are in green.
   b. Adding former senators to the list of those who may table for spring elections.
   c. Encourage record keeping of who has won elections in previous years.

2. Q&A (none)
3. Debate (none)
4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – passes.

ix. Beneficial Purpose of Student Organizations (Section 6B1)
1. Presentation
   a. Changes beneficial purpose section, raises the bar somewhat so that the organization has to be sufficiently related to the law school and sufficiently unrelated to that of any other recognized organization to offer a distinct benefit to a substantial number of law students. Intent is to prevent further student group balkanization.

2. Question & Answer
   a. Can friendly amendments be made?
      i. They would have to get approved by the committee.

3. Debate
   a. Balkanization is important but there should be more concrete standards.
   b. Kathrin (Former chair of recognition committee) notes that this is something that the recognition committee already does, but didn’t entirely feel they had the authority to do.

4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – passes.

x. Recognitions of Student Groups (Section 6C)
1. Presentation:
   a. Parallel processes currently exist for recognition (new versus existing and continuing groups)
   b. Currently to be recognized or re-recognized you have to list the names of at least 7 current members. Change raises the number to 12 current members. 2 leaders also need to be specified for finances and record keeping.
c. Committee may waive this requirement if the beneficial purpose of the group does not require it (i.e. Deans Cup or Bar Czars, which don’t require standing membership)

2. Question & Answer
   a. What was the problem with only requiring 7?

3. Debate (none)

4. Vote
   a. Call for consent – no objections – approved

xi. Additional amendment submitted by Dan Shin

1. Presentation
   a. Paragraphs 8 and 9 (Housing and Computers and Library). These committees are chaired by non-e-board members. The amendment proposes that they be confirmed by the Senate.
   b. “The Chair shall be chosen as provided in Section 5 of Article VIII of the Constitution, except that a timely Senate vote to confirm the Executive Board’s selection shall be held before she may assume the chair.”

2. Question & Answer
   a. Why is this necessary?
      i. Idea was to conform the process for all committee chairs. Nothing specific to any individual chair holders.

3. Debate
   a. Senator says the change should be struck down, as it is unnecessary.
   b. Traditionally they have both been 1L positions and the idea is that the Senate can do anything other than rubber stamp for someone they don’t know

4. Vote
   a. 2-28-1
   b. Amendment does not pass.

xii. Additional substantive amendment submitted by Jason Lear on Graduation Speaker selection

1. Presentation:
   a. Many 3Ls are upset with the selection of the graduation speaker this year. The rules should be clearer in giving students a role. People are passing the buck on who made the decision and students should have more say.
   b. Proposal to create a more transparent process that’s clear about who has a say. Prevents the situation that happened this year if the grad committee doesn’t consult with students.

2. Question & Answer
   a. Clarification question
      i. Senate can’t effect what the Administration does, but the sponsor has had conversations with the administration saying that a list was created by the co-chairs, the administration was guided by that list in choosing a speaker. Sponsor objects that students had no say.
      ii. Graduation chair confirms that Gray Davis was on the list of suggestions as well as many others. The chairs were restricted to alumni who wouldn’t need an honorarium or honorary degree.
      iii. Points out that changing the bylaws will not solve the current problem.
      iv. Gray Davis was #3 on the list that was submitted last July.
      v. The Administration places significant limitations on the selection process.
      vi. Kathrin says that Dean Schizer has the last say. Max disagrees.
      vii. Queen of Jordan and Angelina Jolie were ahead of Gray Davis on the list.
      
      iii. Was the procedure that was put in place (the struck out procedure) used last year? How is the new language different?
      1. It’s to prevent straying from the procedures.
      iv. Clarification by the parliamentarian:
         i. Original language which Jason is proposing to strike was added in 1991. Resulted from controversy over the 1990 speaker. The old language “full and participatory” was not followed. It was not
followed last year or a number of years because it calls for a full participatory nomination process.

v. Do we as the Senate have the power to extend an offer to a speaker?
   1. Jason: Dean has ultimate authority to extend invitation as a formal act. But the dean’s decision is premised on the options made available by the graduation committee.
   2. Kathrin: It’s not Senate’s invitation to make. Dean Schizer makes the invitation as the representative of the law school.

vi. Is it the dean or the administration as a whole who selects the graduation speaker? Who are we talking about?
   1. It’s not clear to the graduation committee who is involved. It’s not transparent. Dean Schizer makes the decision, Dean MGK and alumni development also have input.
   2. Max clarifies on the process:
      a. Names were submitted last summer to Dean MGK.
      b. RBG was original choice, then she couldn’t speak.
      c. Grad chairs pulled together a list.
      d. Dean Schizer chose a speaker, Craig Kathrin and Max approved, the speaker was announced in March.

vii. How many names were on the list?
   1. About ten.

viii. Opinion that the clause is redundant. (“If a speaker is invited to address the graduating class before this process is completed, the invitation will not be considered valid”)

3. Debate
   a. Support for the amendment given the amount of controversy in the last week or two. The language is not too reactionary and starts to set up a process. It may overreach the authority of the Senate, but even if it overstates our power, it’s clear that Senate does have some role in selecting a speaker.
   b. Support for the thrust of the amendment as well.
   c. Proposal to amend the amendment: (Adam Sparks). Seconded.
      i. Presentation:
         1. Creating an ad-hoc committee of 3L and LLMs disperses power too much and create an antagonistic base. Change should just be the approval of all 3L and LLM senators.
         2. What if the selection process is happening during the 2L year?
            a. Outside the scope of the amendment.
         3. Rather than set up an ad hoc committee, it’d be better if everyone just worked together.
      ii. Question and Answer
         1. Is the list supposed to be confidential and is there a problem to having the whole senate vote?
            a. The grad chair doesn’t know. In spirit, no one is supposed to know until the grad kick off party. The administration would probably not approve of the whole Senate seeing the list and voting.
         2. Suggestion: can this be a closed meeting? Withdrawn.
      iii. Debate
         1. The concern is not that senators will have access to the list. We can trust 3Ls and LLMs to not divulge the contents of the list. The goal is to create more transparency.
         2. Even if the process does happen in the spring, while this would exclude the LLM vote, the graduating senators could still vote.
            a. Sponsor hopes this will push the process to the fall.
         3. Support for getting more Senators to vote. Idea of getting more people to vote is good. We don’t need to make it too secret because we’re all responsible human beings.
   iv. Amendment accepted as friendly.
4. Vote (31 present)
   a. Motion to do a roll call vote. (Requires 1/5 vote = 7 senators). Approved.
   b. 16-10-4
   c. Amendment fails

III. Ad hoc request: Columbia Law Revue Spring 2009 Performance
   a. Presentation: (Adam Sparks) Law Revue did not factor in costs of having 3 proctors @ $25/hour plus an extra security guard. Amounts to $600 in extra expenses.
      i. Proctors were required because of intervening events at law school events.
   b. Question & Answer
      i. If Lerner Hall made these changes last minute, shouldn’t they cover the cost?
         1. Law Revue is trying to recoop a number of costs from Lerner Hall. If they do cover the proctors, Law Revue will return the funds.
   c. Debate
      i. Call the question
   d. Vote
      i. Call for consent – no objections. $600 approved.

IV. New business
   a. Lerner Hall Discussion (Adam Sparks)
      i. Lerner Hall and the law school have been clashing on a bunch of issues, including alcohol policy. A meeting was held earlier. They’re very territorial and they impose a lot of requirements on the law school. Causes problems for Law Revue, PILF Auction, Barristers’ Ball.
         1. Something needs to be changed with Lerner Hall, it’s possible they’re outside their legal authority.
         2. The Senate should consider boycotting Lerner Hall for events heading forward.
         3. A resolution is under question.
         4. Vote to commit 5 minutes of discussion time to the issue. (Requires 2/3 vote)
            a. Vote: 17-7-1
            b. Motion withdrawn, people encouraged to post on Basecamp.

V. Announcements
   a. Eric Wolkoff still needs people who use Apples or Macs to test the exam software.

VI. Committee Reports
   a. Graduation Committee
      i. Successful trip to Atlantic City
      ii. Ciao! NY events coming up – Cloisters and Brooklyn Bridge
      iii. Bar Crawl – Goodbye Morningside Heights. 3Ls and LLMs will have shirts which will be their tickets.
      iv. Grad Bowl moved to Friday, April 24 at noon. Teams are practicing.
      v. Grad ball – need to sell 500 tickets.
   b. IT
      i. Mac announcement

VII. Officer Reports
   a. Parliamentarian:
      i. Senate elections next Wednesday. Email to the 1L and 2Ls will go out tonight or tomorrow morning encouraging people to run. Requires candidate statements, which will be due on Sunday at 5pm. (Same for University Senator)
      ii. Volunteers needed for the election tabling. Email Ben.
      iii. E-board elections will be the following meeting (April 21). Question about whether officer candidates should be able to stay in the room for the discussion of the. Trying to asses people’s preferences re: procedure.
         1. In favor of candidates being in the room: 11
         2. Not in favor of candidates being in the room: 8
         3. If you feel strongly about this, email the e-board.
         4. Issue will be determined by an e-board vote.
         5. Suggestion that candidates be out of the room but be allowed to address substantive issues that come up during discussion.
      iv. Thanks everyone for revising the bylaws.
   b. Secretary
      i. Attendance Records
      ii. Blood Drive: Tuesday, April 14
1. Volunteer sheet will be circulated

c. Treasurer
d. Vice President
   i. Social Committee will be voting on where to hold the end of year event. Preference right now is for the Boat Basin on 79th and Riverside.
   ii. Open to more event ideas.

e. President
   i. Vote to spend up to $300 on food at the Town Hall meeting on Student Senate. Approved.
   ii. Vote to spend $500 on the blood drive. Approved.

f. Announcements:
   i. Kathrin will stick around after the meeting if people want to discuss the grad speaker.
   ii. Anyone interested in academic counseling for 1Ls should speak to Erik Lindemann.
   iii. Rajiv is impressed at what people do in this body.

g. President’s Final Words: We’ve had 15 meetings together as a Senate. This is a volunteer effort to improve the student body and your efforts are appreciated.
   i. List of our accomplishments, keep these in mind as you consider whether or not to run again:

      1. Constitutional Revision and Referendum
         a. First time done in 20 years
         b. Record turnout of students
      2. Blawck Party, props to Meredith and Craig
      3. Budget Guidelines successfully approved
      4. Budget committee approved
      5. Streamlining the budget audit process and budget forms.
         a. Used to be a written out difficult process, it was updated to be an online form and the information is now more accessible.
      7. Senate retreat
         a. Review of procedures + dinner and social event
      8. New Senate timekeeping was a major accomplishment. Countdown clock. Complete with Jeopardy sounds!
      9. Introduction of Basecamp. Growing pains associated with it but it allows the Senate to get a lot done.
     10. Fall group recognition – 12 new groups approved. Fall allocations.
     11. THE STAPLER. Bane of the senate’s existence.
         a. Two staplers!
     12. New Amenities
         a. Staplers in the 3rd floor lab
         b. Color printer in the 3rd floor computer lab
         c. Hole punch
         d. Refrigerator (will be arriving soon). Space will be cut out. Thanks to Brittany Schoepp.
         e. Scanner in the library computer lab.
     13. Halloween Party @ Mansion (Lauren, Aditi, Gillian) included NY law schools
     14. Heartbreakers Ball (Lauren)
     15. Email digest
     16. Underground Keg, new initiative made by the graduation committee to bring people together.
         a. Trail of Beers
         b. Great addition to the senate’s social calendar
     17. End of 1L exam period put on by Kahlil, shortly after he took over the Vice Presidency.
     18. Ice Skating event (Will Leavitt)
     19. Election of a new VP – Go Kahlil and Will Leavitt
     20. Improvements to the Senate website
         a. Record hitting days!
            i. ATL April Fools joke – previous record was 1000 in a day. On April 1 there were 6500 hits.
     21. Senate office hours as a way to communicate with the student body
     22. Exam schedule resolution was presented to the faculty.
     23. Student Senate Survey
         a. Completely unprecedented
b. Super props to Ben Brickner
  c. Presented at the senior administrator meeting. Also to the faculty. Will be presented to the student body next week.

24. Communication issues, particularly between administration-students
   a. Dean Schizer has started emailing the student body more
   b. Town hall meetings
   c. More administrator visits to the Senate (Dean Moroni, Natasha Patel, Dean Chapnik)
   d. Greater student presence in hiring decisions
      i. CPIL staff
      ii. Dean of Career Services

25. Around the World Party (Stephen Chu)

26. Date Auction and Sweet Treats event

27. Successful Barristers’ Ball
   a. So successful people scalped tickets
   b. Live music was a good addition

28. Clerkship committee – at the behest of student senators on the committee held a lot of clerkship events. Historically they’ve been inactive.

29. New bylaws.

30. Improvement in Lenfest Café – a continuing effort.

31. Adam Sparks is finishing up his fourth term as student senator and will graduate!!

h. Motion to adjourn, 11:35 p.m.