

Joint SAC and AIC Meeting

October 9, 2012

Meeting called to order: 12:40pm

President:

- Wants to give a picture of the budget meeting and aftermath to prevent further misinformation
- Sent out email on respectful dialogue; encouraged to read UBC and LSS statements of value
- Communications with nexus to UBC can entail sanctions from the University
- There used to be no process at all for requesting funds, just random emails and there was no policy
- The process was not transparent and it was difficult to get people to show up and to pass the budget
- Last year, the LSS put in place a number of reforms, including re outside funding
- The Finance Committee was charged with making the proposal this year
- In the future, we would like to have two weeks notice of the proposed budget
- We will be having a budget reform committee to have policies for requests, the provision of reasons, and the posting of records online for students to view
- The budget meeting didn't really go as it was supposed to, but we were glad that the openness has resulted in a lot of input from students
- Many things this year went really well and being volunteers, the people that contributed deserve a lot of respect
- The budget will stand, if only for the reason of timing; it would not really be feasible to redo the whole process
- We are prepared to deal with any equity issues that come to light
- We have had a lot of support from the Equity Office and faculty, and they definitely respect our independence from the university
- We do not, however take this issue lightly and we are responding

Q&A

- We would like to put in place a process for appeal, reasons, resubmissions, and the submission of potential amendments beforehand
- Funding for clubs, e.g. Wine Club, should involve a dialogue so that the FC can have an accurate picture of the request and to consider it; the FC stands by its process and it largely worked, but the issues generally are equity ones and not necessarily FC ones
- We are not experts and are soliciting as much advice as we can get
- We are trying to determine and maybe even redefine our role within the law school

Prof. Goold:

- The faculty as a collective is itself diverse as people and holders of different views; however, the faculty does have some views expressed as a collective coming from Faculty Council
- Faculty appreciate the independence of the LSS and want them to govern themselves; however, this needs to be balanced with the faculty's obligations to comply with UBC policies on any equity issues and problems they perceive in the law school
- It is not so much a question of what we let students do, but rather we limits can we place on their self-governance
- There are differing views, but generally the faculty views its role as limited to intervening where necessary and to let students deal with their own affairs even where the faculty might have some right to intervene
- The non-academic code of conduct applies quite broadly, including on social media where it occurs on campus or where there is a clear link to the university
- Prof. Goold often solicits advice on the role and duties of the faculty, including outright legal advice
- It is generally not controversial that the University has jurisdiction in these areas
- The administration is working to have faculty, staff, and students go through equity training

- Administrators are charged with the operation of the law school and the JD program; they are very aware of the effort the LSS puts into the student program and that they will take action when needed and when asked to improve the institution,
- He sees it as a healthy sign that so many most are involved and are discussing issues