AIC meeting minutes – 15 February 2012 – 11:30 a.m.

Present: Sara Hopkins, Emily MacKinnon, Mark Dorner, Ehsan Monfared, Amelia Boultbee, Bryan Badali, Eric Gauf, Jessie Gill

Regrets: Everyone else

1. Elections
   1. Eric Gauf will be chief returning officer, although Sara will help with the final counting
   2. They will happen week of March 6th
   3. Eric’s done work on setting the bzzr-ups
2. Admissions
   1. We need three student reps, since admissions will be split in three categories. Ben Goold wants someone from second year for discretionary file review. Sara will re-consult with him about having first year students involved.
   2. Ben Goold wants to have another conversation about the discretionary category changes
3. Curriculum proposal for faculty council
   1. Motion is to eliminate all the baskets, even the ones which aren’t covered by a new mandatory course
   2. Discussion about the proposal to eliminate the procedural basket:
      1. People tend to take these courses anyway
      2. It’s problematic that you can graduate from law school without taking a procedure course
   3. Does the removal of the baskets remove the requirement to take a seminar class?
      1. Unclear from the proposals; Sara will clarify with committee
4. Course proposals sent to curriculum committee
   1. Prof. Benedet’s sexual assault course – to be approved by faculty council 16 Feb
      1. Application met the senate requirements
   2. Prof. Wexler’s topics in tort law course – not before faculty council yet
      1. Application does not meet the senate requirements
      2. Concern that the amount of work students would do for that course wouldn’t merit four credits
      3. Committee is determining if their role is to hold applications back if they wouldn’t meet the senate requirements, or send them up and wait until they’re rejected
         1. The committee thinks they should probably ensure applications will pass before they send them up
5. Ethics Committee
   1. Debated purpose of code of conduct; binding/ non-binding etc.
   2. Decided effective while at law school; non-binding; include non-academic conduct
   3. Only option for binding consequence would be exclusion from LSS
   4. Discussed potential content (subject areas): conduct that matters as law students
      1. Collegiality; respect (peoples, environment, space, ideas); awareness/ openness/ tact;
      2. Respect for variety of career paths
   5. Hoping to introduce in orientation week - pathways for resolving breaches of conduct
      1. Typically ombudsperson will direct concerns to appropriate faculty member/ staff
6. LSS exec meeting
   1. President has floated the idea of a UBC leadership award, not tied to academic achievement
      1. Proposal for 2 x $1500, with $500 coming from LSS and the rest from faculty
      2. Award would be open to everyone (not only LSS members); student-nominated
   2. Concern about LSS binding itself to $1000 every year
   3. Discussion over whether this is appropriate
      1. Some suggestion that the money might be better spent on clubs; maybe award in name only would be just as valuable
      2. Other discussion that attaching money is important in terms of recognition and valuation
      3. Discussion of how the club money is split up & whether there’s inequity around the quantity of money received by some clubs
      4. The monetary value of these awards is much higher than other awards currently available
7. Examinations committee proposal to faculty council
   1. Committee isn’t fervent about pushing it forward & expects a lot of pushback
   2. Prof. Grant has said the only way she’ll table it is if there’s vocal student support
   3. 1L courses should be consistent, although there seems more dissention around making upper year courses consistent
   4. Perception that participation marks, or paper options, give students an advantage
   5. Consistent marking promotes harmony amongst 1Ls
   6. Even grading lends authenticity to the grading scheme and the emphasis placed on grades
   7. Students appreciate the opportunity to be evaluated in different ways, & we would urge you to discuss that, & we would really love that opportunity to be extended to all students – especially in 1L, when everything’s new & being blown out of proportion (not all 100% exams)
   8. Student speakers will be Sara, Emily, & Bryan
8. Bryan’s proposal to examinations committee: should there be consistent grading across all upper-year classes?
   1. Employers might be using these new mandatory classes as another comparative measure between students
   2. Problematic because you’d have to standardize across years
9. Examinations committee’s question about invigilators
   1. They should be present – answer student questions or be able to track down the answer
10. Update on computerized exams
    1. Committee feels it went well & is devoted to moving to computerized exams for all years in April
    2. Current concern is resources
    3. Bryan will ask for a breakdown of paper vs computer exam grades from the 1L December exams