

AIC Minutes November 3, 2010

Present: Yun Li, Sara Hopkins, Kate Phipps, Kyle Johnson, Aimee Schalles, Shirley Smiley, Bryan Badali, Joe Scafe, Emily MacKinnon, Kelli McAllister

Absent: Eric Gauf, Dave Peltier, Graham Hardy, Anthony Oliver

1. Pre-law club event on Nov 15:

- Yun & Sara will go and speak
- Thoughts on faculty to invite: Fiona Kelly...David Duff...Dennis Pavlich ...Ben Goold

2. Interim Report of the Working Group (Kate) on Strategic Framework

- Kate spoke to interim report
- Shirley: congratulated Kate on good job. 4th point of vision statement..."work with practicing lawyers" instead of "work with law firms" to avoid pigeon-holing
- Joe: Are there are issues in transparency?
- Aimee: No problems with transparency, but we could do better
- Shirley: if specific agenda items we should put it in the LSS announcement for that week where it is beneficial to have people
- Sara: will forward Kate a values statement from ombuds perspective
- Kate: will look at values that LSS says it publically has
- Kyle: very good and has the broad and specific things...transparency and inclusiveness line.
 - How are we measuring what level of transparency?
- Kelli: Lack of contact points for students given the disjointed nature of the law school (swing space) and no updated website was where the transparency concern came in from previous discussions
- Joe: change transparency to "visible" something that doesn't have negative connotations
- Emily: part of the Mission statement "cultivate student academic and professional achievements" ...cultivating means more involved than 'advocating' which is what we are doing.
- Kate: hearing that people are uncomfortable with 'transparent' and 'inclusive'...will hang out with a thesaurus
 - we provide a forum to cultivate achievements...and play with wording.
 - change why we do it to the end?
- Shirley: instead of cultivates "supports" "promotes" ...with 'transparent and inclusive' maybe the 'will become more' is the problem in that sentence
- Kate: will play with the wording, make it less far reaching.

3. Committee updates:

- Bryan: examinations committee is meeting tomorrow, considering change to appeals rule and they want student input.
 - Current rule: if file appeal, talk to instructor first. Then pay \$50 and talk to examinations committee and then they have another prof read and mark. Plus 2 steps which are ambiguous (can marks be reduced? how far apart should the two instructors be?)
 - Proposed rule change: marks may be adjusted upward or downward & have to have a 10% difference in mark to 'win' the grade appeal.
 - Emily: only change if 10% difference by outside reader or is it 5%?
 - Bryan clarified: resolved version is that it must be 10%

- Aimee: is it the average change? (Bryan: only if the outside reader can't resolve). 10% is a huge difference, it makes it practically impossible to get any change from the appeal process, doesn't like ability to move the mark downward—seems like a penalty
- Bryan: doesn't like it able to make it marked downward
- Kyle: before this, no appealed mark was moved downward? If downward mark (eg, -10% was implemented) that would put off so many appeals.
- Yun: how much does it cost to appeal?
- Bryan: \$50
- Sara: Ombuds office tells students that on appeal they can't be marked down.
- Joe: 5% v 10%...with 5% will be a lot of papers—possibly not a negative thing. If you don't have the possibility of your grade going down, that will hugely increase the number of appeals(floodgates).
- Bryan: stated goal is to recognize the importance of deference to original instructor and make clear that appeals are an exceptional process (are looking to deter overall use of the appeals process). Maybe high thresholds is one way to avoid excessive use
- Kate: no problem with 10% threshold...it shows there is a real discrepancy that needs to be addressed, 5% who knows if it's a real discrepancy. The people who appeal already do it all the time anyway.... not much we can do about that
- Sara: agrees with Kate about the floodgates. Grades will not be lowered is already told to students. 10% is not appropriate for law..any other faculty where marking scheme/grade range was not dictated then it would be ok...but not law. 10% is too much; makes appeal bound to fail before it starts.
- Kelli: I agree 10% is too much
- Bryan: what about classes below 20 students which have no grade range? The committee is looking at implementing the mandated average rule.
- Kate: the rationale behind that was seminars should be able to give all exceptional students exceptional marks not subject to the curve.
- Emily: 5% and mark can go down or up. If 10% then can't go down.
- Kate: can't go down if it's on appeal. Push for that. It's important to reduce it from 10%...doubt all the way down to 5% maybe 7/8%.
- Joe: what about removing the lack of curve for seminars?
- Kelli/Kate: no.
- Emily:
 - NCBL: one student related thing was moots. Corporate securities moot is no longer happening b/c lost their funder. Profs also don't receive credit
 - Profs don't receive any credit for the moots they help out on. Getting credit should be advocated for profs should be advocated for.
 - Library & Research Committee met: they also were working on vision/mission statement; they want to integrate student involvement in prof research. One of their action elements is to add credit for students to do research for profs (b/c research funding is so low right now).
 - Aimee: isn't it already available under directed research?
 - Emily: Yes.
 - Yun: how do we put that into action?
 - Kate: you bring it to the committee responsible. In this case Research is within the mandate of the Library & Research Committee.
- Kate:

- AMS met 3 week ago, some legal issues started to come up. Engineering Student Union tried to negotiate contract to get a business in their building then went to AMS, and AMS told the engineers that they couldn't negotiate a contract because they are not a legal entity
 - AMS needs to know if we (LSS) plan on negotiating any contract with the faculty that goes beyond renting a space.
- AMS is getting a new elections system and can run ours (good news!).
- Yun: Grad panel
 - Supposed to happening next Tuesday, we need volunteers
 - Kelli will introduce
 - will email Alex and tell him the details.
 - Kelli make posters.
 - 1Ls will announce in class

Meeting adjourned at 1:21 PM