

* **University of New Brunswick Law Students’ Society**
* **EMEGENCY COUNCIL MEETING**
* **Tuesday, March 23th, 2018**
* **8:30AM – Room 28**
* **Call to Order—** Nushka Blais
* The Chairperson called the Emergency Meeting of Council to order at 8:33am, and welcomed those present.
* **In Attendance:**
* Nushka Blais
* Ben Lord
* Desiree Duplessis
* Genviève Gangné
* Molly Murphy
* Natalie Feltrin
* Adam Foote
* Ciara Jerrett
* Dylan Coady
* Hilary Perry
* Serena Smith
* Fahim Rahman
* Jill Pilgrim
* Rosy Arora
* Kathleen Adams
* **Motion—**Adoption of the Agenda
* *Nushka Blais (Chairperson) calls for additions. None offered*
* Moved by: Adam
* Seconded: Gen  **Motion CARRIED**

1. **Proposed Tuition Increase Discussion**

* **Nushka:** We only have one item on the agenda, which was the purpose of this meeting
* **Ben:** Personally as a student advocate I believe, it’s difficult because he [VP Academic George Maclean] is coming back but as it stands now he has not said that he will make any changes, and this could go through April 19th.
* I think we need to consider students that will be out priced by this tuition increase. I think the stance should be that we oppose the tuition increase point blank.
* **Fahim:** Do we know what the timeline is for approval? Because I was under the impression that it was going to go for approval in the next academic year as part of 2019/2020.
* **Jill:** It’s going to the Board of Governors April 19th of this year for approval, implementation would be 2019/2020.
* **Hillary:** My perspective is a little different in that a tuition increase would be feasible if we got some benefit from it but as of now it does not seem like we are. It would be worth noting that even though what is at issue isn’t the differential fee, but because of our fee we are being disproportionately impacted by this, therefore the Law faculty must see a tangible benefit.
* **Jill:** That’s important to note because it is not being said among students that a tuition increase is the key point at issue, it is the lack of benefit.
* **Ben:** I feel like that position is hard to articulate. What is a benefit? They could just say the overall benefits for UNB services vis a vis benefit the law school.
* **Jill:** Which is exactly what he stated at the meeting ‘we benefit from the Student Union, we benefit from the CC Jones’, which obviously are benefits but it doesn’t really get at the fact that our entire school experience for the most part happens in this building.
* **Hillary:** It’s not enough to justify a 4000$ increase with only continued access to the same benefits.
* **Molly:** In addition to the points that were raised I would push for a delay so that some of the methodological considerations that were raised yesterday can be reviewed, as of now it is not ready to be passed. So, I think underpinning our official stance, should be that we are pushing for this necessary procedural delay due to the flawed manner in which these calculations were made and data derived.
* **Lucas:** I would echo Molly. I’m under the impression that after the April Board of Governors meeting there is not another one until October. If that vote is delayed the rationale would be to take the summer to extend consultation, and gives us time to consider what a tangible benefit to the law school means. As well this gives the Dean the opportunity to take the summer to fully realize what it is that we want put back into the law school. I think that there is an opportunity there instead of just opposing the tuition hike entirely, we should be steering them in a different direction.
* **Adam:** I agree substantively with Lucas’ comments. A delay would also allow us to go to the student body to gather hard qualitative feedback toward what an official stance should be.
* **Kathleen:** Excuse my anarchist bone here but I vehemently disagree with the tuition increase. While I was working at Stfx at the administration level we would only ever see small, incremental increases. That being said we did not have the freeze that New Brunswick had.
* It appears as though the research team that they put together, and one of them was in the audience yesterday, who was that?

**Jill:** Michelle, she’s admin.

* **Kathleen:** I think that she’s the person that we’re going to want to talk to. People like Dr. Maclean are never those people, from my experience, that are doing the legwork. Why talk to her? Because that’s where the research was coming from and I do not think it was professional. I don't believe they consulted a professional body of accountants, I truly believe they looked at a list of Canadian law school tuitions, that they tried to place us amongst those, and I think that they just came up with a number. I think that we should be opposing this completely. There has not been any benefit to the law school.
* **Fahim:** It would be great to draft a survey with 5-6 questions, although we may be in unanimous agreement with how the faculty also feels. It would be beneficial to have numbers to support that though.
* **Serena:** I’ve worked for administration, and they really just think in numbers, only saying we are opposed to this is not going to be enough.
* **Dylan:** I was thinking, what if we made a video of all of us, just going off to use all of the things we don’t have. Other schools seem to have services to match their tuition rates, that we could really just record ourselves going to use things that aren’t there.

**Nushka:** Applying for programs that don’t exist

**Des:** Student Clinic out of order

* **Nushka:** Any other opinions
* **Ben:** I’m confused on where we are taking this. Are we saying we are opposed to the increase because of the planning behind it? e we saying we are opposed to the increase because?

**Jill:** Probably best option. We can’t just say we don’t like it.

**Ben:** Well you can based on a tuition increase of 4000$.

**Jill:** Up until this point we’ve been very much working together as an LSS but I do have to go back to the council and speak in a manner that I think is representative of the student body. I’m not going to sit in the meeting and say that we don't like it, it’s just going to make us look lazy.

**Ben:** I’m not saying that either but I’m saying that addition to the consultation process being a farce, it's not unreasonable to say I don't want the increase. I don't want it qualified with the process needs to better. It should be that the a 4000$ increase will out price our diverse socio-economic student body.

* **Nathalie:** Is it possible to oppose it and have have a three pronged reasoned approach? Too much all at once, there wasn't enough consultation, the methodology flawed and present all of those concerns wrapped up in a general opposition
* **Serena:** I agree with that and also that our law faculty fees are covering so much of what I think should not be what the faculty fees are used for. Fees towards power bills, Martha, the Associate Dean, those should be covered by UNB, not our fees.
* **Hillary:** I think Ben captured this, the disproportionate increase, disproportionate impact needs to be part of whatever sentiment is captured
* **Fahim:** *Echoed Nathalie*
* **Des:** *Echoed Nathalie* because the increase is being done in a way that is 'pulling the wool over our eyes', putting pressure on them for the quality of their planning would be beneficial
* **Gen:** Would it be too much work to find out what the differential fees?
* **Des:** You mean like a research-a-thon?
* **Kathleen:** We want the reputation of the school to prevail. What does the administration not want? They don't want angry students; they don't want negative publicity. Our wants are similar to theirs in that capacity. It is obvious that there is misconduct here. I may be coming from an angry position but I say we blow this up. We hit them where it hurts, we hit them in the pocketbook. We are the future donors. We were kept from any meaningful consultation. Is this the last experience with UNB law that you want as 3rd years?
* **Des:** You are terrifying
* **Nushka:** Not bad for an anarchist

Who was next?

* **Serena:** I agree with Kathleen, the donor angle is also very good. I think its interesting outlining the tuition. George mentioned that yesterday in terms of it working against us in some instances, where we would see that 14k is reasonable in terms of our comparator schools. I don’t know why George kept referencing our comparator schools as Dal and U of A, where U of O USask or UdeM are more so in line for a comparison.
* **Nathalie:** If we compiled our own list of comparator schools based on the criticisms given yesterday, would it be possible to also account for the services and benefits that result from that? Dal for example, for their 18k they have three specialized services, the have x amount of faculty, the student to faculty ratio is *this*. In other words, they have something to show for that tuition price - they have the services to match.
* **Ben:** What were the outlined reasons we were going to include in the statement
* **Fahim:** Lack of consultation, bad deal for students because no benefit, and because of the flawed methodology for the data used.
* **Molly:** Once I make the minutes available we will be able to adduce earlier statements.
* **Nushka**: Looking to input my opinion.

During the first semester of my first year I needed to get healthcare on campus but the clinic does not open until I am in class, therefore it took three months to get an appointment with a doctor who could help with what I needed. The way that the health services are run is not functional for students is law.

Yesterday when the term accessible continued to be thrown around it irritated me. Coming from a low income background, working, these were all added difficulties. We do not even have a properly accessible building. On top of that going to be asked to take a 4000$ tuition hike and I’m not seeing any benefits to my career or school to show for it.

* **Lucas:** I suggest that after an official stance is drawn that we can do something next week [letter writing campaign among other ideas] to hand off to the Board of Governors through our faculty representatives. What is clear is that personal stories are important, and George was much more receptive to them. That’s what we want to send with our faculty representatives on the Board of Governors. If they are given that evidence at their meeting they can’t conclude that the consultations are finished. It may their conscience more
* **Adam:** We need to draw a proper distinction. Are we opposed to the tuition increase *as is*, or *at all*?
* **Ben:** My preference would be that we oppose *this* tuition increase. An *as is*, not an *at all*.
* **Adam:** Can the official stance be circulated for feedback to the student body because of the uptick in student interest on this issue?
* **Hillary:** I’m under the impression that the purpose of this meeting is to provide Jill with the information necessary to report to the greater SU council and present a unified statement. For these purposes it would be for Jill to have a united front.

**Adam:** *Clarification*

**Ben:** *Clarification.*

* **Serena:** Might be helpful to have a quick survey to have a comment section where they could do general comments to also accompany a letter writing campaign to provide for the Board.

**Nushka:** Some of those future students do not have a voice because this question is of great importance and we should be consulting them.

**Hilary:** Not for 2019-2020

**Ben:** Not under out umbrella

And outside the confines of our current society. I believe that it is a large enough issue on its own.

**Hillary:** I’m worried that it may become too tangential for our purposes. It may be because it is unreasonable because we have seen the consultation process and we have seen the report

* **Lucas:** In terms of the timing of when we are going to be giving our thoughts on the issue. George Maclean will be coming back. Should we now wait until he comes back for the second time.

**Jill:** He does want it to be next week, I would like to pick a different day so that more students who may not have been able to make it. He said you give me a time and that I will make time.

* **Serena:** I agree with Lucas in looking for a delay so we should do this early in the week
* **Ben:** We need to keep in mind the time these things require and the timing in terms of our semester as a student body. We are approaching the busiest time of year. Coming out with a broad statement next week. The reality of the situation is that we have certain faculty who are very vocal looking to engage the media. I can say that we have already emailed the *Bruns* and said that we have not had a chance to fully engage in the process, we are unable to gage what the effects of this way increase will increase.
* **Jill:** The Bruns has been holding on to this and waiting for the Law School to have a position on this and I want to have give them something but we want to engage more in the process.
* **Fahim:** I'm not sure how I feel about holding off for a fulsome opinion.

**Jill:** He may not come.  
**Fahim:** That would be a poor move on his part.

**Hillary:** I feel like he was very receptive, and that is a bridge that we may not want to burn. Jill when you speak at the Student Union, I feel like your role is more so to update than to give an official stance. That may be a way to balance both.

**Serena:** Him coming back could also be a political move. A statement made respectfully should not hinder that.

**Lucas:** The concern wasn't that George wasn't coming back that there were still 15 students on that list that still had questions to ask.

* **Fahim:** I agree but with what Adam said, I feel as though we need to get a better pulse. Student feedback for those who couldn't voice their concerns for a proposal or report that everyone can get behind. I don't agree with that being "this is our counter proposal". How would be collect student feedback. We don't want it to be on Facebook. Someone will have to go through that feedback and compile it.
* **Ben:** I believe that there is value in a report but we should plan for the fact that this is moving forward in April.
* **Lucas:** We just need to get it delayed,
* **Ben:** My tangible win here is a delay. If we could continue to get student opinion out for letters, before we meet with him, we could scan and give to nob for distribution
* **Nushka:** Is there a motion or proposition here?
* **Ben:** I guess that I don't really understand what we would move as a motion, to adopt a 3-pronged opposition.
* **Molly:** We wouldn’t need to move for a motion on *inaction,* if we were just tabling discussion. Maybe move for the general content of the statement.
* **Des:** The motion should be to adopt the three pronged stance that was stated and I agree with those points personally so that we oppose the proposed tuition review report *as is* .

**MOTION:** To adopt the LSS stance to adopt the tuition stance as is to adopt the

approach that is taken in the minutes. To adopt the official LSS stance being as opposing the tuition hike *as is* based on the three-prong approach that is outlined in the minutes.

* + Moved by: Des
  + Seconded: Ben
* That the official LSS stance stands as being as opposed to the tuition hike *as is,* based on the three-prong approach that is outlined in earlier the minutes.

Vote was unanimous **Motion CARRIED**

**2) New Business Roundtable**

* *Serena: I agree with Molly’s point and think we should move toward an online survey.*
* *Molly: I will get in contact you on that.*

**3) Motion—Adjourn**

* Moved: Des
* Seconded: Nathalie

That the emergency meeting of Council dated March 23th, 2018 be adjourned at 9:57 am.

**Motion CARRIED**