

MANITOBA LAW STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION COUNCIL MINUTES
January 27, 2014
12:00pm
Room 309 - Robson Hall

Attending:

Peter Anandranistakis – *President **
Blair Vincent – *Executive Director **
Brynne Thordarson – *Chair*
Serena Ehrmantraut – *MALSA Representative*
Josh Bokhaut – *MBA Representative*
Matthew Carvell – *UMSU Representative*
Zachary Courtemanche – *Senator*
Sarah Thomson – *3rd Year Representative*
Jaclyn Lawrence – *3rd Year Representative*
Geoff Schneider – *2nd Year Representative*
Jena Colpitts – *2nd Year Representative*
Adam Gingera – *1st Year Representative*
Agapi Mavridis – *1st Year Representative*

Jesse Epp-Fransen – *1st Year Representative*
Connor Levy – *Professional Development Committee (Chair)*
Bryton Moen – *Professional Development Committee*
Stephanie Chan – *Professional Development Committee*
Stacy Senkbeil – *Community Outreach (Chair)*
Danielle Barchyn – *Marketing Committee (Chair)*
Miranda Grayson – *Social Committee (Chair)*
Heather Wadsworth – *Social Committee*
Nicole Drayton – *Social Committee*
Benji Greenberg – *Graduation Committee*
Aaron Maister – *Sports Committee*

Regrets:

Melissa Cattini – *Vice-President**
Zoe Abreder – *Treasurer **
Rob Prokopanko – *Communications Director*
Kyle Emond – *Strategic Relations Committee (Chair)*
Megan Smith – *Graduation Committee (Chair)*

Kevin Mehi – *Sports Committee (Chair)*

Absent:

Kevin Schulz – *Strategic Relations Committee*
Tashia Dreger – *Yearbook Committee (Chair)*
Jordan Smith – *Strategic Relations Committee*
Shasta Benaim – *Yearbook Committee*
Ambre Anjoubault – *Community Outreach*

* denotes members of the Executive Committee

1. Call to Order: at 12:25pm

1.1 Approval of January 27th, 2014 minutes: Anandranistakis/Carvell **Carried**
Courtemanche abstained

1.2 Approval of Agenda: Anandranistakis/Lawrence **Carried**
Courtemanche abstained

2.1 President – Peter E. Anandranistakis

- i. Upcoming Networking Events
- ii. BOSS Meeting
- iii. MLSA Elections
- iv. Faculty Council, Etc.

Questions/Comments:

Carvell asked if anything happened at BOSS.

Peter answered that there was a presentation from Toastmasters.

2.2 Vice-President – Melissa Cattini

- i. Nothing to report

2.3 Treasurer – Zoe Abreder

- i. Nothing to report

2.4 Executive Director – Blair Vincent

- i. Nothing to report

2.5 Communications Director – Rob Prokopanko

- i. Nothing to Report

2.6 MALSA Representative – Serena Ehrmantraut

- i. Nothing to report

2.7 UMSU Representative – Matt Carvell

- i. UMSU Election

Questions/Comments: None

2.8 MBA Representative – Josh Bokhaut

- i. Luxalune Event
- ii. Feedback email

Questions/Comments: None

2.9 Senator – Zachary Courtemanche

- i. Senate Meeting – February 5, 2014

Questions/Comments: None

2.10 Third-Year Representatives – Sarah Thomson, Jaclyn Lawrence

- i. Nothing to report

2.11 Second-Year Representatives – Jena Colpitts, Geoff Schneider

- i. Nothing to report

2.12 First-Year Representatives – Jesse Epp-Fransen, Adam Gingera, Agapi Mavridis

- i. Nothing to report

2.13 Marketing Committee – Danielle Barchyn, Sean Restall

- i. Nothing to report

2.14 Social Committee – Miranda Grayson, Heather Wadsworth, Nicole Drayton

- i. Nothing to report

2.15 Community Outreach Committee – Stacy Senkbeil, Ambre Anjoubault

- i. Nothing to report

2.16 Graduation Committee – Megan Smith, Benji Greenberg

- i. Nothing to report

2.17 Sports Committee – Kevin Mehi, Aaron Maister

- i. Nothing to report

2.18 Yearbook Committee – Tashia Dreger, Shasta Benaim

- i. Nothing to report

2.19 Professional Development Committee – Connor Levy, Bryton Moen, Stephanie Chan

- i. Mock Interview Event – February 4th

Questions/Comments: None

2.20 Strategic Relations Committee – Kyle Emond, Kevin Schulz, Jordan Smith

- i. Nothing to report

3. New Business

i. Faculty Council Discussion

Anandranistakis provided the following introduction to the discussion:

Peter noted that there is a lot of confusion at faculty council about what is confidential and what is not. He spoke to the Dean and Peter is going to present everything that has been said at open session.

Peter noted that it started with discussion about the budget and asked faculty for reports that if they had to cut 5% of their budget where would it be. Peter noted that for the law school budget there was discussion about merging the 1st year sections into 2 rather than 3. The discussion became that the faculty needs more money so the discussion turned to tuition increases. Faculty council adopted a motion to consider a tuition fee proposal. He considers this as not taking a formal position on it. Since then, there has been a discussion draft that has circulated. The dean wants that to be kept confidential so that it comes out to everyone at once. There was discussion on the merits of a tuition increase. The last time there was a tuition increase it was separated into three sections – student services, student bursary programs and faculty retention.

Once the memo is released there will be a consultation and discussion period. At some point faculty council will need to adopt this, and this is what the vote will be yes or no on. Peter advocates for a student referendum on a yes or no. For the tuition increase to happen there must be student consultation. One of the key places that we must be aware of is student support. Peter doubts that progress would happen if the students were not in support of it. Based on the time lines if the students feel as though it is being rushed, they can vote no on the timeline rather than the merits.

The timeline at the moment for the report is uncertain. It could be a proposal that gets circulated and there are some discussions but the consultations do not happen until next academic year. It is hard to gauge student support when the matter is rushed. The dean does not know the timeline for the discussion draft. The Dean has asked that the discussion stay within Robson Hall, the idea at the moment is to keep it within RH.

Questions/Comments:

Wadsworth asked how much the tuition increase would be?

Anandranistakis stated that the details are in the report that is to be kept confidential, however it is likely going to be \$5,000.

Carvell asked would that all be in one swoop?

Peter stated that it is yet to be seen.

Senkbeil noted that a referendum has to be held because the government has a tuition cap. She has requested the Robson Hall financial records since 2000 so that it could be determined where the money was going. She is pleased to hear that it might not go further this year.

Anandranistakis noted that this might be addressed in the discussion draft but it is good that other students are looking into the matter.

Coutemanche asked what the tuition increase cap is in Manitoba?

Senkbeil answered that it hasn't been decided yet but it was 2-4% or something.

Epp-Fransen noted that there was also a discussion about whether students would be grandfathered in or how it would be implemented.

Anandranistakis noted that he does not think it would be implemented all at once for everyone

Gingera asked about what else might be cut if there is no tuition increase?

Anandranistakis noted that there is also a consideration of decreasing the credit hours that you would need to graduate, because at the moment it is higher than what the law society requires. There was also discussion on reducing IT support, but it might not happen.

Senkbeil noted that there was also discussion about centralizing IT and have it be an online system.

Anandranistakis noted that faculty did consider the online system but Peter things it would be a huge blow to the school.

Epp-Fransen noted that in addition to the cut, it may possibly result in a reduction of teaching hours.

Carvell asked if there is any discussion of adding more students to Robson Hall?

Anandranistakis answered that there hasn't been any talk of that what with the articling crisis, and the building might not support that either, it would be a bad idea. If the class size would go up to 150 they would not fit in the moot court room, on his understanding that is something that is not happening at this time.

Gingera asked how 5% budget cuts lead to \$5k tuition increase?

Anandranistakis noted that instead of adding small increases later they want to be proactive now and add more now.

Courtemanche asked if there was any aspect of the conversation about how increasing tuition might affect admission?

Anandranistakis noted that it was discussed.

Ehrmantraut noted that in the meeting they did discuss that the \$5k increase would put U of M at the national average of Canada.

Courtemanche noted that the average probably notes includes the higher tuition in ON

Colpitts noted that it most likely can't go forward unless it gets student support and she noted that it is important for our opinions to be canvassed to discuss what the money should go towards.

Anandranistakis also wants to emphasize that the tuition fee proposal in and of itself is being considered, the idea of what it should be is being considered right now. Part of that consideration should be that maybe there shouldn't be one.

Grayson asked if that means that the \$5k is the bare minimum that is needed to keep RH running or if they can improve RH with that amount?

Anandranistakis answered that a tuition increase of that magnitude would be needed to keep things ok, and for things to get better the school would need more than the \$5k. He thinks students should be considering how satisfied they are with the RH education and are you ok with the faculty stating that if you don't pay will it be ok?

Schneider also noted that meeting the Canadian average, was not given with any reasoning from the numbers as to what the \$5k would get us to, there was no discussion as to what the average amount provided, and that should be something that the students consider.

Carvell asked who is involved with writing the discussion paper?

Anandranistakis answered that he believes it is just the dean, no students. But you could speak to the dean.

Anandranistakis noted that there is a lot to be taken from the discussion he does not want to dive into what the draft says, but once it is not confidential he wants a town hall type of meeting where the students voice their opinions. There will also be town halls run by the MLSA that are student-only so that the faculty factor does not come into what students say. He also noted that students should consider how they feel about other aspects of RH education, such as career services, if there is not satisfaction with that then there should be proactive comments coming forward to the faculty.

Senkbeil noted that there is not always a money issue, that it might be other issues that are affecting the services that we have.

Carvell noted that irrelevant of the discussion for tuition increases there should still be a discussion for improving career services and courses.

Colpitts noted that the 2nd year reps want to canvass for opinions of how the students feel about their education.

Anandranistakis noted that the scale of satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be done when we move into the canvassing phase.

Chan noted that the staff at Career Services is worse than last year because Maria Roy who was Marla's assistant went on mat leave and the new hire did not work out so there is no assistant now and no one is monitoring the website.

Moen noted that we still want a career services regardless of the tuition increase, and we should keep that in mind so that the two issues do not get conflated.

Anandranistakis responded that the two separate issues can be brought separately and the MLSA will keep that in mind.

Epp-Fransen noted that he is happy to help canvass the students and he thinks sooner is better in that the earlier students speak up the better. Since if the students have their priorities in order and express that to faculty they can allow it to be put in their discussion paper. Knowing what the students want is important.

Courtemanche noted that there should be a canvassed opinion about a tuition increase and a canvassed opinion on the services. There should be a dichotomy of the issues, we should not passively endorse an increase if that is not the way we want to go.

Thordarson noted that they may be too connected to separate them fully.

Courtemanche noted that the increase should be considered first and then if it is agreed on, what it should be used for.

Bokhaut agreed with Jesse that the student opinion should be canvassed sooner rather than later so that we do have an opinion on what services we want so that the cohesive opinion can be presented as a unified force.

Senkbeil noted that students should have a forum to raise issue sthat they have. The MLSA should listen to every single concern that students have. Under the heading of tuition increase the canvassing should include what the impact of the tuition increase should be, such as student loans not being able to cover tuition

Anandranistakis wants to separate it to a before and after the discussion draft is released. That allows for us to discuss the specifics. What he thinks for the moment is to proceed and look for student opinions that are concerning students right now. Peter stated that it is important to note that if we canvass that things are bad right now, it should be separate from whether we agree to a tuition increase or not. He also agrees that it should be done professionally and to come to the dean with student opinions would be a good way to go about it. Peter is open to what the MLSA would like to do in order to move forward. It might be best to work with a top-down approach to get information from students.

Mavridis noted that there should also be a way for students to comment on improvements that don't cost money and that should be the type of messaging that should be presented to students.

Restall noted that we should ask the previous years of students that have graduated what their opinions are.

Anandranistakis noted that that would be a difficult task since we do not have lists of previously graduated students.

Anandranistakis noted that this discussion has been helpful, we have identified some things we would like to address in advance of the discussion paper. If the referendum comes out the power

is in the hands of the students. In terms of this it is all open session, so you can tell people, the only thing you would want to keep in mind is to keep it within RH to help with the working relationship with faculty. There should not be rumour mongering or misinformation as it affects our credibility.

MOTION #1: Motion to allow Josh Shaw to address the MLSA Council.

Motion to allow Josh Shaw to speak to address the MLSA Council on behalf of Outlaws.

MOTION #1: Anandranistakis/Schneider

Carried

Questions/Comments: None

Vote:

All in favour

ii. MOTION #2: Motion for MLSA to present Outlaws petition to faculty council and present a motion to faculty council to publicly condemn the law school at TWU.

WHEREAS

- 1) Trinity Western University ["TWU"] is a private Christian university, at which all TWU students must sign a Community Covenant Agreement which requires that they abstain from 'sexual intimacy that violates the sacredness or marriage between a man and a woman'.
- 2) TWU has obtained accreditation from the Federation of Law Societies of Canada to open a law school.
- 3) The requirement of the Community Covenant Agreement discriminates against lesbian, gay, and bisexual ["LGB"] people contrary to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and creates an environment fundamentally at odds with educating legal professions who must promote, preserve, and defend the rule of law and the equality principles which underlie our legal system.
- 4) Outlaws, a LGBT student group at Robson Hall Faculty of Law, has at the time of this motion garnered over 100 signatures in opposition to TWU.

THEREFORE be it resolved that voting members of the MLSA on faculty council present this petition [provided attached to this e-mail] to faculty council and be it further resolved that the MLSA present a motion to faculty council to publicly condemn the law school at TWU.

MOTION #2: Schneider/Colpitts

Amended

Questions/Comments:

Shaw provided that professors Fainstein and Parkes have signed the petition and there are also 112 signatures from students in support of the petition. What the petition is essentially is for the Law society of MB to use their retained ability to pass policy in consideration of public policy to bar graduates from TWU from practising in Manitoba. Hopefully by asking each law society to

bar law graduates from TWU from practising, it would effectively make TWU defunct and would pressure the Federation of Law societies to remove the accreditation. Shaw noted that the way that the covenant is stated at the moment it would prevent any LGBT would be accepted and welcomed to the law school but they cannot live the way that they want and he believes that is wrong.

Moen asked if this issue hasn't already been addressed with the Federation of Teachers case. Mavridis noted that the covenant also affects straight students that engage in pre-marital sex so students should consider that also.

Restall noted that the petition only has about 33% of the student body in signatures, and it is not the majority decision at the moment and that should also be considered.

Epp-Fransen noted that there are two parts to the motion, one to present the petition which seems fine but the second is to publicly condemn and he doesn't know what that means.

Shaw noted that Osgoode has just sent a public letter condemning the law school at TWU, it would go in the form of a public letter addressed to the Federation of Law Societies, the Law Society of Manitoba, or the public.

Carvell asked if any of this would change if TWU removed the covenant, would this change the Outlaws viewpoint?

Shaw noted that it is the covenant that is a problem and the fact that it discriminates.

Anandranistakis noted that this is another example of where there is an outside group wanting to move things forward, and we should support it. The MLSA has voting seats on faculty council, he thinks it is reasonable for us to bring this on behalf of Outlaws, with both parts of the motion to be on the table. On the matter of the SCC Federation of Teachers decision it is a tricky issue, he thinks that the Outlaws group put together an excellent FAQ and while he cannot quote it, there is something along the lines, that if we as lawyers are going to function in a certain role that is regulated by the government, then we as a profession should not be discriminating. Although it is not a majority decision of the Robson Hall student body, the fact that more than 100 people came out and put their name down should be enough to present the motion to faculty council and the debate can proceed at council. He also wanted to note that faculty council will be debating it there.

Senkbeil noted that if voting members do not feel comfortable there could also be a way to split the portions of the motion.

MOTION #3: Motion to amend the final paragraph of Motion #2.

Motion to amend the final paragraph of Motion #2 into two distinct motions being:

THEREFORE be it resolved that voting members of the MLSA on faculty council present this petition [provided attached to this e-mail] to faculty council.

and

THEREFORE be it resolved that the MLSA present a motion to faculty council to publicly condemn the law school at TWU.

MOTION #3: Courtemanche/Carvell

Carried

Questions/Comments: None

Vote:

In favour:

Peter Anandranistakis
Blair Vincent
Serena Ehrmantraut
Matthew Carvell
Zachary Courtemanche
Sarah Thomson
Jaclyn Lawrence
Geoff Schneider
Jena Colpitts
Adam Gingera
Agapi Mavridis

Opposed: None

Abstained:

Josh Bokhaut
Jesse Epp-Fransen

MOTION #4: Motion for MLSA to present Outlaws petition to faculty council.

WHEREAS

- 1) Trinity Western University ["TWU"] is a private Christian university, at which all TWU students must sign a Community Covenant Agreement which requires that they abstain from 'sexual intimacy that violates the sacredness or marriage between a man and a woman'.
- 2) TWU has obtained accreditation from the Federation of Law Societies of Canada to open a law school.
- 3) The requirement of the Community Covenant Agreement discriminates against lesbian, gay, and bisexual ["LGB"] people contrary to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and creates an environment fundamentally at odds with educating legal professions who must promote, preserve, and defend the rule of law and the equality principles which underlie our legal system.
- 4) Outlaws, a LGBT student group at Robson Hall Faculty of Law, has at the time of this motion garnered over 100 signatures in opposition to TWU.

THEREFORE be it resolved that voting members of the MLSA on faculty council present this petition [provided attached to this e-mail] to faculty council.

MOTION #4: Schneider/Colpitts

Carried

Questions/Comments: None

Vote:

In favour:

Peter Anandranistakis
Blair Vincent
Serena Ehrmantraut
Matthew Carvell
Josh Bokhaut
Sarah Thomson
Jaclyn Lawrence
Geoff Schneider
Jena Colpitts
Adam Gingera
Agapi Mavridis
Jesse Epp-Fransen

Opposed:

Zachary Courtemanche

Abstained: None

MOTION #5: Motion for MLSA to present a motion to faculty council to publicly condemn the law school at TWU.

WHEREAS

- 1) Trinity Western University ["TWU"] is a private Christian university, at which all TWU students must sign a Community Covenant Agreement which requires that they abstain from 'sexual intimacy that violates the sacredness or marriage between a man and a woman'.
- 2) TWU has obtained accreditation from the Federation of Law Societies of Canada to open a law school.
- 3) The requirement of the Community Covenant Agreement discriminates against lesbian, gay, and bisexual ["LGB"] people contrary to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and creates an environment fundamentally at odds with educating legal professions who must promote, preserve, and defend the rule of law and the equality principles which underlie our legal system.
- 4) Outlaws, a LGBT student group at Robson Hall Faculty of Law, has at the time of this motion garnered over 100 signatures in opposition to TWU.

THEREFORE be it resolved that the MLSA present a motion to faculty council to publicly condemn the law school at TWU.

MOTION #5: Schneider/Colpitts

Carried

Questions/Comments:

Anandranistakis noted that the publicly condemning wording may be throwing people off.

Shaw noted that the MLSA could ask Faculty Council to express their public opinion whether positive or negative.

Epp-Fransen noted that he supported condemning but I just wanted to know what that meant when he asked earlier.

Thordarson asked if there are concerns with the wording of the motion as it is. No one voiced any concerns.

Bokhaut noted that one of the issues is that we are asking them to bring the motion and also act on it, which the MBA is still trying to determine a unified opinion on.

Colpitts noted that it might be helpful to bring the motion sooner rather than later to avoid a delay from faculty council

Schneider asked if there was a way to word it so that the MLSA can support it but there is no requirement on council?

Anandranistakis noted that might make things more difficult. There is also a timeline issue to consider.

Shaw noted that the benchers of the law society will meet in March and that's when they want to petition to be raised.

The chair brought the matter to a vote

Vote:

In favour:

Peter Anandranistakis

Blair Vincent

Serena Ehrmantraut

Matthew Carvell

Sarah Thomson

Jaclyn Lawrence

Geoff Schneider

Jena Colpitts

Adam Gingera

Agapi Mavridis

Jesse Epp-Fransen

Opposed:

Zachary Courtemanche

Josh Bokhaut

Abstained: None

4. Old Business

5. Announcements

Vincent thanked SC for Carbolic

Carvelll thanked Brynne for chicken fingers

Bokaut wanted to thank everyone for the ball hockey equipment and to thank PDC for the mock interviews

Anandranistakis noted that if you wanted a cheque to get it to Zoe as soon as possible

6. Notice of Next Meeting:

- i. Rob Prokopanko will contact MLSA Members with notice of next meeting.

7. Adjournment: Josh/Jesse at 1:36pm

Carried

Courtemanche abstained.
