

# plenary minutes

## FINAL PLENARY

OUSA Fall General Assembly 2009  
Wilfrid Laurier University  
Sunday, October 25, 2009

### 1. Roll Call

All Present

### 2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the 2009 Fall Plenary Agenda.  
**approved by consensus**

### 3. Approval of Speaker

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves \_\_\_\_\_ as the Speaker for final plenary.

**Moved: Williams; 2<sup>nd</sup> Shumk**

**Williams nominates Pat Duncan**

**Pat Duncan Accepts**

**passes unanimously**

### 4. Approval of 2009 Spring Plenary Minutes

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the 2009 Spring Plenary Minutes.

**Moved: williams; 2<sup>nd</sup>: martin**

**A. Rowe: Three amendments changing Highland to Hyland**

**passes unanimously**

### 5. 2008-09 Year In Review

President Moulton presents the Year in Review. Presentation examines the 08-09 action plan and provides progress updates. Action Items 1, 2, 18 and 21 were not completed.

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives 2008-09 Year In Review

Moved: Williams; 2<sup>nd</sup> Lanteigne

passes unanimously

\*\*\*\*Pat steps down as speaker\*\*\*\*

Motion to approve Jeff Henry as speaker: Moved: Williams; 2<sup>nd</sup> Preston

Motion passes

### 6. Officer and Home Office Reports

a) President's Report

President Moulton presents report. Report focuses on strategic planning retreat, national student survey – will take place in November at all OUSA schools and 19 total schools across the country. Dan thanked schools for contributing extra funds to this project; college-university credit transfer; national student partnership – successful summer conference in Edmonton, will meet again in Toronto in November; Partnerships; Campus Visits – include townhalls, meeting with administration, media opportunities, presentations to councils, raising awareness on campus; long-term plan – looking at our budget situation and where we need to grow; Campus Coordinator Day – brought coordinators together for training at Western in September; Reaching Higher Consultations – many meetings with bureaucrats and political staff to push our agenda, specifically tuition, financial aid and student success; Home Office Staff – Dan thanks the home office staff for all their hard work; Steering Committee – Dan commends the committee for their commitment, leadership and hard work.

b) Vice-President (Finance) Report

VP Lanteigne informs the Assembly that much of the specific financial information will be presented in later presentations. The report describes the audit process and the significant budget and account overhaul that took place this year

c) Vice-President (Administration) Report

VP Williams presents advancements in file management through online tools, bringing major changes and new operating policies

d) Home Office Report

White, Bien and Tedjo present important advancements in their portfolios.

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives the reports of the Officers and of Home Office.

Moved: Moulton, 2<sup>nd</sup> Martin

Motion passes

## **7. Presentation of Financial Statements and Audit**

Executive Director White introduces the OUSA Auditor Tim Sothern from BDO Dunwoody. Mr. Sothern reviews the 08 and 09 audit statements for the membership. Reports that the books are clean. OUSA had a small loss of approximately \$1,000 in 08 and a profit of approximately \$10,000 in 09.

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives the financial statements and audit from the Vice-President (Finance) and Executive Director

Moved: Lanteigne; 2<sup>nd</sup> Woodrich

Motion to approve carries.

## **8. Presentation of Mid-Term Financial Report**

VP Lanteigne presents spreadsheet comparison of budget to actuals as of October 20. OUSA is on track to meet its surplus of \$613. The budget is very tight.

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives the mid-term financial report from the Vice-President (Finance) and Executive Director

Motion Preston, 2<sup>nd</sup> Gouinlock

Motion carried

## 9. By-Law Amendments

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the proposed changes to the OUSA By-Laws

Moved, Moulton; 2<sup>nd</sup> Preston

-Duncan: question, has it changed since we last saw it?

-Moulton: No, the discussion held yesterday highlighted the lack of definition of “undergraduate student” and after extensive steering committee discussion, it was felt that with too many definitions out there that did not fit, the ability of steering committee to remove members from steering committee could suffice.

Motion Carried

## 10. Policy Resolutions

### a) Repayment Assistance Program

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy statement on the Repayment Assistance Program

Moved: Lanteigne, 2<sup>nd</sup> Williams

Lanteigne and Williams present the changes to policy that were made based on the discussions in previous day's breakout sessions

King-Wale (McMaster): question asked about the removal of concern three

Williams: Sufficient overlap with concern number two. Additionally, there was a concern about the lack of research to support the argument.

Duncan (Western): Question about adding information on private debt.

Beach (Western): Remove word program after RAP in Recommendation 2.

Lanteigne: Explains that the program fits and is not overlap.

Beach (Western): withdraws concern

Motion carries unanimously

### b) Pan-Canadian Accord

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy statement on the Pan-Canadian Accord

Moved Williams, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lanteigne

Williams discusses changes to the policy based on breakout sessions of the previous day.

Motion carries unanimously

### c) Student Success

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on student success

Moved: martin; 2<sup>nd</sup> Woodrich

Martin and Gouinlock discuss changes to the policy based on breakout sessions of the previous day.

Changes made to principles 3, 4, 5(stricken), 7, 8. Changes to concerns 1, 2, and 4. Changes to Recommendations 1, 4, 5, 8...16, 17(added)

Amendment to concern 2: Traditional lecture style pedagogy, still pervasive across Ontario, if made more comprehensive via inclusion of other learning styles would be more conducive to student success.

Moved: Shumka (Western); 2<sup>nd</sup> Beach (Western).

Moulton: speaking against; this is not a concern and thus should be included elsewhere.

Kasper (waterloo): speaking against; doesn't reflect spirit of the passage that active learning is better  
Shumka (western): in response, reluctant to acknowledge that other methods of learning are better.  
Should consider them as enhancements to the lecture style  
Martin: We wouldn't have included this without the significant research. The change would not reflect the research.

### **motion fails**

Amendment to Principle 7: Replace word "greater" with word "positive"

Moved: Bradley (Brock); 2<sup>nd</sup> Prins

School?

Bradley: Positive is just more what we're going for.

Martin: We will accept as a friendly amendment

### **motion passes**

Amendment to Principle 6: That the final five words be struck.

Moved: Taylor; 2<sup>nd</sup> Martin

Maclsaac: Motions another amendment; out of order.

### **motion passes**

Amendment to change wording of recommendation 8: Quality teaching must feature prominently in all decisions relating to hiring, promotion and tenure.

Moved: Madden (WLU); 2<sup>nd</sup> Duncan

Carpenter (WLU): Speaking in support: the idea of the recommendation is to increase the importance of teaching in these processes. We are selling ourselves short with the word equally. Too mathematical. Respect the autonomy of universities.

Moulton: Speaking against the motion. OUSA has long advocated for an equal consideration for teaching and research. Research must be maintained as equal. Paper speaks to the importance of research. Equal consideration piece is central to this paper.

Duncan (Western): The amendment is more part of the theme of the paper and the consistent message. Overly aggressive to say equally. Want more flexibility.

Moulton: Question for the mover. What exactly is your concern with the word equal?

Madden (WLU): Too much standardization across the board

Andrey (Waterloo): Speaking against. Doesn't want to lose that metric. Feature prominently is too vague

Carpenter (WLU): This paper is about student success. This paper proves research methods taught in the classroom are valuable. This has nothing to do with the prof's independent research. Equal is not a metric so that is irrelevant.

Lanteigne (Brock): Speaking against. Prominently could mean anything. Don't want to be discouraging promotion and tenure of fantastic teachers with no research or vice-versa.

Kasper (Waterloo): As a metric equal is a way to hold our universities to account. I like the teeth of the current wording and we would weaken it by changing it.

Wade (McMaster): Speaking against.

A. Taylor (Waterloo): Speaking against. Recognize the concern but research methods are covered in recommendation 14.

### **Motion Fails**

Kasper: Point of Information. Does making an amendment end your speaking turn?

Henry: Yes

Carpenter (WLU): I would like to see all reference to the co-registration removed from the paper  
Moulton: General assembly approves the principles, concerns and recommendations. Bring other concerns to steering committee. If it seriously affects the PCRs then motion to change them

Moulton: Speaking in favour of the whole paper. The government is asking all stakeholders about quality and what it means to different people. Nobody can currently day exactly what quality is. Student success and the future of quality outlines what quality is to OUSA. It's not just about getting in but about being supported. I'm excited the policy has come forward so we can finally say we have this vision for the system. We need to see the government taking leadership through the accountability framework to say this is what is necessary for student success. This paper gives us tools to say when we talk about quality we talk about leadership the government can take to support students. Its very easy to cut student services budgets. What we're going to see in the next few years is an increase in university costs and we're going to see the quality of teaching and support services significantly reduced. Our government doesn't know these are the things that are important to students, that we need as students. It's important that as an alliance of students that quality is important to us and this is how we achieve it. This paper wasn't easy to write. I want to commend the authors for starting the dialogue. This isn't the end of the process, it's the beginning. We hope to bring new research and ideas to increase the relevancy and importance of this paper. We are calling on the government to say it's time to put money toward these programs.

King-Wale: Seeking clarification of the inclusion of needs-based grants in recommendation 13

Martin: One of the concerns in the breakout groups was that OUSA typically doesn't ask for grants that aren't needs based. If we are to ask for grants for students going abroad they should be targeted to those who need them most.

Amendment to recommendation 13: Remove "need based".

Moved M. Lanteigne (McMaster); 2<sup>nd</sup> Wade (McMaster)

M. Lanteigne (McMaster): International opportunities are not a requirement its an enrichment. These programs should be available to all students. By opening this grant up to all students and not just those with the greatest need this will ensure these opportunities are available to more students.

Williams: Speaking in favour. NSSE shows there is a great desire for students to participate in international exchanges. I see removing this as good.

Wade (McMaster): Speaking in favour. If we lobby for a need based program the government will just set it at OSAP eligibility

Beach (Western): We're saying all students should have work study and then we're saying only those with need will need international experiences

**motion passes**

Martin: This is not going to be the last word OUSA has on student success. But it is vital that we have something because we are being asked about the future of quality. This is a phased project. There are a number of key areas brought up in breakout sessions that were not able to make it in. I would like to reiterate that this is not the last version of student success we will see and I ask that you continue to forward comments to steering committee members

Duncan (Western): Question: Can you explain the spirit behind concern 5 for me?

Martin: We found significant data that highlights the importance of on-campus work-study opportunities. We wanted to highlight concerns about the availability of these programs. Although it's not the case at Western, many schools don't give work-study to students not on OSAP. We want to correct this.

Amendment: add "standardized" before teaching evaluations in recommendation 11.

Moved: Sousa (Western); 2<sup>nd</sup>: A. Rowe.

Sousa (Western): Accountability is key. Standardization allows instructors who transfer between institutions to still have comparable evaluations

Martin: Speaking against. I'm sensitive to your concern but as soon as you open that up, institutions who are protective of their autonomy will not comply. This would impede on collective-bargaining issues. The reality is that we're not going to see one.

Kasper: Speaking against; also sensitive to the concern. The cost to the province in administering or setting up this program would not be justified by the result. We must respect university autonomy and so must the government.

A. Rowe: Speaking in favour. By including the term standardized we are furthering the spirit of concern seven.

Moulton: Speaking against. There is merit in the motion and we do want to think big. I want to give some context. I don't disagree with the concept but it's not feasible in any way. The government could never do this unless they legislated it, which is something they have never done. It's very unlikely the government would ever do this. We want to recommend actions for the government but we tend not to recommend things the government will not do based on institutional autonomy.

Walker (WLU): Speaking in favour. The simple principle that standardized evaluations are better.

Soave (Waterloo): Something could be lost if we did try to standardize. I'm speaking against.

Carpenter (WLU): Speaking in favour. Universities could have supplementary evaluations of their own if they're worried about institutional differences not being covered.

Sousa (Western): We always talk about data. I acknowledge the differences in our institutions but students deserve to know what they're getting out of their classes. We don't have that. The student body enjoys ratemyprofessor.com. This is what students want and we should be bringing it up to the higher levels.

Preston: Speaking against. With this paper we're going to have the government's ear. I can see the government being turned off by this. Secondly, in terms of being able to compare between institutions, that's covered by the end of the recommendation. The questions won't be the same but if they're all public, the student would be able to do their own investigation and look at the results and make up their own mind. I don't think we're losing the ability to compare without the word included.

MacIsaac (Windsor): Too complicated to have multiple evaluation systems

Walker (WLU): Speaking in favour. I fail to see how a standardized test-evaluating teachers affects the autonomy of member schools.

Grewal (Brock): I'd like a clarification on what standardized means

Sousa (Western): We don't want a difference in what the questions are between evaluations at various schools

### **Motion fails**

Amendment to recommendation five to say: The provincial government must encourage institutions to consider all students eligible to apply for government and institutionally subsidized work-study opportunities.

Moved: Coker (Western); 2<sup>nd</sup> Duncan (Western)

Duncan: Strongly in favour. More accurately reflects the research.

Kasper: Question: Is this supposed to make all students eligible for work-study?

Coker: It's to remove the need for a student to be OSAP-eligible in order to get work-study

R. Taylor (Windsor): Speak in opposition. I feel that in my institution there's not enough work study money available to give it to all students.

Shumka (Western): Want to promote the idea of institutional autonomy and allow all institutions to decide.

Martin: This is friendly but I want to clarify work-study. To receive a provincially subsidized work-study opportunity you must be OSAP-eligible.

Lanteigne: Point of confusion. I don't see how this has made the recommendation stronger. What's changed?

### **Motion passes**

Amendment to recommendation 3: The provincial government must support early warning systems to ensure the protection of its investment in students across the continuum of their education.

Moved: A. Taylor; 2<sup>nd</sup> Martin

No debate

### **Motion passes**

Amendment to concern 5: Opportunities for students to further their educational experience through meaningful work-study programs are threatened by budgetary constraint, especially in difficult financial times. Furthermore, decreases in student employment can negatively impact a student's chance of successfully completing their degree.

Moved Beach (Western); 2<sup>nd</sup> Shumka (Western)

Want to change the words to clarify what the concern is about.

R. Lanteigne: Where does budgetary constraint factor into success?

Beach (Western): Concern about the economy as well as budgetary constraints in the future that may remove opportunities.

Sub-amendment: Change the words "are threatened" to "can be threatened"

Moved: Kasper (Waterloo); 2<sup>nd</sup> Akbar (Waterloo)

### **sub-amendment carried**

Carpenter (WLU) – is this a friendly amendment?

Chair, this will be voted on.

sub-amendment carries

Beach (Western): clean up grammar of statement

### **Amendment carried**

Prins (Brock): Question on principle 3: I hope to see physical health issues included here. Is the intention to focus solely on mental health?

Martin: Students with disability paper will be brought forward at the spring GA

Duncan (Western): In favour of passing the paper solely so we have something to say. I'm hearing from Steering Committee that we will continue to work on this paper over time and there are certainly many issues with it right now. My comment is that putting things out that we're not fully satisfied with is not something we want to get into the habit of doing. This paper will say something about us.

Beach: Point of information: why insert "campus" in concern 4?

Martin: We only comment on supports offered through our campus. We wouldn't recommend changing hospitals for students. We're talking just about what's offered through our institutions.

Wade (McMaster): Want to comment on Mr. Duncan's remarks. This paper encapsulates every issue I've heard from students. We can't hold this back; we must pass it today.

**Motion passes unanimously**

## 11. Policy for 2010 Spring General Assembly

- a) Students with Disabilities – policy paper
- b) Alternate Cost-Recovery Models – research paper
- c) Differentiation – policy statement
- d) University Inflation – policy statement

BIRT OUSA Assembly tasks Steering Committee with preparing the above policies for submission at the 2010 Spring General Assembly

Moved: Moulton, 2<sup>nd</sup> mammoletti

Amend to add student success policy paper.

Moved: Carpenter (WLU); 2<sup>nd</sup> Walker (WLU)

Carpenter: I'm bothered that we're going to lobby on a document that was rushed to the ministry just to get our submission in. I'm concerned that a number of issues are not included. I want to talk about this again more comprehensively with multiple breakout sessions and policy consultations between GA's.

Walker (WLU): Steering Committee has mentioned this is not the last we will see of the issue so let's bring it up in the spring. It's crucial we give it all the time it needs.

Martin: I'm sympathetic to your points

Moulton: Speaking against. We don't have the capacity and we shouldn't choose this over other things. I suggest you task Steering Committee to have this done at the next general assembly.

Moulton: I suggest that a delegation could take on the responsibility of updating the policy.

Carpenter (WLU): There are a lot of people here who want to be engaged. There are a lot of people interested in policy. It's indeed an option that delegations do this.

Martin: Is there an interest from the Laurier delegation to take this over?

Lanteigne (McMaster): I want to stall until we have someone take this project on.

Grewal (Brock): Could the Laurier delegates work with others to help?

Prins (Brock): I think it would make the most sense to break it up by the different segments. I think Brock would be interested in working on a part of the paper.

Beach (Wester): Speak against the motion. If we pass this amendment it would task Steering Committee and that's not what we want to do.

Williams: You don't need a motion to do policy. If you want in, go for it.

**Amendment defeated**

Beach (Western): Question: the titles listed here for the papers, are those their real headings?

Moulton: No, the titles can be discussed at spring general assembly.

**Motion passes**

## 12. Simple Resolutions

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves a 2010-11 membership fee of \$2.68 per FTE

Moulton gives presentation on the OUSA growth plan. Provides more information on why OUSA needs the money from the fee increase

Shumka: Could the presentation be made available to delegates?

Moulton: Yes

Prins (Brock): Is this a small enough sum that you could pay it out of your organization's budget?

Zabrodski: Yes that's possible as a last resort

**Motion Passes**

### **13. Adjournment**