

## **OUSA 2010 Fall General Assembly**

**BROCK UNIVERSITY**  
November 7, 2010

### **PLENARY MINUTES**

Called to order at 10:10am.

#### **Members Present**

ALMA MATTER SOCIETY OF QUEEN'S UNIVERISTY (Morgan Campbell, Clayton Lee, Chris Rudnicki, Kieran Slobodin, Julian Traficante, Catharine Wright)

BROCK UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' UNION (Sohail Ahmed, Daud Grewal, Steven Nicholls, Luke Speers, Chris Ventura)

McMASTER STUDENTS UNION (Alicia Ali, Tahiya Bakht, Douglas Calderwood-Smith, Matthew Dillon-Leitch, Joe Finkle, Huzaifa Saeed)

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR STUDENTS' ALLIANCE (Laine McGarragle, Kim Orr, Stephen Peters, Kyle Wilson, Robert Woodrich)

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' COUNCIL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO (Tamer Abdalla, Neha Chandrachud, Adam Fearnall, Emily Jarvis, Alysha Li, Patrick Searle, Brandon Sousa, Mike Tithecott, Jennifer Ye Won Kim)

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO FEDERATION OF STUDENTS (Reemah Khalid, Kristen Leal, Konrad Listwan-Ciesielski, Nilani Logeswaran, Brad Moggach, Trevor Jenkins, Dave Smith, Nick Soave, Andrea Taylor)

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' UNION (Saad Aslam, Luke Dotto, Nick Gibson, Sean Madden, Max Tremaine)

#### **Observers Present**

GUELPH CENTRAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION (Kevin Bowman, Denise Martins, Demetria Jackson, Anastasia Zavarella)

McMASTER ASSOCIATION OF PART-TIME STUDENTS (Violet Wakeman-Ajandi)

#### **1. Roll Call**

Representatives of all seven OUSA member schools were in attendance.

#### **2. Approval of the Agenda**

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the Plenary Agenda.
---

Moved by Searle (Western), seconded by Slobodin (Queen's).

CAMPBELL (Queen's): Motion to amend the agenda to add:

BIRT OUSA change the reference of "publicly funded" institutions in all policy papers and future communications to the term "publicly subsidized" institutions.

Motion seconded by Madden (Laurier).

No debate.

**Motion to amend adopted.**

**Motion as amended adopted.**

### **3. Approval of the Speaker**

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves Rob Lanteigne as the Speaker for Plenary.

Motion by Rudnicki (Queen's), seconded by Tremaine (Laurier).

No debate.

**Motion adopted.**

The Speaker introduces Robert's Rules and rules of the day.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): The amendment to add a discussion item will be added as agenda item #12.

### **4. Approval of 2010 Spring GA Plenary Minutes**

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the 2010 Spring General Assembly Plenary Minutes.

Moved by Moggach (Waterloo), seconded by Woodrich (Windsor).

No debate.

**Motion adopted.**

### **5. 2009-10 Year In Review**

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives the 2009-10 Year In Review.

Moved by Woodrich (Windsor), seconded by Moggach (Waterloo).

Presentation given by Executive Director Alexi White.

No debate.

**Motion adopted.**

### **6. Officer and Home Office Reports**

The Speaker divides the question and asks the Assembly to approve each presentation individually.

a) President's Report

Motioned by Coker (Western), seconded by Grewal (Brock).

Presentation given by President Meaghan Coker.

DOTTO (Laurier): Why does Kieran hide in every photo?

SAEED (McMaster): What are the next steps in the switching of the A's process [in reference to a change in structure of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations to have provincial alliances as members]?

COKER (Western): We are having a meeting at CASA Lobby Conference on November 13<sup>th</sup>, where we will receive an update on how the Partnership meeting went and the communiqué that was sent out. OUSA will be reiterating our support for further conversation on the idea and our stipulation of flexible membership moving forward.

**Motion adopted.**

b) Vice-President (Finance) Report

Motioned by Aslam (Laurier), seconded by Leal (Waterloo).

Presentation given by Vice-President (Finance) Saad Aslam.

ABDALLA (Western): Have we considered investing in stocks?

ASLAM (Laurier): We have changed the way fees are collected to have more money up-front. We are exploring our options for investments, but there are better ways to invest surplus.

ABDALLA (Western): Clarification; does OUSA have a reserve fund?

ASLAM (Laurier): We have a \$10,000 Guaranteed Investment Certificate.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): We do have a built-up surplus from previous years that can be seen in the audited financial statements that are available for investment.

ZAVARELLA (Guelph): Can you speak up please?

**Motioned adopted.**

c) Vice-President (Administration) Report

Motioned by Finkle (McMaster), seconded by Calderwood-Smith (McMaster).

Presentation given by Vice-President (Administration) Joe Finkle.

**Motioned adopted.**

d) Home Office Report

Motioned by Speers (Brock), seconded by Sousa (Western).

Presentation given by Executive Director Alexi White, Director of Research & Policy Analysis Sam Andrey, and Director of Communications & Public Relations Alvin Tedjo.

ZAVARELLA (Guelph): Does OUSA have anywhere in its lobbying priorities to lower tuition?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): We have standing policy on tuition. Our lobby priorities are set annually by the Steering Committee. This past year, Ontario locked into a two-year tuition framework so it not up for debate. Tuition is likely to be something we focus on next year.

**Motion adopted.**

## 7. Presentation of Financial Statements and Audit

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives the 2009-10 financial statements and audit from the Vice-President (Finance) and Executive Director.

BIFRT OUSA Assembly reappoints BDO as the auditors for the 2010-11 fiscal year.

Motioned by Aslam (Laurier), seconded by Woodrich (Windsor).

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Why was there a four-fold increase in delegate fees?

ASLAM (Laurier): I'll have Rob Lanteigne speak to that since he was the Vice-President (Finance) for 2009-10.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): We moved last year to a model where delegate fees collected after the fact based on actual costs. Previously, we set delegate fees beforehand and individual student unions paid most of their fees, but the Home Office would take the surplus or loss. OUSA tried to centralize the process so more things were included in it. Also, there was a change in the lines for where money came in and a change in the way it was recorded. This is why 'other income' dropped.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): Accounts were restructured so lines are difficult to make direct comparisons on.

McGARRAGLE (Windsor): Could you speak to what are the professional fees?

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): Regular cost of audit and insurance. There were also one-time expenses for the website and a second audit for the previous year.

KHALID (Waterloo): What is in the special projects line?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): We budgeted \$5,000 for special projects. That was made before the decision to do a national student survey. That initiative used money from member schools and the OUSA budget; the rationale being because they benefited as institutions and it also helped OUSA. The amount was higher because additional revenue in that category was used to help cover costs of the survey.

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): Why the large increase in office and printing?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): Because of how the accounting practices have changed, it is hard to know why it changed so much. But I can explain how the money was spent – some of it was purchases of equipment and the photocopier lease.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): As Alexi noted, the prior year's line items were all over the place 70% have been redefined and moved. The important thing to note is that the overall amount of expenses is within 10 dollars of the budgeted amount.

ABDALLA (Western): There has been increasing concern about the expenses of the President not being accommodated by OUSA. Western has spent \$15,000 each year. Has there been any discussion about dealing with this?

COKER (Western): Point of information. We don't actually know the costs of OUSA presidency due to the way that Western accounts for the costs.

SPEERS (Brock): Point of information. Where did Abdalla get \$15,000?

ABDALLA (Western): It has been a rumour that has been going around. There has been concern about the costs being in interest of our school and how it compares with the time and financial commitment.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): Traditionally, the role has not been subsidized by OUSA because of the benefits to individual institution of having an OUSA president, so we've been okay with institutions picking up the tab. Last year, OUSA gave Western \$1,500 to cover costs of the Presidency by the approval of Steering Committee. The rumour may have come from the Gazette asking OUSA home office and it misprinting the \$1,500 cost.

TITHECOTT (Western): Point of information. It could have also come from the fact that \$15,000 was how much last year's President Dan Moulton over-spent his budget.

COKER (Western): I can speak to conversations had with Steering Committee. There will be a concerted effort to come up with a more concrete number for presidential costs and formalize a cost-sharing agreement between student union and OUSA.

ABDALLA (Western): Is the membership fee per-student?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): It is based on a calculation of full-time equivalents.

SAEED (McMaster): Would this be changed for the McMaster Association of Part-time Students if they joined OUSA?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): No, they would just have zero put in for the number of full-time students and the rest of the formula would remain.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Do we have budget control mechanisms for individual lines?

ASLAM (Laurier): Alexi and I get an update every two months, and if there is something off, we bring it to Steering Committee.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): My concern is that we went 270% over budget on a single line. Is there a mechanism for when these instances need approval?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): It is not laid out specifically in policy. But the Vice-President (Finance) is updated regularly. And I don't think there is any instance that we went significantly over budget without it having been discussed or approved by Steering Committee.

ASLAM (Laurier): It is a good point. I will look into putting an approval mechanism in for that.

**Motion adopted.**

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

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

Motioned by Aslam (Laurier), seconded by Smith (Waterloo).

JENKINS (Waterloo): Can you explain the 440% increase in costs of the Strategic Planning conference?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): We brought in an external facilitator for the conference. Cost will be shared by OUSA and the campuses. The delegate fees for that have not been sent out.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Can we expect delegate fees to stabilize in the next few years?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): I would expect so. I can't say for sure, because things change if Steering Committee decides they want to pay more or less for something, but there's a lot of transparency on delegate costs.

SAEED (McMaster): Why is guest accommodation so high? I assume the facilitator?

ASLAM (Laurier): That is from when we hosted Dr. Grace Lynch from Open Universities Australia for the online education conference.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): HEQCO and OISE agreed to pay these costs. It shows we are over, but it will come back as revenue.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Motion for a 5-minute recess.

COKER (Western): We would prefer to wait until this motion is done and then take lunch.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Would like time to speak to my delegation and Steering Committee in preparation for this motion.

**Motion for a 5-minute recess adopted.**

COKER (Western): Thank you to representatives from Waterloo for bringing forward their concerns. Our Vice-President (Finance) is going to work on policies formalizing what is conventionally done right now in terms of accountability for budget lines.

**Motion adopted.**

Break for lunch.

Called back to order at 1:20pm.

## **9. Policy Resolutions**

### a) Financial Assistance

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on student financial assistance.  
BIFRT OUSA Assembly declares the Repayment Assistance Plan policy paper to have expired.

Motioned by Rudnicki (Queen's), seconded by Leal (Waterloo).

Presentation of changes to the policy paper by Rudnicki (Queen's).

TREMAINE (Laurier): With regards to Recommendation Five, I want students with poor credit to be included under OSAP only if they also have a low income.

RUDNICKI (Queen's): Can you clarify the point?

TREMAINE (Laurier): Would like students with more than \$1,000 in loans to get OSAP regardless of their income.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): There is still an income-contingent component to qualifying to OSAP for dependent students.

SMITH (Waterloo): What about considering a wording change to include income status?

RUDNICKI (Queen's): OSAP already takes into account income status.

SMITH (Waterloo): Motion to amend Recommendation Five to add "taking into account income status" to the end of the recommendation. Seconded by Tremaine (Laurier).

TREMAINE (Laurier): I just got the feeling reading it that it could be misconstrued as rewarding over-spending.

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): The reason we want that in there is to make sure that students who are low-income don't have credit rating impacting their OSAP. We believe this resolution should be more to benefit low-income students.

LEAL (Waterloo): Can I have a clarification on Logeswaran's point?

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): We don't want low-income students having their credit rating affecting OSAP status.

LEAL (Waterloo): What's the rationale for assuming an income based difference?

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): They might be forced to borrow more credit.

SPEERS (Brock): If the OSAP evaluation already takes into account your income status, it feels like this is redundant.

SAEED (McMaster): It should be pointed out that it sounds like only low-income students may have bad credit, and do you guys think that it is only low income students that have bad credit – we might as well leave it.

GOODING-TOWNSEND (McMaster): Speaking against. I think it makes it more complicated, and if it is lack of clarity that's an issue, there are better ways of dealing with it.

**Motion to amend defeated.**

ZAVARELLA (Guelph): I obviously cannot put a motion forward because we are guests at this time, but I recommend that interest should not be accrued at all, rather than at prime rate, on the secondary loans in Recommendation Nineteen.

MADDEN (Laurier): I would like to propose an amendment to make the rate for all OSAP loans at prime, not prime minus one.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): We are not at that concern yet.

LI (Western): Just to clarify, what was the proposed interest rate for the secondary loans?

RUDNICKI (Queen's): Prime.

ABDALLA (Western): I'd like to motion to discuss the possibility of no interest being accrued on the secondary loans while being a student in Recommendation Nineteen. Seconded by Woodrich (Windsor). Seeing as income is key to being eligible for OSAP system, very few students who are high-income will be able to qualify. The faults of a few shouldn't burden the system; it is reasonable for the government to alleviate some interest.

SMITH (Waterloo): I'd like to speak against changing it to no interest – if this is a secondary student loan for students who don't get into OSAP, why not just make it OSAP if the qualification requirements are the same?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): If the Assembly desires this change, I would propose eliminating the entire reference to secondary loans.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): The effect of this would mean removing all of Recommendation 19.

NICHOLS (Brock): Can you explain what you meant by deleting Recommendation 19?

RUDNICKI (Queen's): Right now, students whose parents don't qualify for OSAP resort to private loans, and this is a problem. The idea of this is that for students who don't qualify for OSAP to give them a government alternative with some interest. They would need interest to stop high-income students from taking advantage of it.

KIM (Western): Would it be possible to advocate for parental income to be removed from OSAP, while keeping secondary loans?

RUDNICKI (Queen's): I'd like to refer this to Sam.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): Yes you could, but then the vast majority of students would be eligible for OSAP and it would be redundant to have secondary loans. I want to reiterate that this is a large change and would be close to a billion dollar investment.

KIM (Western): I feel like this particular change is restructuring the whole OSAP system, and that is not the point of the debate – I feel like the point of this is to address problems within the OSAP system.

ABDALLA (Western): Directed to Sam. Are we recommending we create a new program that would exist in the future and would there need to be a new paper?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): The recommendation is that there would be a new system of loans, but I don't think we'd need a new paper on it. We could advocate on this if this passed.

SMITH (Waterloo): Are we voting to strike this or continue with no interest?

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): Sam, can you clarify?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): The paper would not have to change, but if we were to present this to government with no interest, they would be confused, since that is what OSAP is. As the author, I would suggest that if this amendment passes, I will go back and change this recommendation and change other areas of the paper that touch on parental contribution and bring it back to spring General Assembly.

WOODRICH (Windsor): Motion to call the question.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): There are two more people on the Speaker's list, so this vote will require two-thirds in favour.

**Motion to call the question adopted.**

**Motion to amend defeated.**

SEARLE (Western): Point of information. Could you explain when to abstain?

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): Please only abstain if you feel you don't have the information necessary to weigh in.

KIM (Western): If you feel you don't have enough information, shouldn't you vote against until you can get more information the decision to call the question?

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): To call the question means you've heard enough people speaking and you have enough information to make a decision. Because it cuts off minority rights, it requires a two thirds vote. So if you're someone who's going to abstain, you probably want to vote against calling it.

MADDEN (Laurier): Motion to amend Recommendation Twenty-One to read "prime" rather than "prime minus one". Motion seconded by Dotto (Laurier). I wonder what it would do for the viability to the program because it amounts as a subsidy across the board. There are other things I'd lobby harder on, and I don't know if this is the best thing to put forward. I think it's an after-the-fact issue and we spend a lot of time incentivizing access. I'm not sure what it would do to the stability and size of the OSAP program. I'm not sure that we should be making loans more expensive for the government

DOTTO (Laurier): A significant portion of the OSAP program receives funding from OSAP payments being paid back, and I am concerned that this will mean less funding for students.

LEAL (Waterloo): Can we confirm OSAP loans are generated by interest of other student loans?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): The government doesn't borrow at any fixed rate, they borrow at a fluctuating rate based on Bank of Canada rates. The government gives out about a billion dollars in loans and receives most of it back. The cost to the government to subsidize the interest for students in-study with the revenue generated from students paying back at higher than prime is very small; works to be close to break-even.

SMITH (Waterloo): Point of clarification; do we have ballpark numbers on the cost difference if it's prime or prime minus one?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): Can't be sure, but my guess is, since it's still under 1% of the loan, it would be less than \$50 million dollars.

KHALID (Waterloo): Is there precedent from other jurisdictions?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): Most of our peer jurisdictions do not charge above government rate of borrowing.

MADDEN (Laurier): To clarify my own remarks, I was not questioning immediate fall out of program, but long term fall out of program regarding grants and a holistic strategy.

**Motion to amend adopted (21-19-3).**

SPEERS (Brock): On the proposed OSAP helpline, isn't the usual way of getting information through financial aid office on campus?

RUDNICKI (Queen's): The problem was that some financial aid offices refer you to OSAP and OSAP refers you back to the institution.

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): Wouldn't the institution have more information on the individual situation of students?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): We wouldn't suggest financial aid office close, but it's a frequent complaint that they do not provide enough information on OSAP.

KIM (Western): To clarify, this was a pertinent point that I have raised because a friend has had difficulty in receiving explanation. Why we ask for the centralized OSAP help so you could ask those questions and get answers.

SAEED (McMaster): In the breakout, it was asked if the piece about work-study programs would be put into student success.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): Yes, it will be passed onto Meaghan and Nick for their re-write for the Spring General Assembly.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): We'll proceed to the vote on the motion to adopt the paper and to expire the Repayment Assistance Plan policy paper.

**Motion adopted.**

b) Access

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on a comprehensive access strategy.

Motioned by Slobodin (Queen's), seconded by Speers (Brock).

GOODING-TOWNSEND (McMaster): Concerned with Principle Three that changing "child" to "youth" implies that outreach starts at age 12.

SMITH (Waterloo): Move to change "youth" to "elementary".

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): I am hoping this might be friendly. Is anyone opposed? No, okay, passes as a friendly motion.

SMITH (Waterloo): Correction, “elementary” is not the correct term, rather “primary”.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker) – Friendly? Anyone opposed? Passes as friendly.

SMITH (Waterloo): Can I ask what the current guidance counselling formula is, with respect to Recommendation Six?

SLOBODIN (Queen’s): Right now, it is numbers-based, but we recognize that some schools have higher need, so consideration of need-based allocation.

TAYLOR (Waterloo): I would like to propose an amendment to Recommendation Seven to state: “The effect of dual credit programs on the success of students entering Ontario universities must be tracked and the results used to decide how best to fund and expand this type of access opportunity”. Seconded by Khalid (Waterloo). I think in principle that this is a good idea, but no research in this document describes the effects of dual credit programs. Also concerned that students in second year are at a disadvantage because have a reduced course-load in first year; concerned it may be detrimental to student success.

SLOBODIN (Queen’s): I think the nature of the concern was more relevant when considering IB programs, though in terms of advocating for more research, I agree with the point, and I think it can be folded into Recommendation Thirteen.

LEAL (Waterloo): Speaking for. It was also a concern that dual credit programs would be for students already wanting to go to post-secondary education.

SMITH (Waterloo): Speaking for. I have a concern that they would also take those first credits in their first term, and I’m in favour of students taking a full course-load in their first term so that students would have the full university experience.

JARVIS (Western): Point of information. Are these programs not already funded by the government anyways?

SLOBODIN (Queen’s): These dual credit programs are offered within colleges and we are encouraging them to be expanded to universities.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): There has been research done in the programs. Students who enrol in these programs are more likely to finish high school, they’re more likely to go to college, and they’re more likely to do well while there. Participants are identified as at-risk students and then enrolled in these programs.

CAMPBELL (Queen’s): Point of information. I think another thing that we’re trying to get into with the expansion is that right now it’s dependent on already existing partnerships, so it’s unfair. The idea is to give everyone a chance.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): Not really a point of information.

ABDALLA (Western): Point of clarification. Does this include university level credits at high school?

SLOBODIN (Queen’s): Not the way the term is used here.

LOGESWARAN (Western): Speaking for the amendment. In dual credit program, students are not getting credits, not a bridging program. They're not receiving anything of value, which I think that is why we need more research into what exactly is the benefit of the dual credit program.

SLOBODIN (Queen's): These types of programs are targeted at students at-risk, and also at students unsure of their future careers – for students identified within student success teams in the high school. Again these programs are while the student is in high school, in terms of distinction between bridging programs and dual credit, here a very specific type of program – bridging credits are different, often do confer credits, and are building students towards university. Dual credit programs are very specific and are for students who are at-risk.

RUDNICKI (Queens): Speaking against. From my experience, I think that earning dual credits does not affect choice to enrol full or part time.

LI (Western): Speaking against this amendment. Students benefit from finding out what they do not want to pursue, I personally found it very helpful in deciding what I wanted to pursue.

TAYLOR (Waterloo): Point of information. Why wasn't the research put into the body text?

SLOBODIN (Queen's): While there is only one specific citing in body text, we can add in more.

TAYLOR (Waterloo): When I read through this, I did not see any research.

TITHECOTT (Western): Speaking against this motion. Working in first year course registration at Western, it's a fallacy. IB/AP students still take full course loads and instead take upper year courses. They do not take lower number of courses and many of these courses are incentives to go to university.

KIM (Western): Speaking against the motion. I know someone who took a first year psychology course in high school; they said it was great because gave her a chance to experience university, helped her decide how to focus her studies. Also the original recommendation said the program must be expanded and funded within college and university. I'm sure there is great research that was conducted to back up this recommendation, so I do not think this should be changed

COKER (Western): I think before we vote it would be important to hear Sam Andrey's information from discussions with people within the Ministry.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): When talking with the Ministry, they drew our attention to how effective have been in the United States and in college programs in Ontario. Provided us with research.

SAEED (McMaster): Point of information. What is the qualification for identifying high-risk students?

SLOBODIN (Queen's): You must be identified by the student success teams in the high schools. For those that need an academic challenge, there are other enrichment programs available.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Point of clarification. The direct concern was on the impact on the transition into post secondary education and not on the benefits at the high school level – is there research supporting this?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): In the United States, yes. In Canada, there has not been as much research.

SMITH (Waterloo): I'd like to motion to call the question.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): Since there's no one else on the Speaker's list, we don't have to vote, so to reiterate, the motion would be to amend the text in Recommendation Seven.

**Motion to amend defeated.**

SLOBODIN (Queen's): Would like to change wording of Recommendation Seven to "Dual credit programs in high schools must be funded and expanded within Ontario colleges and should be introduced, monitored, and evaluated at the university level."

MOGGACH (Waterloo): I ask that we introduce research into related body text.

CAMPBELL (Queen's): I would suggest adding the words "and results" to the amendment to Recommendation Seven.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): If no one is opposed, take it as a friendly amendment, passes as friendly amendment. Voting on adoption of this paper as official OUSA paper.

**Motion adopted.**

COKER (Western): Motion for a 5 minute break.

**Motion adopted.**

c) Internationalization

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on internationalization.
---

Motioned by Grewal (Brock), seconded by Woodrich (Windsor).

GREWAL: Note that the name of the paper has been changed from "internationalization" to "international students".

LEAL (Waterloo): Point of clarification about the section on branch campuses and recruitment.

GREWAL (Brock): We are re-titling it; it will be addressed when we get to that section.

LEAL (Waterloo): We don't have a concrete number as to what it does cost to get an education as an international student. Is there some way we can get that number?

GREWAL (Brock): The problem with that is it's very difficult to know what that costs is – do we include electricity, water, and recruitment? Unless the universities and COU gets together and comes up with that number, it would be difficult for us to do alone.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Isn't there an issue that we can't establish a real cost?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): The principle stands the same, we just can't fill in that data right now; it's still a principle we can take a position on.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): It's implied that if this principle was adopted, we'd have to discuss what the number is.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): Yes and someone could.

GOODING-TOWNSEND (McMaster): Can we change the principle to be up to 250% of the cost?

LEAL (Waterloo): If we do crunch numbers that it does cost more than 250% to educate an international student, what would we do?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): I can spend a week and do it, if you want, but we can advocate without it.

KHALID (Waterloo): What's the real cost; if you were to take the domestic plus the subsidy, are we saying that they should be paying the same thing?

GREWAL (Brock): There are some additional costs like recruitment and services.

SEARLE (Western): What are the real costs for me, how much does it cost for me, is the recruitment cost one of our costs too? Isn't that a cost on the university?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): The revenue is not equal to the cost of educating for domestic students; we don't really focus on that so much because the government subsidizes so much, so it's not really comparable. But you could do it for international students; you could ask what a reasonable cost for capital and for recruitment is. It's doable, but would be difficult.

NICHOLS (Brock): One of the implied notions is that if adopted by government, they would be forced to analyze the true cost of both domestic and international students' education.

CAMPBELL (Queen's): A concern about not specifying the real cost, gives ambiguity to the government to define real cost, and they could inflate it. I'd like to motion to get Home Office to look into more specific details on this in the spirit of the principle.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): We don't need motion on the Home Office clarify the subtext.

CAMPBELL (Queen's): Home Office should look at putting a specific number on the cost of educating international students.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): That's not a motion that comes out of a policy paper, that's an item that can be added to section 11 if the room supports us, as something that can come back to us in Spring Assembly in policy or report format.

KHALID (Waterloo): Clarification on changes to the body text.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): If it's not going to change the meaning of what's in the box, then changes can be e-mailed in on the body text.

ABDALLA (Western): Point of clarification to Sam. In terms of the final document, you would submit it, and then what's the process if some of this was going to be given to the government, or an unbiased organization that would look into it.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): Are you asking how it would be operationalized by the government?

ABDALLA (Western): Yes.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): My guess is that the government would task the Ministry to do it, and it would be worked out within their research wing.

SAEED (McMaster): I'm okay with leaving it ambiguous, but at the same time, I would recommend putting pressure on the government for the government to figure out the costs.

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): If the government was to change their 5% cap on undergraduate tuition, would we change our 5% or less cap on international students?

GREWAL (Brock): This would lock in the OUSA policy regardless of changes in the government.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): Domestic rates are too unpredictable to achieve predictability if international tuition is tied to it, which is the point of the recommendation.

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): We would be paying more than international students then is my concern.

COKER (Western): International student tuition is deregulated so it can increase by whatever it wants. So I don't think that domestic would increase to the same level.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): Does that satisfy your concern?

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): Yes.

JENKINS: Motion to amend Recommendation Four to bring back to original text of "continue to provide merit-based scholarships". Seconded by Leal (Waterloo). Recommendation in student financial assistance says that we should slow down the growth of merit-based entrance scholarships; I feel this re-wording goes against the breakout yesterday as well, and we do not need to encourage more money to merit based scholarships.

SPEERS (Brock): Speaking against the motion. We're against disproportionate growth but I do not think we want to be against scholarships in general.

KIM (Western): Speaking against the motion. The original recommendation continues to provide that by saying keep providing what you have. It doesn't encourage providing more; international students have a hard time finding scholarships they can apply to.

LISTWAN-CIESIELSKI (Waterloo): Speaking for the motion. I believe the amount of scholarships we had before is sufficient. In the body text it says that we want to compete with American universities. Is there research that shows the reason students go to American universities is scholarships, and not other reasons like support services or prestige?

MADDEN (Laurier): Point of information. What is the source of information for stating that merit-based scholarships are not important?

LISTWAN-CIESIELSKI (Waterloo): From the body text of the recommendation.

JENKINS (Waterloo): I feel there should be more emphasis on need-based assistance.

SAEED (McMaster): There are a disproportionate number of scholarships for domestic students. Asking for more is good because there are very little that exist. Need to attract the best, therefore need better scholarships.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Motion to call the question.

**Motion to call the question adopted (25-9).**

**Motion to amend defeated.**

SMITH (Waterloo): Motion to amend Recommendation Four to say “more merit-based and needs-based scholarships”. Seconded by Jenkins (Waterloo). More scholarships are good, but not specifically merit-based. I think more on the whole is good.

GOODING-TOWNSEND (McMaster): Speaking against the motion. I am concerned that this will contradict Principle One. This means that we’d need to bring in more tuition to fund more scholarships because cost of educating international students will increase.

MOGGACH (Waterloo): Speaking against. I think we can add this into the tuition set-aside section instead.

LOGESWARAN (Waterloo): Point of clarification – how would scholarships offered through the government work against not subsidizing international students?

SMITH (Waterloo): To speak to that in Principle One, international students should not be subsidized in the manner that the tuition is set lower, I think this is a different case, and scholarships would not be from the same pot of money. I think scholarships are a separate issue.

LISTWAN-CIESIELSKI (Waterloo): Point of clarification – what is the difference between needs-based scholarships and needs-based financial aid?

ANDREY (Home Office): I think the difference between Recommendation Three and Four is that this one is talking about public dollars and the other one is talking about tuition set aside.

**Motion to amend adopted.**

McGARRAGLE (Windsor): I would like to propose to amend Recommendation Five to strike “without paying an additional premium” from the end. Seconded by Wilson (Windsor). Taxes paid by international students are not sufficient to cover costs of OHIP, and I am concerned that this is contradictory to Principle One about not subsidizing international students. While I agree that international students should be covered by OHIP, this amendment works to insure that health care will not be overburdened by those that do not pay the same user fees.

McGARRAGLE (Windsor): Motion changed to also strike “in the short term” from Recommendation Six.

SEARLE (Western): Point of information – when you say paying an additional premium – what do you mean?

GREWAL (Brock): We’re saying, similar to the way it works in many places, they should not pay any fee at all.

McGARRAGLE (Windsor): Point of information – I want to make clear that an additional premium is so that they are contributing what other users of the health care system pay.

SEARLE (Windsor): Point of information – would they pay for OHIP or just get it?

GREWAL (Brock): The point is that they wouldn’t pay in to OHIP.

KIM (Western): Point of information – after this, would UHIP still exist?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): It would not be used by international students, maybe still by faculty.

SMITH (Waterloo): Speaking against the motion. The current issue we’re having is that UHIP does not cover similar things as OHIP, like it was supposed to. I think the cost recovery is important, but I think if we took Recommendation Five out and enrolled them in OHIP at a premium, what’s the difference between that and UHIP?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): Because Sun Life insurance company only has certain providers, and so it could never have as comprehensive coverage as under OHIP.

SMITH (Waterloo): How do we decide what the real cost of health insurance is in Ontario though?

COKER (Western): In a meeting with the Minister of Health, we discussed this and what would be charged would be the fee to register and administer and that it would be transferred from the universities.

RUDNICKI (Queen's): Speaking against the motion. \$50 million dollars is the cost estimated if international students were to pay for OHIP. This translates to roughly \$1,500 per student, which is in contrast with the current \$800 per student, which would result in large increase in cost, which is why I'm moving against the motion.

McGARRAGLE (Windsor): Mr. Andrey said that it would be similar to UHIP. Perhaps my numbers are wrong

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): That estimate does not include college students. It is about \$3,000 for students with dependants which changes the per-student rate. The UHIP Steering Committee said was that the costs would be similar to the current rates if they were placed under OHIP.

KHALID (Waterloo): Point of clarification – if refugees and other people are already eligible to enter OHIP, why are international students considered separately?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): They were previously included, but the government changed it in the mid-1990's to save money.

**Motion to amend defeated.**

CAMPBELL (Queen's): I have something still related to the OHIP issue. Is there information given in the text about international comparisons?

GREWAL (Brock): It is here in the body text.

KIM (Western): Could more rationale be provided behind the use of "pessimistic" in Concern Nine?

GREWAL (Brock): This concern highlighted research showing that the pessimism was actually a barrier to employment.

KIM (Western): Motion to change "pessimistic" to "discouraged" in Concern Nine. Seconded by Listwan-Ciesielski (Waterloo). The barrier is not because they are not willing to work, or don't want to, but rather because they feel they are held back. This is just a change of wording.

LISTWAN-CIESIELSKI (Waterloo): I also feel that discouraged more accurately reflects the situation.

SMITH (Waterloo): Motion to also remove the word "strongly" from Concern Nine.

NICHOLS (Brock): Speaking against the motion. Means the exact same, no substance change.

COKER (Western): If it said pessimistic, concerned, discouraged, it's all saying the same thing. Let's stay with discouraged.

LANTEIGNE (Speaker): If no one dislikes discouraged ... no one does. Changed as friendly to "discouraged" instead of "strongly pessimistic" in Concern Nine.

SAEED (McMaster): With reference to Principle 13, how do you determine equivalent academic standards?

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): Not necessarily has to be the same Grade Point Average. It could be through test equivalencies. That would be up to the individual institutions. The purpose of this principle is to ensure that there are not lower standards for international students.

SEARLE (Western): In your research on satellite campuses, are nations considering teaching in English or other languages?

GREWAL (Brock): In English.

CAMPBELL (Queen's): I'm concerned that we shouldn't be supporting international branch campuses, and I feel that encouraging partnerships is less harmful in terms of not integrating in the community; I'm concerned that we do not have enough information on this point.

KHALID (Waterloo): There's no clarification as to who's judging the benefits and exactly what is defined as a benefit for the local community, with respect to branch campuses.

SMITH (Waterloo): Regardless of whether it's a good idea, universities and students are moving forward with international branch campuses, so I think it's important to keep this in. I think we do need policy on this because the issue already exists.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): This is a complex issue. The home office will continue to look into this and find more information.

JARVIS (Western): We as an organization should not take a full stance either way without doing further research as long as it's made clear, I think we should continue with the spirit of it, but think about it further.

**Motion adopted.**

## **10. Government Submissions**

BIRT OUSA Assembly ratifies the government submissions entitled: Educated Transformation and The Ontario Online Institute.
--

Motioned by Aslam (Laurier), seconded by Taylor (Waterloo).

No debate.

**Motion adopted.**

## **11. Policy and Research for 2011 Spring General Assembly**

- a) Ancillary Fees – policy paper
- b) Aboriginal Students – policy paper
- c) Student Success – policy paper
- d) University Cost Inflation – research paper

BIRT OUSA Assembly tasks the Steering Committee with preparing the above policy and research papers for submission at the 2011 Spring General Assembly.

Motioned by Nicholls (Brock), seconded by Khalid (Waterloo).

DOTTO (Laurier): Motion to add to the list, item e): "That the Director of Research & Policy Analysis revise and lengthen OUSA's material on policy creation to provide more comprehensive materials, resources, and best practices that better reflect the intricacies and breadth of the policy creation process". Seconded Madden (Laurier). We want to see more grassroots involvement. We want to have more materials, knowledge, to help take and work with, to do research. There is currently a one page piece of information available to Steering Committee and a short presentation to help them work on policy papers, but I think it should be broadened and given to whole General Assembly.

COKER (Western): I'd like to ask Mr. Andrey if he thinks it's reasonable for his time considering the other items on the list.

ANDREY (OUSA Home Office): I think it should be fine and is a good idea.

SAEED (McMaster): The policy works right now, it might not be perfect, so yeah if we had a bit more information.

**Motion to amend adopted.**

**Motion as amended adopted.**

## 12. Discussion

BIRT OUSA change the reference of "publicly funded" institutions in all policy papers and future communications to the term "publicly subsidized" institutions.

Motioned by Campbell (Queen's), seconded by Speers (Brock).

CAMPBELL (Queen's): This helps to reinforce the message that governments are only subsidizing our universities at this point and that there are many other revenue sources that are affecting this.

LEAL (Waterloo): My only concern is that the ratio of student contribution to government contribution varies from institution to institution.

TITHECOTT (Western): Point of clarification – what would this do to our advocacy efforts and our relationships with the sector?

COKER (Western): I think that's a consideration. I think it might be something we might want to include to drive home the point that we are very concerned about the ratio. OUSA could play an influence in changing this sort of vernacular and could push action on it. But especially with the upcoming election, have to be conscious of how government responds.

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): My understanding of this motion is that it would not actually limit what we would say, but rather what's in the policies and official communications. I may not use the term in lobbying meetings, depending on the situation.

**Motion adopted.**

### **13. Simple Resolutions**

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves a 2011-12 membership fee of \$2.76 per FTE.
---

Motioned by Finkle (McMaster), seconded by Aslam (Laurier).

COKER (Western): Point of information. This increase would correspond to the regular increase by the Consumer Price Index, as outlined in our bylaws.

NICHOLLS (Brock): How many FTEs does OUSA represent?

WHITE (OUSA Home Office): I can find out for you after the meeting.

**Motion adopted.**

### **14. Adjournment**

Motioned by Leal (Waterloo), seconded by Rudnicki (Queen's).

No debate.

**Motion to adjourn adopted.**