

OUSA 2011 Fall General Assembly

University of Windsor | November 6th, 2011

Called to order at 9:31 am.

Members Present

ALMA MATER SOCIETY OF QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY (Morgan Campbell, Mira Dineen, Clayton Lee, Kieran Slobodin, Catherine Wright)

BROCK UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' UNION (Tyler Evans, Daud Grewal, Bryan Levesque, Steven Nicholls, Luke Speers, Chris Ventura)

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

McMASTER STUDENTS UNION (Alicia Ali, Lisa Bifano, Matthew Dillon-Leitch, Jeffrey Doucet, Shivani Persad, Huzaifa Saeed)

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR STUDENTS' ALLIANCE (Andre Capaldi, Krystal Chan, Kimberly Orr, Osman Raza)

UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' COUNCIL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO (Brian Belman, Neha Chandrachud, Jesse Collins-Swartz, Andrew Forgione, Melissa Kargiannakis, Alysha Li, Nick Palambo, Patrick Searle, Patrick Whelan)

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO FEDERATION OF STUDENTS (Natalie Cockburn, Matthew Colphon, Adam Garcia, Kristen Leal, Marc LeBlanc, Christina Ronaldo, Skaidra Puodziunas, Li Zhu, Shana-Kay Wright)

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' UNION (Luke Dotto, Sean Madden, Nick Savage, Max Tremaine, Sean Yu)

Associate Members Present

TRENT IN OSHAWA STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION (Phil Bailey, Kelly VanLeyden)

1. Roll Call

Members from all OUSA student associations were in attendance.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the Agenda

Moved by Whelan (Western), seconded by Speers (Brock)

No debate on motion.

Motion approved unanimously.

3. Approval of the Speaker

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves Jeff LaPorte as the Speaker for Plenary

Moved by Capaldi (Windsor), seconded by Tremaine (Laurier)

No debate on motion.

Motion approved unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the 2011 Spring General Assembly Plenary Minutes

Moved by Colphon (Waterloo), seconded by Leal (Waterloo)

No debate on motion.

Motion approved unanimously.

5. 2010-11 Annual Report

BIRT OUSA Assembly approves the 2010-11 Annual Report

Moved by Raza (Windsor), seconded by Belham (Western)

Presentation given by Vice-President (Finance) Natalie Cockburn.

COLPHON (Waterloo): Should we save questions on the audited financials until later?

COCKBURN: Yes.

LEAL (Waterloo): Is this something we will do every year?

COCKBURN: Hopefully. The decision is up to future steering committees, but a continuation of annual reporting is my wish.

SLOBODIN (Queen's): I was very proud that we did this, as it is an excellent accountability tool. *Educated Solutions* a communications tool, whereas the annual report is an accountability tool. This is the first look and is a snapshot on our priorities, methods and finances. I'd like to thank Natalie for putting this together, but also urge everyone to bring it back to your schools to use as a tool.

COCKBURN: You may be familiar with the action plan. The objectives in the annual report come forward from the action plan, so that the process is integrated with our current accountability mechanisms.

Motion approved unanimously.

6. Officer and Home Office Reports

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

Moved by Palambo (Western), seconded by Slobodin (Queen's)

1) President's Report.

Presentation given by President Sean Madden.

2) Vice-President (Finance) Report

Presentation given by Vice-President (Finance) Natalie Cockburn.

3) Vice-President (Administration) Report

Presentation given by Vice-President (Administration) Patrick Searle.

LEBLANC (Waterloo): Is the planned policy for ethical consultation only for Aboriginal students or all under-represented groups?

SEARLE: Aboriginal only, but I will be developing primary research guidelines as my next priority.

4) Home Office Report

Presentation given by Executive Director Sam Andrey, Director of Communications Alvin Tedjo and Director of Research Chris Martin.

GARCIA (Waterloo): What was the value of attending the European Access Network conference?

ANDREY: They paid for us to go and it was an opportunity to interact with our peers all over the world. The United States Student Association and the European Students' Union were there, as well as people working in access initiatives. It was a valuable experience that did not cost OUSA anything.

GARCIA (Waterloo): I applaud the recent consultations with Aboriginal students, but what ethical policies are being developed for them and other under-represented groups?

MARTIN: Development of these policies is currently proceeding, under the guidance of Patrick Searle. They will likely come forward in the spring.

SAEED (McMaster): How did we decide on Abacus Data as our polling company? There has been criticism about their methodology and accuracy.

COCKBURN (Waterloo): I can speak to that – we received three proposals; the Executive decided together on Abacus Data as the price difference was quite substantial and the other proposals would not have fit in our budget.

MARTIN: The criticism of Abacus Data from other pollsters stemmed from their decision to measure undecided voting intention in the election. However, in the end they were the second most accurate polling firm and I think they've established themselves as quite reputable.

LEAL (Waterloo): Did we share this data with anyone?

MARTIN: We first attempted to shop it around to the media. Then preliminary data was posted on the website. A full report will also be coming out and available in the Research Library.

Motions approved unanimously.

7. Presentation of Mid-Term Financial Report

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

Moved by Raza (Windsor), seconded by Garcia (Waterloo)

Presentation given by Vice-President (Finance) Natalie Cockburn.

LEAL (Waterloo): What has the Executive professional development line been spent on?

COCKBURN: A half-day session with a consultant to strategize and understand the working styles of the Home Office and the Executive. We saw a lot of value in the exercise.

ANDREY: It was a teambuilding exercise with a firm called Xennex.

LEAL (Waterloo): Why is the research intern line zero?

COCKBURN: Research intern salaries have been budgeted into the salaries line to conform to ensure they are taxable income. That is why the salary line has increased, as well as due to the inclusion of the research analyst position.

Motion approved unanimously.

8. Presentation of Financial Statements and Audit

BIRT OUSA Assembly receives the 2010-11 financial statements and audit from the Vice-President (Finance) and Executive Director. BIFRT OUSA Assembly reappoints BDO Canada as the auditors for the 2011-12 fiscal year.
--

Moved by Evans (Brock), seconded by Tremaine (Laurier)

Presentation given by Vice-President (Finance) Natalie Cockburn.

COLPHON (Waterloo): Why is there such a large disparity between cash flows between 2010-11 and 2011-12?

COCKBURN: Part of it is that we carried a surplus last year.

ANDREY: Much of our cash flow is dependent on when member associations send their cheques, so our cash on hand can move significantly from year to year. This was just a snapshot of April 30th.

LEAL (Waterloo): Was it last year that we approved a fee increase above CPI?

COCKBURN: No, the year before.

COLPHON (Waterloo): When was the last time we went out to tender for our auditors?

ANDREY: Three years ago.

Motion approved unanimously.

9. Policy Resolutions

a) Tuition

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on tuition

Presentation of changes to the policy paper by Ali (McMaster).

Moved by Doucet (McMaster), seconded by Bifano (McMaster)

No debate on motion.

Motion approved unanimously.

b) Accountability

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on accountability

Presentation of changes to the policy paper by Orr (Windsor).

COLPHON (Waterloo): I wish to congratulate the authors on the improvements. However, recommendation sixteen on page eighteen sentence isn't finished. I would like this to be finished. I would also like recommendation eleven to reflect funding entirely by student union or administration. If this could be added to supporting text, I would appreciate it.

BIRT OUSA Assembly amends recommendation eleven to read "Multi-Year Accountability Agreement report backs should include a complete breakdown of support services offered to students **by university administrations and student associations**, as well as the degree to which they are supported by compulsory ancillary fees and university operating budgets."

Moved by Garcia (Waterloo), seconded by Colphon (Waterloo)

GARCIA (Waterloo): Many of our associations offer student services. These services have been determined by students to be important, but are not offered by administrations. MYAAs should acknowledge that students are taking additional responsibility for funding these services.

DOUCET (McMaster): MYAAs hold institutions accountable to students and government. Students fund student associations. I don't see why we would use MYAAs to hold student associations accountable.

DINEEN (Queen's): The function of MYAAs does not extend to student associations. I am uncomfortable with this amendment.

GARCIA (Waterloo): My idea is the universities should be held accountable for what they are not doing. University administrations should be held accountable for things like human rights and equity services.

COLPHON (Waterloo) My concern is that administrations take credit for things they aren't doing.

BIRT OUSA Assembly strike "and student associations" from the amendment.

Moved by Colphon (Waterloo), seconded by Belman (Western)

ORR (Windsor): I don't think this is the place for holding student associations accountable. With a reporting mechanism as proposed, you would see gaps in student supports offered.

LEAL (Waterloo): There are also services that are externally administered (not administration or student associations); shortening the amendment to include only administration suits our purposes.

Amendment to amendment approved unanimously.

Amendment approved unanimously.

Debate on main motion continues.

COLPHON (Waterloo): Could we finish the sentence in recommendation five?

S. WRIGHT (Waterloo): I have a question about recommendation six. In what form you would want a re-negotiation to be requested?

ORR: It would happen through university boards of governors, where you have all of those groups represented.

LEAL (Waterloo): Going to recommendation twenty-four; I advocated that the government should provide all funds, why was this ignored?

MARTIN: Student associations fund ombudsperson offices in many cases and have corresponding accountability controls over these offices. We didn't think that every student union would willingly cede their funding of ombudsperson offices.

EVANS (Brock): I agree with the point that Leal raised. Additionally I disagree with the rewording on recommendation five. I disagree with advocating for online learning. I'd like my concern noted.

BIRT OUSA Assembly amends recommendation five to its original wording: "The government should utilize its ability to control university operating funding if MYAA targets are not achieved."

Moved by Grewal (Brock), seconded by Evans (Brock)

GREWAL (Brock): Not all university funding should be tied to MYAAs, but there should be some teeth to the agreements. The MYAAs currently have no teeth. We felt that there should be more teeth.

RAZA (Windsor): What did you feel was wrong with the new text?

GREWAL (Brock): The new language was too soft.

DOUCET (McMaster): I oppose this amendment; it hits on the issue of funding. We don't know enough about funding, making it tough for us to tell governments how to fund on the universities. We don't want to get into a system where funding is pulled on a year-to-year basis. We should ask progress to be measured, but not to tell them how to do it.

COLPHON (Waterloo): I oppose this amendment. Over the weekend we spent a lot of time making sure the recommendation wasn't black and white. Sometimes a university is going to go below a target for unforeseen reasons, and we shouldn't punish institutions for this. The new recommendation encompasses our feedback.

GARCIA (Waterloo): In recommendation six we acknowledge that there are external factors that could affect the achievement of a target. When progress is made, we should not take away funding.

EVANS (Brock) I stand in favour of this amendment. We are telling universities what to do, we're just not telling them how to do it. The word "influence" allows for too much ambiguity for government. It also doesn't give the government enough power for giving institutions accountable. I don't agree with Garcia.

GREWAL (Brock): I agree with all the points, but the way we're framing this is that funding not received as a "punishment" instead of as if when they reach targets they are rewarded. This is a bonus, not a way of punishing universities. If you reach it, you get four per cent, if you don't, you don't get four per cent.

DOTTO (Laurier): Speaking against. Control vs. influence is different than showing progress towards MYAA agreements. If you remove funding for making progress, you inhibit their ability to make their targets. I would recommend that the Brock delegation make a motion to divide the discussion.

COCKBURN: I'm not speaking for or against. However, I have concerns about taking out "making progress." We want institutions to spend time and resources on activities, but take away funding if they don't meet them?

PERSAD (McMaster): I'm speaking in opposition along the same lines as Dotto; removing funds prevents the achievement of MYAA targets.

Tremaine moves to call the question

In Favour: 40, Opposed: 7

Opposed: Speers, Grewal, Habib, Evans, Levesque, Ventura, Nicholls

Call to Question Passed

Vote on Main Motion

In Favour: 6, Opposed: 41

Motion to Amend Fails

BIRT OUSA Assembly amend recommendation five to read “The government should utilize its ability to ~~influence~~ **control** university funding mechanisms if measurable progress is not made towards Multi-Year Accountability Agreement targets, as well as when measurable progress towards targets are made.”

Moved by LeBlanc (Waterloo), seconded by Evans (Brock)

LEBLANC (Waterloo): This amendment keeps the intention of having teeth in the MYAAs. Keeps the original analogy of a stick pushing towards a carrot.

Speaker rules that the motion is too close to the last amendment.

Belman (Western) challenges the ruling of the speaker.

Belman (Western): The original motion has two questions in it, both of which were denied, but there may be will in the room to answer just one of them.

In favour of the challenge: 24, Opposed: 16.

Challenge passes.

Debate on amendment commences.

DOUCET (McMaster): I don't see the difference between influence and controlling. I don't think the change is substantive.

EVANS (Brock): That is not correct; the word control you set a clear term. Administrations can quibble over “influence.” Control implies a hierarchy where people have lesser or greater say in influence.

In favour: 11, Opposed: 24.

Amendment fails.

LEAL (Waterloo): On recommendation twenty, I understand that institutions have ombudsperson offices in place, funded by both administration and students. If an office is funded by administration, there is a bias. When I look at “majority.” I don't see a bias. I suggest an addition to the paper suggesting that government and administration research ways to share costs equally between students, government and administration.

BIRT OUSA Assembly amends recommendation twenty to replace “the majority of funding” with “all funding.”

Moved By Leal (Waterloo), seconded by Colphon (Waterloo)

GREWAL (Brock): We need to respect that institutions have different ways of funding this office. For example, the administration at Brock has historically funded it in its entirety. Now we are pushing moving towards the student union funding part of it. From our perspective part of it should continue to be funded by the students' union.

COLPHON (Waterloo): I also think all funds is important, because with 'sufficient funding' it is hard to know exactly what that means to each school, too much ambiguity, all is very certain. Problem with fully funded by students is that it means that it is not a fully neutral office. It is more of a staff member; may not be seen as objective. Same issue with university funding. Having a third party, the government, fund it, is a mechanism for keeping it independent.

DOUCET (McMaster): I think this motion creates more bias. If government funds it then what happens when the office needs to speak against the government?

PUODZINUNAS (Waterloo): Giving government control lets them decide what is and isn't sufficient. I am in favour of the amendment.

EVANS (Brock): I agree with the delegation from Waterloo because I think the current wording will give one group disproportionate control over how this office is run. The wording should reflect that if the student union be found incapable of funding the ombudsman, someone should step in in. I am against this amendment.

PERSAD (McMaster): Ombudsmen are trained to be unbiased, so I think irrespective of where the funding is coming from it is up to whoever trains the person to ensure they will be unbiased. I am against the motion.

GARCIA (Waterloo): Speaking in favour of the motion. I think that the problem is we aren't sure of reporting structures, so I do think the government should be providing the funding, but I think we need to look into reporting structures for ombudsperson offices after this.

CAMPBELL (Queen's): I am in agreement with the sentiment of this motion. But I do not think that this word, the word "all" does not sound right. Complete funding would be way better.

Amendment to Amendment: BIRT "all funding" be replaced with "complete funding."

Moved by Campbell (Queen's), seconded by Leal (Waterloo)

Tremaine (Laurier) calls the question, seconded by Campbell (Queen's)

COCKBURN (Waterloo): Point of order – the speaker did not clarify whether the motion is friendly or unfriendly.

Speaker clarified that the motion is friendly.

Vote on amendment to amendment approved unanimously.

Vote on amendment:

In favour: 22, Opposed: 11

Amendment approved.

TREMAINE (Laurier): My fellow delegates, I would like to finish on a positive note. This paper has gone through a near complete transformation this weekend, and its current state is an absolute credit to the adeptness body, the effectiveness of this new format that we have this weekend and the admirable pragmatism of its authors. Pass or fail, I really want to commend everyone. I hope that you reflect on what democracy has granted us.

BIRT that recommendation twenty be amended to include “overseen by an advisory committee of equal representation from identified stakeholders”.

Moved by Garcia (Waterloo), seconded by Ramaldo (Waterloo)

GARCIA (Waterloo): I think people were worried about bias coming into the office, so I think the idea of OUSA coming up with some sort of policy recommendation in terms of the reporting structure, that students, university, governments should be represented.

DILLON-LIETCH (McMaster): I’m confused about the change here in having an advisory committee: my understanding was that the point of ombudspersons was that it was not under the thumb of anyone, so would not an advisory committee create bias?

GARCIA (Waterloo): The sense I got from the room is we’re not sure there can be no bias. Perhaps equal bias is a better way to look at it.

SAEED (McMaster): According to policies, ombudsman offices are not supposed to share an office or identify with any person or body on campus, so having a committee is making us going against their own policies. Are you aware any other examples of an ombudsman reporting to advisory committees?

COLPHON (Waterloo): Speaking against this, having equal bias is not a clear solution. Conceptually having an accountability body does not bother me but I don’t like the wording right now.

EVANS (Brock): I like the general spirit of it, but not sure about how it is currently formatted.

MADDEN (Laurier): Speaking against the motion. Ombudsmen act without advisement; perhaps the assembly is not the right place to redefine how ombudsperson offices operate.

DOTTO (Laurier): We defined stakeholders earlier in the paper, should stick with that definition.

GREWAL (Brock): I think advisory committee makes sense but should not oversee ombudsman. The word oversee is problematic.

DOUCET (McMaster): I think we are now debating how it should be advised, and not whether or not the advisory committee should exist.

SLOBODIN (Queen's): Speaking against. To appoint an overseeing body goes against the idea of an independent office. Concerned we are beyond the scope of what we need to do since regulations already exist around ombudsperson offices.

FORGIONE (Western): There is already an advisory committee at Western made up of stakeholders, so not sure where this new body would fit in – at Western the committee exists to give direction, but does not oversee programs.

GARICA (Waterloo): In agreement with comments, I do not want an overseeing or a reporting structure, but do want an avenue of consultation for identified stakeholders.

DOUCET (McMaster): Are we governing ombudsman offices or making sure that they report to a committee at each university?

Amendment to amendment: BIRT the amendment read “with an advisory committee of equal representation from identified stakeholders as a resource and sounding board.”

Moved by Grewal (Brock), seconded by Ventura (Brock)

No Debate on Motion

In Favour: 15, Opposed: 29

Amendment to amendment fails.

Vote on amendment:

In Favour: 15, Opposed: 29.

Amendment fails.

BIRT OUSA Assembly recess for five minutes.

Moved by Puodzinunas (Waterloo), seconded by Orr (Windsor).

Motion passes unanimously.

Assembly recessed at 12:15

Assembly called to order at 12:21

No further debate on main motion.

Motion passes unanimously.

c) **System Growth**

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the policy paper on System Growth.
BIFRT OUSA Assembly declares the policy paper on differentiation to have expired.

Moved by Cockburn (Waterloo), seconded by Madden (Laurier).

Changes to policy paper presented by Cockburn (Waterloo) and Madden (Laurier).

No Debate on Motion

Motion passes unanimously.

d) **Aboriginal Students**

BIRT OUSA Assembly adopts the amendments to the policy paper on Aboriginal Students

Moved by Slobodin (Queen's), seconded by Speers (Brock)

Amendments presented by Laura Pin.

CAMPBELL (Queen's): I'd like to congratulate you on the consultation. Are we going to go back to groups to inform them of changes?

PIN: Absolutely, we will highlight where their information was included. If they have concerns, I would recommend re-opening the paper.

DOUCET (McMaster): I have a concern with where to go with this. This is an extremely important issue, but I worry about precedent. There are people marginalized on every social issue. Should we advocate on social issues? Should we be advocating for specifically international students? In many ways it can be a slippery slope.

COCKBURN (Waterloo): There is plenty of information that points to the fact that Aboriginal students hold a special status. If OUSA doesn't do this work, who will?

DOUCET (McMaster): We should tread with caution on how we treat our partners when speaking on these issues. This provides us a background for our lobby efforts. My work on access spoke to this. We should try to identify root causes of problems in higher education.

NICHOLLS (Brock): Doucet clarified OUSA's position on this. There are many factors that affect students when they get here.

BIRT that the word "Aboriginal" be stricken from recommendation nineteen.

Moved by Tremaine (Laurier), seconded by Colphon (Waterloo).

TREMAINE (Laurier): There was much conversation on this language yesterday; I hope we don't repeat all of it. The concern came up that singling out Aboriginal students could perpetuate stereotypes.

EVANS (Brock): It is not germane to the paper. Paper is on Aboriginal issues. We're speaking on aboriginal issues.

LEVESQUE (Brock): The paper doesn't limit any other type of training.

DOUCET (McMaster): We're talking about Aboriginal racism, but putting in comprehensive racism and all other minority groups could make this more applicable. We could expand this recommendation multiple folds to encompass many other groups.

PIN: This was raised by a student as a unique need to address specific Aboriginal students on campus. It was raised as being unique from normal diversity training.

DINEEN (Queen's): I would speak against the suggestion on broadening this. There is a need for specific Aboriginal-specific anti-racism training. Changing would water this down.

LEVESQUE (Brock): The Aboriginal word strengthens the objective of the paper.

EVANS (Brock): I am not against comprehensive trainings sessions. By including comprehensive, we dilute the original objective of the paper.

Vote on Amendment:

In favour: 6, Opposed, 41.

Motion to amend fails.

Meeting adjourns for lunch at 1:00 PM.

Meeting called back to order at 1:37 PM.

Vote on Main Motion:

Motion approved unanimously.

10. Policy and Research for 2010 Spring General Assembly

- a. Credit Transfer**
- b. Mature Students**
- c. Rural and Northern Students**

BIRT OUSA Assembly tasks the Steering committee with preparing the above policy papers for submission at the 2012 Spring General Assembly.

BIRT that Student Health be added to this list.

Moved by Raza (Windsor), seconded by Puodzinunas (Waterloo).

GARCIA (Waterloo): I would like to speak in favour of the amendment. The future policy session was very positive towards it. It is our top priority.

LEAL (Waterloo): How will resources be done to manage this work-load and ensure quality?

MADDEN (Laurier): We do hesitate to over-burden Home Office staff, but Natalie and I have heard your feedback loud and clear. The student health paper will lend our advocacy priorities strength. We will take on the principal authorship on the paper.

COCKBURN (Waterloo): From a precedent perspective, we need to be careful that we don't mandate four papers annually nor have people write multiple papers in a year. I'm not speaking against however.

SAEED (McMaster): Will the mental health and student health paper be the same?

PIN: They are the same.

Vote on Amendment:

In favour: 46, Opposed: 1.

Amendment passes.

LEAL (Waterloo): Will the ethical research guidelines in place before doing primary research?

SEARLE (Western): They will be presented at the next Assembly.

SLOBODIN (Queen's): We will be using Queen's Research Ethics Process in the meantime.

Vote on main motion:

Motion approved unanimously.

11. Simple Resolutions

BIRT OUSA Assembly recommends a 2012-13 membership fee of \$2.85 fee per full-time equivalent student.

Vice-President (Finance) Natalie Cockburn presents.

Amendment: WHEREAS Bylaw 1, Section 4.06 allows the membership fee to be indexed on an annual basis to the Ontario Consumer Price Index; BIRT OUSA Assembly recommend an inflationary increase to the current per-FTE membership fee of \$2.76; BIFRT OUSA Assembly recommend a membership fee of \$2.85.

Moved by Cockburn (Waterloo), seconded by Orr (Windsor)

ORR: I want to make sure that the wording doesn't confuse our students.

COCKBURN: I don't want to get into the practice of reflecting our bylaws in a motion.

ORR: I only ask for this, due to that the fact that fee increases go to referendum, not easy to take back through council. My council needs to understand that this isn't a real fee increase, just inflation.

C. WRIGHT (Queen's): Change the wording to be phrased with "to be."

SMITH (Queen's): Current wording makes it look like increase is \$2.76. I would suggest a change to "to the current \$2.76 per-FTE membership fee."

EVANS (Brock): I think it should read that "the OUSA Assembly accepts an inflationary increase to the current per FTE membership from 2.76 to \$2.85."

COCKBURN (Waterloo): I think that sounds clunky. I might suggest: WHEREAS OUSA Official Bylaw 1, Section 4.06 allows fees to increase...

DINEEN (Queen's): I think that we should keep \$2.76 in the wording of the motion.

MINNITI (McMaster): I think that the phrasing should reflect "from \$2.76 to \$2.85."

Amendment to Amendment: WHEREAS Bylaw 1, Section 4.06 allows the membership fee to be indexed on an annual basis to the Ontario Consumer Price Index; BIRT OUSA Assembly recommend an inflationary increase to the 2011-12 membership fee from \$2.76 to \$2.85.

Moved by Minniti (McMaster), seconded by Evans (Brock)

EVANS (Brock): Can we use adopt instead of recommend?

COCKBURN: General Assembly generally doesn't set the fee; Steering Committee does if an inflationary increase. Recommend is the only appropriate word to use in this case.

Vote on Amendment to Amendment:

Amendment to amendment approved unanimously

Vote on Amendment:

Amendment approved unanimously.

Vote on Main Motion:

Motion approved unanimously.

12. Adjournment

BIRT OUSA Assembly adjourns.

Moved by Raza (Windsor), seconded by Leal (Waterloo)

Motion approved unanimously.