

Date: 2025-11-30

Reference: 2025 ACUOSU 6

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA STUDENT UNION'S APPEALS COMMITTEE

BETWEEN

**WOMEN'S HEART HEALTH CLUB, MUSLIM MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, TURKISH
STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION CLUB, UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA STUDENT
ATHLETIC COUNCIL, MEDLIFE UOTTAWA**

The Appellants

AND

UOSU CLUB COMMITTEE

The Respondent

Indexed as

Women's Heart Health Club et al v UOSU Club Committee

In a matter concerning five separate appeals of a final Club Committee's decision under the University of Ottawa Student Union's Constitution

Before: a panel of the UOSU Appeals Committee composed of:

Philippe Giguère, Chair of Appeals Committee
Élodie Proulx, Student member at the Faculty of Law

For the Appellants: Sarah Sadat, Women's Heart Health Club; Fatima Arshad and Maleeka Ellaithy, Muslim Medical Association; Alper Ortabasi and Ata Kandiyeli, Turkish Students' Association Club; Kate Sydney Hulford, University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council; Isabella Arlotta and Ananya Jain, MEDLIFE uOttawa

For the Respondent: Emilia Bah, Student Life Commissioner

REASONS FOR DECISION

I. Overview of the Appeals Committee's decision

1. Club recognition is a significant and contentious issues within UOSU governance system. Recognition allows student clubs to run events, book space, access funding, and participate meaningfully in campus life. Because of its importance, the recognition process must be fair, accountable, equitable, and transparent to those affected as required by Article 8.12.4 of the UOSU Constitution. These are not aspirational values; they are binding standards governing how the Club Committee must exercise its authority. The record demonstrates that it did not meet these standards in the 2025-2026 recognition cycle.
2. The five appeals before the Appeals Committee all arise from the 2025–2026 club recognition cycle. All five clubs were refused recognition. When the applications are reviewed collectively, the record establishes a consistent pattern of procedural fairness failures, including differential and inconsistent treatment of applicants; a lack of transparent, neutral, or documented criteria for selecting the 17 approved clubs; and incorrect use of the 300-Club Cap as a substitute for reasoned, fair, transparent and accountable decision-making.
3. Taken together, these defects undermined the integrity of the 2025–2026 recognition cycle. For four of the five appeals, the procedural unfairness is so significant that the refusals cannot stand. Those decisions are therefore set aside. The Women's Heart Health Club and the Muslim Medical Association are granted full recognition for the 2025–2026 academic year, and Turkish Students' Association Club and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council; are granted conditional recognition, subject to curing outstanding POL-GEN-03 bilingual requirements.
4. However, in the fifth appeal by the MEDLIFE uOttawa, a distinct and substantive eligibility defect, unrelated to the systemic fairness issues affecting the cycle justifies upholding the refusal. Even had the process been fair, the MEDLIFE uOttawa would not have met a mandatory requirement under POL-GEN-03. The systemic flaws in the broader process therefore do not alter the outcome of that appeal.
5. In addition, to these corrective remedies, the Appeals Committee issues systemic remedies to address the structural and recurring fairness issues identified in this cycle and to ensure future recognition processes comply with the UOSU Constitution.

II. Background and Submissions of the Parties:

6. The five appeals arise from the 2025–2026 club recognition cycle administered under POL-GEN-03. During this intake period, approximately 160 applications were submitted to the Club Committee, and it approved 17 new clubs for recognition. The Appellants were all refused recognition and subsequently filed appeals seeking reversal of the Club Committee's decisions.

7. Exercising its authority as master of its own proceedings, the Appeals Committee joined the five appeals. The factual matrix, evidentiary record, and issues substantially overlapped, and a consolidated process promotes adjudicative efficiency, coherent reasoning, and consistent findings.
8. The record before the Appeals Committee includes the parties' written submissions and supporting documents; including the Annex A spreadsheet used in the intake process; and the Club Committee's October meeting minutes.
9. In their submissions, the Appellants raise a range of issues some concerning procedural fairness, others relating to the substantive merits of their applications and the Appeals Committee has considered all of them. For efficiency, only the most material submissions are summarized.
10. Some clubs submit that they received only a brief email stating that the cap has been reached and argue that the refusal disclosed no criteria or evaluative process. Meanwhile, the Turkish Students' Association Club submits that the POL-GEN-03 bilingualism requirements were inconsistently enforced across applicants.
11. The Club Committee advances two overarching positions. For the Women's Heart Health Club, the Muslim Medical Association, Turkish Students' Association Club, University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council, it relies on the 300-club cap, asserting that capacity had been reached and that the Committee lacked discretion to recognize additional clubs. For the Turkish Students' Association Club, the MEDLIFE uOttawa, and University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council, the Respondent also submits that each failed to meet mandatory requirements of POL-GEN-03. More specifically, the Turkish Students' Association Club and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council failed to provide the required bilingual documentation, while MEDLIFE uOttawa failed both the bilingual requirement and an additional internal-governance requirement relating to its executive removal process. The Respondent argues that these POL-GEN-03 deficiencies independently justified refusal.
12. The Appeals Committee has reviewed all of the written and documentary material filed. The following analysis below addresses the issues that are determinative of the appeals.

IV. Analysis

A) The Applicable Club Recognition Framework:

13. Clubs at the University of Ottawa operate within the framework of POL-GEN-03 (Policy on Student Groups), which sets out eligibility requirements for recognition, including but not limited to executive structure, a valid bilingual logo and constitution, and alignment with UOSU policies, positions and constitution. Recognition is the gateway to accessing funding, space booking, and promotion channels. Without recognition, clubs face significant barriers to participating in campus life.

14. While the Club Administration Service conducts and initial review of applications and make recommendations to the Club Committee, the Club Committee is the final decision-making body for all club registration, renewal and refusal decisions under POL-GEN-03. In essence, the bucks stops at the Club Committee.
15. The Club Committee exercises discretion when determining whether to approve or refuse applications. However, this discretion must be exercised consistently with Article 8.12.4 of the UOSU Constitution, which requires all committees involved in club governance to act in furtherance of fairness, accountability, transparency, consultation, and equity.
16. These are not symbolic values; they are binding governance standards that guide how discretionary power must be exercised. This requirement is also consistent with general principles of administrative law, which hold that discretionary decisions must be made in a manner that is intelligible, transparent, and reviewable, so that affected individuals can understand what was decided and why.
17. The need for clear, fair and reasoned decision-making is particularly important in this case, where decisions materially affect students' ability to participate in campus life. Club recognition is not symbolic. It determines whether students can access funding, hold events, and meaningfully contribute to student life.

B) The Club Committee's Systemic Fairness Failures

Inconsistent and Differential Treatment of Club Applicants

A) Applicants who did not meet all POL-GEN-03 bilingual logo and Constitutional requirements

18. The Appeal's Committee's procedural fairness concerns are heightened by information revealed by the Turkish Students' Association Club appeal and directly confirmed by the Committee's own public meeting minutes from October 18, 2025. During this meeting, multiple Committee members acknowledged that not all clubs were held to the same POL-GEN-03 eligibility requirements during the club recognition cycle.
19. More specifically, in response to the allegations from the Turkish Students' Association Club, Committee Member M. Suvo Salinas clarified "*That the clubs who did not fulfill the basic requirements were only provisionally approved, as long as they made the necessary changes under a defined deadline.*" He then expressly asked the Student Life Commissioner E. Bah to confirm this.
20. Student Life Commissioner E. Bah confirmed this practice, stating "*that the Student Life Team has imposed deadlines on certain clubs to change the requirements that they did not fulfill in order to be eventually approved. Usually, they ask clubs to make the necessary changes by the Autumn General Assembly.*"
21. This exchange demonstrates that some clubs were granted recognition despite not meeting mandatory POL-GEN-03 eligibility requirements, on the condition that they

would correct deficiencies later. This stands in clear contrast to the treatment of other clubs, including several appellants whose applications were denied outright for similar reasons without any opportunity to amend or cure defects.

22. The minutes also include additional statements reinforcing this disparity. For example, Member G. Tongue acknowledged *“that it is concerning that some other clubs were approved without fulfilling the bilingual requirements, and that the committee should look into this.”* These internal concerns highlight that even Club Committee members recognized the procedural fairness concerns around differential application of eligibility standards.
23. The Appeals Committee finds that this practice of approving some non-compliant clubs conditioned on future corrections, while denying others for the same or similar deficiencies reflects an arbitrary exercise of discretion and a failure to apply eligibility POL-GEN-03 requirements transparently, fairly and equitably.
24. These inconsistencies were not disclosed in the Annex A spreadsheet, in the reasons provided to applicants, or in the October 4 meeting minutes provided by the Clubs Committee and would not have been uncovered absent the Turkish Students’ Association Club’s appeal.
25. This discrepancy underscores why a transparent, documented, and consistently applied club recognition process is essential. Without such a framework, arbitrary disparities can remain hidden and affected club applicants cannot meaningfully understand or challenge the decisions affecting them. The fact that these inconsistencies surfaced only because of one appellant’s evidence confirms the need for clear, recorded, and reviewable decision-making.
26. The disparity described here further undermines the unfairness, inequity, and lack of transparency of the recognition process, and directly supports the conclusion that the decision-making framework fell short of the principles set out in Article 8.12.4 of the UOSU Constitution.

B) Fully Eligible Applicants who met all POL-GEN-03 requirements

27. The Appeals Committee notes that two of the appellants, the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa and the Women’s Heart Health Club (WHHC) are listed in the Annex A spreadsheet as having met all requirements under POL-GEN-03 and as “approved” in Column N.
28. Neither club has any comments recorded in the “Commentaires” section. On the face of the record, both organizations were fully compliant, raised no administrative concerns, and met every eligibility requirement.
29. Despite this, neither the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa, nor the Women’s Heart Health Club was not selected among the 17 clubs ultimately approved for recognition.

The spreadsheet contains no explanation, criteria, prioritization, comparative notes, or scoring indicating why they were excluded or what distinguished them from the clubs that were selected. Their exclusion without any documented rationale exemplifies the broader fairness concerns revealed throughout the 2025–2026 recognition cycle.

30. This inconsistency is particularly troubling since fully compliant clubs such as the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa and the Women’s Heart Health Club were denied, despite having no deficiencies noted in the Annex A spreadsheet. Meanwhile, as aforementioned some non-compliant clubs were provisionally approved. Such differential treatment reflects arbitrary and inconsistent application of policy, contrary to the fairness, transparency, accountability, and equity obligations in Article 8.12.4.

Absence of a Transparent, Fair, Neutral, or Documented Selection Method for selection of the 17 approved clubs

31. The record demonstrates that the 2025–2026 recognition cycle lacked a fair, accountable, transparent, and equitable applied method for selecting the 17 clubs ultimately approved for recognition. Over 90 applicants met all eligibility requirements, yet the Club Committee documented no scoring method, prioritization criteria, or comparative evaluation to explain how the 17 approved clubs were selected from among the eligible group.
32. The Committee’s meeting minutes simply list the approved clubs and contain no discussion of how they were chosen, despite the large number of fully compliant applicants.
33. The Committee’s Annex A spreadsheet, while containing more information than the meeting minutes, suffers from the same lack of transparency. The spreadsheet identifies over 90 clubs marked “approved” in Column N. Of these : 41 contain comments regarding “similar clubs, and 52 contain no such comments.
34. Moreover, among the 17 clubs actually selected for recognition, three have comments indicating the existence of similar or duplicative clubs. This inconsistency raises serious questions: Was “similarity” to another club a factor or not? If it was a negative factor, why were three selected clubs accepted despite such comments? If it was not a negative factor, why were other clubs (including appellants) excluded because of potential duplication?
35. The opacity and internal inconsistency of the Committee’s process is further underscored by the tally at the bottom of the spreadsheet, which lists: 12 “Yes”, 32 “Maybe”, and 42 “No.”
36. These tallies do not correspond to the decisions recorded elsewhere in the same document and do not align with the 17 clubs ultimately selected. This internal inconsistency makes

it impossible to understand: what criteria were used, how those criteria were evaluated or weighed, whether they were applied uniformly across applicants, or why certain fully compliant clubs including the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa (MMAO) and the Women's Heart Health Club (WHHC) were rejected while others with similar or greater concerns were approved.

37. As this Committee noted in prior decisions, the record may show *which* clubs were approved, but here it provides no insight into *why*. Without documented reasoning, the decision-making process fails the constitutional standards of fairness, accountability, transparency, and equity.
38. When determining which clubs should receive recognition from among many eligible applicants, the Club Committee was obligated to use a transparent, fair, neutral, and consistently applied decision-making method., supported by reasons that allow applicants to understand the basis for their approval or rejection. This did not occur in the 2025–2026 cycle.

Incorrected Use of the 300-Club Cap as a Substitute for Reasoned, Fair, Transparent and Accountable Decision-Making

39. The Board of Directors recently adopted and amended POL-GEN-03, including the establishment or modification of the 300-club cap as a resource-management measure. The validity of the cap itself is not in dispute.
40. The 300-club cap is a legitimate resource-management tool. However, it had not been reached at the time the Appellants' applications were reviewed. Seventeen recognition spaces remained available.
41. The Club Committee received over 90 complete and compliant applications, with 17 recognition spots still available. Despite this, several applicants received rejection emails that stated only that "the cap has been reached." This explanation was factually incorrect at the relevant time and failed to account for the Committee's obligation to exercise discretion fairly and transparently when recognition spots remained open.
42. Once the Club Committee chose to approve some applicants and not others, its discretion was fully engaged, and the cap could no longer serve as a blanket justification. The existence of a numerical cap does not grant the Club Committee carte blanche to select any 17 compliant clubs and deny all remaining applicants without reasons.
43. On the contrary, because 93 clubs were substantively eligible, the Club Committee was required to apply a fair, transparent, neutral, and consistently documented selection methodology, as mandated by Article 8.12.4 of the UOSU Constitution. Simply invoking the cap, without further explanation, falls far short of these standards and results in an opaque, arbitrary, and procedurally unfair outcome.

44. As the Appeals Committee held in Empower Orphans and University of Ottawa Cinema Club, minimally sufficient reasons must be provided to applicants. At a minimum, applicants are entitled to know why they were not selected, what criteria were used, and how those criteria were applied.
45. A brief email to the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa and the Women's Heart Health Club stating only that the cap had been reached when 17 spots remained open is insufficient and violates the principles of fairness, transparency, equity, and accountability under Article 8.12.4.

The Appeal Committee's Decisions with Respect to the Merits of Each Appeal:

Women's Heart Health Club & Muslim Medical Association

46. The Women's Heart Health Club and the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa stand on materially different footing from the Student Athletic Council. The record establishes that both clubs submitted complete applications that satisfied every substantive requirement of POL-GEN-03, including bilingual documentation, governance structures, membership criteria, and all mandatory constitutional provisions. There is no evidence that either club failed to meet any eligibility condition.
47. The only basis provided to these applicants for their rejection was a reference to the 300-club cap. However, it is undisputed that the cap had not yet been reached at the time their applications were received and assessed. This means the Club Committee was still obligated to exercise its discretion, evaluate compliant applications, and provide reasoned decisions supported by identifiable, consistent, and transparent criteria. It did not do so. If the record does not explain the decision, the Appeals Committee cannot guess at the Club Committee's reasoning. The Women's Heart Health Club and the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa were therefore denied recognition in circumstances that were not fair, transparent, equitable, and accountable as required by the Constitution.
48. Because these clubs demonstrably met all objective requirements at the time of application, the Appeals Committee is satisfied that, had the Club Committee exercised its discretion lawfully both the Women's Heart Health Club and the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa would have been recognized in this cycle.
49. Granting full recognition now therefore places them in the position they should have occupied absent the procedural unfairness, fulfilling the Appeals Committee's remedial mandate while maintaining the integrity of the recognition framework. For these reasons, the appeals of the Women's Heart Health Club and the Muslim Medical Association of Ottawa are allowed.

Turkish Student's Association and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council

50. The Turkish Students' Association and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council present a distinct category of cases. Both clubs submitted applications that were

substantively complete and compliant with nearly all requirements of POL-GEN-03, save for deficiencies relating to bilingual documentation typically involving a missing, incomplete, or non-functional French version of their constitution or uploaded materials.

51. The record demonstrates that these bilingualism issues arose in a broader context where the Club Committee applied the bilingualism standard inconsistently, unpredictably, and without transparent criteria or explanation. Some applicants with comparable bilingualism defects were provisionally approved; others were denied. This inconsistency constitutes a significant breach of fairness, transparency, equity under the Constitution.
52. In such circumstances, the Appeals Committee's corrective role is to restore these applicants to the position they would have been in but for the procedural unfairness. Therefore, granting conditional recognition contingent on satisfying the outstanding bilingualism requirement within a defined period achieves two goals. It remedies the prejudice caused by the Club Committee's unfair and inconsistent process; and it preserves the bilingualism requirement as a meaningful and enforceable eligibility standard, rather than waiving it entirely.
53. Conditional recognition is therefore the remedy that best reconciles fairness, policy coherence, and the integrity of POL-GEN-03. For these reasons, the appeals of Turkish Students' Association and University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council are allowed on a conditional basis, subject to timely compliance with the bilingualism requirement.
54. The Appeals Committee notes that, in the Latin American Heritage Association appeal decided few weeks ago, the Appeals Committee upheld the Club Committee's refusal on the basis that Latin American Heritage Association failed to satisfy the mandatory bilingual documentation requirement under POL-GEN-03. At that time, no evidence had been presented suggesting that the bilingualism requirement was applied inconsistently, unfairly, or selectively across applicants. In the absence of such information, the Appeals Committee was bound to interpret the bilingualism requirement as a valid and consistently applied eligibility standard. Under those circumstances, the Appeals Committee correctly concluded that the Latin American Heritage Association had not met a core constitutional and policy requirement and that the appeal could not be allowed.
55. Ordinarily, the same result would have followed for the Turkish Students' Association and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council. Their bilingualism deficiencies, standing alone, would have justified upholding the refusals, just as in the Latin American Heritage Association decision. However, unlike in the earlier appeal, these matters were accompanied by a significantly expanded evidentiary record provided through the Turkish Students' Association appeal which revealed systemic arbitrary and inconsistent enforcement of the bilingualism requirement,

56. The Appeals Committee cannot ignore evidence of systemic unfairness that was not previously before it. Once the Appeals Committee became aware that the bilingualism requirement had not been applied consistently or equitably across applicants, it could no longer treat the refusals of the Turkish Students' Association and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council as equivalent to the Latin American Heritage Association's earlier situation. To have upheld the refusals despite clear evidence of procedural unfairness would have reproduced the same inequities the appeals process exists to correct.
57. Had the Appeals Committee been aware, at the time of the Latin American Heritage Association decision, of the full extent of the inconsistent application of the bilingualism requirement, the outcome of that appeal would have been different. However, the Constitution provides that Appeals Committee decisions are final and binding. The Appeals Committee cannot retroactively reopen or vary an earlier decision absent explicit constitutional authority to do so. Finality is essential to the stability of UOSU's governance system and ensures that parties can rely on appeal outcomes with certainty.

MEDLIFE uOttawa

58. The Appeals Committee arrives at a different conclusion in respect of the. Unlike the other appellants, MEDLIFE uOttawa did not merely fail to meet the bilingual documentation requirements under POL-GEN-03 a deficiency that, on its own, would not have precluded granting their appeal. Rather, it also failed to satisfy a separate and more substantive organizational requirement: the existence of a clear, adequate, and constitutionally compliant internal appeal or removal process for members, as required by POL-GEN-03.
59. POL-GEN-03 requires that every club constitution include transparent, fair, and accessible procedures for removing members or executives, including an internal appeal mechanism. This requirement is foundational to the recognition system because it protects students' democratic rights and ensures that recognized clubs operate with basic procedural fairness toward their own members. In MEDLIFE uOttawa's case, the documentation provided does not establish the existence of a compliant removal or appeal process. The omission is significant, substantive, and directly contrary to a mandatory eligibility requirement.
60. Moreover, there is no evidence before the Appeals Committee that the Club Committee failed to enforce this particular requirement for other clubs, nor that similarly non-compliant constitutions were overlooked. While the Club Committee's treatment of the bilingualism requirement was inconsistent, opaque, and in some cases unfair, the record contains no indication that the internal-governance requirements of POL-GEN-03 were selectively or improperly enforced.
61. The Appeals Committee considered whether the systemic procedural fairness concerns in this recognition cycle might justify overlooking MEDLIFE uOttawa's substantive non-

compliance. However, to do so would extend corrective relief beyond restoring parties to the position they would have been in had the process been fair. Even if the Club Committee had followed a fair, transparent, and constitutionally compliant process, MEDLIFE uOttawa would still have been required to demonstrate a valid internal appeal and removal mechanism. Its failure to meet this prerequisite distinguishes it from the other appellants whose applications were otherwise complete and compliant.

62. Put differently, if MEDLIFE uOttawa's only deficiency had been the bilingual documentation requirement, the Appeals Committee would have granted the appeal, as it has in the other cases. But MEDLIFE uOttawa's constitution falls one step further removed from compliance. Granting full or conditional recognition despite this substantive defect would not be consistent with the Appeals Committee's remedial role, would not reflect the position MEDLIFE uOttawa would have held but for the Club Committee's procedural errors, and would create unfairness for other applicants who complied with the internal-governance requirements.
63. For these reasons, and notwithstanding the systemic fairness issues affecting the recognition cycle, the appeal of the MEDLIFE uOttawa is dismissed.

The Appeals Committee's Remedial Authority

64. None of the parties raised the scope of the Appeals Committee's remedial authority as a live issue. However, the Appeals Committee finds it necessary to clarify the source and breadth of its powers in order to situate both the corrective and systemic remedies ordered in this decision.
65. The Constitution imposes only one explicit limit on the Appeals Committee's jurisdiction: it may not amend the Elections Code when adjudicating Elections-related appeals. If the framers of the Constitution had intended to impose similar limits on the Appeals Committee's remedial authority in other contexts, they would have done so expressly, just as they did for Elections appeals. The absence of any comparable restriction confirms that no such limitation exists in the club-recognition context.
66. On the contrary, the Constitution provides that decisions of the Appeals Committee are "final and binding" on all parties. This language necessarily implies the authority to craft remedies individual and systemic that are effective, meaningful, and capable of addressing the procedural or substantive unfairness identified on appeal. A remedial power that could not correct or prevent the very harms it is mandated to review would be incompatible with the Appeals Committee's constitutional purpose and with the function of an appellate body within a student-governance framework.
67. Accordingly, when procedural unfairness, inconsistent application of policy, or systemic barriers are identified, the Appeals Committee's jurisdiction extends to ordering remedies that not only redress the specific prejudice suffered by the appellants but also prevent

recurrence and ensure compliance with the Constitution and POL-GEN-03 going forward.

68. The Appeals Committee's role in individual cases is to place the affected party, as closely as possible, in the position they would have been in but for the breach of fairness, transparency, or equity. Corrective remedies therefore address harms suffered by specific clubs, such as the loss of recognition status, and seek to restore the individual rights that were improperly denied.
69. Individual corrective remedies, however, are not always sufficient to address broader or recurring governance issues. Where multiple appeals have exposed consistent, repeatable, and structural fairness failures, as is the case in the 2025–2026 recognition cycle, the Appeals Committee possesses the authority to order systemic remedies. Broadly speaking, systemic remedies aim to ensure that a group affected by institutional decision-making will not face the same barriers or inequities in future cycles. Their purpose is to prevent the recurrence of unfair, opaque, or unconstitutional practices.
70. Whereas corrective remedies focus on past harms to individual parties, systemic remedies are prospective and institution-wide. They can require the Club Committee to reform its procedures, adopt transparent criteria, document rationales, standardize selection methodologies, or review past practices for consistency. Systemic remedies are often the only effective way to reverse institutional patterns of unfairness, inequality, inconsistent treatment, or administrative inertia that cannot be meaningfully addressed through individual relief alone.
71. The Appeals Committee notes that, in this recognition cycle, many other applicants were likely affected by the same procedural fairness issues as the appellants but did not file an appeal. The Appeals Committee cannot remedy the situation for applicants who did not appeal their cases. However, this reality underscores the necessity of structural safeguards. Where widespread issues are identified, the Appeals Committee is compelled to adopt systemic measures to ensure that the same problems are not reproduced in future recognition cycles and that applicants who did not appeal are not subjected to the same unfairness again.

V. Conclusion

72. In light of the findings above, the Appeals Committee concludes that the remedies granted in this decision are both necessary and constitutionally justified. The record establishes that the Club Committee failed to properly exercise its discretion, applied inconsistent or opaque criteria, and did not provide the procedural fairness required under the Constitution and POL-GEN-03. These failures materially affected the appellants' ability to be fairly considered for club recognition.

73. The Appeals Committee's central remedial function is to restore affected parties, as closely as possible, to the position they would have occupied had the Club Committee respected the Constitution, complied with POL-GEN-03, and exercised its discretion lawfully and transparently. Where an improper process results in the denial of recognition to clubs that met all eligibility requirements, the only meaningful corrective remedy is to grant the recognition that ought to have been awarded originally. In doing so, the Appeals Committee is not amending or overriding the 300-club cap; rather, it is correcting the consequences of an unlawful decision made by the Club Committee at a time when the cap had not yet been reached.
74. Therefore, no UOSU policy is violated by restoring club applicants to the position they would have held but for the procedural fairness errors of the Club Committee. Moreover, in any case, the principles outlined in the UOSU Constitution are binding and take precedence over the 300-club cap found within POL-GEN-03.
75. Conversely, merely issuing a declaratory statement of unfairness would fall far short of the Appeals Committee's constitutional mandate. An appeal is not an academic exercise in identifying errors or scoring debating points. It is a remedial process designed to correct wrongful outcomes. Declining to grant effective relief would deprive the appellants of meaningful justice and would render the Appeals Committee's "final and binding" authority largely symbolic. The Constitution entrusts the Appeals Committee with the power and the duty to make decisions that fully resolve the prejudice suffered by parties, not merely describe it.
76. At the same time, the Appeals Committee's mandate is not limited to addressing discrete past harms. Where appeals reveal systemic or recurring governance problems, it may issue systemic remedies. These measures aim not only to correct the injustices suffered by the appellants but to impose safeguards to prevent them from reoccurring.
77. The systemic orders issued in this decision are therefore justified by the breadth and depth of the fairness issues identified during this intake. Without a structural audit, procedural reforms, and public transparency, there is a real risk that the same barriers and inequities will reoccur, affecting both future applicants and those who did not appeal despite being subjected to similar errors. The Appeals Committee would abdicate its constitutional role were it to limit itself to individual relief while ignoring evidence of systemic deficiencies.
78. Taken together, the corrective and systemic remedies granted herein are proportionate, necessary, and firmly rooted in the Appeals Committee's constitutional authority to issue final and binding decisions that meaningfully address both individual prejudice and structural unfairness. The Appeals Committee therefore grants the orders that follow.

IV. Order

79. The appeals of the Women's Heart Health Club and Muslim Medical Association, Turkish Students' Association, and University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council are allowed
80. The Appeal of the MEDLIFE uOttawa is dismissed
81. The decisions of the Club Committee concerning the Women's Heart Health Club and Muslim Medical Association, Turkish Students' Association, and University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council are set aside.
82. Women's Heart Health Club and Muslim Medical Association are granted full recognized club status for the 2025–2026 academic year, effective immediately.
83. The Turkish Students' Association, and the University of Ottawa Student Athletic Council are granted conditional full recognized club status for the 2025–2026 academic year, effective immediately, on the condition that each club satisfies all outstanding POL-GEN-03 requirements within 20 business days of this decision.
84. The University of Ottawa Student Union is ordered to conduct and complete an internal audit and review of the Club Committee recognition cycle practices and decision-making procedures within 60 business days of this decision. The overall purpose of this internal audit and review is to ensure that necessary safeguards, practices and procedures are put in place so that future recognition cycles do not encounter the same systemic fairness, transparency, equity and accountability concerns identified in this decision.
85. The University of Ottawa Student Union is ordered to publish this appeal decision as well as past Appeal Committee decisions in both official languages on the University of Ottawa Student Union public website within thirty 30 business days of this decision, to ensure transparency, accountability, and accessibility for all members and clubs of the University of Ottawa Students' Union community.

October 30, 2025, at 12:38pm.

Philippe Giguère, Chair of Appeals Committee
Élodie Proulx, Faculty of Law Member of Appeals Committee