

AGM PART TWO MEETING MINUTES

GROUP	Ontario Tech Student Union (OTSU) General Members
LOCATION	In-person (BIT 2080)
DATE & TIME	Jan 29, 2026 , 7:31 p.m. - 9:57 p.m.
NOTE TAKER	Katie Lapp
ATTENDEES	<p>Directors (in-person): Faculty of Graduate Studies & Chair, Sergio Maljuf Suarez; Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science & Vice-Chair, Sifatul Mostafi; Faculty of Business and Information Technology, Craigton Corda; Faculty of Social Science & Humanities, Keenan Howells; Faculty of Health Science, Ifra Khurram</p> <p>Executives: President, Eloghosa Avenbuan; VP Downtown, Kailey Haskell; VP Student Life, Tuirani Kerfelec; VP Student Affairs, Anwoy Barua</p> <p>Staff: Executive Director, Brian Robson & Administrative & Governance Coordinator / Chief Returning Officer, Katie Lapp</p> <p>Guests: N/A</p>
REGRETS	N/A

OPENING PROCEDURES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called into order at 7:31 p.m. Moved by Michael Proboszcz and seconded by Christopher Panetta . Motion carried.

2. TERRITORIAL RECOGNITION

3. AGENDA APPROVAL

DISCUSSION

No Discussion

RESOLUTION

Moved by Daniel Roufail and seconded by Sara Elsayeda . Motion carried.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ontario Tech Student Union approved the agenda for Jan 29, 2026.

AGENDA TOPICS

4. SPECIAL RESOLUTION: BYLAW AMENDMENTS

The Vice-Chair stated that the proposed bylaw amendments are not intended to change or reduce students rights but rather to reorganize and clarify the bylaws to better reflect current operations. The Vice-Chair noted that general voting members of the OTSU would be informed of the proposed changes so they could make an informed decision. They also stated that the bylaw amendments had been reviewed by a law firm.

DISCUSSION

Eugenio Morales inquired about voting procedure, specifically whether the Board would be voting on all bylaw amendments as a single package or individually. The Chair confirmed that the vote would be conducted as a single package.

Jonah Gibson raised concerns regarding the bylaw changes on an individual basis and stated that, as a voting member, they have the right to request individual votes on the amendments. The Chair acknowledged that voting individually could be a lengthy process but agreed that individual votes could be conducted if such requests were approved.

RESOLUTION

Moved by **Aviv Dad** and seconded by **Miles Forint**. Motion carried.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the General Members of the Ontario Tech Student Union proposed to vote on each bylaw amendment separately.

DISCUSSION

Ryan Dean referenced Section 12.3.2 of the bylaws, under Section 12.3 *Responsibilities and Powers of the Executive*, which outlines the proposed bylaw change, stating:

“The executive is empowered and responsible: to hire and supervise an executive director for the Student Association.”

Members inquired about the rationale for the proposed changes. The Executive Director stated that the amendments were reviewed and recommended by a third party law firm to strengthen the governance structure. The Executive Director explained that while the Executive Team would remain involved, the Board of Directors would assume primary responsibility under the revised structure. He questioned why the wording had been changed or removed if the responsibilities of the Executive remained the same. Ilya Soukoreff added that if the process is intended to remain mostly unchanged, the wording should reflect that. They further stated that bylaws should clearly and publicly outline processes, as students expect them to be followed as written. They also emphasized the importance of clarity for future Board members and students to prevent misinterpretation.

RESOLUTION

Moved by **Anja Biskupic** and seconded by **Murasa Ehsan**. Motion carried.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the General Members of the Ontario Tech Student Union proposed to vote on keeping or changing the wording for Section 12.3.2 of the OTSU bylaws.

DISCUSSION

Miles Forint sought clarification on the wording of Section 7.3 of the bylaws, specifically regarding whether executives are considered equal to Board members. The Executive Director clarified that while the Board of Directors and the Executive Team share similar responsibilities, the Board of Directors holds ultimate responsibility for supervising and hiring the Executive Director.

Taha Rana sought clarification on Section 13.2.4 of the bylaws, under Section 13.2 *Nomination Rules*, which states:

"Nominations must be submitted in advance of an election, in accordance with such deadlines as may be established by the Board."

The Chair explained that the proposed changes are intended to provide students with additional time to vote, noting that the time required to collect votes may vary depending on the position a candidate is running for. The Chair further noted that Board positions have two year terms and that some faculties may present greater challenges in reaching voters. The Executive Director reiterated that the proposed amendments were recommended by a third party law firm. They explained that certain provisions were added, while others were made more flexible to improve functionality and allow for easier future adjustments in response to student needs. The Executive Director also stated that any bylaw changes must first go through the Elections Committee and then the Board of Directors for approval.

Sydney Spyksma sought clarification on the amendments to Sections 6.2 and 6.9, of the bylaws. The Chair confirmed that the numbers referenced in those sections would adjust based on student population growth. The student acknowledged this reasoning and noted that clarification was sought due to the removal of the previously stated minimum requirements.

Lindsay Horner sought clarification for Section 12.5 (*Duties of Vice-President of Student Affairs*), specifically Section 12.5.4 which states:

"Work with the Student Union personnel to oversee advocacy and student rights services and consult with students to ensure that their needs are being met."

They wanted to clarify that the whole point of this position is advocacy in itself. The Chair explained Section 12.5.3 explains why.

Ryan Dean sought clarification on bylaw Section 8.5 (*Notice of Motions*), noting that the 72 hour notice requirement had been reduced and asked for the rationale behind the change. The Chair explained that under the revised bylaw, Board members are required to submit substantive issues in writing to the Chair at least one week prior to a meeting. In urgent circumstances where less than 72 hours notice is provided, an item may still be brought forward if a majority of the Board agrees to waive the notice requirement.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Muhammad Hashim Shah Nawaz and seconded by Joshua Mather. Motion carried.

Voted to not change Section 12.3.2

Voted to not remove Section 13.2.4.

In favour - 61 | Opposed - 34 | Abstained - 24

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ontario Tech Student Union adopts the 2025 bylaw amendments as presented.

5. NUTRITION ACCESSIBILITY PROGRAM (NAP) ANCILLARY FEE

The VP of Student Life presented an overview of the proposed Nutrition Accessibility Program (NAP), highlighting that food insecurity impacts approximately 30% of Ontario Tech University students and has significant effects on academic success, physical health, and mental well-being. The program aims to provide students with reliable and dignified access to nutritious food while promoting equity and supporting overall student wellness. NAP was introduced as a three year

initiative focused on addressing food insecurity, improving student well-being and academic outcomes, and developing sustainable, student-led solutions.

The proposed three year implementation plan is outlined below:

- **2025–2026:** Pilot phase focused on data collection through initiatives such as the Snack & Go program weekly and monthly breakfast tables.
- **2026–2027:** Expansion of the program through the introduction of food gift cards, food hampers, and partnerships with local organizations.
- **2027–2028:** Evaluation of the program with the goal of establishing NAP as a permanent student service to ensure long-term sustainability.

The proposed fee structure for NAP was presented. The proposal includes a \$5.00 annual fee for full-time students, effective Fall 2026, with an estimated annual revenue of \$60,000. It was also noted that annual reporting would be provided to the OTSU Board of Directors and students to ensure accountability.

In addition, a proposed budget allocation for the 2026–2027 academic year was presented. The majority of funding (\$48,000) would support the Gift Cards Program, with additional funding allocated to the Snack & Go and Breakfast Table initiatives (\$5,000), Food Hampers (\$5,000), and fundraising and marketing efforts (\$2,000). It was further noted that ongoing discussions are taking place with the University to develop programs that better support students experiencing financial insecurity.

DISCUSSION

Daniel Yelle inquired whether a portion of the proposed budget could be directed toward purchasing food directly from local farms or producers, rather than through major grocery retailers, to maximize the impact of program funding. VP of Student Life explained that this approach was considered during the program's development. However, sourcing directly from local producers would require additional storage facilities, food handling infrastructure, and regulatory licensing. Also purchasing through established grocery retailers was identified as the most practical and feasible option for the program at this time.

Sara Elsayeda asked for clarification on the proposed eligibility for the program and whether access to support would be based on a needs assessment. VP of Student Life advised that the program has been created by University data, consultation with other student unions, and student feedback. It was further noted that eligibility for certain supports would be determined in collaboration with the University, while the Breakfast Table initiative would remain open and accessible to all students.

Andrew Klodnicki asked how eligibility for the food insecurity program would be determined and raised concerns about the program's limited funding and overall reach. VP of Student Life explained the program will work with the Financial Aid Office, which was implemented in response to gaps in existing supports and is intended to expand through future partnerships and investments.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Tommy Michailidis and seconded by Muhammad Hashim Shah Nawaz. Motion carried.

In favour - 97 | Opposed - 14 | Abstained - 1

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ontario Tech Student Union approve the application to the Ancillary Fee Committee for a new \$5.00 student fee for the Nutrition Access Program, to then go to referendum.

6. STUDENT RESOLUTION: HEALTH PLAN

Sara Elsayeda presented a proposal requesting that OTSU explore making prescription drug coverage optional for students eligible for OHIP+, beginning with the next health insurance contract negotiation. Sara noted that the proposal

aims to reflect changes to OHIP+, which now provides prescription drug coverage for many eligible students under 25, while acknowledging that the OTSU health plan offers broader coverage than OHIP+. It was also noted that students with private insurance are not eligible for OHIP+ and any future changes would need to consider the differing coverage needs of the student population.

DISCUSSION

Maryam Baz asked questions regarding the flexibility of the current health insurance plan and opportunities to review benefit levels during future contract negotiations. Sara Elsayeda responded that while she had not discussed the proposal with the insurance provider, future negotiations could provide an opportunity to address concerns and improve the overall value of the plan.

Daniel Yelle asked about the benefit of maintaining mandatory prescription drug coverage given the availability of OHIP+ for many students. Sara Elsayeda explained that the OTSU health plan provides broader prescription drug coverage than OHIP+.

Andrew Klodnicki requested clarification on the connection between mandatory prescription drug coverage and OHIP+ eligibility. Sara Elsayeda explained that students enrolled in the OTSU health plan are considered to have private prescription insurance and are therefore ineligible for OHIP+ under provincial policy.

The VP of Student Affairs and Tommy Michailidis requested clarification on the voting options for the proposal. Sara Elsayeda explained that a vote in favour would support exploring optional prescription drug coverage for students eligible for OHIP+, with any resulting changes to premiums to be determined through future negotiations. A vote against would maintain the current mandatory prescription drug coverage under the OTSU health plan.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Tommy Michailidis and seconded by Lindsay Horner . Motion carried.

In favour - 24 | Opposed - 67 | Abstained - 10

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ontario Tech Student Union does not adopt the Student Resolution: Health Plan.

7. STUDENT RESOLUTION: RESPONDUS LOCKDOWN BROWSER

Sara Elsayeda presented a proposal requesting that OTSU advocate for the discontinuation of the mandatory use of Respondus LockDown Browser for online assessments. The proposal raised concerns regarding student privacy, security, accessibility, and the requirement to install monitoring software on personal devices. It was noted that the proposal encourages the University to explore alternative assessment and proctoring methods that better protect students' privacy while maintaining academic integrity.

DISCUSSION

Christopher Panetta expressed general support for open source software and asked several questions regarding the proposal. He requested clarification on potential alternatives to Respondus LockDown Browser for online and hybrid assessments, questioned the characterization of the software as malware, and requested clarification on the technical and security concerns outlined in the proposal. Sara Elsayeda responded that the proposal does not prohibit the use of Respondus LockDown Browser but instead advocates for students to be provided with an alternative assessment option so they are not disadvantaged for choosing not to use the software. She also clarified that the proposal's concerns relate to the software's overall level of access and permissions on personal devices rather than standard software installation practices, and emphasized that the proposal supports alternative methods of maintaining academic integrity rather than relying solely on proctoring software.

The VP of Student Affairs requested clarification on the intent of the proposal, specifically whether it sought to eliminate the use of Respondus LockDown Browser or ensure alternative assessment options were available. Sara Elsayeda clarified that the proposal does not prohibit the use of Respondus LockDown Browser but instead supports requiring alternative assessment options for students who choose not to use the software.

Ryan Dean requested clarification on the scope and potential implementation of the proposal, including how alternative assessment options would apply and the authority of OTSU in making changes. Sara Elsayeda clarified that the proposal seeks to advocate for alternative assessment options wherever Respondus LockDown Browser is required and that any changes would be subject to discussions and negotiations with the University rather than being implemented directly by OTSU.

The VP of Student Life asked how the proposal would accommodate students enrolled in fully online courses. Sara Elsayeda explained that the proposal is intended to provide students with alternative assessment options, while recognizing that the specific method of assessment would remain at the discretion of course instructors.

RESOLUTION

Moved by Anja Biskupic and seconded by Lauren Olivier . Motion carried.

In favour - 51 | Opposed - 43 | Abstained - 5

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ontario Tech Student Union shall negotiate with Ontario Tech University to prohibit the use of Respondus Lockdown Browser as a mandatory curriculum component, with the effect that it is either not required under any circumstances, or an alternative to using Respondus Lockdown Browser such as writing paper tests is provided to all students who wish not to install Respondus Lockdown Browser.

Note: The Executive Director noted that the meeting was close to losing quorum and that if quorum was lost, the meeting would need to be adjourned.

8. INCREASE BASE CLUB FUNDING

The Executive Director provided an overview of the financial position of clubs and societies, noting that current fees do not fully cover operating costs and that financial constraints may limit the implementation of future proposals. It was also noted that additional funding enhancements may require an increase to the designated club fee.

Note: The Chair advised that attendance had decreased to 98 students, resulting in the loss of quorum. As a result, the remaining agenda items could not be presented.

9. NEW BUSINESS

No new business at this time.

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements at this time.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 p.m. Moved by Laura Costantini-Pare and seconded by Joshua Mather . Motion carried.