



**Report of the Chief Returning Officer regarding the
2017 Spring Election for the Student Association of
George Brown College which was held on March 31
to April 7, 2017.**



ELECTIONS SERVICES
cro@sagbc.ca

April 24, 2017

Alastair Woods
Chair of the Board
Student Association of George Brown College
Toronto, ON

It is my please to communicate to you part I of the report of the Elections Services Office regarding the electoral event which occurred from March 31, 2017 to April 7, 2017.

Sincerely,

Charles Wilson
Chief Returning Officer



Part I—the Electoral Event

Introduction

The 2017 Spring Election for the Student Association of George Brown College was held on March 31, and April 3-6, 2017. The Election was called by resolution of the board on March 7, 2017 after several other timelines being proposed. The Election Officials were

Charles Wilson, B.A., M.P.A., Cnd M.Div.	Chief Returning Officer
Anuja Jeeva, B.A., Cnd M.A.	Deputy Returning Officer
Daniel Gladstone, B.A., M.A.	Deputy Returning Officer

The Elections Committee was composed of:

Lorraine Gajadharsingh, Chair	until March 6, 2017
Roslyn Miller, Chair	after March 6, 2017
Gracel Quibrantar	
Michelle Harrypaul	until March 16, 2017
Charles Wilson	from February 13, 2017

The Chief Returning Officer is grateful for the wise counsel and assistance of the Deputy Returning Officers. I speak on behalf of the entire Election Services division when I say that I am grateful for support and oversight of the Elections Committee. I especially want to thank Roslyn for her encouragement and assistance during this time, the Elections Committee under her leadership faced many difficult conversations and she was able to facilitate them in a manner of which we can all learn from. Further Gracel was second to none in being there when we needed her. She is a true student leader who cares about her community. It was a pleasure to work with both these wonderful and dedicated people.

The timeline of the election is as follows:

February 13, 2017	First day of the appointment of the Chief Returning Officer
February 21, 2017	First day of the appointment of the Deputy Returning Officer
March 9, 2017	Nominations open
March 15, 2017	Nominations Close
March 16, 2017	All Candidates Meeting – Kings Lounge, St. James Campus
March 30, 2017	Debate Waterfront Campus
March 31, and April 3-6, 2017	Elections Days
April 4, 2017	Debate Casa Loma
April 5, 2017	Debate St. James Campus
April 7, 2017	Ballot Count – Casa Loma Campus

Appointment of Elections Officials

Following an competitive interview process the Elections Committee appointed Charles Wilson as Chief Returning Officer his appointment took effect on February 13, 2017. Further following a competitive interview process Anuja Jeeva and Daniel Gladstone were appointed Deputy Returning Officers these appointments took effect on February 21, 2017. Polling and tabulation officials were appointed March 25, 2017 by the Chief Returning Officer based on the recommendation of the Deputy Returning Officers.

Did you know?

Poll officials undertake a comprehensive training process which involves both in classroom training on procedures and hands on training involving different voting situations which they might encounter. The entire training process takes about 4 hours.

Pre-nominations and Procurement Period

During the pre-nomination period election staff were busy. A number of objectives were achieved during this period including procurement of elections supplies, revising forms and training processes, and locating and placing polling stations.

A request for quotation was issued for the printing of the composite ballots. After over 50 bids, C+D Graphics were chosen as the official printer. The ballots and other elections printing were delivered on March 30, 2017. A total of 6000 ballots were printed in books 25 ballots using four ballot types or faces. This in addition to other printing cost a total of \$2,2226.10 (including taxes).

A request for proposals was issues for election list software services. Six bidders were preselected and the contract was awarded to Monirul Pathan IT Consulting (Instavote Systems) for a total cost of 2825.00 (including taxes).

A number elections supplies had to be bought off the shelf, including ballot boxes due to a shortage of ballot boxes provided by Elections Canada, and accessibility supplies. Most of these supplies were purchased off the shelf through a sole sourced contract with Municipal World Inc. Municipal World is one of Canada's leader in providing traditional election supplies.

Nominations Period

Nominations opened on March 9,2017 and closed on March 15, 2017. By the close of nominations 31 nominations forms were received. Three of those nomination forms were ruled invalid due to incorrect signatures. Every signature on the nomination forms was verified for authenticity of signature against the certified list of members given by the registrar's office.

All Candidates' Meeting

An all candidates' meeting was held on March 16, 2017 in King's Lounge, St. James Campus. The meeting covered the necessary elements of the election and verified the candidate's information.

Nominated Candidates

Director Communications and Internal

Riddhi, Modi (Act Now)

Singh Dua Harjit (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

Director Operations

Beker, Gemeda "Gem" (Act Now)

Died on April 7, 2017

Director Campus Life

Burrowes, Mercedes (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

DaCosta, Brittney (Act Now)

Director Education

Rasan, Abithira

Withdrawn

Toye, Mitchell (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

White, Tiffany (Act Now)

Director Equity

Mortimore, Sheldon (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

Stewart, Alex (Act Now)

Casa Loma Campus Director

Melaragno, Matthew

Withdrawn

St. Hilaire, Jasmyn (Act Now)

Acclaimed

Satellite Campuses Director

Cammisa, Ashley (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

Acclaimed

St. James Campus Director

Bartholomew Soto, Calvin (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

Torres, Francis (Act Now)

Arts and Design Representative

Prieto, Alejandro

Acclaimed

Business Representative

Greenberg, Ron

Acclaimed

Community Services Representative

Graham, Tisha (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

Murrell, Andrew (Act Now)

Hospitality Representative

Ogbonna, Chioma Adaeze (Act Now)

Acclaimed

Liberal Arts and Preparatory Studies Representative

Truong, Vanessa

Acclaimed

Accessibility Representative

Jackman, Yuseph (Act Now)

Tookalak, Charlie (V3)

Black Students Representative

Grant, Zhorrah

Sabrina Mohammed

First Nations, Metis and Inuit Students Representative

VanEvery, Leslie (V3)

Acclaimed

International Students Representative

Manchanda, Kushagra (V3)

Sheth, Aman (Act Now)

LGBTQ Students Representative

Vernon, Garth (V3)

Acclaimed

Women and TransStudents Representative

Beckles, Tiah Mercedes Arlene (V3)

Acclaimed

The following were the nominations forms found not to be in order:

Carla A. Rudberg

Business Representative

Roxana Lopez

Health Sciences Representative

Anthony Hooper

Community Services and Early Childhood Representative

Election Marketing

There were three candidates debates held Waterfront Campus (March 30th), Casa Loma Campus (April 4th) and St. James Campus (April 5th). These were moderated by the Chief Returning Officer, and only executive candidates were invited to debate. American Sign Language interpretation was provided at the Waterfront and Casa Loma Debates, however due to a scheduling conflict by the college it could not be provided at the St. James Campus debate. The debates were livestreamed via Facebook live and Youtube.

The website and posters in addition to social media was use to advertise the election including for poll clerks and the nominations period. Advisements and candidate's bio and pictures (from the all candidates meeting) were inserted into the Dialog designed in house by Yaw Okyere. We are grateful for the support of Faris Lehn, Mick Sweetman, and Yaw Okyere in working so hard to advertise the election.

Campaigning

Campaigning commenced on March 17, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. and continued until the end of the election April 6, 2017. Posters and other campaign materials were approved by the Chief Returning Officer.

The Chief Returning Officer issued the following demerit points:

April 4, 2017

Mercedes Burrows for illegal posting resulting in four points and three seized posters

Calvin Bartholomew Soto for illegal posting resulting in four demerit points and three seized poster.

Tish Graham for illegal posting resulting in four demerit points and three seized posters.

Sheldon Mortimore for illegal posting resulting in four demerit points and three seized posters.

April 5, 2017

Harjit Singh Dua, Mercedes Burrows, Sheldon Mortimore, Mitchell Toye, Tisha Graham, Charlie Tookalak, Kushagra Manchanda, and Sabrina Mohammed for improper distribution of campaign materials resulting in a takedown order of two banners and four demerit points.

Riddhi Moodi for improper display of campaign materials resulting in five demerit points.

April 6, 2017

Sheldon Mortimore for campaigning in illegal areas resulting in ten demerit points.

Brittney DaCosta for breaching social media rules resulting in five demerit points.

Brittney DaCosta for breaching social media rules resulting in ten demerit points.

Voting

There were eight main voting stations, held from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. daily. The stations were located at:

- St. James Campus, Kings Lounge
- St. James Campus, Lower Level
- St. James Campus, Culinary School
- Waterfront Campus, Main Lobby
- Ryerson Campus, SHE Building
- Casa Loma Campus Main Lobby (Kindall St)
- Casa Loma Campus, Dartnell Ave entrance
- Casa Loma Campus, Student Centre

In addition to these polling station a mobile poll operated at both Casa Loma and St. James Campus alternating days.

Additional polling stations were held at Young Theatre Centre and Sunnybrook Hospital for students in those programs only.

Counting and Recounting

The counting of the ballots took place on April 7, 2017 at the board room at Casa Loma Campus. The Tabulation Officers worked in pairs to count the ballots. The entire process begun around 10:00 a.m. and was completed around 6: 00 p.m.

The Chief Returning Officer together with the deputies performed validations the night of the initial count and published the unofficial not validated results that night. Validation had to be stopped due to four certificate to votes which had to be verified by the Student Services Office. Validation finished on April 10th and the final count at validation was realised at that time.

A recount was required in the St. James Campus Director and International Students' Representative, these recounts took place on April 13th and April 11th respectively.

Validated results (at recount)

Director of Communications and Internal

RIDDHI MODI	603
HARJIT SINGH DUA	477
Rejected ballots	13
unmarked ballots	273
total	1366

Director of Campus Life

MERCEDES BURROWES	612
BRITTNEY DACOSTA	401
Rejected ballots	12
unmarked ballots	341
total	1366

Director of Education

MITCHELL TOYE	433
TIFFANY WHITE	545
Rejected ballots	8
unmarked ballots	380
total	1366

Director of Equity

SHELDON MORTIMORE	517
ALEX STEWART	582
Rejected ballots	9
unmarked ballots	258
total	1366

St James Campus Director

CALVIN BARTHOLOMEW SOTO	312
FRANCIS TORRES	333
Rejected ballots	12
unmarked ballots	237
total	894

Community Services and Early Childhood Education Representative

TISHA GRAHAM	73
ANDREW MURRELL	34
Rejected ballots	3
unmarked ballots	27
total	137

A breakdown of eligible voters	
Total eligible voters	20820
Casa Loma	5847
Satellite	1074
St James	11089
Waterfront	2810
Arts, Design and Information Technology	3278
Business	3945
Community Services and Early Childhood Education	2107
Construction and Engineering Technology	3620
Health Sciences	2868
Hospitality and Culinary Arts	3108
Preparatory and Liberal Studies	1893
Number of ballots casted	1362
Voter Turnout	6.54%

Accessibility Representative

YUSEPH JACKMAN	418
CHARLIE TOOKALAK	279
Rejected ballots	10
unmarked ballots	659
total	1362

Black Students Representative

Zhorrah GRANT	276
SABRINA MOHAMMED	388
Rejected ballots	16
unmarked ballots	686
total	1362

International Students' Representative

KUSHAGRA MANCHANDA	371
AMAN SHETH	358
Rejected ballots	13
unmarked ballots	624
total	1362

Acclaimed positions**First Nations, Metis and Inuit Students Representative**

VanEvery, Leslie (V3)

LGBTQ Students Representative

Vernon, Garth (V3)

Women and TransStudents Representative

Beckles, Tiah Mercedes Arlene (V3)

Casa Loma Campus Director

St. Hilaire, Jasmyn (Act Now)

Satellite Campuses Director

Cammisa, Ashley (V3: Values | Voices | Virtue)

Arts and Design Representative

Prieto, Alejandro

Business Representative

Greenberg, Ron

Hospitality Representative

Ogbonna, Chioma Adaeze (Act Now)

Vacant positions

Director of Operations

Waterfront Campus Director

Health Sciences Representative

Construction and Engineering Technologies Representative

George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technologies, Board of Governors Representative

Candidate's finances

Candidates presented their financial reports to the Chief Returning Officer. The following are the results of the reports received. The following is the total campaign expenditures for each candidate. The Chief Returning Officer has reviewed these expenditures and expresses no concerns over them.

Director Communications and Internal

Riddhi, Modi (Act Now) \$163.00

Singh Dua Harjit (V3: Values| Voices| Virtue) \$292.77

Director Campus Life

Burrowes, Mercedes (V3: Values| Voices| Virtue) \$303.42

DaCosta, Brittney (Act Now) \$151.75

Director Education

Toye, Mitchell (V3: Values| Voices| Virtue) \$295.92

White, Tiffany (Act Now) \$214.77

Director Equity

Mortimore, Sheldon (V3: Values| Voices| Virtue) \$312.47

Stewart, Alex (Act Now) \$150.00

St. James Campus Director

Bartholomew Soto, Calvin (V3: Values| Voices| Virtue)

Torres, Francis (Act Now) \$59.75

Community Services Representative

Graham, Tisha (V3: Values| Voices| Virtue) \$75.75

Murrell, Andrew (Act Now) no expenses

Accessibility Representative

Jackman, Yuseph (Act Now) no expenses

Tookalak, Charlie (V3) \$75.00

Black Students Representative

Grant, Zhorrah no expenses

Sabrina Mohammed \$75.20

International Students Representative

Manchanda, Kushagra (V3) \$75.00

Sheth, Aman (Act Now) \$58.00

Ruling, advisory opinions, and other documents

The Chief Returning Office issued the following rulings throughout the course of the election. This does not include any discipline rulings mentioned earlier in this report:

In the matter of by-law amendments (Black Students' Representative), on March 6, 2017.

In the matter of section 13.12 of the by-laws, on March 7, 2017.

In the matter of section 13.12 (c) of the by-laws (addendum), on March 13, 2017.

In the matter of the questions regarding pervious social media sites (interim order), on March 17, 2017.

In the matter of the questions regarding previous social media sites, on March 17, 2017.

The Chief Returning Officer issued the following advisory opinions during the course of the election.

Advisory opinion of the Chief Returning Officer regarding attendance at the membership meeting by members of the board, staff, volunteers, and committee members of the corporation in an official capacity, on February 15, 2017.

Advisory opinion of the Chief Returning Officer to the Chair of the Elections Committee regarding the death of a candidate, on April 19, 2017.

The Chief Returning Officer published a candidate's manual and a comprehensive elections proceedings manual both of which contained key and vital information regarding how this election was ran, and both of which are left in the format of a digital file with the chair of the elections committee and the internal coordinator.

Report on accessibility in the electoral process

Mr. Gladstone, the Deputy Returning Officer took the lead on creating and ensuring an accessible election. The Chief Returning Officer and all elections staff were committed to ensuring an election which are as accessible as possible.

During the pre-election preparation period, the election team discussed various means of ensuring that the election would be accessible. The accessibility measures discussed were as follows (Bold segments were implemented during this election period):

Accessible Elections: “Best practices in election administration and outreach, from the perspective of disability rights, must be consistent with principles of accessibility, individual autonomy, community inclusion, respect for the inherent capacity and dignity of people, privacy in casting a ballot, and also assistance in voting, at the request of electors with disabilities, by a person of their own choice.” (Elections Canada, <http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rec/part/spe&document=p5&lang=e>)

Location and setup of polling stations

Accessible locations

- **Building entrance**
 - **no special entrance required for accessibility**
- **Floor access**
 - **elevators,**
 - **no steps on floor with polling station**
- High contrast signage posted at all entrances, stairwells and elevators
 - Yellow/Blue best practice
- Make polling stations visible and welcoming
 - banner denoting polling station, colourful balloons, **“Vote Here” signage**
- Polling station greeter
 - assess needs of all voters (e.g. assistive devices, seating),
 - answer questions (e.g. how to vote, provide candidate statements) and
 - prepare electors to vote (e.g. have ID ready, increase efficiency of polling stations))

Accessible polling stations

- Ensure wheelchair access to all polling stations
 - space around and behind polling station that still allows for privacy
- Provide seating area next to polling station for voters who have trouble standing in line (ensure that their space in the queue is maintained)
- Provide accessible materials
 - Easy grip pencils (triangular)
 - **Magnifying sheets**
 - **Voter-assist consent/confidentiality agreements**
 - **Large print ballots**
 - Staff identification badges (Name and Position)

Accessible Communications and Training

Accessible communication

- **Ensure that all electors are spoken too in the same manner (write script for poll clerks)**
 - **E.g. ask all electors what accessibility needs they might have**
 - **Offer all modes of voting to all electors**
 - **Make accessible offerings prominent and visible**
- High contrast voting materials (blue/yellow)
- **Post written directions “How to Vote” for voters at all polling stations prominently and on GBSA website for previewing**
- Post a sample ballot, candidate statements, and map of polling locations (including accessible entrance and elevator locations) on GBSA website for previewing
- **Make elections page linked at GBSA homepage (currently hard to find) and add links to accessibility resources**
- **Post accessibility tools that will be present at polling stations online and ask for feedback**

- ***Poll clerk training***
 - **AODA training (also provide a manual for each polling station)**
 - **Roll playing poll clerk script and assistance for electors with disability (perhaps ALS can send a representative to train clerks how to respectfully assist electors with disabilities)**
 - **Double envelope training (how and when)**

Remarks:

Within the available timeline and budget, the election team worked effectively to make the voting process accessible to SA members. Each polling station was equipped with large-print ballots, magnifying screens, voter consent/confidentiality agreements, and large-print instructions visually defining valid/invalid voting. This being said, there are limits to the accessibility measures that can be taken by the elections team when using paper ballots. It should be noted that there were no large-print ballots cast in this election. This is not to say that no electors required these measures. Rather, it is the opinion of this report that the polling stations themselves posed a significant barrier to any member with a disability. Despite our efforts to offer accessible resources and to ensure that all poll clerks received AODA training, SA polling stations, by their nature, require individuals with disabilities to disclose their needs to fellow students in public spaces. Given the state of modern online elections technology, it is the opinion of this report that these polling stations pose an unnecessary barrier to the SA membership. Online elections allow members to vote from any location, using accessible software that they are acquainted with and have adjusted to their particular needs. Therefore, it is the recommendation of this report that the SA move away from paper ballots, instead, utilizing an online voting system, to the exclusion of all other methods. It is further recommended that the SA cease utilizing polling stations. The accessibility software required to make a computerized polling station accessible to the membership is prohibitively expensive. Further, the computers that we currently have are insufficient to truly make an online voting process at polling stations accessible. Accessibility software requires training to set up and must be modified for each member based upon their particular needs. All of this makes computerized polling stations untenable. Therefore, it is the additional recommendation of this accessibility report that the SA do away with polling stations entirely and allow members to vote from anywhere using an online voting system selected by a committee of the board.



***Part II—Retrospective Report of the Chief Returning
Officer***

***“Ensuring the Safeguard, Strengthening the
Foundations”***

Introduction to the Retrospective Report

This portion of the report contains recommendations regarding how to ensure electoral safeguards and strengthen electoral foundations. Each election is unique, and this election is one without equal in my experience. There is a need to ensure that the electoral safeguards are in place to ensure that the elections process is fair, disciplined, and allow the members to select who shall preside over their student association.

I will keep my introductory remarks brief, this report looks at the electoral organizations and systems, at the Elections Committee and my request Daniel Gladstone has reviewed the by-laws and statutory structures.

I cannot stress enough the need to reform the electoral practices of this association. The recent by-law changes creates additional challenges to electoral system, as large portions of the by-laws have been moved to policy. While I generally support making electoral policies more flexible, I am concerned that without companion policies future elections are a recipe for disaster, and require chronic attention.

In general, a number of changes made during this electoral process improved proceedings from previous election, this included the use of composite ballot, the use of certificate to vote with the registrar's office replacing the double envelope system, the introduction of practical element to the training of poll staff, and the combination of all required poll documents into one poll log.

This election was one of the most accessible to date elections staff were trained using the same resources as Elections Ontario used, and with assistance from both Municipal World and Elections Canada devices to ensure accessible ballot access were introduced at all polling stations.

While in this report I make direct recommendations regarding the electoral discipline system itself, notwithstanding those recommendations the tone of this campaign was at times not acceptable. While I understand the slates can bring into the electoral process more creditability, it cannot be at the expense of election itself. At the end of the day barring any dramatic election results the board will be composed of a combination of both slates, and a bitter election does not set the board, executive, or association as a whole up to succeed. I urge, implore, and exhort the board and the executive for the sake of the organization to heal the sometimes toxic environment which has been festering and perform the sacred task ahead of them, leading this organization for the good of the students, while fostering mutual respect and trust for each other and for the common good.

Section 1 Election Organization and Systems

Issue #1 Election timing

The timing of this election was not ideal. Had the original elections calendar been carried out, the election would be held one week before exams. This is the chronologically the latest in the province, and possibly in the Canadian Post Secondary system. The timing creates issues surrounding voter apathy and fatigue. While an earlier election would have put additional stress on elections officials giving their appointment dates, in all likelihood it would have led to greater student engagement and results.

Recommendation #1

That elections happen earlier in the year. The following is a draft calendar for the 2017-2018 academic year elections:

Fall Elections

September 6-15	Posting of the CRO/DRO positions
September 18-22	Hiring the CRO
September 25-29	Hiring the DRO/Orientation of the CRO
October 2-6	Orientation and prep of the Elections Team
October 9-16	Nominations period
October 17	All Candidate's Meeting
October 18-November 1	Campaign Period
October 25-November 1	Elections Period
November 2	Count day

Spring Elections

January 8-17	Posting of the CRO/DRO positions
January 18-19	Hiring of the CRO
January 22-26	Hiring of the DROs
January 29– February 16	Prep of the elections team
February 16-22	Nominations period
February 22	All Candidates meeting
February 26-March 2	Reading week
February 5-March 16	Campaign Days
March 9, 12-15	Elections days
March 16	Count days

This calendar gives over a month to prepare the new executive and board to take office and gives a timeline which is both realistic and reasonable. Further, should this timeline can be adopted in advance, it can become clear to all candidates that their activities and programming can be avoided to be booked during the elections period.

Issue #2 voting methods

I will be brief here, the Student Association of George Brown College is one of the last institutions which uses paper ballots. While I understand that paper ballots are trustworthy and time tested, technology exists to vote securely and effectively online. While I understand that both provincially and federally elections are still held using traditional paper ballots, I will like to point out that in the 2014 Municipal Election sixty-one out of the three hundred and ninety Ontario Municipalities used internet or Telephone voting as the sole source of voting, while an additional twenty-nine used internet or telephone voting as an additional voting method. According to my June 2015 article in *Municipal World Magazine* those municipalities which used electronic voting had on average a high voter turnout than those which did not, this trend was shown across the province in terms of both geographical location and population size.

Further, the capacity to count the ballots by hand was severely tested by the amount of positions and ballots we had. Should we have had even 7-10% voter turnout it would have been beyond the capacity of election staff to count in a quick and efficient manner.

Recommendation #2

That the 2017 fall election be held online as a test of the use of electronic voting. However, in order to do so a request for proposal must be done to select a provider who both have the technical capacity to provide online voting for the elections but also has experience in delivering online voting for the elections. There are companies which do this well, and one of them can be contracted for a smaller price than what elections currently cost. Under no circumstances should this be something that can be done in house, simply put the IT departments of most colleges and universities are generalists, and elections are a speciality requiring speciality knowledge of election processes and protections.

Election helpdesk should be set up on each campus in place of individual polling stations to assist students who are having difficulties voting to vote during the election. The elections crombooks can be used for this purpose and to provide students without internet access at home a way to vote.

Issue #3 election staffing

The elections services department is currently understaff should the board continue to run traditional paper ballot elections. Even with a full time Chief Returning Officer and two full time Deputy Returning Officers, the geography of the campus and city makes it impossible to provide effective leadership and supervision of all polling stations while administering the elections code. To provide some perspective the eligible electors for the Student Association of George Brown College is greater than ten federal ridings and the average riding population of all three territories and four provinces. To do this in a ten week period with three full time staff members is extraordinary. The Chief Returning Officer has seen the mental, emotional, and physical toll this election took on his department and himself. There were ten days during the election period where election staff worked more than ten hours with a similar work day thereafter. I cannot stress how much energy it takes to 55 polls opened for over 700 combined staffing hours over five days with three supervisory staff members.

Recommendation #3

That the Election Services Department be given more resources during the election period to run the election. This could take any number of forms either through the addition of a third Deputy Returning Officer for the entire elections process or a poll supervisor during the course of the election period.

Issue #4 The Elections Committee

I cannot underestimate the amount of energy the Elections Committee spends on electoral matters during the course of the elections. The committee meet numerous times and committee members were present to witness key elections moments such as the storage of ballot boxes, vote counting, debates, and numerous other occasions during the course of the elections.

The Chair of the Elections Committee acted as a key resource person for the Chief Returning Officer, often providing insights into the administrative practices of the association far beyond that which a Chief Returning Officer on a ten week contract would know.

The board member on the Elections Committee at times became a *de facto* member of the elections team performing key tasks when no other election services member had either the time or energy to do so.

Recommendation #4

That members of the Election Committee who are non executive members of the board are paid an honorarium above their normal salary for their work on the Elections Committee.

Recommendation #5

That the board records its thanks for Roslyn Miller and Gracel Quibrantar for their role on the Elections Committee.

Issue #5 Candidate's financing

There are serious issues with the election financing system. In this election over \$3500.00 of a \$10,000.00 election supplies budget was set aside for election campaign expenses. This was the single biggest expense and in some cases the single greatest risk to the elections budget. There is risk in two areas here. First, there is risk for financial dishonesty in the elections expenses. Second, it is not the best use of financial resources to spend an estimated \$1000.00 of a election supplies budget in the college Library and Learning Commons without proper receipts being issued for the poster printing when the printing could be done elsewhere with a fraction of the cost.

Recommendation #6

That all poster printing either be done in house or through the campus copy centre or other contractor. Each candidate would be given their allocation of posters to be printed and an advance would not be given to them. Funds will be advanced to them for all other campaign items, but the Election Services Staff should try to find preferred providers for these items. If the cost of printing these items are below fair market value, the candidate will be charged a standard fair market value for the printing, and this will be take directly from the camping funds.

Recommendation #7

That the Consumer Price Index increase for campaign expenses use 2017 as a base line and be rounded to the nearest interval of twenty-five dollars.

Issue #6 discipline

The Issue of election discipline throughout the election has been one of great contention. While there were those who took a “strict constructionist” approach to election discipline, the Chief Returning Officer did not.

The Chief Returning Officer took great consideration of the words of Justices Rothstein and Moldaver (speaking for the majority) in *Opitz v. Wrzesnewskyj* ([2012]3 SCR 76): “If elections can be easily annulled... public confidence in the finality and legitimacy of election results will be eroded”. Any use of discipline has the potential to erode public faith in the electoral process. Further in *R. v. Hall* ([2003] OJ n. 3613) found that elections officials had duty to be a gatekeeper against attacks against candidates which were “frivolous, vexatious or otherwise devoid of merit”. Finally in *Lancaster v. Compliance Audit Committee et al* ([2012] ONSC 5629) Justice Quinn wrote in regards election audits that Election Compliance Audit Committee and therefore those who administer election discipline as a whole were “entitled to look at all the circumstances and determine if an audit and charges are necessary.” Further, in *Harrison v. Toronto District School Board* (OCJ June 19, 2008 unreported) found that complaints of such a minor nature that the doctrine of *de minimis non curat lex* (“The law does not concern itself with minor matters”) should apply and no discipline can be granted. Finally professional expertise of election officials is sufficient to determine what matter is so minor enough not to warrant discipline and what is major enough to warrant discipline (*Lyras v. Heaps* ([2008] ONCJ 524).

However, the by-laws are written in such a way as would suggest a strict liability approach, and after repeat interjections by candidates and others, a strict liability approach had to be taken to ensure the sanctity of the electoral process. I will be clear on this matter, when a strict liability approach is taken the electoral process is not enhanced, and the prospect of disqualification over trivial offences thereby disenfranchising the membership occurs. This is not a democratic option, and in fact goes against the very issues which election staff serve to uphold, that is the right of the electorate to choose who shall govern them. It speaks volumes that student elections disqualify or declare more elections null and void than any other elections. This is not a democratic outcome. This is not desirable. This is not in line with the messages of the courts when it comes to the legitimacy of the election and the electoral process.

A new electoral discipline system is needed. The elections system should reflect the expectation of the jurisprudence on the issue. While I make this recommendation, I understand the need for more intervention to ensure a campaign which is not a “runaway election” over which there is no control of the electoral process and no civil discourse. The political reality of the Student Association of George Brown College create two challenges to the way in which an election like this will unfold. First, the expertise of the Chief Returning Officer and other elections staff will vary from year to year. I cannot expect or imagine that every year will have an academic with both peer review publications and an appointment to hear and rule of cases of election discipline to be the Chief Returning Officer. In fact, I would imagine my expertise is abnormal when it comes to being in a position such as this one. Second, the history of the Student Association of George Brown College is one of conflict around elections. As a result of this history, a culture of conflict exists. This culture cannot be underestimated when it comes to election discipline and a balance must be struck to ensure both the jurisprudence that elections should not be overturned for minor issues and the need to ensure that the elections are meaningful and basic ground rules are respected by all candidates. Finally the Student Association, unlike other electoral processes does not benefit from a full time permanent elections administrator who can review evidence after the election. Points must be used, but they must be used in a fair manner and with a mind on the jurisprudence and expectation of the courts that election discipline only be used as a last resort.

Recommendation #8

The board need to adopt a new discipline system based on the annex to this recommendation.

Recommendation #8 annex

Principles of Election Discipline

The underlying principles of election discipline are as follows:

1. When allegations are made within the scope of election discipline all involved in the process should take steps to ensure that the process is completed promptly, fairly, and to ensure that election process is not brought into disrepute;
2. Elections are within themselves an event of great sanctity, to this end it is understood that any discipline decision made should allow as much as possible to ensure that the voice of the members can be heard, disqualification should be only be used when the offence is so grievous that the integrity of the election is brought into disrepute; and
3. The role of the Chief Returning Officer and others involved in the investigation and enforcement of election discipline is to ensure a fair hearing of all the facts, to this end election officials should not be seen as winning or losing in the discipline process, but to ensure the election is conducted with honour and respect for the process and for democracy.

Principles of election infraction and demerit points

1. Demerit points are issued to candidates for infractions against the by-laws. Demerit points are punitive by nature since their design is to punish the infractions against the elections code. Demerit points are also corrective by nature, since the underlying objective when issuing points is to correct infractions. Demerit points also serve as an exhortation to other candidates and to the membership that infraction of the elections code is not allowed.
2. Infractions can only be determined by the Chief Returning Officer. In this role the Chief Returning Officer has a gatekeeper role to screen against allegations which are frivolous, vexatious or otherwise devoid of merit which would undermined the trust of the public in the electoral system.
3. Investigations into infractions shall begin when the Chief Returning Officer is presented with evidence that there is reasonable possibility that an infraction could have occurred. When there is a reasonable likelihood that an infraction could have occurred after an investigation, the Chief Returning Officer should issue a Notice of Apparent Contravention. It is only after the response of the candidate against who a Notice of Apparent Contravention has been issued and either a response given or a reasonable timeframe has elapsed that the Chief Returning Officer can issue a ruling on the apparent contravention.
4. The role of the Chief Returning Officer in this process is administrative. The Chief Returning Officer can only find and lay forth facts in order to administer the election code. Final determinations regarding infractions belongs to the elections appeals committee. However candidates have the right to procedural fairness when dealing with both the Chief Returning Office and the Elections Appeals Committee.

Roles of various election officers in the discipline system

It is the role of the Chief Returning Officer in regards to election discipline to:

1. Investigate all complaints made under the code, or other apparent contraventions and find all relevant facts;
2. Act on behalf of the electoral system by reviewing all relevant facts regarding apparent contravention and determine what a just result would be given the facts of the apparent contravention;
3. Issue notices of infractions, allowing for the person to whom the infraction notice has been issued to respond, before the Chief Returning Officer makes a final determination; and
4. To determine the facts and attain a just result for the elections process. The Chief Returning Officer when performing this role must find facts based on the balance of probabilities.

It is the role of the Deputy Returning Officers and Chair of the Elections Committee in regards to election discipline:

1. To provide the Chief Returning Officer advice, warning, and counsel regarding discipline proceedings;
2. To assist the Chief Returning Officer in the finding of facts regarding the elections discipline process; and
3. To provide independent advice to the Chief Returning Officer regarding discipline when requested.

The Elections Appeals Committee exists of the members of the Elections Committee without the General Manager and with the Chair of the Board as Chair of the Committee. It is the role of the Elections Appeals Committee to hear and decide discipline cases which has been appealed by the candidates, based on the facts as presented by the Chief Returning Officer and the reply by the candidate.

It is the role of the candidates in regards to election discipline:

1. Ensure compliance with the rules of the election; and
2. Reply to the Chief Returning Officer with any new or relevant facts regarding a matter under review.

Type I infractions

- Poster violation
- Tape violations
- Campaigning in restricted areas

Level I infractions should be dealt with as much as possible as occasions for correction and not punishment.

The following are guidelines for points:

1st offence	warning or 5 points
2nd offence	5-7 points
3rd offence and future	7-10 points

Type II infractions

- Violation of online campaigning rules
- Fair play violations
- Improper distribution of materials
- Pre campaigning
- Distribution of unapproved materials
- Unsanctioned use of corporate resources
- Failure to start campaign within reasonable time
- Failure to attend debates without reasonable cause and 24 hours notice

Level II infractions should be dealt with as much as possible with points to discourage future infractions of this nature. The following are guidelines for points:

1st offence	5-10 points
2nd offence	7-10 points
3rd offence	10-15 points

Type III infractions

- Abuse of status or position
- Gross misrepresentation of the facts, or defaming other candidates
- Interfering with other's campaigns
- Respectful workplace violations

Level III infractions are gross infractions which brings the integrity of the election into disrepute. Any of these offences should be dealt with at minimum with 20 points, but depending on the severity of the offence may lead to disqualification.

Type IV infractions

- Not attending all candidates meeting
- Overspending
- Not submitting expense report
- Attempting to have outside groups interfere with the election process
- Refusing to comply with directives of the Chief Returning Officer regarding expenses, or other procedures
- Obstruction of election officials while performing duties of office

Level IV infractions are infractions which brings the integrity of the elections and the electoral process into grave disrepute. These offences are worth a minimum of 30 points, but in most circumstances would lead to disqualification.

Issue #7 Posters and other campaign material

Posters and other campaign material were a major cause of problem and tension during this elections process. To this end I have begun a conversation with the Director of Student Experience over the future of campaign posters at the college. He was gracious to review out rules and make recommendations to me. Recommendation #9 reflect the results of this conversation, and additional sections changed based on the experience of this election. Recommendation #10 reflect a best practice from another institution which is my recommendation the Student Association of George Brown College adopt.

Recommendation #9

That the posters section of the campaign code is replaced with the following:

1. A limit on the quantity of posters shall be for Executive Candidates 300 and for all other candidates-100. If there is clear and convincing proof that one candidate's posters have been targeted, then the Chief Returning Officer may increase the total number of approved posters.
2. The following shall apply to all posters:
 - i) Posters shall not exceed 11"x17".
 - ii) No more than three banners shall be allowed, and shall not exceed 9'x3'.
 - iii) Each candidates posters shall not overlap another candidate's posers.
 - iv) All posters may only contain information that is relevant to the election.
 - v) All posters must be removed within 72 hours of the close of voting.
 - vi) All posters can be placed on brick, cinderblock, or painted drywall using masking tape or painters tape, and no other surfaces whatsoever.
 - vii) Materials may not be posted inside or on the doors of elevators, or egress (fire) stairwells.
 - viii) Banners can be hung from ceilings but cannot obstruct views down hallways or corridors.
 - ix) The candidate must ensure that their campaign materials are not damaging the property of George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology. Candidates are responsible for any damage done to the college's property.
 - x) Campaign materials cannot overlap or obstruct a sign or other posters.
 - xi) Campaign materials cannot be in classrooms.
 - xii) No campaigning of any form is permitted in the Student Association offices, or any area that can be perceived to be under the jurisdiction of the Student Association. For the purposes of this section the jurisdiction of the Student Association means the administrative offices of the student association and their operations, but does not include areas which are opened to the public which the student association controls. The Chief Returning Officer shall list these places at the all candidates meeting.
 - xiii) No campaigning of any form is permitted where alcohol is being served.
 - xiv) Campaigning within a classroom is forbidden without the expressed permission of its presiding faculty member(s). To campaign in a classroom, a candidate must obtain consent from the professor/lecturer before the start of class.
 - xv) Campaigning is not allowed within the Student Residence, Library or computer labs. The entrance of these locations may be allowed based on the conversations with colleges.
3. The foregoing shall from time to time be altered or amended by the Chief Returning Officer after seeking the advice of the college.

Recommendation #10

Each candidate be given a supply of approved tape by the Student Association when their posters are approved.

Issue #8 campaign starts and debates

The one issue of especial concern was how late the campaign started after the camping period commenced. This could be due to a number of different reason. Further not all candidates were able to attend every debate. Recommendations 11-14 seeks to encourage campaigning.

Recommendation #11

Nominations for the spring election should close the Thursday before intersession week. The All Candidates meeting should be held on the Friday of that week. Campaigning should commence on Monday after intersession week. This will allow all candidates a week to prepare their campaign material.

Recommendation #12

Candidates who do not have materials approved by the start of the campaign should lose 1/14 of the total campaign amount for each day they do not have campaign materials approved and posted.

Recommendation #13

The Chief Returning Officer should seek letters of academic accommodation for all candidates requesting professors give some academic relief for students who seek to run in the election from the office of the Director of student Experience. To this end candidates are expected and required to attend debates.

Recommendation #14

The election should be timed in such a way as to avoid the end of the semester so that candidates and electors can fully participate in the electoral process.

Issue #9 Office and supplies of the Chief Returning Officer

One issue which was of especial concern during the course of the election was the lack of private space for election officials and the procurement of supplies for elections officials.

Recommendation #15

The Chief Returning Officer and the Deputy Returning Officers should have at on at least one campus an office which is lockable with a door and a filing cabinet. Further the Chief Returning Officer should have a locked drawer on each campus to keep sensitive documents and money.

Recommendation #16

The Chief Returning Officer and Deputy Retuning Officers should be given a monthly Metropass for the duration of their employment with the Student Association, and an allowance of \$60.00 for mobile phone services.

Recommendation #17

The Chief Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officers should have access to any broadcast emails to all staff throughout the elections period.

Recommendation #18

That the board considers and refers to the by-laws committee these recommendations and the recommendations of the Deputy Retuning Officer as contained in the annex to this recommendation.

Recommendation #18 annex

Suggestions for Updating By-laws and Creating an Elections Code

What is presented below is a series of Election related Bylaws and Articles of a potential Election Code (from here on to be referred to simply as “Code”). The Code shall be found within the Operations Manual for the Elections Committee (OMEC) and shall be the primary document utilized in the administration of an election. Following many of the proposals, this document offers rationale for the suggested change.

It is important to consider carefully which rules will be placed in the By-laws and which will be placed in the Code. Because the By-laws can only be changed with a vote by the membership, Election By-laws should be reserved for only the most fundamental elements of the SA’s democratic processes, e.g. when elections are to be held, what elected positions constitute the Board, what are legitimate methods of voting, who shall administer the election...etc. All other election related matters should be placed in the Code so that the Board can modify sections that become antiquated or no longer serve the democratic rights of the membership. Changes to the Code should only be put forward to the Board by the Elections Committee along with rationale for each proposal. These proposals should be debated by the Board before being put to a majority vote.

This document does not represent a complete proposal for revising the Election By-laws. Rather, it is a model, based upon the election team’s expertise, which the Election Committee should consider when developing new election policies. Composing Election By-laws and an Articles of a Code cannot be done unilaterally, but instead they must be developed through a collaborative process. The best interest of the membership’s democratic rights must be put ahead of all other considerations in restructuring these Election Documents. Clarity and consistency in these Documents is vital to sustaining the membership’s confidence in the election of SA Board Members. The Board is strongly urged to consider this proposal in moving forward with its much needed updates to the SA By-laws and the establishment an Election Code.

Definitions:

Define key terms in the By-laws and Elections code to ensure clarity and consistency in interpretation.

Election Documents:

By-law: The Elections Code shall be the governing document for all elections. It shall be found in the Operations Manual for the Elections Committee (OMEC). Where there is a contradiction between the Elections Code and the By-laws, the By-laws shall be abided. The section of the OMEC that contains the Code may only be amended with a majority vote by the Board.

By-law: The Election Committee shall produce, maintain and update a Best Practices Manual (BPM) to ensure consistency in election processes. The BPM only shall be a user’s guide to elections, not a governing document. It shall be found in the Operations Manual for the Elections Committee (OMEC). Where there is a contradiction between the Best Practices Manual and either the By-laws or Elections Code, the By-laws or Election Code shall be abided. The BPM may be amended by a majority vote of the Elections Committee.

Campaigning:

Code: Candidates may only campaign on Facebook through a new slate page or (for independents) through a new personal account.

Reasons: The Election Team can better able to monitor online activity; easier to hold candidates accountable; no worry of accidental campaigning through regular usage of personal account; no advantage for candidates with more "friends"; no possible history of prior campaigning

Code: Acclaimed candidates must recuse themselves from any slate and may not campaign

Reasons: Acclaimed candidates may not accrue any campaign expenses and for this reason should not be implicated in any other candidate's campaign.

Voting:

By-law: Voting may take place online, by paper ballot, or a combination of the two methods. Valid Identification is required for voting. Online voting shall not be restricted to certain operating hours.

Code: All voting on SA elections shall be held online.

Reasons: Online voting ensures better voter turnout; it is cheaper (polling stations are extremely expensive), and it covers all campuses (even satellite); and it creates less paper waste. In addition, online voting allows for voting from anywhere. This allows for greater accessibility in the election process and ensures that the election is AODA compliant. As voter turnout for elections increases for SA elections paper ballot counting becomes less viable. For instance, the Spring 2017 ballot counting process took ten (10) elections officials eight (8) hours to count. Fewer than 7% of eligible voters cast ballots in the Spring 2017 election. The time it would take to count ballots would become prohibitive, if the voter turnout were to increase to even just 10% of the membership.

By-Law: Voting will be held over a three (3) day period

Reasons: Longer voting period creates an unnecessary expense to the SA and does not increase voter turnout

By-law: Voting will end a minimum of one (1) week prior to the start of the College's official exam period

Reasons: During and near exam periods students are focussed on school work. This reduces voter turnout and affects candidates' ability to campaign affectively

Code: Election dates (e.g. Nomination period, voting days and ratification vote) will be set by the Elections Committee no later than August 15 for the Fall By-Election; and no later than December 15 for the Spring Election.

Reasons: Elections should not be an afterthought. By setting the election dates early they will be given priority over other, potentially conflicting, SA events. Further, this will afford the Election Committee the time to hire the election team (CRO and DROs) and ensure that the necessary elections materials (especially an accurate voters list) are acquired.

Debate:

Code: There shall be one (1) executive debate in during the Spring election period. All executive candidates are required to attend this debate. Only under extreme circumstances (e.g. a medical emergency), where documentation is provided, will an executive candidate be excused from the debate.

Reasons: three debates, each on a different campus, creates dramatic complexity to scheduling. It is already very difficult for the elections teams to cover polling stations on all three campuses for voting. The membership turnout was very low during the Spring 2017 debates. They were held in public spaces where other activities were taking priority over the proceedings. This resulted in a lack of meaningful discourse during the debate and made it difficult for the few members who were interested to actually hear and engage with the candidate's ideas. Holding a formal debate in a dedicated space will allow for a meaningful debate where members' can express their concerns and where candidates' platforms can truly be heard. The membership has the right to a formal discussion of important platform points. As part of the democratic process, candidates must be open to questions from the membership. A single debate could be properly planned and advertised to increase member turnout. The debate can be live streamed to dedicated sites on other campuses and members' questions can be taken live from an online forum.

Election Committee

By-law: The Election Committee shall oversee the administration of all SA elections.

By-law: The Election Committee shall be comprised of the following:

Two (2) Executive members of the Board (one of whom shall act as chair of the committee)

Three (3) members of the Board

The General Manager and CRO shall sit as a non-voting members of the committee. They shall be consulted on all logistical matters and participate fully in all meetings.

Reasons: Staff must have a role in facilitating the functioning of the election, however, decisions about how the elections are to be administered should fall on the Elections Committee. The GM is a vital resource person in the facilitation of the election process. They have institutional knowledge and relationships with GBC that are invaluable to the committee's functions. The CRO should also participate as a non-voting member of the Election Committee. The CRO's input into decisions about the administration of the election is vital to a functioning Committee. The CRO and Elections Committee must coordinate, through shared meetings, their vision for proper elections procedures and interpretations of the Election's governing documents. However, as the Elections Committee, under this proposal, shall hear all appeals to CRO rulings, the CRO should not have a vote on the Committee. During appeals, the CRO should be in attendance in order to offer a defence of their ruling, but nothing further.

By-law: The Election Committee shall act as the Elections Appeals Committee, hearing all appeals to CRO rulings during the election period. The decisions of the Elections Appeals Committee shall be final and no further appeals shall be heard once this committee has made a ruling.

Reasons: It is not feasible to re-establish an ad hoc, separate Appeals Committee for each election. It is untenable to provide the amount of training required to make a short-term, unpaid committee truly functional. The Election Committee is already acquainted with the By-laws and Election Code and is therefore prepared to make informed decisions about election related issues without further training. This will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the election team by streamlining the workload.

By-law: The Election Committee shall hire a CRO such that the CRO will take office on September 1.

By-law: The Election Committee retains the right to overrule the CRO's rulings

By-law: The Election Committee members shall be unpartisan at all times while on the committee.

Code: The members of the Elections Committee shall receive a special stipend during each election period.

Reasons: This is in recognition of the exceptional amount of indispensable work that Election Committee members contribute to the election process. This special stipend is expected to have an additional effect: this stipend will contribute to the SA ensuring that the Election Committee is full for each election period. The SA ought to be concerned with optimizing the election process to ensure fairness, transparency and accountability. A fully staffed and stipended Elections Committee is vital to achieving these commitments.

By-law: The Election Committee shall produce, maintain and update a Best Practices Manual to ensure consistency in election processes.

Reasons: Whereas, the Election Committee is the body overseeing the administration of SA elections, and whereas, the Election Committee is constituted for the duration of the year, it is best suited to updating the document based upon the recommendations of the CRO.

CRO:

Code: The CRO shall be hired no later than September 1. The CRO shall hold office until the ratification meeting for the Spring elections the following year. Leading up to, and during, election periods the CRO shall work full time. Between these times, the CRO shall work on a part-time basis working with the elections committee to modify the Elections Code and working to implement these modifications

Reasons: The hiring process is cumbersome and time-consuming. In addition, the experience that the CRO acquires over the Fall By-election is invaluable to the implementation of the much more contentious Spring election. Efficiency and fairness will be greatly enhanced by ensuring that the SA has the same CRO in the Fall and Spring election periods. Further, the CRO is the most knowledgeable person to advise the Elections Committee on how best to modify the Elections Code. Utilizing the CRO as a resource for improving the elections process will greatly enhance the SA's democratic processes.

Code: The CRO shall be provided private, dedicated office space on at least one of the three (non-satellite) campuses to work in throughout their tenure

Reasons: The CRO and election team require space to work on and discuss sensitive and confidential materials. It is important to remember that the current board has access to SA offices until the beginning of the nomination period. During this time, potential candidates may be privy, accidentally or otherwise, to confidential information that would put them at an advantage during the campaign period. This possibility leaves the SA open to substantial complaints about fairness and transparency, and could result in justifiable complaints from the membership.

By-law: The CRO shall be responsible for overseeing the logistics and administration of the elections.

Duties include, but are not limited to the following:

- Hiring DROs
- Providing proper notice for all election dates and events
- Applying and enforcing the By-laws and Codes to all election proceedings
- Receiving an up-to-date membership list
- Administering the online voting system
- Administering elections in a non-biased, fair and transparent manner
- Providing a written exist report to the Election Committee and presenting that report to the board at the ratification meeting. This report shall detail the events of the election and offer insights into how to improve the electoral system.
- Organizing and running the All Candidates Meeting
- Organizing and moderating the Executive Debate (Spring General Election only)

By-law: The CRO shall be empowered to adjudicate and provide rulings on complaints filed by candidates during the electoral process. The CRO is also empowered to take initiative to investigate violations of the By-laws or Code without receipt of a complaint.

By-law: The CRO retains the authority to make rulings on actions by campaigns not covered by the By-laws or Code.

DRO:

By-law: There shall be a minimum of two (2) DROs hired to assist the CRO in the administration of an election.

By-law: The DROs shall be hired a minimum of one (1) month prior to the opening of the nomination period.

Code: The DROs shall work part-time until the beginning of the nomination period whereupon they shall work full-time until the close of voting.

Election Periods:

By-law:

Spring Elections

An election shall be held in the winter term for the election of the following positions:

- All Executive Members
- Campus Directors
- Educational Representatives
- Constituency Representatives

The date of the nominations and election shall be approved by The Board based on the recommendation of the Elections Committee, provided that elections must occur in the Winter Semester of each year. Notice of the date of the election and the nomination procedures shall be given to members by publication in a campus newspaper at least fourteen (14) days prior to the start of the nomination period. In case a Director position on the Board is vacant after the Spring election ratification vote, the position shall remain empty until the Fall election. In case an Executive position is vacant for the Spring ratification vote, the Election Committee shall, at the Spring ratification meeting, propose dates for a Special Election for the vacant position. Nominations for this position shall begin within two (2) weeks of the ratification meeting. In case of a Special Election, the CRO's contract shall be extended to encompass the duration of the Special Election. In case the CRO is unavailable to extend their contract, the Election Committee shall hire one of the DROs from the previous election. In case no previously employed election official from the Spring Election is available, the Election Committee shall commence hiring a new CRO and election staff immediately.

Fall Elections

An election shall be held in the Fall term for any vacancies in The Board or Executive that occurs before September 1. The dates of the nominations and election shall be approved by The Board, based on the recommendation of the Elections Committee provided that it must occur in the Fall Semester of each year. Notice of the date of the election and the nomination procedures shall be given to members by publication in a campus newspaper at least fourteen (14) days prior to the start of nomination period. If no member is nominated to fill a vacancy for an Executive seat on the Board, the Board shall, at the close of the nomination period, establish a Hiring Committee for the express purpose of finding a member to fill the vacancy. This Hiring Committee shall be comprised of one (1) Executive Member and three (3) Directors. The Hiring Committee shall put out a public notice in all campus publications and the Career Centre for no less than two (2) weeks. This notice will include, but are not limited to, the job title, expectations of hours worked per week, duties of the position, and financial remuneration. The Hiring Committee will interview a minimum of three (3) candidates for this position and put forward their recommendation to the Board for a majority vote. This hiring process is expected to conclude in time for the Board's Fall ratification meeting.

