

STUDENTS' COUNCIL LATE ADDITIONS

Tuesday August 8, 2006
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

2006-08/1 **SPEAKER'S BUSINESS**

2006-08/1b Resignation from Councilor Chapman effective August 8, 2006 from Alberta Public Interest Group (APIRG)

Resignation from Councilor Chapman effective August 8, 2006 at 6:00 pm from the Bylaw Committee.

Please see document LA 06-08.01

2006-08/1c Year End Report of CRO 2005/2006

Please see document LA 06-08.02

2006-08/5 **BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

2006-08/5b University Policy Committee – August 3, 2006

Please see document LA 06-08.03

2006-08/5c Audit Committee – July 25, 2006 (Report and Standing Orders)

Please see document LA 06-08.04

2006-08/5c (i) **CHAPMAN/ERUVBETINE MOVED THAT** Students' Council read Bill #10 a first time.

Bill #10 – *Audit Committee Reformation* (sponsor; CHAPMAN)
Principles (first reading)

Changes to Bylaw 100:

Bylaw 100 will be amended as such that the mandate of the Audit Committee shall be struck and replaced with the following principals

1. The Audit Committee:

- (a) Shall review for compliance funding agreements and contracts between the SU and any DFU or Faculty Association;
- (b) Shall monitor the use of all Faculty Association Membership Fees and Faculty Membership Fees;
- (c) Shall monitor the use by AUFSJ the funds allocated to it by the

- Students' Union;
- (d) Shall withhold disbursements of funding to a DFU or Faculty Association that the Audit Committee has determined is not in material compliance with a funding agreement, Bylaw or contract, with regards to present or past disbursements of funding to that DFU or Faculty Association, provided that
 - i. A withholding decision shall be reviewed by the Audit Committee upon application by the DFU or Faculty Association;
 - ii. An appeal lies to DIE Board of any withholding decision.
 - (e) Upon finding that the Students' Union is in breach of a contract, shall, in no particular order:
 - i. Inform Council and indicate to Council a proposed course of action to remedy or mitigate the breach;
 - ii. Inform and question the Executive Committee, as soon as reasonably prudent, concerning the circumstances of the breach, its causes, and the actions being taken by the Executive to remedy or mitigate the breach.
 - (f) Shall monitor the Grant Allocation Committee's allocation of the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund, the Eugene L. Brody Fund, the Golden Bear and Panda Legacy Fund, and the Refugee Student Fund;
 - (g) Shall review the proposed uses and make a decision on the disbursement of funds for DFUs not listed in section (g), no later than August 31 of each year or within 4 weeks of their submission of documents required in Bylaw 6000(1), whichever is later;
 - (h) Shall annually select the Students' Union auditor and oversee the Students' Union's external audit;
 - (i) Shall review the Students' Union's audited financial statements in advance of their presentation to Students' Council;
 - (j) Shall review all alterations made to the Students' Union's budget for the purpose of verifying compliance with Students' Union legislation;
 - (k) Shall review, for appropriateness and compliance with the Students' Union's budget, the transactions of the Students' Union organizational units;
 - (l) Shall review all expenditures made on Students' Union credit cards;
 - (m) Shall investigate any inappropriate transactions or significant variances against the Students' Union's budget;
 - (n) Has the authority to require to appear before it, in a reasonable period of time, any Students' Union employee(s) and/or member(s) of the Executive Committee;

Changes to Bylaw 6000

- 2. In addition to the provisions in Bylaw 6000(2), the DFU must provide the Audit Committee with:
 - (a) Copies of any contracts with the Students' Union
 - (b) Evidence of compliance with all contracts with the Students' Union
 - (c) Evidence that they are fulfilling their mandate as described in Bylaw 6000

2006-08/5d

Budget and Finance Committee - August 1, 2006

Please see document LA 06-08.05

2006-08/5d (i)

CHAPMAN/KEHOE MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Budget and Finance Committee, amend Part 10 of Standing Orders of

Students' Council to read:

PART 10: LEGISLATIVE PROCESS FOR BUDGET

Vice President (Operations and Finance) Recommends Budget Principles

16(1) The Vice President shall submit or cause to be submitted a proposed set of budget principles to the Budget and Finance Committee no later than November 1.

Budget and Finance Committee Amends and Recommends Budget Principles

16(2) The Budget and Finance Committee shall recommend a set of budget principles to Students' Council no later than November 30.

First Reading of Budget in Council

16(3) Students' Council shall approve a set of budget principles no later than December 15.

Executive Committee to Recommend Budget

16(4) The Executive Committee shall submit an Operating and Capital Budget, which shall reflect the set of budget principles approved by Council, to the Budget and Finance Committee no later than January 15.

Budget and Finance Committee to Amend and Recommend Budget

16(5) The Budget and Finance Committee shall recommend an operating and Capital Budget to Students' Council no later than January 31.

Second Reading of Budget in Council

16(6) When the budget is being read a second time:

- (a) Students' Council shall either:
 - (i) approve the Operating and Capital Budget, or
 - (ii) refer the Operating and Capital Budget with amended budget principles back to the Executive Committee no later than February 15;
- (b) the budget will be presented in a three part document consisting of:
 - (i) the budget principles passed on 1st reading,
 - (ii) the estimates numerical breakdown of the budget, and
 - (iii) additional written instruction on how money within budget categories is to be spent;
- (c) debate is confined to:
 - (i) technical merits and whether the committee properly interpreted the budget principles passed in First Reading,
 - (ii) Fiscal prudence of the proposed budget, and
 - (iii) Whether the budget principles passed on first reading should be retained or altered based on the numerical breakdown and the merits of the budget principles.

Executive Committee to Recommend a Final Budget

16(7) Where Council refers the Operating and Capital Budget back to the Executive Committee with amended budget principles, the Executive Committee shall submit a revised Operating and Capital Budget, which shall reflect the amended set of budget principles approved by Council, to the Budget and Finance Committee no later than March 15.

Budget and Finance Committee to Amend and Recommend Budget

16(8) The Budget and Finance Committee shall recommend an Operating and Capital Budget to Students' Council no later than March 31.

Third Reading of Budget in Council

- 16(9)** When the budget is being read a third time:
- (a) Students' Council shall vote to approve the Operating and Capital Budget no later than April 30;
 - (b) the budget will be presented in a three part document consisting of:
 - (i) the budget principles passed on 1st reading,
 - (ii) the numerical breakdown of the budget, and
 - (iii) additional written instruction providing further instruction on how money within budget categories is to be spent;
 - (c) debate is confined to technical merits and whether the committee properly interpreted the budget principles referred to the Executive Committee in Second Reading.

2006-08/7

INFORMATION ITEMS

2006-08/7e

Chris Cunningham, Vice President (Operations and Finance) – Report

Please see document LA 06-08.06

Dear Students Council & Bylaw Committee,

In an effort to balance my commitments and better fulfill my duties on other committees, Please accept this letter as formal resignation from the Bylaw Committee effective at 6pm on Tuesday, August 8, 2006. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to serve on this committee and I apologize for any inconvenience to Council and the Committee resulting from my resignation.

Sincerely,

Theresa Chapman

Dear Students Council & Alberta Public Interest Research Group,

In an effort to balance my commitments and better fulfill my duties on other committees, Please accept this letter as formal resignation from the APIRG Board effective Tuesday, August 8, 2006. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to serve on this Board and I apologize for any inconvenience to Council and the APIRG Board resulting from my resignation.

Sincerely,

Theresa Chapman

Received via email Tuesday August 8, 2006



Year End Report of the Chief Returning Officer

2005/2006

Prepared By Rachel Woynorowski

Email: rwoynorowski@gmail.com

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	CRO's Message.....	3
1.2	Gratitude	4
2	Election-Specific Information	4
2.1	September By-Election.....	4
2.2	Main Election.....	5
2.3	March Councillor Election	6
3	Marketing	7
3.1	General Marketing Information	7
3.2	Tables and Banners	7
3.3	Posters.....	10
3.4	Gateway Supplement.....	11
3.5	Campus-Wide Email	12
3.6	Website	13
3.7	Other Marketing Methods.....	14
4	Staffing	14
4.1	Deputy Returning Officers & Poll Captains.....	14
4.2	Poll Clerks	16
5	Nominations.....	18
5.1	Petition Questions	18
5.2	Candidate Nominations	19
6	Election Campaigns	20
6.1	Candidates' Meeting.....	20
6.2	Forums.....	20
6.3	Mediating Disputes	21
7	Voting.....	22
7.1	Voting Days	22
7.2	Voters' List.....	23
8	Ballot Counting.....	23
8.1	September By-Election.....	23
8.2	Main Election.....	24
8.3	APiRG Elections	24
8.4	Councillor Elections.....	25
9	Problems & Challenges.....	26
9.1	Approved Petitions.....	26
9.2	Petition Verification	27
9.3	Fall Campus Recreation Guide	28
9.4	Staffing	28
9.5	Councillor Election Upgrades.....	29
9.6	Faculty Associations Elections	30
9.7	Michelle Kelly Disqualification.....	31
10	Online Voting	32
10.1	Recommendations	32
11	Election Turnout	32
12	Appendices	33

1 Introduction

1.1 CRO's Message

Throughout the year it's a regular occurrence for a CRO to be asked about the normality of the elections – whether certain events had occurred in previous years; or were there similar rulings, or what trends could be observed in the election results. During the year I did my best to provide the desired information and comparisons, research old bylaw regulations and pull up quotes from previous CRO reports - however in hind sight my response is simply this;

There is no such thing as a “normal” election.

Elections come with there own unique challenges that differ from year to year which makes running each election a completely new experience. Each election is a reflection of many different elements; the current student government, the number of candidates and their personality types, changes in electoral processes and bylaws, and the Election Offices' own rules and practices. Even within each year the by-election, Executive Election, and Councillor Elections are all unique.

As our electoral system continues to evolve and change it's increasingly important for the CRO to focus on creating elusive “normalacy” – consistency between electoral years. This includes not only holding the same electoral events, or voting on the same days, or applying the rules and regulations in the same fashion – but also creating a consistency within the Elections Office from using standard forms, to consistent training practices, to investing in capital projects – and most importantly ensuring that documentation and records exist so that past events and mistakes can be improved on in future years.

As CRO my primary goal for all the elections was to ensure that they were run in a fair an open manner in such a way that the integrity of the results would never be called into question, and overall, I was extremely pleased with outcome.

This report outlines all the elections the occurred during 2005/06 and focuses on highlighting both the successful elements and events that should be continued, and more so the areas where mistakes were made, or improvement is needed. I've included recommendations to future CRO's throughout the report that will hopefully provide insight into what to expect from any given election – that being to expect the unexpected.

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer 2005/06

1.2 Gratitude

To the following individuals an immense amount of gratitude is owed for all the help and assistance you provided during the elections and throughout the year - and your contributions in making this year's elections memorable;

Thanks to:

Duncan, Dane Bullerwell, Samantha Power, Jason Tobias, Justin Kehoe, M. Mustafa Hirji, Chris Henderson, Steve Smith, Ross Prusakowski, Scott Nicol, Greg Harlow, Mike Reid, Stephen Kirkham, my DRO's (Andrew Kwan and Florence Cheng), all the Poll Captains and Clerks, Chris Jones, Alex Ragan and DIE Board, the SU Accounting Department, Iain Gillis at Augustana, Dan Precht at CNS, Marc Dumouchel and Jason Ward and the rest of the Whitematter team, Christian Tremblay at Le Fac, Kim Oksanen at the Registrar's Office, the SU Reception team, the Gateway, and the hacks.

And most of all, thanks to all the candidates, campaign managers, and campaign volunteers, without whom we would have had no elections.

2 Election-Specific Information

2.1 September By-Election

2.1.1 Important Dates

1. Close of Nominations – Monday, September 19 @ 18:00
2. Mandatory Candidates' Meeting – Monday, September 19 @ 18:30
3. Deadline for Slate and Name Changes – Wednesday, September 21 @ 09:00
4. Campaign Begins – Wednesday, September 21 @ 09:00
5. Budget Deadline – Wednesday, September 28 @ 09:00
6. Campaign Ends – Wednesday, September 28 @ 21:00
7. Voting – Thursday, September 29 & Friday, September 30 @ 09:00-17:00

2.1.2 Seats Available

Faculty	Open Students' Council Seats	Open GFC Seats
Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics	1	1
Arts	0	1
Augustana	0	0
Business	2	1
Education	2	4
Engineering	0	0
Law	0	0
Medicine and Dentistry	0	2
Native Studies	1	1
Nursing	2	2
Open Studies	2	0

Physical Education & Recreation	0	1
Pharmacy	1	1
Rehab Medicine	1	1
Faculté St. Jean	0	1
Science	1	0
Total Seats Available	13	16

2.2 Main Election

2.2.1 Important Dates

- Close of Nominations – Thursday, February 16 @ 17:00
- Mandatory Candidates' Meeting – Thursday, February 16 @ 18:00
- Deadline for Slate and Name Changes – Saturday, February 18 @ 06:00
- Withdrawal Deadline – Saturday, February 18 @ 18:00
- Campaign Begins – Monday, February 27 @ 09:00
- Fac. St. Jean Forum – Tuesday, February 28 @ 12:30
- Lister Hall Forum – Wednesday, March 1 @ 17:00
- SUB Stage Forum #1 – Thursday, March 2 @ 12:30
- SUB Stage Forum #2 – Friday, March 3 @ 12:00
- Budget Deadline – Monday, March 6 @ 09:00
- Myer Horowitz Forum – Monday, March 6 @ 12:00
- Advanced Polling – Monday, March 6 @ 09:00 – 17:00
- Campaign Ends – Tuesday, March 7 @ 21:00
- Voting – Wednesday, March 8 & Thursday, March 9 @ 09:00-17:00

2.2.2 Plebiscite Questions Text

Physical Activity Complex Fee

Do you support the establishment of a non-instructional fee, levied by the University of Alberta, subject to the following conditions?

1. *The fee would be dedicated to the construction of a new Physical Activity Complex (PAC) as well as concurrent upgrades to the Van Vliet Physical Education and Recreation Centre.*
2. *The fee would be assessed to each undergraduate student at*
 - a) *\$20.00 per Fall or Winter term;*
 - b) *\$10.00 per Spring or Summer term, to*
 - c) *a maximum of \$40.00 in a twelve-month period.*
3. *The fee would provide unrestricted use of the Fitness and Lifestyle Centre* during its hours of operation to each undergraduate student who*
 - a) *is currently paying the fee; or*
 - b) *has already paid the fee for eight consecutive months within the twelve-month period.*

4. *The fee would be assessed*

- a) *once the Fitness and Lifestyle Centre* is fully operational; and*
- b) *for 30 years or until the costs incurred in (1) have been recovered, whichever occurs first.*

5. *Undergraduate students would be unable to alter or rescind the fee.*

** Fitness and Lifestyle Centre would contain fitness equipment including cardiovascular equipment, free weights, and resistance training machines.*

Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban

Do you support a campus-wide tobacco ban at the University of Alberta subject to the following conditions?

1. *A ban on the sale of all tobacco products in any University-owned or leased building or on University property effective July 1, 2006.*

2. *A ban on the use of all tobacco products in any University-owned or leased building or on University property, except property surrounding residences, effective July 1, 2006.*

3. *A ban on the use of all tobacco products on all University property effective July 1, 2008.*

4. *Exceptions may be made to accommodate the use of tobacco or related substances in connection with culturally significant celebrations.*

2.3 March Councillor Election

2.3.1 Important Dates

- *Close of Nominations – Tuesday, March 14 @ 17:00*
- *Mandatory Candidates' Meeting – Tuesday, March 14 @ 18:00*
- *Campaign Begins – Thursday, March 16 @ 09:00*
- *Budget Deadline – Wednesday, March 22 @ 09:00*
- *Campaign Ends – Wednesday, March 22 @ 21:00*
- *Voting – Thursday, March 23 & Friday, March 24 @ 09:00 - 17:00*

2.3.2 Seats Available

Faculty	Open Students' Council Seats	Open GFC Seats
Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics	2	2
Arts	9	8
Augustana	1	1
Business	3	3
Education	4	4
Engineering	5	4
Law	1	1
Medicine and Dentistry	1	2
Native Studies	1	1
Nursing	2	2
Open Studies	1	0
Physical Education & Recreation	1	1
Pharmacy	1	1
Rehab Medicine	1	1
Faculté St. Jean	1	1
Science	8	8
Total Seats Available	42	40

3 Marketing

3.1 General Marketing Information

A detailed advertising plan for each year's elections is available. It sets out the number and timing of Gateway advertisements, as well as information about our other means of advertising throughout the year. Please refer to the 2005/2006 ad plan for these details.

3.2 Tables and Banners

Table and Banner spots need to be booked early to ensure that these positions can be reserved. In SUB these spots are booked through the Students' Union, tables and banner spots in HUB are booked through the HUB administration, and tables spots in CAB, BioSci, V-Wing and Tory Atrium are booked through Facilities Management. Generally, all other table and banner locations are booked through the relevant faculty. For example, banner and table spots in Van Vliet are booked through the Department of Phys. Ed, and tables in ETLIC are booked through Engineering. Some of these locations (particularly SUB) need to be booked ASAP as they fill up quickly.

Having the tables booked and set up a day in advance of both campaigning and voting. Ensure which spots provide tables, and whether or not they will be set up when you

arrive. On the first day of campaigning or during the mornings of voting days there is not enough time to be assembling and moving tables. University Facilities Management will drop off and pick up tables for a fee – whatever it ends up being pay the fee, it will save you and your staff hours of work as well as your peace of mind.

During the first several days of the Executive Election campaign candidates did not make full use of the table locations. It was extremely disappointing to see highly visible tables being unused, and overall I felt this reflected badly on the Elections Office.

The previous CRO had suggested providing incentives for table usage. This was a useful suggestion. To do so, I attempted to relax some of rules that I felt were inhibiting table usage by the candidates and campaigns. The primary incentive that was introduced allowed candidates to display any number of posters on their tables, with these posters not counting towards the building limit, regardless of whether or not their tables had volunteers sitting at them. In retrospect it could be observed that the number of individuals who used their tables increased dramatically, unfortunately it also resulted in fewer people sitting at their tables leaving the appearance in many buildings (in particular SUB) that no one was truly involved in the Elections. However this may have also been a result of a lack of campaign volunteers willing to sit at tables, or candidates being assigned too many tables each day.

By the third day of campaigning (Wednesday) some tables were still unused in any fashion even with the incentive described above. At that time during the daily candidates meeting I announced that empty tables would result in penalties against the campaign team who did not utilize this resource. And while it is up to each campaign to use their campaign resources how they choose, I felt that the profile of the election was suffering when these tables remained empty.

Candidates who had empty tables at 11am of each day were given the choice of either accepting a monetary fine of \$5.00/table, having \$10.00 worth of campaign materials confiscated, or alternately giving up one table during the remainder of the campaign period. I was reluctant to only impose monetary fines on candidates as it would ultimately further reduce the profile of the election by reducing the amount of money they had available to spend on campaign materials, thus allowed the candidates to “pick their penalty”. While no candidates choose to give up a table, an equal number of candidates accepted fines and material confiscation. The majority of the penalties were delivered in one day, after which time the tables were fully utilized.

Increased monitoring of table usage was effective, however it consumed time that both the DROs and I did not have to begin with, and could have been more effectively spent elsewhere. I would suggest that future CROs consider ways to give positive incentives for table usage as this has a large impact on the overall profile of the election, and only resort to fines if not other incentives prove ineffective.

Against the recommendations of the previous CRO I did allow candidates and campaigns to trade table and banner locations, however imposed the restriction that any candidate who later dropped out of the election would have their trades reversed. I felt this

precluded the possibility of collusion between candidates, an issue that was raised by the CRO previously as a possible result of allowing trading.

During the Executive Election campaign several tables were also reserved for the use of the Election Office. Informal displays were setup containing “Quick Fact” Handbills as well as information and nomination packages about the upcoming Councillor Elections. This was an effective method to distribute information. However, as this was a last minute marketing concept it was hastily pulled together.

Banner locations were booked in SUB and HUB and given out to candidates based on a random draw conducted at the candidates meeting. All other banner spots were available on a “first come first served” basis.

In advance of the Executive Elections the DRO’s removed old and outdated banners hanging in Tory Atrium and CAB freeing space for candidates to hang their own banners. Each group that previously had a banner hanging was contacted prior to their banner being removed. Most groups gave the DRO’s their permission to remove their banner.

I did not create any banners this advertising the Elections – partially due to lack of time, and partially due to budget concerns. I would suggest in future years that the Elections Office invest in the creation of high quality banners that could be used in multiple years to assist with advertising various aspects of the Election, and that these banners be displayed prominently in high traffic buildings

It would be also be beneficial to make use to the “Wall of Debt” in SUB during both the Executive Election and Councillor Elections. This space could be used to display banners that list the candidates, descriptions of the various positions, referenda/plebiscite text, forums dates and times, vote today signs, etc.

3.2.1 Recommendations:

- Book table and banner locations as soon as possible, preferably no later than September.
- Only reserve enough tables such as each candidate has 2 or 3 tables/day.
- Ensure all tables are delivered and set up a day in advance of campaigning and voting.
- The CRO should create firstly positive incentives for campaigns to use tables they have reserved, and only resort to penalties if other incentives prove ineffective.
- Work with the DRO’s during the Executive Election to promote the upcoming Councillor Elections via table displays in high traffic locations.
- The DRO’s should contact groups displaying banners in CAB and Tory Atrium prior to Reading Week requesting that they remove their banners prior to the Election.
- Create banners that can be used for multiple years to provide information about the Elections in high traffic locations.
- Make use of the “Wall of Debt” in SUB to provide information about the Elections.

3.3 Posters

This year, when discussing with the marketing department themes for the elections posters it was decided that we would utilize less edgy and sexualized imagery than had been produced in previous years, and shift the focus of the posters towards positive messaging. It had been noted that some students were offended by the imagery produced previously. Furthermore it was discussed that the use of sexual imagery and advertising in an already heavily saturated market is becoming mainstream, and has little shock value or impact.

The most important goal we focused on when designing the posters was to reach as many students as possible with simple and informative messages.

An initial theme of sensual and interactive posters was suggested by the marketing department (as in appealing to the senses – look, feel, smell, and taste) and was extensively developed prior to the Winter semester. However, at a very late date the marketing department revealed that it would be highly financially impractical to produce. As a result the final poster themes, imagery, and messaging was done last minute over a period of approximately 10 days in mid-January, and was largely completed by the marketing department with little input from the Elections Office. Because of the rushed production of the Elections posters there was little time to review the final design. The posters were delivered a week behind schedule. Overall, I was unsatisfied with the results as the posters were overly complicated and busy to the point where it was not immediately apparent the posters were designed to advertise elections.

Poster design is a challenge, as it is an accumulation of the thoughts, ideas and concepts of the CRO, marketing department staff, and the designer who will be producing the posters. The goal of producing a simple poster with a clear message that is still visually attractive and clever is difficult, this problem was compounded by the fact that I found the time availability of the marketing department designers was scarce. It is important to continually follow-up on the status of your poster design so that your project does not fall to the bottom of the work pile.

If half of the challenge is to design an effective poster, the other half of the challenge is to make sure the posters go up - and stay up around campus. Speaking with Facilities Management ahead of time about where posters could be placed was highly beneficial as it not only clarified the rules posted on their website, but also provided them with a contact to call to deal with any future postering issues. However even though these rules were discussed with Facilities Management, the staff in Tory Business Atrium were taking down our (very expensive) posters because they thought they were not approved. After repeated phone calls, emails, and more phone calls the posters continued to come down.

Not having posters in these highly visible areas outlines the importance of not only talking to Facilities Management, but also to the building staff in these high traffic areas about when and where SU Elections posters will be going up. The removal of posters was especially disappointing, as I ended up paying Elections staff multiple times to re-poster the same buildings.

Once SU Elections posters go up around campus it's interesting to note how rapidly every other student group suddenly decides it's acceptable to put up posters on walls just because there are SU Election posters there as well. Unless the group is on a designated list of exempted events (available on the Facilities Management website) they should not be putting their posters on the walls. The CRO should talk to Facilities Management about having the offending posters removed, as well as the group responsible.

3.3.1 Recommendations

- Start poster design as early as possible and aim to have poster design finalized before the start of the Winter semester. Involve as many of the Election staff as possible in brainstorming ideas with the design department.
- Do not be afraid to scrap ideas you do not like. Make sure you have enough time to re-work posters so that you are not forced into accepting a design you are not satisfied with because posters need to be sent for printing.
- Ensure the Elections posters contain clear and concise messaging.
- Continue to pay election staff to put up posters.
- Talk to Facilities Management about poster guidelines for both SU Election Office posters and posters from candidates. Ask them to let their building staff know about SU election posters ahead of time. Contact building staff in large, and high traffic buildings independently to confirm that they are familiar with the appearances of the SU Election posters and timelines.
- Communicate with student groups directly when they are poster in areas designated for specific events only.

3.4 Gateway Supplement

An eight page centre supplement featuring statements from the Executive candidates and plebiscite sides ran in the March 7th edition of the Gateway. Every candidate had an opportunity to submit a statement before a set deadline, and the vast majority of candidates choose to do so. I wasn't extremely strict with the deadline for submissions (I still accepted statements submitted at 0:30 when the deadline was 23:59), however when an individual attempted to submit his statement several days after the deadline I felt that the extra time provided to that individual to write a statement was an unfair advantage, and I did not accept that submission for publication.

The majority of the feedback that I received about the supplement was that it was too text heavy, and that few if any students spent the time reading through each statement. Finding a better way to format the text, getting candidates to answer set questions, and reducing the number of words each candidate can submit should all be considered by future CRO's as options for making the supplement more reader friendly. While there are always critiques to be offered for each marketing technique employed it should be noted that the Election Supplement is one of the most far reaching methods of advertising and in some cases may be the only opportunity that students have to learn about each candidate and their platform.

Having election material available during voting days is an important marketing initiative to pursue. Fortunately the Gateway was able to produce an extra 2000 copies of the supplement for the Elections Office for little extra cost. The idea behind this marketing

initiative was to make the supplements available near voting booths during the days of voting.

Following the removal of candidate posters there is a general impression across campus that the election has ended, as the visibility of the Election drastically drops - yet for the Students' Union this actually signals the start of voting. Maintaining a presence across campus during voting days with VOTE related materials and advertising attempts to counteract the problem described above, and provides an added reminder to students to cast their ballot. The attempt to make additional copies of the Gateway available during voting largely failed this year, due to the combined lack of organization for this initiative including a shortage of staff, as well as other unforeseen election issues.

3.4.1 Recommendations

- The CRO should review the format and word allowance for the Gateway Supplement to make the text more reader friendly.
- The CRO should focus on maintaining the visibility of the Elections during voting days by ensuring that the Gateway supplement is prominently available.

3.5 Campus-Wide Email

The campus-wide email mail out initiated in 2004/05 was once again utilized with approximately 28,000 undergraduate students receiving the mail out. Prior approval for the mail out was received from the Associate Provost (Information Technology) and the University Secretariat. CNS was also notified about the large volume of email traffic they would be receiving to ensure the email would not be filtered out as spam. The email was sent on the weekend before the Myer Horowitz forum for the main election by the SU tech department from SU servers, with the complete email blast taking approximately 12 hours to complete.

Only one email was sent out, as it was felt that more than one would dilute the effectiveness of the message and likely irritate students. Along the same lines of reasoning the email was kept brief and to-the-point, mirroring the message delivered the previous year.

From: election@su.ualberta.ca

Date: March 5, 2006

EXECUTIVE ELECTIONS & PLEBISCITES

<http://www.su.ualberta.ca/election06/info>

** Your Students' Union is holding its annual executive elections on Wednesday, March 8 and Thursday, March 9. Polls will be open for voting from 9 AM to 5 PM. Remember to bring your OneCard to vote. An advanced poll will be open for voting on Monday March 6 in 306 SUB.*

** The President and Vice Presidents you elect will represent your interests to government, plan campus events, act as your voice in the University community, and manage Students' Union-owned businesses.*

** You will also have a chance to approve or reject a plebiscite questions on a proposed Physical Activity Complex Fee, and a Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban.*

** It doesn't take much time to make an informed choice. Visit the website below or attend a candidates' forum!*

<http://www.su.ualberta.ca/election06/info>

** The Horowitz Candidates' Forum will be held in the Myer Horowitz Theatre in SUB on Monday, March 6 at 12:00 Noon. Classes are cancelled from 12:00 to 1:00 to allow you to attend.*

COUNCILLOR ELECTIONS

The annual Students' Union Councillor elections will be held on March 23 and 24.

** If you would like to get involved in your university community, consider running for Students' Council or General Faculties Council. Find out more on the Councillor Election website:*

<http://www.su.ualberta.ca/election06/councillor>

3.5.1 Recommendations

- That the CRO continue to send out a campus-wide email advertising the election, and that the total number of emails sent be restricted to one.
- Information about the Councillor Elections be included in the campus-wide email.

3.6 Website

The website was greatly expanded the year prior for the Executive Election, the same design and formatting I continued to use. This design interface was also expanded to the Councillor Elections. I tried to include the website in all of our advertising as a central repository of information on how to run, the current candidates, as well as how to get involved with the Elections Office. The campus-wide email contained links to the following two pages within the email, the following are some statistics about how the website was used by students:

	Main Exec. Election Candidate Information Page	Councillor Election “How to Run” Page
Total Hits	6,262	693
Unique IP Addresses	2,020	86

Total Hits	
Date	Main Exec. Election Candidate Information Page
Sunday, February 27	32
Monday, February 28	169
Tuesday, March 1	238
Wednesday, March 2	230
Thursday, March 3	197
Friday, March 4	121
Saturday, March 5	88
Sunday, March 6 (<i>mail out</i>)	1,053
Monday, March 7	662
Tuesday, March 8	360
Wednesday, March 9 (<i>voting</i>)	481
Thursday, March 10 (<i>voting</i>)	563
Friday, March 11	165

3.6.1 Recommendations

- The CRO continue to use the SU Elections website as one of the primary means for keeping voters, candidates, and potential candidates informed.
- The CRO expand the website to include more user-friendly information for potential candidates.

3.7 Other Marketing Methods

Print media, classroom announcements, personal endorsements, prize give-a-ways, free barbeques, and men running around dressed up in spandex and capes – as we’ve seen from the SU in the past, opportunities for marketing are endless.

I would encourage future CROs to be creative in their marketing approaches, keeping in mind that the ultimate goal of any marketing plan is to focus on providing clear, easily accessible information about the candidates and elections.

3.7.1 Recommendations

- That the CRO continue to pursue both traditional and non-traditional marketing approaches to promote elections.

4 Staffing

4.1 Deputy Returning Officers & Poll Captains

DRO positions were advertised in the Gateway, and on the SU website immediately following the September by-election. A total of six applications were received with the individuals presenting a wide range of backgrounds and qualifications. Following the recommendations of several previous CRO’s (Chad Moore, and Dane Bullerwell) only two DRO’s were hired from this pool of applicants (as opposed to hiring three as was

done in past years) with each DRO being delegated responsibilities for a unique aspect of the election.

Prior to starting I ensured that I took the time to provide training to each of the DRO's both individually and together. We covered topics such as the SU as an organization, the role of the Elections Office and past elections history (and what was learned from events/mistakes that occurred), as well as training specific to their roles. This was a great opportunity for me to get to know each of the DRO's as well as provide them with the background they required to complete their tasks.

Working independently on their unique areas of the election the DRO's provided invaluable assistance in completing tasks and meeting deadlines, freeing up time that I did not have to spend doing these tasks myself. I developed a high level of trust in both the DRO's abilities to both work independently and with little instruction when needed. I found that this trust in their abilities and knowledge about the election was particularly helpful when I was occupied with other tasks (or in DIE Board Hearings). During this time the DRO's jointly opened/closed polling stations without my direction, oversaw the Poll Clerks and Captains, and even assist in ruling on spoiled ballots during the Executive Election.

The two general areas of responsibility that the DRO's were assigned were "Human Resources" (hiring, scheduling, payroll, communications with staff), and "Logistics" (APIRG Elections, FA Elections, physical setup and bookings). The DRO's were not given clear titles as listed above however, and one fault committed by myself in this area was not thoroughly defining the roles and responsibilities of the DRO's prior to advertising and hiring for these positions. It was only once the DRO's were hired that they were assigned areas of concentration. I would suggest that future CRO's thoroughly define each DRO position along with its responsibilities and advertise not for DRO's positions, but for specific responsibilities to be carried out by individuals while acting as a DRO.

Moreover, I found that while previous CRO's had suggested hiring fewer DRO's, I would have preferred to have a third individual working for the Elections Office to specifically focus on media advertising, postering, and to assist with approving materials for candidates.

Additionally, five Poll Captains were hired to assist the DRO's and myself immediately leading up to the Elections and during voting days. Prior to the Elections Poll Captains were responsible for putting up all the Elections Office posters and were paid for their time – this was a good investment to make to ensure posters were up in a timely fashion. Additionally during the voting days they assisted opening/closing polls, running ballots out to locations around campus, as well as filling in for Poll Clerks who didn't show up for their shift.

The phrase "an organization is only as good as the people who run it" definitely applies to Elections – and staffing is a topic which deserves it's own report to document successes and failures. I've done my best to highlight some of the key points in this report. I'd be happy to discuss this topic in more detail with anyone who wishes.

4.1.1 Recommendations

- Prior to hiring DRO's thoroughly define the positions and tasks expected from each individual position.
- Compensate your staff fairly for their time.
- To find high quality applicants advertise for unique positions such as DRO- Human Resources, DRO- Election Coordinator, and DRO- Media and Candidate Relations. Consider additional advertising on CAPs or contacting specific faculties to target advertisements at individuals with a specific skill set.
- Once DROs and Poll Captains are hired, extensively train each of them ahead of time. Discuss not only the Election and timelines, but also the role of the SU and electoral history that has led to certain actions or rules.
- Ensure all senior level staff understand that they will be called upon to keep the election running, at times this may require long hours or occasionally missing class.

4.2 Poll Clerks

4.2.1 Hiring

Ads for poll clerks were run in the Gateway for both the September by-election and the March elections, placed on the SU job board and Elections website, as well as sent to the FA's and larger mailing lists. Application forms from the previous year were used, which included a shaded diagram indicating when they could work. Interviews were deemed impractical to conduct for over 100 staff and unnecessary, and hiring was almost entirely on the basis of who had the most convenient schedules.

The application deadline for the Executive and Councillor Elections was extended as we hadn't received enough applications to fill all the positions at the polling stations. Even with the extended deadline bringing in additional applications we were challenged at times to fill morning shifts at the polling stations. (Special thanks to Pete Haggard for helping out.)

4.2.2 Scheduling

Scheduling was done entirely by the DRO's. They found it was a challenge to fill our staffing schedule throughout the Executive Election with a particular lack of staff available for morning shifts. The vast majority of individuals who were available to work anytime between 9am and noon were automatically hired.

Individuals who could work entire day shifts were assigned to more remote locations such as the Fac. St. Jean, Corbett Hall, and Medical Sciences simply because they required less supervision as there was no need to worry about staff changes during the day. Likewise, individuals who could work longer periods of time were assigned to the larger/busier polling stations, with poll clerks who could only work short shifts being assigned to less busy stations where a delayed shift change would have less of a disruptive effect on voting.

In busy areas such as CAB and SUB I attempted to open a second polling station during the peak lunch hours, 10:00 – 14:00 to prevent the poll clerks from being overworked.

4.2.3 Training

To average Joe Student the closest interaction they will have with the elections office will most likely be while voting at a polling station. Keeping this in mind, I wanted to ensure that the Poll Clerks were well trained and informed not only about voting procedures, but also about the Elections Office, the positions available, and both the Students Union and General Faculties Council.

The DRO's, both having served as poll clerks in several previous elections assisted in rewriting the Poll Clerk Training Manual to include the information above as well as restructured the training sessions provided to the all the poll clerks.

We decided to hold six smaller training sessions with a maximum attendance of 25 poll clerks each in attendance. The goal of holding the smaller sessions was to give the poll clerks hands-on time with the electronic voting software prior to using it on the days of voting.

The DRO's lead these sessions that were approximately 45 minutes long. During each session poll clerks were given a brief introduction to the elections office structure and election procedures, and rules were reviewed, and a demonstration of the online voting process was given with each poll clerk having an opportunity to try out the computerized software. I felt this was a highly effective format as it allowed the Poll Clerks to meet at least one DRO in person prior to voting days, as well as the opportunity to ask more questions in a small setting.

While I found the training provided to the Poll Clerks highly effective there were a couple drawbacks when using this format – one being the decision to hold the sessions in SUB 306 which interfered with the candidates and Elections Office supplies, and secondly my own limited interaction with the Poll Clerks. I observed part of each training session and introduced myself during these sessions, however the Poll Clerks were much more familiar with the DRO's come voting days - and as a result they often looked to the DRO's as authority figures to fix problems and answer questions rather than myself. While I was happy that the DRO's could deal directly with issues raised by the Poll clerks without my direct involvement, I was also concerned that the DRO's could deal directly with issues raised by the Poll clerks without my involvement.

4.2.4 Payment

Previous CRO's emphasized the collection of timesheets and timely payment as one of the obstacles encountered during their time in the Elections Office, and as a result it was one of the areas that was focused on and covered in detail during the Poll Clerk Training sessions. Poll clerks were told that immediately following their last shift they were to fill out a timesheet and submit it to the Elections Office – if they did not submit their time sheet prior to the end of day Friday (giving them 1 day following the end of voting) they were told to expect a delay in being paid. For the most part this worked very efficiently as we had envelopes with blank timesheets outside the office where they could fill out and drop off their completed timesheets.

It was made clear to the poll clerks during training that filling out a timesheet was the only manner in which they would be paid, and that they would be notified when a cheque

was available for them to pick up. We did our best to process the timesheets as they were dropped off, and as a result we had the majority of cheques available for pickup 7 days following the election.

4.2.5 Recommendations

- Work with Whitematter Development to design an online Poll Clerk/Captain Application process to streamline the application, scheduling, and payroll process.
- Run ads advertising poll clerk positions in at least three Gateways, starting in early to mid January.
- Email everyone who applied for the by-election, asking them to re-apply if interested.
- Ensure job opportunities are sent to the International Centre, Orientation volunteers, and large mailing lists.
- Have the DRO's hold multiple poll clerk training sessions keeping attendance at each session under 20 people. Provide the poll clerks with a training manual, as well as a demonstration of the voting software and a chance to familiarize themselves with the voting software.
- Pay the Poll Clerks for the training session. They are more likely to attend, arrive on time, and pay attention. Pay them for a full hour whether it takes that long or not.
- The CRO should attend each training session.
- Have a DRO (singular) schedule starting with the most available clerks and then find other clerks to fill in the gaps.
- Have a DRO (singular) email out shifts, confirm the shifts, and confirm attendance at the training sessions.
- Operate multiple polling stations in high traffic locations during peak hours so that Poll Clerks are not overworked.
- Hand out "reminder slips" to the Poll Clerks at the Training Sessions with the dates, times, and locations of their shifts
- Have poll clerks' hand in time sheets to a central location following their last shift. Set a firm deadline for all timesheets to be received.
- Send chocolates to the Accounting Department along with a notice about the large volume of cheque requests they'll be getting later that day.

5 Nominations

5.1 Petition Questions

Students' Council was presented with a large number of petition requests (over 25) to circulate plebiscite and referenda questions to be placed on the main Executive Election Ballot. This process started early in the Fall semester and continued up until the time immediately preceding the Main Executive Election. During this time I made myself available to Students' Council and its committees for the purpose of providing information regarding proposed legislative changes, as well as the potential impact that approving a large number of questions would have on the Elections Office.

Student Council ultimately approved a total of eighteen separate petition questions, of which two were submitted to the Elections Office. For more information on the text of

the questions, debate, and relevant changes made to the Referenda and Plebiscite Bylaw please refer to Council minutes.

A more thorough discussion of the petition process is outlined in the section titled “Problems and Challenges”.

5.1.1 Physical Activity Complex Fee Plebiscite

A previous petition attempt in 2004/05 headed up by the student lead Recreation Action Committee (RAC), and the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation to have a question regarding a Physical Activity Complex (PAC) Fee placed on the ballot was deemed unsuccessful. The main reason behind the failure being a legislative/procedural error discovered at the last minute regarding what constituted the “official” version of the Students’ Union bylaws. Details of this discrepancy are outlined in Students’ Council minutes, as well as have been summarized in the 2004/05 CRO final report to Council.

The Faculty of Physed. and Rec. and RAC pursued a second attempt at having a referenda or plebiscite question placed on the ballot for 2005/06.

During the summer months myself, along with the Students’ Union General Manager, VP Operations and Finance, and President met with representatives from the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation. At these meetings we discussed the Students’ Unions electoral procedures, the involvement of the Faculty in bringing forth a potential referenda or plebiscite question, and the Faculty’s involvement in the election.

Firstly, the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation decided to lobby Students’ Council to place a plebiscite before students. The motion placed before council to place a question regarding PAC on the ballot did not succeed.

Secondly, the chair of RAC approached Students’ Council and had a petition question approved calling for a plebiscite question to judge the support for a student fee to fund the PAC. The petition requirement of 1402 signatures was met and the plebiscite question was placed on the ballot.

For a discussion of the signature verification process please see Appendix 5

5.1.2 Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban Plebiscite

A request for a Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban Plebiscite petition to be circulated among students was brought to Students’ Council during the Fall semester. Students’ Council approved a petition request. The petition requirement of 1402 signatures was met and the plebiscite was placed on the ballot.

For a discussion of the signature verification process please see Appendix 5

5.2 Candidate Nominations

Why candidates insist on handing in their nomination packages at the very last minute when they’ve had the better part of 60 days to hand them in I may never understand, yet it’s an event that happens annually. For the mental health and well-being of all future CRO’s the following is a recommendation to future candidates for any elected position –

hand your nomination packages early, this will cause the CRO to be in a much better mood, and significantly less stressed as the CRO will not be scrambling to verify your candidacy at the last minute. More importantly, should the CRO find a problem with a nomination package; the potential candidate will have the opportunity to correct the mistake prior to the deadline.

During the main Councilor elections an individual attempted to hand in an incomplete nomination package. The package was lacking a signed statement from the individuals' faculty stating that they were a current student of the faculty in good academic standing. Unfortunately, because the nomination package was submitted at the last minute there was not enough time remaining for the individual to acquire the signature required as their faculty office had closed for the day. The nomination was not accepted, and as a result the seat remained empty.

5.2.1 Recommendations

- All candidates should be encouraged to hand in their nomination packages in a timely manner prior to the day of the nomination deadline.

6 Election Campaigns

6.1 Candidates' Meeting

The theme that all CRO's should try to keep in mind when planning the candidates meeting is to keep the meeting "short, simple, and sweet". I focused on summarizing key sections in the Elections bylaws and limiting the amount of time spent on activities such as ballot order selection, and the drawing of table and banner locations.

One activity that I found particularly helpful was having the candidates randomly draw table and banner locations out of a hat as opposed to individually take turns selecting them draft style. This significantly cut down on the amount of time required.

6.1.1 Recommendations

- The Candidates' Meeting should not be a Hack Circus – the CRO should take control of the meeting and ensure that it keeps moving so it does not get bogged down.
- The CRO should anticipate questions that may be asked in advance of the meeting and consider their response.
- The CRO should put thought into how the bylaws/procedures could be changed to cut down on the time it takes to do ballot order draws and table/banner allocation.

6.2 Forums

I initially planned to organize a September by-election forum despite the previous years' forum receiving little attention and being plagued by lack of attendance from both the candidates and general population. However, at the Candidates Meeting there was no interest among the candidates in participating in such an event, and as such none was held.

For the Executive Election the same forums were held as were done in the previous years with a slight change in the scheduling. The Faculte St. Jean Forum kicked off the campaign, and there was relatively low attendance at this event outside of the candidates and election volunteers. It was difficult to judge the attendance at the Lister forum, but I would say it was moderately well attended with the usual dinner crowd coming to listen in on some of the speeches. Questions during this forum largely came from fellow candidates and election volunteers, I did allow the Managing Editor of the Gateway to ask a question as well which in retrospect was a mistake.

The SUB Stage forums were fairly well attended, with students stopping to listen to the question and answer portions of the event. One aspect that drew people into listening to the forum was the debate style that was introduced this year. Candidates, in addition to having an opportunity to respond to the questions being asked, also could rebut the responses of other individuals within their race. This back and forth (or round robin) style of debate was engaging for both myself and the audience, and I found it provided more information about the candidates positions than was outlined in many of their speeches. The format was only effective because of the limited number of candidates in each race – attempting to engage in a debate with more than four candidates in a race would be difficult, and ultimately less effective.

Both SUB Stage forums were rather lengthy I didn't open up the floor for questions from the audience. In the future it might be better to cut down on the length of speeches at this forum and focus more so on the debate portions, which would draw in the crowd.

The Myer Horowitz was well attended with the main floor of the theatre being filled. Knowing that many students would leave after 50 minutes to attend class I ensured the plebiscite speeches occurred immediately following the presidential speeches so that students could hear speakers for these positions. However, this meant that everyone in attendance did not hear the final speeches.

For the March Councilor Elections I did not organized an all candidates forum as I received little interest from individuals in participating. A Science Councillor forum was organized through UASUS and held in conjunction with their Faculty Executive Election Forum. The forum was moderated by the UASUS FADRO, and had a respectable attendance.

6.2.1 Recommendations

- Implement forum formats that engage students' and invite participation while allowing candidates to speak to their platform.
- Encouragae Councillor candidates to participate in forum activities in conjunction with their respective faculty associations.

6.3 Mediating Disputes

The formal electoral process is a long and arduous one starting with a campaign violation, followed by and individual filing a complaint, the CRO investigating the complaint and writing a ruling, then an appeal being filed and DIE Board meeting to hear the complaint, finishing up with DIE Board writing a ruling. If every campaign violation

that occurred followed through this whole process the CRO would likely still be ruling on complaints from the Executive Election in September.

Starting with the candidates meeting I attempted to set a tone of cooperation when dealing with complaints and disputes between candidates. Many complaints such as seeing posters placed in restricted areas (such as on painted walls), having 11 posters in a building (as opposed to the 10 maximum), or possible illegal campaigning do not require a formal complaint to be filed. I tried my best to deal with these minor issues informally providing a warning to the candidate or campaign, sending someone to take down the offensive posters, or simply talking to the candidate in question to seek clarification. As long as the issues were unintentional and didn't become chronic I saw no reason to impose a serious penalty or have any individual go through the lengthy and time-consuming process of filing a complaint.

6.3.1 Recommendations

- That the CRO maintain an open door policy and attempt to informally resolve all complaints and disputes between candidates before a formal complaint is filed.

7 Voting

7.1 Voting Days

Voting days are long days often filled with intermixing periods of chaos and calm – with often a lot more chaos than anything else. The CRO's best allies during this time is his/her staff – trusting them to do their jobs will help everything will flow that much more smoothly.

Polling stations were located in traditional locations around campus with the goal being to reach as many students as possible and provide them a convenient location in which to vote. Another consideration when setting up polling stations is to ensure that the clerks manning the polls are not overworked due to a large volume of traffic. For this reason additional polling stations from 10am – 2pm were opened in both SUB and CAB.

The most challenging time during the two days of voting is always the mornings. With numerous people, boxes of supplies, and computers systems needed to run the election I found it was a hectic process getting these out to the polling stations, and getting the polling stations setup on time. Planning ahead is essential. Assembling all the polling station materials a the day before the elections was highly beneficial – this way no one was running around trying to organize supplies the morning of the election.

As staff arrives their names were checked off from a master schedule so that they could be sent out to set up the different stations as soon as their partner arrived. It helps to have a map for each polling station so clerks know exactly where they are going.

When a large number of staff and moving in and out of the Elections Office with supplies in the morning's ballot security is something that should always be kept in mind. Creating a ballot tracking form and ensuring that ballots were signed out before they left the office was essential to ensuring security. Additionally we attempted to only sign out

the number of ballots that that specific polling station would use that particular day. When polling stations were running low on ballots more were sent out to that location.

Communication between all the polling stations and the Elections Office during voting was facilitated through the use of Walkie-Talkies. For Elections where there are a smaller number of voting stations (September by-election and perhaps March Councillor Election) walkie-talkies can be borrowed from Safewalk provided they are returned immediately after polls closed. Walkie-talkies were rented from Glentel for the Executive Election.

During voting you can never have too many individuals on staff – this is something that I cannot emphasize enough. Routinely people will not show up for their shifts, and will either arrive late or need to leave early. I always had two extra poll clerks on hand to fill in at polling stations or help out when clerks need to take break.

On the last day of voting I designated a DRO to oversee the polls as well as coordinate all takedown activities, as I was preoccupied with the start of ballot counting and a DIE Board Hearing. Having thoroughly trained the DRO's and Poll Captains I was confident that they were able to oversee this task.

7.1.1 Recommendations

- Voting Station kits should be assembled a minimum of one day in advance of voting.
- A minimum of one additional Poll Clerk should be hired during the by-election and councillor elections, and a minimum of two additional Poll Clerks hired during the Executive Election to fill in as needed at Polling Stations.

7.2 Voters' List

The Students' Union and the Registrar's Office are both party to an Information Sharing Agreement, which allows the Elections Office to have access to students' names, student ID numbers, faculties, and email addresses to create the voter lists. Protecting the security and confidentiality of this information entrusted to the Students' Union is vital as it forms the backbone of our voting software.

8 Ballot Counting

8.1 September By-Election

Paper ballots were used, with voters writing in their number rankings next to each candidate. Due to this format, hand counting of ballots was necessary.

The process outlined in bylaw 2200 is fairly straight forward, however the physical process of sorting and counting ballots was a time consuming and tedious process, especially in races with multiple candidates as this necessitated many additional rounds of counting. It was highly beneficial to have a few of the Election staff members assist with sorting; counting, and double-checking ballot counts in each round.

After hand-counting for the September by-election lasted nearly four hours, I began to dread how long it would take to hand count ballots for the Main Councilor Elections when the number of candidates running would be significantly greater.

8.2 Main Election

Once again optically scanned ballots were used for the main Election. This process worked extremely well. There were a limited number of spoiled ballots and counting proceeded quickly and efficiently. Counting began at 1PM and lasted until approximately 6PM, after that time there was a pause until the Augustana ballots arrived later that evening. Results were announced at the Powerplant at approximately 9:30PM.

In advance of counting the DRO's and myself spent time brainstorming on how many different ways a ballot could be spoiled, as well as how to possibly rule on incorrectly filled out ballots. This was time well spent. We went through a similar procedure with the scrutineers and this seemed to please everyone that the ballots were being ruled on in a consistent manner. Having both the DRO's and myself familiar with the standards was beneficial when I was forced to leave during the ballot counting process to attend a DIE Board Hearing, during that time the DRO's jointly ruled on ballots in my absence.

Online-balloting was offered to off-campus students again this year. My only suggestion in this area comes from feedback received from some faculties who had students on practicum, placements terms, or Co-ops who were not technically termed off-campus students, when they were working in another location within Edmonton. If it is possible to identify these students through course enrollment or through their faculty office and add them to the online-voting list it would allow them an equal opportunity to cast a ballot.

8.2.1 Recommendations

- In advance of ballot counting the CRO and DRO's should discuss how ballots can be incorrectly filled-out and how they can be ruled upon.
- That the Elections Office continues to use the scantron-based preferential ballot system for the main election.
- That the Elections Office continues to use Whitematter for election consulting work.
- Arrangements should be made with the Augustana CRO for ballots to be delivered promptly to Edmonton following the close of polling.
- Those students' on practicum placements or teaching assignments be given the opportunity to vote online.

8.3 APiRG Elections

Next to the Students' Union Executive Elections, the APiRG Election is by far the largest Election that occurs on the University of Alberta campus – and while the SU is not involved in the counting of ballots in any way for APiRG I feel that the process used for the APiRG Elections is important to note.

APiRG utilizes a paper ballot system with the ballots being one half page in size, the ballots are not numbered or notarized. Printing of ballots is completed from their office in HUB Mall. Using this system the ballots have to be hand counted. While having

never observed the process myself, one can imagine that with over 2500 votes this is a very long procedure. Additionally, due to the 2005/06 APiRG Election results being very close, a recount of the ballots had to be conducted.

I would encourage future CRO's to meet with the APiRG CRO to discuss the benefits of using an optically scanned ballot. Additionally I feel that the possibility of having APiRG and the Students' Union cooperate in the production and scanning of ballots has the potential to both save time and provide reliable election results to both parties.

8.4 Councillor Elections

Previous CRO's who had experienced 12 hours or more of hand counting through rounds of preferential ballots both strongly recommended that a more "automated" system be employed for this process. In consultation with Whitematter development, a data-counting program that mirrored the program used for the Executive Elections was designed. The use of an automated counting system necessitated that several other changes occur to the voting process.

Firstly, the ballot designed required was a double-sided optically scanned ballot that contained the entire Students' Council and GFC candidates from all the faculties. This ended up being a very cost efficient solution, as only one ballot design was needed. A "qualifier" bubble was used to prevent students from casting a vote in faculties in which they were not registered. When an individual came to vote the qualifier bubble was filled in by the Poll Clerks with a black marker next to faculty in which the student was registered – when the ballots were then scanned during the counting process only the marks made within the section indicated by the qualifier bubble were recorded.

A beneficial side effect of the design of the new Councillor election ballot is that students' were no longer restricted to voting at a designated polling station. They could vote at any station, as the Poll Clerks will simply fill in the qualifier bubble next to the correct faculty in which the student is registered.

Secondly, it was deemed impractical to have physical voters lists at each polling station that contained the names and ID numbers of every undergraduate students on campus. Not only would this potentially jeopardize the security, and confidentiality of this personal information, but also if any of the voters lists ever were to have been misplaced the Information Sharing Agreement between the Students' Union and the Registrar's Office would be put at risk.

The counting software was tested prior thoroughly prior to being used for the Councillor Elections, and performed flawlessly when used for the actually counting. Results for the Councillor Elections were released approximately 3 hours after polls were closed.

8.4.1 Recommendations

- That the CRO and DRO's in advance of ballot counting discuss how councillor ballots can be incorrectly filled-out and how they will be ruled upon.
- That the Elections Office continue to use the scantron-based preferential ballot system for the Councillor elections.

- That the Elections Office continue to use Whitematter for election consulting work.
- That the CRO avoid employing electoral processes that require the hand-counting of ballots, and investigate the financial feasibility of using the scantron based-preferential ballot system for the fall by-election
- That the Elections Office provide training to all Poll Clerks and Captains regarding how ballots are commonly spoiled so they can orally communicate the information to voters.

9 Problems & Challenges

9.1 Approved Petitions

While the CRO is only required to verify the validity of a petition, I found that it was beneficial to be involved in the early initiation of this process by both observing and participating in committees and Council meetings. Increased involvement in the petition, plebiscite, and referenda processes was an early initiative that I set out for myself, not considering the possibility of being confronted with more than 25 petition requests.

Students' Council, the Bylaw Committee, the Executive, DIE Board, and myself spent a significant amount of time dealing with various aspects of this onslaught of petition requests. Being faced with the potential of having an exceedingly large number of petitions on the ballot created several concerns for the Elections Office.

Firstly, the elections budget can only accommodate a maximum of two plebiscites or referenda. The cost of funding "Yes" and "No" campaigns, running ads mandated by bylaw in the Gateway, and extra staffing needed to assist with material approval for the approved 18 petitions would have been astronomical. I outlined these costs for Students' Council at a minimum of \$2600 per petition, and estimated that the Elections Office would require more than \$40 000 in additional funding should each petition be submitted and found to be valid – a possibility that Students' Council needed to consider prior to approving each additional petition request.

Secondly, the balloting infrastructure can only accommodate a maximum of four plebiscite or referenda questions. In a worse case scenario six questions could be placed on one ballot. In approving a large number of petition questions Council was informed that an additional ballot would have to be utilized to facilitate voting. This would potentially require a new ballot design, scanning method, and counting program in addition to doubling the production costs required.

Lastly, having a large number of questions on the ballot is a detrimental to the ability of students to become engaged in the electoral process, and educated about the plebiscite and referenda questions.

In response to the large number of petition questions Students' Council approved changes to it's bylaws to better regulate the number of petition requests it receives, while still allowing the process to remain open and accessible to students. The main mechanistic change was the imposition of a \$25 refundable deposit required to

accompany each petition request prior to the question being forwarded to the Bylaw Committee – a move that appears to have rectified the problem.

9.1.1 Recommendations

- That the CRO actively engage with both Students' Council and its Boards and Committees to further eliminate potential sources of abuse present in the Students' Union Election bylaws.

9.2 Petition Verification

When a student wishes to place a plebiscite question on the ballot via petition they are allocated 90 days in which to collect a minimum of 1402 signatures (5% of the undergraduate student population) in support of their question. When the petition is then submitted to the CRO it falls upon the Elections Office the job of verifying a minimum of 1402 signature for EACH petition. Similar to how candidates choose to largely hand in their nomination packages at the last minute, the proponents of petitions chose to do the same.

Between the DRO's and myself we determined that it was impractical to verify every single signature. We did not have the time, nor staff resources to complete this task. After discussion of the issue it was decided that the DRO's and myself would cooperate on verifying a minimum of 25% of the signatures on each petition, and the results extrapolated to the entire petition.

Fortunately, both the Physical Activity Complex Fee petition and the Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban petition had collected far more than the 1402 signatures required exceeding 2000 signatures each, and both petitions easily met the required minimum number of signatures. However, had the petitions collected a few number of signatures the Elections Office would have been forced to verify a larger percentage of those signatures collected to confirm with greater certainty that the petitions were indeed valid. While I was satisfied with the process we employed I would have been more comfortable had a large percentage of the signatures from each petition been verified.

Verifying 25% of the signatures from each petition was still a laborious process as each signature and student ID number needed to be manually compared to a master voters list provided by the Registrar's Office. The DRO's and myself spent the better part of two weeks working on petition verification activities with the vast majority of the time consisting of repetitive data entry. Unfortunately there is little that can be done to further automate the process.

The verification process was monotonous and draining on both the DRO's and myself, and prevented all of us from engaging in more productive activities. I also felt badly as neither the DRO's were hired with the expectations that would be doing extensive data entry, and due to bylaw restrictions I was unable to further compensate them for the time spent completing these tasks.

9.2.1 Recommendations

- That Students' Council provides additional funding to the Elections Office for staff to assist in the petition verification process.

- A minimum of 50% of the signatures submitted as part of a referenda or plebiscite petition be verified by the Elections Office.

9.3 Fall Campus Recreation Guide

The Fall Campus Recreation Guide was released in August while Students' Council was debating the proposed Physical Activity Complex Fee plebiscite question – with the back cover of the guide including an artists rendering of the proposed Physical Activity Complex and the statement “From Dream to Reality, Watch for it, In 2008 you could be working out here!, The NEW Physical Activity Complex”. Unfortunately I did not immediately notice this advertisement. It was not until well after the initial distribution of the Campus Recreation Guide that the advertisement was brought to my attention.

I viewed this as an advertisement promoting the Physical Activity Complex and immediately approached the Faculty to have the ad removed as soon as I was aware of its' existence. While the advertisement did not constitute pre-campaigning (as the question was not officially approved to be placed on the ballot) I felt that it could potentially jeopardize the ability to hold a fair vote on the Physical Activity Complex Fee when (and if) the question was approved.

Immediately upon notifying the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation of my concerns all the Fall Campus Recreation Guides were removed from the stands immediately upon my request. It was decided the back cover, which contained the advertisement, would be removed, and the Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation would continue to distribute the Fall Campus Recreation Guides. At this time it was also decided that a similar advertisement initially planned for the Winter Campus Recreation Guide would not be published.

While ultimately I feel that the advertisement on the back cover of the Campus Recreation Guide had little effect on the overall outcome of the plebiscite vote on the Physical Activity Complex Fee, it highlights the lack of control that the CRO holds over third party involvement in the Elections. If the Faculty of Physical Education would have been less cooperative and refused to remove either advertisement, the CRO would have potentially been forced into throwing out the results of the plebiscite vote. This situation only highlights the importance of the CRO's involvement in the early stages of the referenda and plebiscite process.

9.3.1 Recommendations

- The CRO should actively pursue relationships with third parties who have an interest in the outcome of a plebiscite or referenda to prevent interference during the campaign.

9.4 Staffing

The ability of the Elections Office to continue to recruit students in future years to operate polling stations has been greatly effected by two significant factors within the last year.

Firstly, with the Alberta economy doing very well it is difficult to find post-secondary students who are willing to work for only slightly over minimum wage. The pay rate for

Poll Clerks was \$8.50 and hour, and we allowed individuals to work around their class schedule. Despite this increase in the hourly wage as well as the large amount of flexibility given to employees it was a struggle to recruit students to this position.

Secondly, International Students' who previously could work only on campus (and who staffed many of our polling stations) have recently been granted permission from the government to pursue more lucrative positions located off campus. With this large labor pool no longer being restricted to campus work only, future CRO's are going to have to provide either a higher hourly wage to employees or other incentives to encourage interest in these positions

9.4.1 Recommendations

- Raise the hourly rate to \$9.00/hour for Poll Clerks, and at least \$10.00/hour for Poll Captains
- Provide additional incentives such as paid training sessions and meals to employees
- The CRO should invest in advertising to ensure that an adequate number of staff are available to facilitate voting.

9.5 Councillor Election Upgrades

While there were no problems with the new Councillor Election ballots and software there were a few challenges that were discovered using the system for the first time.

Firstly, at polling stations where Faculty Association Elections were also be conducted there appears to be a higher than normal incidence of spoiled ballots. While this is partially due to students incorrectly filling out a newly formatted ballot, the primary reason for this phenomenon is due to the fact that not every student who accepted and filled out a Faculty Association ballot also accepted and filled out a Students' Union ballot. Our voter authentication system had no way noting which ballot(s) a voter accepted, only that the student had voted. While this does not a significant problem, for the purposes of accurately tracking voters and statistics it would be worthwhile to investigate possible improvements.

Secondly, while some Poll Clerks explained to students that they were only eligible to vote in the faculty in which they were registered, others did not. This resulted in some individuals ranking every GFC and SU Council candidate. The counting system and computer program dealt efficiently with this error. A variation on this error that also occurred was at the polling station in Dentistry and Pharmacy. This poll was setup primarily to allow Dentistry students to vote for SU and GFC Councillors in the Faculty of Medicine, but also facilitated Pharmacy students to vote in their Faculty Association Election. Due to a poll clerk error, for a period of time at the start of the morning students enrolled in Pharmacy were also handed a SU ballot and told to vote in Medicine and Dentistry. This problem was quickly caught and fortunately during that time no students from other faculties had attempted to vote. Confiscating all the ballots in the ballot box easily rectified the problem and had no effect on the remainder of the election. Both of these issued highlighted some gaps in our Poll Clerk training practices.

Thirdly, in the faculties of Arts and Science it was difficult to fill out the ballot without making a mistake due to the large number of candidates. Despite the various shading and formatting techniques employed the ballot was still tricky to fill out correctly. The large bubble areas in these faculties lead to some individuals unintentionally spoiling their ballots – for others it provided an area to play connect the dots.

All in all however, the errors that occurred were minor and did not affect the integrity of the Election.

9.5.1 Recommendations

- That the Elections Office works with Whitematter Development to modify both the Executive Election and Councillor Election Voter Verification systems so that Poll Clerks can indicate which ballots (SU, APIRG, FA) a voter has accepted.
- Training materials and sessions provided to Poll Clerks should be further developed to reflect changes to the Councillor Election voting systems and ballots.
- Alternate formatting for Arts and Science Councillor Elections should be considered to reduce the number of unintentionally spoiled ballots.

9.6 Faculty Associations Elections

For the last few years Faculty Associations have used SU polling stations during Councilor elections to also run their own executive elections. This process is mutually beneficial and generally improves the voter turnout for both the SU and the Faculty Association. Faculty Associations who choose to participate in this process with the SU were charged \$5 and provided with a ballot box courtesy of the Elections Office. The FADRO or Elections Head from each Faculty Association also was required to comply with a short set of rules set out by the Elections Office.

One of the rules outlined was that each Faculty Association had to ensure that a pre-designated individual in charge of Elections for their organization was on campus, and able to be contacted for the duration of voting in the event that there were any issues or problems with the voting process. I felt that this was a reasonable request.

The Faculty Associations had each estimated the number of ballots that they would require, providing these to the Elections Office in sealed manila envelopes prior to voting. In some faculties we started to run out of these faculty association ballots rapidly during the first day of voting. When I attempted to contact these pre-designated individuals (often FADRO's, or Faculty Association CRO's) I found that several had left campus, or alternately that they provided me with the contact information for their Faculty Association office and were unreachable directly.

One faculty association had a current executive member offer to deliver additional ballots directly to the polling station. However, I was uncomfortable with this arrangement as it was made explicitly clear that the SU Elections Office would be the only location where ballots could be delivered, and that the ballots would only be accepted from designated individuals. Some Faculty Association ballots were lacking from polling stations for several hours during peak voting times. Interestingly, this situation mirrored those that occurred during the APIRG Elections in 2004/05.

9.6.1 Recommendations

- Collaboration between the Students' Union Elections' Office and Faculty Associations continue in an effort to increase voter involvement and turnout.
- That the CRO have each Faculty Association President and designated Election Official sign a copy of the rules laid out by the Elections Office.

9.7 Michelle Kelly Disqualification

The grounds for disqualifying a candidate from running in an election are well defined by the Students' Union Election bylaws, and at the University of Alberta disqualification is not a rare occurrence. With a limited number of individuals interested in becoming involved with the Students' Union is it especially unfortunate that any candidate is disqualified for making an unfortunate mistake, after investing so much time in campaigning for office. Disqualification is not only a blow to the individual candidate, but also to the Students' Union as it deprives the organization of the ideas, concepts and valuable contributions that that individual could have potentially made. I will not discuss the details of Michelle Kelly's disqualification as details of this matter are well documented in both my own initial ruling, and the following DIE Board appeal. Instead I will focus on the impact this decision had on the Executive Election.

DIE Board officially upheld the ruling of the CRO to disqualify Michelle Kelly at approximately 23:00 on Tuesday March 7, literally 10 hours before polls were scheduled to open for voting. The last minute nature of this ruling was stressful for all parties involved. As CRO I focused on several important alterations that needed to occur prior to the opening of polls.

Firstly, the ballots had already been printed which included Michelle Kelly as the first Presidential candidate, and it was impractical to attempt to reprint the ballots prior to polls opening. Thus my first concern was to find a way to communicate to voters that Ms. Kelly had been disqualified. Signs printed on pink paper and posted around the voting statements accomplished this. Additionally information was provided to the poll clerks about how to deal with questions regarding the disqualification. Information was also posted inside the polling booths indicating that where an individual indicated a vote for Ms. Kelly it would automatically be re-assigned to the next highest ranked individual.

Secondly, the ballots counting software had a disqualification program built in, but it had not been tested as part of our testing process prior to voting. Fortunately data from a series of sample ballots previously used to test other aspects of the system could be used for this purpose and testing of the disqualification procedure was completed successfully while students were voting.

Finally, due to the timing of Ms. Kelly's disqualification, news of this occurrence missed being published in the Tuesday Edition of the Gateway. Thus many students were not informed about Ms. Kelly's disqualification until such time that they arrived at a polling station. The Gateway did publish a front-page article in the Thursday paper, which seemed to ease many of the inquiries both the Poll Clerks and myself were receiving.

It was interesting to note that while voter turnout on the first day of polling (Wednesday March 8) was up slightly from the previous year, voter turnout during the second day of

polling dropped significantly below expected levels, perhaps in response to the Gateway article that was published. Additionally many poll clerks reported that some individuals when seeing that Michelle Kelly was disqualified chose not to cast a ballot for any of the positions in the Election.

There will be no recommendations issued in this section, as I feel that there is little that a CRO can do to prepare for the potential disqualification of a candidate or campaign. And the best response in these situations is simply for the CRO to do their best to ensure that the Elections can continue.

10 Online Voting

The appeal of a universally accessible website at which people can vote will always be appealing to individuals and organization who see this as an option of increasing voter turnout. However, an aspect that cannot be ignored is the technical difficulty in implementing and securing such a system. While I have immense confidence in the abilities of Whitematter Development and the Students' Union technical department I would refrain from ever suggesting that such a system be implemented.

One only need look as far as other Universities that have attempted online voting before to see some of the potential downfalls. The University of Calgary's 2004 online election was unable to stop students from voting multiple times, ultimately the election had to be rerun. The University of British Columbia had implemented successfully an online voting program in 2005, only to return to physical ballots in 2006.

In any situation where physical processes are being replaced by technology we have to ensure that blind trust is not laid on new innovations. Whitematter Development produced a report on this subject previously, and outlines some of the potential benefits and weaknesses of such a system

10.1 Recommendations

- That, when deciding whether to extend online voting to all voters, future CROs make the integrity of the electoral process the most important factor guiding their decision.

11 Election Turnout

If the first question most people ask is about who won the election, the second question is bound to be about some aspect of voter turnout. While the CRO's runs the election I ultimately feel that there is little that they can do to drastically increase voter turnout – the aspects about why students vote are simply too complex, and encompass too many different aspects for one CRO to address.

Students will only vote if they perceive their vote as mattering and making a difference. A lack of engagement between the Students' Union and the general student body cannot be rectified in a single year, or even over several years. Engagement is a long term issue that requires a long term strategic plan. Only then, perhaps, when students become more actively involved and engaged with the SU will any notable increase in voter turnout be observed.

While there have been several methods proposed for increasing voter turnout – everything from providing prizes, to tying a students university and students union privileges to whether or not they cast a ballot there is a fine line to walk between increasing turnout and compromising the integrity and fairness of the election. The dichotomy between ensuring an election is fair and increasing voter turnout is one of the fundamental issues for every CRO, one that I'd more than happily discuss with any future CRO.

12 Appendices

12.1 Main Election Regulations

See attached "Appendix 1".

12.2 CRO Rulings

See attached "Appendix 2".

12.3 DIE Board Rulings

See attached "Appendix 3".

12.4 Election Results

See attached "Appendix 4".

12.5 Petition Verification Results

See attached "Appendix 5".

12.6 Letter to Council Announcing Winners

See attached "Appendix 6".

Appendix 1: Main Election Regulations

Regulations and Guidelines March 2006 Main Campus (Exec. & BoG) Election

Note: It is important that all candidates and their campaign managers read Bylaw 2100, the Main Campus Elections Bylaw, and make all campaign volunteers aware of the election rules. This document supplements Bylaw 2100, but does not replace it.

1 Nominations

1.1 *Acceptance of Nominations*

Acceptance of a nomination by the CRO does not guarantee the candidate is eligible to run. If the candidate is later determined to be ineligible, he or she will be disqualified. Candidates must have paid Students' Union fees and not have any debts owing to the Students' Union at the time of the nomination.

1.2 *Joke Candidates*

Candidates, who run under a name that is not their given name, or a reasonable derivation of their given name, will be designated joke candidates. Joke candidates are not eligible to take office if elected.

1.3 *Candidates Meeting*

A mandatory Candidates' Meeting will be held at the time and place listed in the election timeline. Candidates who fail to attend the meeting in its entirety (or fail to designate someone else, in writing, to attend in their place) will be disqualified.

2 General Campaign Rules

2.1 *Precampaigning*

Candidates may not engage in any campaign activities between the close of nominations and the beginning of the campaign period.

2.2 *Permitted Areas*

Campaigning is not permitted in the following areas without permission of the CRO:

1. Any business or service operated by the Students' Union;
2. Any University library;
3. In any classroom during a class, without permission of the instructor;
4. In any residence;
5. In any building or on any land not owned or operated by the University or the Students' Union.

For the purposes of the election, “residences” include University-owned residences (including the residential areas of HUB), St. Joseph’s College, Augustana residences, and Fraternity houses leased from the University. Please note specifically that the following areas are off-limits to campaigning: U of A administration buildings, the PowerPlant & RATT, the LRT Station, SU Info Booths, any SU Service, and any location off-campus. Candidates are reminded that they must remain a minimum of twenty (20) feet away from polling stations during voting days.

2.3 Volunteers

Volunteers for campaigns are bound by the same rules as candidates. It is the candidates’ responsibility to inform his or her volunteers of election rules. Candidates are responsible for the actions of their volunteers.

2.4 Collusion

Candidates are prohibited from endorsing or acting as a volunteer for any other candidate in his or her race. Candidates are also prohibited from sharing resources (tables, posters, banners, budgets, etc.) with any other candidate in his or her race. Volunteers however may volunteer for more than one campaign.

3 Campaign Materials & Advertising

3.1 Material Approval

All campaign materials must be approved by the CRO prior to use. Copies of campaign materials must also be checked and counted by election staff prior to being distributed. Office hours for campaign material approval will be announced at the Candidates’ Meeting.

3.2 Students’ Union as a Primary Vendor

When campaign materials can be produced by a business operated by the Students’ Union, candidates must purchase those materials from that business.

3.3 Identification of Printed Materials

All campaign materials **must** include the name of where the item was produced – either the name of the external printer, or the SU Print Centre.

3.4 Posters & Banners

There are no limits to the total number of posters, but no candidate or slate may place more than ten (10) posters in any single building, and no more than one (1) banner on display in any building. Banners are greater than four (4) square feet in area, and posters are less than four (4) square feet.

Banners must be coated with a fire retardant spray prior to being posted. Fire proofing is available from the receptionist in 2-900 SUB for \$10.00

Candidates should be careful not to apply tape to surfaces that are easily damaged. Several buildings, such as ETLC, Education, and Business have regulations about poster approval and placement. When in doubt, use a public-use bulletin board or ask building staff. Posters that are placed in violation of building rules will be removed without compensation, and a fine may also be imposed.

3.5 Photocopying

All photocopying must be done at the SU Print Centre, located on the lower level of SUB.

3.6 External Printers

The following printers are the approved external printers:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Capital Colour Press
4904 89 Street | 465 8080
FAX 469 4017 |
| 2. Quality Colour
18330 102 Avenue | 486 1199
FAX 484 3246 |
| 3. Sunrise Printing
8920 60 Avenue | 469 6772
FAX 465 8989 |
| 4. ABC Press
18105 107 Avenue | 484 5515
FAX 484 0606 |
| 5. Dial Printing
10515 111 Street | 420 6266
FAX 426 5943 |

Please contact the CRO prior to using any of these printers, to obtain an SU Purchase Order form. If none of these printers can supply a desired item, candidates may apply to the CRO for an alternate printer to be used.

3.7 Tables

Tables around campus have been booked for candidates to use during the campaign period. A random draw for tables will occur at the Candidates Meeting.

3.8 Classroom Speaking

Candidates must have the permission of the instructor before speaking in any classroom during a class.

3.9 Election Forums

There will be five election forums held during the campaign; The Faculte St. Jean forum, the Lister forum, two SUB Stage forums, and the Myer Horowitz forum. Candidates will be given time to make a short speech, answer a series of set

questions, and then respond to any questions from the audience. No heckling or unruly behaviour is permitted during the election forums.

Forum	Date & Time	Moderator
Faculte St. Jean Forum (CSJ Student Lounge)	Tuesday, February 28 @ 1230	Ryan Lomenda AUFSJ President
Lister Forum (Lister Cafeteria)	Wednesday, March 1 @ 1700	Rachel Woynorowski CRO
SUB Stage Forum #1 (President, VPA, VPX)	Thursday, March 2 @ 1230	Florence Cheng DRO
SUB Stage Forum #2 (Referenda, VPSL, VPOF)	Friday, March 3 @ 1200	Andrew Kwan DRO
Myer Horowitz Forum	Monday, March 6 @ 1200	Rachel Woynorowski CRO

3.10 Gateway & CJSR

Candidates may advertise with the Gateway and will receive 50% off the regular ad prices; however, ads must run during the campaign. As with all campaign materials, the CRO must approve Gateway ads. (NOTE: The Gateway requires all ads to be provided as PDF 4.0 files)

CJSR may have airtime available as paid political announcements. Again, the CRO must approve all ads before they are broadcast.

3.11 Gateway Supplement and Elections Website

A photograph (100 pixels wide by 120 pixels high), brief biography (100 words) and platform statement (200 words) from each candidate will be posted on the SU Elections website. Candidates should be prepared to hand in their submissions no later than TUESDAY FEBRUARY 21 @ 23:59 . The SU Elections website will remain operational throughout voting days. More information on submissions for the Gateway Supplement will be available at the Candidates Meeting.

3.12 Website, Email & Webboard Policy

The content of candidate websites should be provided to the CRO for review prior to being made publicly available. Candidates are reminded to make arrangements to have their websites taken offline before the end of campaigning.

No “mass emails” to unofficial groups (e.g. lists of your friends from your personal account) are permitted. It is permissible to send mass emails to campaign volunteers. Emails to student group mailing lists (list-servs) are permitted, with the following rules:

1. Candidates who wish to send an email must contact the CRO and all other candidates in his or her race to ensure that all candidates have an equal opportunity to participate.

2. The executive member of the student group responsible for administering the mailing list must approve, in writing, the text of all campaign emails sent to the list.

Any group emails sent by any other means will be considered a violation and subject to penalty.

Candidates are permitted to post to the SU Webboard during the campaign, but should be cautious not to engage in pre-campaigning or to endorse candidates in other races. Posts to external webboards, online forums, or electronic bulletin boards are not permitted without the permission of the CRO.

3.13 External Media Policy

Candidates may speak to external media after obtaining permission from the CRO. Requests will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

3.14 Material Removal

All campaign materials must be removed by the end of campaigning. Failure to do so will result in penalties being imposed.

Candidates and volunteers will meet shortly before the end of campaigning to coordinate poster removal. The CRO will announce the time and place at the Candidates' Meeting.

4 Campaign Expenses

4.1 Budget Limits

Bylaw 2100 establishes the following budget limits:

Individual Candidates	\$500.00
Slates	\$375.00 per slate (in slate expenses) plus \$125.00 per slate candidate (in candidate expenses)
Joke Candidates	One half a regular candidate's limit (\$250.00 per individual candidate, \$62.50 per joke slate member)

Candidates who exceed these limits will be disqualified.

It is important to note that GST is **NOT** included in these budget allowances. Candidates (or their campaign managers) are responsible for keeping a separate record of applicable taxes, for which the candidate will be reimbursed (along with the non-tax expenses) at the end of the election.

All campaign expenses over \$100.00 must be approved by the CRO. Excessive or unreasonable expenses will not be permitted. Candidates should get approval from the CRO if there is any doubt about permitted expenses.

4.2 Donations

All donations to a campaign will be assessed fair market value by the CRO and accordingly deducted from a campaign's total allowable expenses. This does not include general volunteer labour and expertise held by a significant proportion of the population, such as web page and poster design.

4.3 Expense Reporting

Candidates must submit an expense form, with all receipts included, to the CRO no later than **Monday, March 6 @ 09:00** as specified on the election timeline.

5 Ballot Counting

5.1 Scrutineers

Ballot counting will take place on the second day of voting, and will continue until all ballots have been counted. Candidates are encouraged to designate a scrutineer in writing to assist with ballot counting. Scrutineers must not divulge the results of the count until they have been officially announced by the CRO.

5.2 Results

Unofficial election results will be posted on the 3rd Floor of SUB and on the Elections web site as soon as counting is finished. Official results will be submitted to Students' Council.

6 Amendment of Regulations

Any changes, clarifications, or additions to these rules will be announced at the Candidates Meeting and/or emailed to all candidates and campaign managers.

Appendix #2 – CRO Rulings



Ruling #1

September 2005 Councillor By-Election

Summary of Complaint

That Amanda Rajotte, GFC and Students' Council candidate :

- Hung posters not stamped by the Elections Office
- Distributed candy to several classes

Parties to the Complaint

- Ms. Amanda Rajotte
General Faculties Councillor Candidate and Students Union Councillor Candidate

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

- Bylaw 2200 (Council Elections Bylaw)

Facts

Elections Office

1. The CRO received Ms. Rajotte's Expense form on Wednesday, September 29, 2005 and noted the following;
 - A receipt for Internal expenditures (Print Center photocopying) was not attached.
 - An External expenditure, along with a receipt for "Candy" was attached.
2. The Elections Office did not;
 - Stamp posters produced by Ms. Rajotte
 - Approve "Candy" as a campaign material for Ms. Rajotte

Rajotte Campaign

3. In an email to the CRO Ms. Rajotte noted;
 - A receipt for internal expenditures will be turned into the Elections Office.
 - That all the posters produced were put up.
 - The External Expenditure for "Candy" was 1 bag of Halloween Candy (55 pieces), which was distributed to two Agriculture classes as part of Ms. Rajotte's campaign.

Ruling

1. The Elections Office contacted Ms. Rajotte the following day after reviewing the budget forms submitted requesting her to clarify her budget expenditures. Ms. Rajotte did so, replying in a timely manner with the facts listed above, therefore there is no reason to penalize Ms. Rajotte for a delay in submitting her complete budget.
2. As Ms. Rajotte's posters were hung on campus without being stamped by the Elections Office it is impossible to know the exact number of posters used for the campaign. However, having given approval to print her posters I believe that it was merely an oversight that they were not stamped before they were hung, and I am confident that Ms. Rajotte was not intentionally attempting to distribute unapproved materials. A fine of \$2.00 will be levied against both Ms. Rajotte's GFC and Students' Council campaigns.
3. The use of nominal value items as a campaign material has occurred in the past, however, in this instance Ms. Rajotte did not seek approval before distributing the candy. I feel that the candy was a nominal value item, and had Ms. Rajotte asked for approval it would have been granted. In this situation since it is impossible to confiscate the campaign material as it has already been distributed a fine of \$2.00 will be levied against both Ms. Rajotte's GFC and Students' Council campaigns.

Penalty

\$4.00 will be deducted from Ms. Rajotte's GFC campaign budget.

\$4.00 will be deducted from Ms. Rajotte's Student Council campaign budget.

So decided this Thursday, September 29 @ 15:25
Time limit for appeal: Monday, October @ 11:25

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union



Ruling #1

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

Summary of Complaint

Tim Schneider, Campaign Manager to Blythe Morrow alleges that Samantha Power, Chris Samuel, Sarah Kalil and Dave Cournoyer shared campaign resources in the form of a classroom-speaking schedule, spoke to classes as a group, and that Mr. Samuel had endorsed the others during his classroom speeches.

Parties to the Complaint

- Mr. Tim Schneider, Campaign Manager to Blythe Morrow (VP External candidate)
- Ms. Samantha Power, Presidential Candidate
- Mr. Chris Samuel, Board of Governors Candidate
- Ms. Sarah Kalil, VP Student Life Candidate
- Mr. Dave Cournoyer, VP External Candidate

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 2100, Section 37(a) (No Use of Non-Universal Resources)

Bylaw 2100, Section 38(a) (No Joint Use of Resources)

Bylaw 2100, Section 39(a) (Freedom of Members)

Facts

1. On February 28 it is alleged that candidates Samantha Power, Chris Samuel, Sarah Kalil and Dave Cournoyer were observed walking together between classes, as well as sequentially speaking to multiple classes in Tory Lecture.
2. All candidates have independently claimed that they possess their own unique individual classroom speaking schedule, and had independently decided to speak to a series of the same classes during February 28th.
3. Mr. Schneider claimed that the candidates stood together until the completion of all of their speeches before leaving the classrooms together. During this time he heard Mr. Samuel endorse the other candidates during a speech in Tory Lecture-11 where Mr. Samuel stated;
"I really encourage you guys to listen carefully to what the following candidates have to say"

Ruling

1. All candidates were provided with a copy of the University Class Lists to plan their speaking schedules. The list itself is a universal resource, while a candidates unique classroom speaking schedule is a non-universal resource.
2. As all candidates involved had a unique classroom-speaking schedule, there is no evidence to support the conclusion that they shared a non-universal resource. It is reasonable to assume that as candidates attempt to speak to large university classes to promote their campaign there will be at times multiple candidates attempting to speak to the same class(es).
3. Mr. Samuels' statement during one of his speeches, as witnessed by Mr. Schneider is unverifiable, and the CRO feels that lacking solid evidence this statement could be interpreted a number of different ways and is not an endorsement.

Penalty

No penalty is assessed.

So decided this Wednesday, March 1 @ 15:18.
Time limit for appeal: Friday, March 3 @ 11:18

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union

vote

Ruling #2

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

Summary of Complaint

Joseph Blais observed a number of Physical Activity Complex YES handbills in St. Joseph's resident mailboxes.

Parties to the Complaint

- Mr. Joseph Blais
- Mr. Chad Fletcher, Physical Activity Complex YES Campaign Manager

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 2400, Section 25(d) (Restrictions on Campaign Activities)

Facts

1. On the morning of February 28 Mr. Blais observed a number of Physical Activity Complex YES handbills and bag-tags in the mailboxes at the St. Joseph's Residence.
2. At the request of the CRO Mr. Blais removed the campaign materials and turned them over to the Students' Union Elections Office a total of thirty-four (34) handbills and four (4) bag-tags.

Ruling

1. The Physical Activity Complex Fee YES campaign is in violation of Bylaw 2400, Section 25(d)

Penalty

1. All penalties should be proportional to the violation that has occurred. As it is unknown the number of handbills that were distributed to residence it will be assumed that one handbill or bag tag was placed in each of the sixty (60) mailboxes at St. Joseph's residence.

2. Therefore the Physical Activity Complex YES campaign is ordered to surrender sixty (60) handbills to the CRO no later than 17:00 on Friday, March 3. These handbills will be destroyed.

So decided this Wednesday, March 1 @ 15:56.
Time limit for appeal: Friday, March 3 @ 11:56

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union

vote

Ruling #3

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

Summary of Complaint

A volunteer of Mr. Greg German produced campaign materials without his authorization, or approval from the Students' Union Elections Office.

Parties to the Complaint

- Mr. Greg German, Presidential Candidate

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 2100, Section 36(a) (Responsibility for Volunteers)
Bylaw 2100, Section 45 (CRO Must Approve Materials)

Facts

1. On the morning of February 28, Mr. German approached the CRO about a violation of campaigning regulations committed by a volunteer on his campaign. The volunteer had attached stickers to their t-shirt reading "VOTE GREG GERMAN" and had for a period of time walked around campus, as well as sat at a campaign table.

Ruling

1. All candidates must take responsibility for the actions of their volunteers as outlined in Bylaw 2100, and must have all materials approved prior to usage – Mr. German's volunteer violated this bylaw.

Penalty

1. Mr German's prompt reporting of the event, and immediate removal of the materials will be taken into consideration, and Mr. German will be fined the equivalent of the fair market value (\$3.00) for the stickers that were applied.

So decided this Wednesday, March 1 @ 16:11
Time limit for appeal: Friday, March 3 @ 12:11

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union

vote

Ruling #4

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

Summary of Complaint

Michelle Kelly, former Presidential Candidate, is appealing her disqualification from the 2006 Executive Election due to budget infractions. She alleges that the final budget submitted for her campaign was incorrect. Materials accounted for in her budget were not used for campaign purposes and therefore should not have been included. By eliminating these materials from her budget her final expenditures would fall within the \$500 allowed campaign budget.

Parties to the Complaint

- Ms. Michelle Kelly, Presidential Candidate

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Candidates Meeting Agenda – Rules and Regulations
Bylaw 2100, Section 35 (Mandatory Attendance – Consequences of Contravention)
Bylaw 2100, Section 2(f) (Campaign Expenses)
Bylaw 2100, Section 2(d) (Campaign Activity)
Bylaw 2100, Section 68-70 (Campaign Records & Budgets)
Bylaw 2100, Section 63 (Campaign Expenses – Individual)
Bylaw 2100, Section 79 (CRO Shall Disqualify Violators)

Facts

1. On March 6th at 09:00 campaign budgets from all candidate must be handed into the Chief Returning Officer. Ms. Kelly's submitted her budget on time, and declared that she had spent a total of \$491.06
2. Ms. Kelly's was fined on March 2nd \$5.00 for failing to set up a table, and an additional \$10.00 on March 6th at 17:15 for failing to attend a Daily Candidates Meeting.
3. Together Ms. Kelly's declared expenditures and fines came to a total of \$506.06, at which time she was subsequently disqualified by the CRO.
4. Ms. Kelly requested that the CRO subtract the cost of one bottle of green paint from her final budgeted amount (a value of \$8.80) as she did not use this material for her campaign. She supplied the CRO with one bottle of green paint.

Ruling

1. Candidates are required by bylaw to submit final budgets to the CRO 12 working hours in advance of polling. At this time ALL expenses must be noted as well as any projected expenses must be accounted for. This criteria is clearly outlined in Bylaw 2100. No where is it stated in bylaw that candidates, following the submission of their budgets, may add/subtract values from their budget.
2. While Ms. Kelly attempted to reduce her budget by \$8.80 (one bottle of unused green paint) the CRO has no way to verify that this bottle of paint was that purchased as outlined on her receipt, or was acquired at a later time. Furthermore, Bylaw 2100, Section 9 states that the CRO shall disqualify any individual who has either exceeded his/her budget or falsified his/her campaign expense record.
3. Finally, the CRO has the ability as outlined in Bylaw to disqualify candidates, however does not have the ability to reinstate these candidates.
4. Therefore, at this time Ms. Kelly is disqualified from the Presidential race as the CRO has found that Ms. Kelly has exceeded her campaign budget. Furthermore the CRO finds that no mechanism within Bylaw 2100 that allows either the CRO or candidates to alter final budgets, or allows the CRO to reinstate disqualified candidates.

So decided this Tuesday, March 7 @ 13:41

Time limit for appeal: Wednesday, March 8 @ 08:59

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union

vote

Ruling #5

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

Summary of Complaint

A student has received a notice on their WEBCT Homepage that indicated students should vote YES for the Physical Activity Complex Fee Plebiscite

Parties to the Complaint

- Ms. Amanda Henry, Vice President Academic Candidate
- Mr. Chad Fletcher, Physical Activity Complex Fee YES Campaign Manager

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 2100, Section 36(a) (Responsibility for Volunteers)

Bylaw 2100, Section 45 (CRO Must Approve Materials)

Bylaw 2100, Section 24 (a) (No use of Non-Universal Resources)

Facts

1. The CRO was provided with a screen shot of a WEB CT site by Ms. Amanda Henry that contained three references that read “09:00 – 11:00 PAC VOTE – VOTE YES!!!!”
2. The individual whose WEBCT was used asked that their identity not be revealed – however provided the additional information that they were a varsity athlete.
3. The Physical Activity Complex YES campaign claims it does not have the ability to post messages to WEBCT.
4. At this point in time no individual with WEBCT has returned repeated messages requesting additional information about the identity of the individual who posted the message, or with the number of students who may have potentially received the message.
5. The Campaign Manager for the Physical Activity Complex Fee YES campaign claims that he is unaware of the individual who posted the message to WEBCT.

Ruling

1. The use of WEBCT posting are limited to University faculty members, and professors – few if any students have the ability to alter postings on other students websites. At this point in time it is impossible to know how many, or how few students received this message, or who posted the message initially.
2. As only one instance of this message was reported it will assume that it has a limited scope in nature – if any evidence to the contrary is later presented a separate complaint for wide spread misuse of this resource will be entertained.
3. The Physical Activity Complex Fee YES campaign will be fined \$10.00 against its budget. Furthermore the CRO will be in contact with WEBCT providers to further investigate this issue and ensure that the offending message is removed.

Penalty

1. A fine of \$10.00 to be levied against the Physical Activity Complex YES Campaign

So decided this Wednesday, March 8 @ 08:11

Time limit for appeal: Wednesday, March 8 @ 08:59

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union



Ruling #6

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

This following is intended as a conclusion to additional information received in conjunction with CRO Ruling #5 – please refer to previous ruling for more details.

Summary of Complaint

Students enrolled in the “UAB – University Athletics Board” course received an announcement and calendar entry via WEBCT sometime prior to 19:00 Tuesday which at the time this ruling was issued, remains online.

Parties to the Complaint

- Mr. Chad Fletcher, Campaign Manager Physical Activity Complex YES Campaign Manager

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 2100, Section 36(a) (Responsibility for Volunteers)
Bylaw 2100, Section 45 (CRO Must Approve Materials)
Bylaw 2100, Section 24 (a) (No use of Non-Universal Resources)
Bylaw 2100, Section 38 (Removal of Materials Before Voting)

Facts

1. The CRO was provided with a screen shot of a WEB CT site that contained three references that read “09:00 – 11:00 PAC VOTE – VOTE YES!!!!”
2. The individual whose WEBCT was used asked that their identity be protected – however provided the additional information that they were a varsity athlete.
3. The Physical Activity Complex YES campaign claims it does not have the ability to post messages to WEBCT.
4. At this point in time it is unknown who posted the messages, and the Elections Office has been unsuccessful in having the messages removed.
5. Bob Boufford with WEBCT identified that the message can be viewed by 387 Students and 18 faculty members enrolled in the course “UAB - University Athletics Board”.
6. The message was posted prior to the end of campaigning and remains online at the time of the ruling.

Ruling

1. Campaigning during voting is unacceptable. However, due to the individualized nature of this message it is not able to be viewed by the general public, and thus does not have wide spread impact beyond the group of individuals who received the message. Regardless, similar to how mass emails encouraging students to

vote are not permitted the posting of a message to WEBCT during voting is not allowed under Bylaw 2100.

2. The Physical Activity Complex Fee YES campaign will be fined \$0.50 for every student to whom the message has been sent, for a total fine of \$193.00. As faculty members cannot vote there will be no fine imposed for these individuals.
3. Additionally the Physical Activity Complex YES campaign must ensure that this message is removed from WEBCT prior to 09:00 Thursday March 9, or they will face further fines.

Penalty

1. A fine of \$193.00 to be levied against the Physical Activity Complex YES Campaign

So decided this Wednesday, March 8 @ 14:29

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union



Ruling #7

March 2006 Executive & BoG Elections and Plebiscites

Summary of Complaint

An email, with content approved by the CRO was sent out to the Outdoors Club with information from all the candidates running for VP Operations and Finance after the end of campaigning.

Parties to the Complaint

- Ms. Theresa Chapman, VP Operations and Finance Candidate
- Mr. Cam Lewis, VP Operations and Finance Candidate
- Mr. Chris Cunningham, VP Operations and Finance Candidate

Applicable Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations

Bylaw 2100, Section 24 (a) (No use of Non-Universal Resources)
Election Rules and Regulations

Facts

1. The content and form of the email sent was approved during the campaigning period – it was communicated to the listserv moderator that the email must be sent prior to 21:00 on Tuesday March 7 (end of campaigning)
2. The email in question was sent out at 23:39 on Tuesday March 7th.

Ruling

1. As the email contained content approved by all the candidates in the race no obvious advantage was gained by any one individual. While it is unfortunate that the message was sent out after the end of campaigning, the reason it was sent out at this time is not due to the actions of the candidates.

Penalty

No penalty shall be assessed

So decided this Thursday, March 9 @ 11:17

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer
University of Alberta Students' Union

Appendix 3: Election-Related DIE Board Rulings

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board **Ruling of the Board**

Reference Re: Bylaw 8451 and Bylaw 2400

Ruling # 2005/2006-03

Date heard: October 26, 2005

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:

Presiding Chair: Jaimie Gruman

Tribunes: Justyna Herman, Catherine Lepine

Appearing for the Applicant:

Mat Johnson, VP Academic
Rachel Woynorowski, CRO

Case summary:

The questions referred to D.I.E. Board deal with the interpretation of Bylaw 8451 and Bylaw 2400. The referendum that is required in order to create a Faculty Association Membership Fee under Bylaw 8451 is not subject to Bylaw 2400. Bylaw 2400 is created with the purpose of governing the initiation, organization and interpretation of any referendum or plebiscite held by the Students' Union. Bylaw 8451 gives the right to Faculty Associations to hold referenda and not to the Students' Union. If Bylaw 2400 governed the initiation, organization and interpretation of a referendum held by a Faculty Association, it would lead to unreasonable result. Specifically, it would entitle all members of the Students' Union to vote in such a referendum. This could not have been intended by the legislators. As such, D.I.E. Board recommends that Students' Council review Bylaw 8451 in light of Bylaw 2400.

REQUEST FOR INTERPRETATION

1. Does the steps of creation outlined in section 6 of Bylaw 8451 need to be done in order (a) through (e)?
2. Does the phrase "the vote shall adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws" mean that it must follow the SU referendum process including prior approval of the question?

3. How must the vote and voting procedure be conducted to be in compliance with relevant Students' Union bylaws?
 - a. Must the approved question be voted on during any election conducted by the Students' Union?
 - b. Must the question appear on a Students' Union produced ballot?
 - c. Must the ballots be counted by the Students' Union, or must the Students' Union verify the result of the referenda?

4. Who is eligible to vote in a faculty fee referenda?
 - a. Are all students enrolled in the faculty as defined by bylaw 8451 eligible to vote (excluding all other faculties)?
 - b. Or in compliance with relevant election bylaws (bylaw 2400) are all members of the Students' Union as defined in bylaw 2400 eligible to vote on a referenda in question?

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2400

2. For the purposes of this bylaw:
 - a. a "member" shall be a member of the Students' Union as defined by Article 1 of the Students' Union Constitution;
 - e. a "referendum" shall be a vote, open to all members except the C.R.O., held on a given question and whose result is legally binding upon the Students' Union;

3. This bylaw shall govern the initiation, organization, and interpretation of any plebiscite or referendum held by the Students' Union.

Bylaw 8451

2. The purpose of the "Faculty Association Membership Fees" is to provide financial support for student activities and the creation of opportunities for student involvement.

3. For the purposes of this Bylaw:
 - b. "Faculty Association Membership Fee" means a fee created specifically for a designated faculty, administered according to the provisions set out in this bylaw.

4. A Faculty Association Membership Fee will only be collected if approved by a 50% +1 majority of the voting **students in that Faculty**, and a minimum voter turnout of 15%. Each student must be given the opportunity to vote in a referendum, **subject to this and other relevant Students' Union bylaws**, and to the bylaws of the Faculty Association.

6. **The following steps must be followed in order to create a Faculty Association Membership Fee:**
 - a. The Faculty Association shall consult with its departmental associations to identify purposes to which the funds collected would be applied.

 - b. Notice of the intent to create a Faculty Association Membership Fee must be forwarded to the Students' Union and the Office of the Registrar by January 15 of the year in which the fee is to be included as a part of the overall fee assessment.

c. A proposal outlining the amount, lifetime, scope, allocation, refund mechanism and distribution of the proposed Faculty Association Membership Fee must be submitted to and approved by Students' Council. This proposal, as approved, governs the implementation and operation of the Faculty Association Membership Fee. The proposal must also address financial oversight over the funds raised by the Faculty Association Membership Fee.

d. The implementation of the fee will be decided by a referendum, in which **all students in the Faculty** must be given the opportunity to vote. **The vote shall adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws.**

e. A formal request to include the Faculty Association Membership Fee assessment for all students within the Faculty must be forwarded to the Office of the Registrar by 1 April, of the year in which the fee is to be initiated. The request must include:

- i. A Short description of the proposed fee;
- ii. Dollar amount to be charged per student, per term;
- iii. Start date to begin collecting the fee;
- iv. End date to cease collecting the fee;
- v. Confirmation of the referendum results;
- vi. Endorsement of the fee by the responsible body of the Faculty Association;
- vii. Endorsement of the fee by Students' Council

ANALYSIS

Question #1

Mr. Johnson and Ms. Woynorowski submit that section 6 of Bylaw 8451 is ambiguous as it can be understood as having two meanings. Section 6 states: *The following steps must be followed in order to create a Faculty Association Membership Fee.* On the first reading, the section requires that the steps listed in subsection (a) to (e) of section 6 must be taken *with the purpose of creating* a Faculty Association Membership Fee. On the other hand, section 6 can be understood as requiring that the steps listed in subsection (a) to (e) of section 6 be followed *in sequence* to create a Faculty Association Membership Fee. Mr. Johnson and Ms. Woynorowski submit that the second reading of the section is correct.

D.I.E. Board agrees with the submission of Mr. Johnson and Ms. Woynorowski and holds that it was the intent of legislators to create a list of events that have to be followed in specified order so that a Membership Association Membership Fee can be created. Section 6 read as a whole, confirms that this is, in fact, the correct interpretation. Specifically, section 6(e) as the last step of the process, lists all the documentation that has to be delivered to the Office of the Registrar; the documentation includes, among other, the confirmation of the referendum (s.6(e)(v)) and endorsement of the fee by Students' Council (s.6(e)(vii)). Clearly, this step has to be taken after the referendum takes place and after Students' Council accepts the fee, which are both steps in section 6. Similar analysis can be applied to the remaining steps.

Question #2

Mr. Johnson and Ms. Woynorowski ask for interpretation of section 6(d) which says: *The implementation of the fee will be decided by a referendum, in which all students*

*in the Faculty must be given the opportunity to vote. **The vote shall adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws.*** Specifically, the question asked focuses on the last sentence of the section. D.I.E Board feels that the last sentence should not be read in isolation and should be read together with the rest of s.6(d). The section clearly states that *all students in the Faculty must be given the opportunity to vote.* The next sentence simply qualifies the word *vote.* Bylaw 8451, s.6(d) stipulates that *the vote,* and not the referendum, *shall adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws.* Accordingly, s.6(d) does not require the referendum process to adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws, Bylaw 2400 in particular. This holding is further supported by section 3 of Bylaw 2400, which states: *This bylaw shall govern the initiation, organization, and interpretation of any plebiscite or referendum held by the Students' Union.* Clearly, in order for Bylaw 2400 to govern a referendum, that referendum has to be held by the Students' Union. In the case of a referendum under Bylaw 8451, it is a Faculty Association that holds the referendum, and not the Students' Union. This is stated in s.5 and s.6(d) of Bylaw 8451.

Question #3

Section 6(d) of Bylaw 8451 states: *The implementation of the fee will be decided by a referendum, in which all students in the Faculty must be given the opportunity to vote. **The vote shall adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws.*** As determined above, section 6(d) requires that the vote and voting procedure comply with all relevant Students' Union bylaws. The bylaw that governs plebiscites and referenda is Bylaw 2400. The relevant sections on voting are sections 61 onward. These are the sections that set out the procedure that is to be followed when casting a vote. Some of the sections pose a problem for Faculty Associations that wish to implement a fee by way of a referendum because they require the C.R.O to make certain decisions. The C.R.O.'s functions are outlined in Bylaw 2500, s.10 and they do not include overseeing the implementation of Bylaw 8451 nor making any decisions under Bylaw 8451. As such, questions 3(a) to (c) are answered in the negative.

D.I.E. Board recommends that the Students' Council review Bylaw 8451 in the context of Bylaw 2400 and 2500.

Question #4

The relevant sections in Bylaw 8451 that are determinative in answering this question are:

Section 4: *A Faculty Association Membership Fee will only be collected if approved by a 50% +1 majority of **the voting students in that Faculty,** and a minimum voter turnout of 15%. Each student must be given the opportunity to vote in a referendum, subject to this and other relevant Students' Union bylaws, and to the bylaws of the Faculty Association.*

Section 6(d): *The implementation of the fee will be decided by a referendum, in which **all students in the Faculty** must be given the opportunity to vote. The vote shall adhere to the relevant Students' Union bylaws.*

Section 3(b) "*Faculty Association Membership Fee*" means **a fee created specifically for a designated faculty**, administered according to the provisions set out in this bylaw.

Bylaw 8451 was created in order to govern the establishment of Faculty Association Membership Fees. Sections 4 and 6(d) clearly state that the referendum is to be voted on by the students **in the Faculty**. D.I.E. Board feels that it is the intention of Bylaw 8451 that only the students that will be affected by the establishment of a new fee should be allowed to vote. It is not reasonable to conclude that Bylaw 8451 is subject to Bylaw 2400 in that respect. If Bylaw 2400 governed the referendum, then pursuant to s.61, all members of the Students' Union would be entitled to vote in that referendum. Clearly, this was not intended by the legislators.

RECOMMENDATIONS

If it is the intention of Students' Council to have Bylaw 2400 govern the referendum process that a Faculty Association must conduct in order to create a Faculty Association Membership Fee, they should do so in plain and direct language and redraft section 6 of Bylaw 8451. Should it be the intention of Students' Council that Bylaw 2400 *not* govern the referendum process mentioned above, they should amend Bylaw 8451 and add a section that deals with the administration of the referendum.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judiciary branch of the Student's Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Student's Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca.

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board ***Ruling of the Board***

Style of Cause: *Re Bylaw 2400 s.7*

Ruling # 4

Date heard: October 27, 2005

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:

Presiding Chair: Alex Ragan

Tribunes: Chris Stolfa, Alan Cliff

Appearing for the referring party:
Stephen Kirkham

Intervenors present:
Rachel Woynorowski, Chief Returning Officer

Case summary:

This case interprets the wording of bylaw 2400, section 7, which concerns petitions for plebiscites. D.I.E. found:

1. The ‘following February 1’ in section 7 of bylaw 2400 refers to the next February 1 occurring after the C.R.O. has received a petition conforming to the bylaw.
2. The 90 day period in section 7 of bylaw 2400 refers to the 90 days preceding the C.R.O.’s receipt of the petition.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

1. What is the interpretation of the words “as of the following February 1” in bylaw 2400(7)?
2. What is the interpretation of the words “within ninety (90) days of submission of the petition” in bylaw 2400(7)?

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2400 (7)

Where a petition bearing the names, signatures, and student identification numbers of at least five percent (5%) of the total membership of the Students’ Union as of the following February 1 requesting a plebiscite on a given Students’ Council-approved question is submitted to the C.R.O., then a plebiscite shall be held on that question, provided that the names, signatures, and student identification numbers were all collected within ninety (90) days of submission of the petition.

ANALYSIS

1. What is the interpretation of the words “as of the following February 1” in bylaw 2400(7)?

The words “as of the following February 1” refer to the next February 1 after the C.R.O. has received a petition conforming to all the requirements set out in the bylaw. For example, a petition submitted before or on January 31, 2006 must bear the signatures of at least five percent of the total SU membership as of February 1, 2006. Petitions

submitted from February 1, 2006 until January 31 2007 must conform to the SU membership as of February 1, 2007. Given the clear language of the provision, i.e. ‘the following’, this is the only possible grammatical interpretation. There is no language in section 7, or anywhere else in bylaw 2400, that suggests that ‘the following’ refers in any way to an academic year as suggested.

The date of February 1 was likely chosen because January 31 is the deadline for tuition fee payment. By counting SU membership on February 1 the total student population will not be inflated by students who drop out within the first month of winter term. The February 1 date creates a fair total number of SU members from which five percent may be calculated. However the date of February 1 creates some technical difficulties for the C.R.O. and petitioners.

Creating a benchmark for the total number of signatories that can only be ascertained in the future means that petitioners will not know if they truly have enough signatures until February 1. Yet, petitioners cannot wait until February 1 to submit their petition because signatures submitted on or after February 1 must be tallied according to the SU membership as of the following February 1.

Section 10 of bylaw 2400 states that a valid petition submitted at least 30 days before a general election will cause the referendum or plebiscite in question to occur at that election. This section in conjunction with section 7 is a trap for the unwary. A petition may only be valid if it conforms to SU membership on the following February 1. Specifically, a petition submitted after January 31 but at least 30 days before elections cannot be a valid petition until the following February 1 and the plebiscite cannot be held until the next general election after the following February 1.

We would like to add that because section 8 of bylaw 2400 contains similar wording to that found in section 7 the preceding analysis applies equally to section 8.

2. What is the interpretation of the words “within ninety (90) days of submission of the petition” in bylaw 2400(7)?

The words “within ninety days” means the 90 day prior to the C.R.O. receiving the petition. In other words, all the signatures on a petition must have been obtained within the 90 days prior to the petition being submitted to the C.R.O. The word ‘submission’ in this provision refers to the submission by the petitioners to the C.R.O. The petition must be submitted to several bodies prior to submission to the C.R.O., specifically the Bylaw Committee and Students’ Council. However, because the provision in question only deals with a submission to the C.R.O. and does not refer to any other submissions, it would be nonsensical to interpret ‘submission’ in reference to any other body other than the C.R.O.

As well, all the signatures on the petition must be obtained after the Students’ Council has approved the question. Petitioners should also beware, Students’ Council approval is considered a ‘miscellaneous motion’ of the Council, so approval will expire the following April 30 pursuant to bylaw 400 section 4(b).

We would like to add that because section 8 of bylaw 2400 contains similar wording to that found in section 7 the preceding analysis applies equally to section 8.

DISPOSITION AND REMEDY IMPOSED

1. The ‘following February 1’ in section 7 of bylaw 2400 refers to the next February 1 occurring after the C.R.O. has received a petition conforming to the bylaw.
2. The 90 day period in section 7 of bylaw 2400 refers to the 90 days preceding the C.R.O.’s receipt of the petition.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Students’ Council should reconsider the wording and meaning of bylaw 2400 and consider a revision.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judiciary branch of the Student’s Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Student’s Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca .

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board ***Ruling of the Board***

Style of Cause: *Re Bylaw 2400 “law”*

Ruling: # 5

Date heard: October 27, 2005

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:

Presiding Chair: Alex Ragan

Tribunes: Chris Stolfa, Alan Cliff

Appearing for the Applicant:

Stephen Kirkham

Intervenors present:

Rachel Woynorowski, Chief Returning Officer

Case summary:

The referring party queries what the definition of the term “law” is as used in s. 4(b) of bylaw 2400. The Board finds that the term is not synonymous with the term “legislation” as defined in bylaw 400. Rather, within this context, the term “law” indicates only bylaws passed by Students’ Council.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

The referring party queries:

What is the interpretation of the term “law” in Bylaw 2400(4)(b)?

- (a) Is the term synonymous with “legislation” as defined by Bylaw 400(1)?
- (b) If not, how does the term “law” differ?

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2400

4. Where a member wishes to circulate a petition, that member shall submit to the Bylaw Committee the intent of the question, and the Bylaw Committee shall approve, within seven (7) days, a question which:

- a. fully reflects the intent submitted by the member; and
- b. if carried and acted upon, would not violate any Students’ Union law or any federal or provincial statute or regulation.

Bylaw 400

1. Students’ Union legislation is
 - a. Students’ Union Bylaws;
 - b. Students’ Union Political Policy; and
 - c. miscellaneous motions of Students’ Council.

ANALYSIS

The DIE Board panel finds that the term “law” as used in the context of Bylaw 2400 s.4 (b) refers only to those bylaws passed by the Students’ Council.

The parties present at the hearing emphasized two possible interpretations of the term “law” within this statutory context. First, it was argued that the term could be synonymous with the term “legislation” as defined in Bylaw 400. This definition includes all Students’ Union Bylaws, Students’ Union political policy, and miscellaneous motions of the Students’ Council. The second possible interpretation argued before the panel was that the term “law” refers only to those bylaws passed by the Students’ Council. The panel prefers the latter interpretation over the former for two reasons. First, there are no reasonable grounds for importing the strained definition of “legislation” into

the context of Bylaw 2400 s. 4(b). The term “legislation” in Bylaw 400 – which is to apply to all uses of that term within Students’ Union Bylaws – is not used by s. 4(b) of Bylaw 2400. Accordingly, it is not legally necessary to import this definition into the meaning of “law” within s. 4(b). Rather, the fact that Students’ Council did not use the term “legislation” in this context may be a strong indication that it did not intend to import the statutory definition into s. 4(b). Moreover, adopting such a definition for the term “law” would likely be unwise. The definition of “legislation” in s. 400 is a very strained conception of what legislation, in the ordinary sense, means. Adopting this statutory definition as a definition for the term “law” could be the cause of serious mischief within the Bylaws.

Second, the panel believes for policy reasons that interpretation of “law” should be restrained to Students’ Council bylaws. The spirit behind s. 4(b) of Bylaw 2400 – which deals with student referenda – is to give students the power to change some aspect of the governance of their student association. By adopting an expansive interpretation of the term “law” the ability of students to affect this end would be adversely impacted. For example, if political policy and miscellaneous motions are included in the definition of “law” then students would be precluded from making many changes dealing with the Students’ Union expenditures or political perspective. The ability to make any meaningful change through referenda would be far more limited

For these reasons, the panel finds it appropriate to give the term “law” within s. 4(b) of Bylaw 2400 the restrictive interpretation of simply meaning Students’ Union bylaws.

DISPOSITION AND REMEDY IMPOSED

The DIE Board panel finds that the term “law” as used in the context of Bylaw 2400 s.4 (b) refers only to those bylaws passed by the Students’ Council.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judiciary branch of the Student’s Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Student’s Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca .

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board ***Ruling of the Board***

Style of Cause: Jones vs. Student Council

Ruling # 7

Date heard: November 7 2005

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:
Presiding Chair: Alex Ragan
Tribunes: Justyna Herman, Guillaume Laroche

Appearing for the Applicant: Chris Jones

Appearing for the Respondent: Gregory Harlow, Speaker of Students' Council

Interveners present:
Stephen Kirkham, Councillor
Jason Tobias, VP Operations/Finance
Rachel Woynoroski, CRO

Case summary:

Mr. Jones alleges petition questions he submitted and had drafted by the Bylaw Committee were unduly rejected by Students' Council as per Sections 4 and 5 of Bylaw 2400. The Board finds that while Council contravened the letter of Bylaw 2400, it also recognizes that members acting in bad faith should not be allowed to abuse the processes of the Students' Union.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

Mr. Jones alleges that Students' Council contravened Bylaw 2400, subsections 4a) and 4b) by refusing to accept petition questions brought forward by the Bylaw committee. Effectively, Mr. Jones seeks to know if Council can reject questions on grounds other than those presented in the quoted sections of Bylaw 2400. Mr. Jones seeks that the DIE Board either approve the questions or that it order Council to consider them individually.

FACTS

Member Chris Jones, following the procedures established in Bylaw 2400, submitted a total of twelve questions to the Bylaw Committee for drafting. These twelve questions were drafted over two meetings of the Bylaw Committee and forwarded to Council for their November 1st meeting. Jason Tobias, VP Operations/Finance, moved during that meeting of Students' Council to strike all twelve of Mr. Jones previously approved questions. The motion was eventually carried by Council after several challenges to the Chair.

The facts presented by the appellant are not contested by the respondent.

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2400:

4. Where a member wishes to circulate a petition, that member shall submit to the Bylaw Committee the intent of the question, and the Bylaw Committee shall approve, within seven (7) days, a question which:

- a. fully reflects the intent submitted by the member; and
- b. if carried and acted upon, would not violate any Students' Union law or any federal or provincial statute or regulation.

5. Students' Council shall, at meeting following the drafting of the question by the Bylaw Committee as set out in Section 4, approve a question which meets the criteria set out in Section 4.

ANALYSIS

This case reflects the tension between the literal interpretation of a statute and the implied term in all Students' Union statutes that the processes enshrined in the bylaws are to be used exclusively in good faith. Mr. Jones' submission of numerous petition questions, some of a rather absurd nature, clearly constitute bad faith and an abuse of the processes of the Students' Union. The Board finds that Mr. Jones' actions breached the implied term of good faith in Bylaw 2400 and that Students' Council has the inherent right to reject those submissions attached where *mala fides* can be established. However, the Board feels that a *wholesale* rejection of *all* of Mr. Jones' petition questions was inappropriate. Bad faith must be determined on a case to case basis, and it would be more appropriate for the Students' Council to consider the bad faith of each petition question individually.

Governing institutions do not design their laws to include flaws to be exploited. The continuing functioning of the Students' Union is placed ahead of actions that could cripple the organization when taken to extremes. The Board cites the 2004-5 "U-pass #2" ruling as a precedent for this principle, where the Board previously ruled that where the will of the students, as represented by the result of a referendum, would cause the eventual implosion of the organization, Council is authorized to not pursue the directive any further. Similarly, if questions submitted (ie, the intent of a member) in bad faith either by result or by sheer number were to hinder Council or its subcommittees in their efforts to go about their ordinary business, Council will have the right to reject such questions.

DISPOSITION AND REMEDY IMPOSED

- a. The Board orders that Students' Council reconsider all of Mr. Jones questions on an individual basis. The Board authorizes Students' Council to reject by simple majority any question that could reasonably be determined to have been submitted in bad faith by any member.

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2400

Section 2 (d) a “plebiscite” shall be a vote, open to all members except the C.R.O., held on a given question but that is not binding;

Section 2 (e) a “referendum” shall be a vote, open to all members except the C.R.O., held on a given question and whose result is legally binding upon the Students’ Union;

ANALYSIS

1. Meaning of “Students’ Union

The term “Students’ Union” in section 2 (e) of bylaw 2400 refers to all members of the Students’ Union and all bodies of the Students’ Union. The issue in this question is whether the term “Students’ Union” means each individual member, Students’ Council and other various SU bodies, or both. No persuasive reason could be found not to give the term “Students’ Union” an inclusive meaning. “Students’ Union” could not mean individual members of the SU because Section 2(e) refers to individual members as “all members”. It would be unconventional to give two different terms in one section of legislation the same meaning. For similar reasons, it would be unconventional to restrict the meaning of “Students’ Union” to Students’ Council or any combination of SU bodies, boards, committees, offices, etc.. Other sections of Bylaw 2400 explicitly mention Students’ Council, Bylaw Committee, and D.I.E. Board. If section 2(e) meant any specific SU body it would say so explicitly. Without any evidence suggesting a more restricted definition of “Students’ Union” the term must be interpreted as inclusive of SU members and SU bodies.

Regarding the citation of the Post Secondary Learning Act, S.A. 2003, c. P-19.5, in the reference question. D.I.E. Board would like to point out that the Board’s enabling legislation, Bylaw 1500 section 4, allows the Board to hear complaints and requests regarding contravention or interpretation of Students’ Union legislation. Interpretation or application of the Post Secondary Learning Act is beyond the scope of D.I.E. Board.

2. Effects of Plebiscites and Referenda

According to the definition of “plebiscite” and “referendum” in section 2 of Bylaw 2400, only a referendum is binding on the Students’ Union. Bylaw 2400 section 2(d) explicitly states that a plebiscite is not binding and section 2(e) explicitly states that a referendum is binding upon the Students’ Union. While the above statements answer the reference question, D.I.E. Board feels it should briefly comment on the nature of plebiscites and referenda as set out in Bylaw 2400.

Plebiscites are not binding. (Bylaw 2400 section 2(d)) In order for a plebiscite to be initiated, by anyone other than Students' Council, signatures of 5% of SU members must be collected. (Bylaw 2400 section 7 and 9, see also D.I.E. Board rulings *Re Bylaw 2400 s.7* and *Re Bylaw 2400 "law"*)

Referenda are binding. (Bylaw 2400 section 2(e)) In order for a referendum to be initiated, by anyone other than Students' Council, signatures of 15% of SU members must be collected. (Bylaw 2400 section 8 and 9, see also D.I.E. Board rulings *Re Bylaw 2400 s.7* and *Re Bylaw 2400 "law"*)

All other sections of Bylaw 2400 treat plebiscites and referenda identically. While the percentage of signatures necessary to initiate a plebiscite or referendum is technical in nature, the difference between binding and non-binding is crucial in distinguishing the terms. The term "binding" and the obligations it imposes have already been discussed in the D.I.E. Board's 04/05 rulings of *Re: Universal Bus Pass Referendum #1* and *Re: Universal Bus Pass Referendum #2* and need not be repeated here.

The expression "not binding" obviously entails a lesser obligation on the Students' Union than the term "binding". This is backed up by a common sense reading of the terms and the different signatory requirement for petitions. However, a plebiscite still represents the will of a majority of voting SU members and cannot be ignored. Because a plebiscite is an expression of the entire SU, any decision making body of the SU should take into consideration the results of a plebiscite when making decisions. When taking plebiscite results into consideration, decision makers are not obliged to strictly adhere to plebiscite results. The decision makers must think about the plebiscite results and consider the relationship between the results and the decision before them. Plebiscite results demand the respect of the Students' Union but cannot dictate any particular course of action.

DISPOSITION AND REMEDY IMPOSED

1. Question:

Are the students, other than the graduate students, of The University of Alberta synonymous with the term "Students' Union" as used in Bylaw 2400 §§ 2(d) and 2(e)? If not, – how does the term "Students' Union" in Bylaw 2400 §§ 2(d) and 2(e) differ from the set of students, other than graduate students, of The University of Alberta for the purposes of the Post-Secondary Learning Act, § 93(2)?

Answer:

The term "Students' Union" in section 2 (e) of bylaw 2400 refers to all members of the Students' Union and all bodies of the Students' Union.

2. Question:

Would a vote conducted by the Students' Union, The University of Alberta, that would bind the students, other than the graduate students, of The University of Alberta be properly held as a plebiscite or as a referendum for Bylaw 2400 purposes?

Answer:

According to the definition of “plebiscite” and “referendum” in section 2 of Bylaw 2400, only a referendum is binding on the Students’ Union.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judiciary branch of the Student’s Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Student’s Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca .

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board
Ruling of the Board

Style of Cause: Langstone v. Students’ Council (re. Pint Petition)

Ruling # 9

Date heard: Dec. 7 2005.

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:

Presiding Chair: Alex Ragan

Tribunes: Catherine Lepine, Alan Cliff

Appearing for the Applicant: Andrew Langstone

Interveners present:

Jason Tobias, Vice President (Operations and Finance)

Stephen Kirkham, Councillor

Rachel Woynorowski, Chief Returning Officer

M. Mustafa Hirji

Amicus Curiae:

M. Mustafa Hirji

Stephen Kirkham

Case summary:

Mr. Langstone’s petition question was denied approval by Students’ Council because of allegations that, if implemented, it would breach the “fiduciary obligations” of Council. The panel finds that Council must have reasonable evidentiary grounds to believe that a question violates specific provision or federal statutes or regulations before it can deny approval under bylaw 2400. Council is ordered to reconsider the petition question at its next meeting, and Mr. Langstone is given leave to collect signatures in the interim.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

Mr. Langstone alleges that his petition question drafted by the bylaw committee pursuant to *Bylaw 2400* s.(5) was wrongfully denied approval by Students' Council. Langstone questions the authority of Council to dismiss petition questions outside of the criteria specified in *2400* s.(4), and asks that his petition question be approved in accordance with s.(5).

FACTS

The applicant submitted a petition question the bylaw committee on October 24th. The Bylaw committee drafted a question, and submitted it to Students' Council at its November 1st meeting. However, as Mr. Langstone did not feel that the question met his intent, he revised his original intent and resubmitted it. Bylaw committee re-drafted the question, and submitted it to Council on November 15th. At that meeting, the question was ruled out of order by the Speaker based on *Bylaw 2400* s.(4)(b), on the basis that it ostensibly violated Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission guidelines. The petition question was further revised, and considered at the Students' Council meeting of the 29th of November. At that meeting, Students' Council voted that the revised question did not breach the ALGC guidelines in a manner that would require non-approval under the violation criteria of s.4(b). The question was then, however, ruled out of order by the Speaker on the basis of a possible transgression of the Students' Council's "fiduciary obligation" to the Students' Union. The ruling of the chair was appealed, and Council voted to uphold the ruling.

Vice President Tobias asserted that a legal opinion has been sought, but that the timeline on receiving the brief is uncertain.

While there was no respondent appearing specifically authorized to speak for Council, none of the interveners contested the facts as presented.

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2400 s.5 states that "Students' Council shall [...] approve a question which meets the criteria set out in Section 4."

Under s.6, Students' Council is excused from approving questions which do not meet the criteria under s.4(a) that a question "fully [reflect] the intent" and s.4(b) "not violate any Students' Union law or any federal or provincial statute or regulation."

Bylaw 1500 s.4 limits the Board to interpreting, and considering infractions of "Students' Union Legislation," which is defined in *Bylaw 400*.

The question submitted by bylaw committee to Students' Council on November 29th read:

Do you support that Students' Union bars charge \$2.00 for all pints* of draught beer effective May 1, 2006 through April 30, 2007 subject to the following conditions?

1. Draught beer will be sold in pint* volumes whenever alcohol is served.
 2. Other volumes of draught beer may be sold at any price.
 3. The existing selection of draught beer will continue to be carried.
 4. Where the wholesale cost of a pint* of draught beer is in excess of \$2.00, its price will be set at wholesale cost rounded up to the nearest dollar.
- *A pint is 16 fluid ounces (473 mL).

ANALYSIS

While Vice-President Tobias presented arguments to the effect that implementing the plebiscite question would be massively deleterious to the students' union, there was no compelling reason given to believe that this would in fact violate any specific "federal or provincial statute or regulation". While the Board respects the desire of Council to maintain its "fiduciary obligations," those obligations can only justify non-approval of petition questions when they are sufficiently grievous to constitute a violation of *Bylaw 2400 s.4(b)*.

It is worth noting that s.4(b) explicitly refers to federal and provincial "statutes and regulation", necessarily excluding the common law. For a question to be discarded under that criterion, it must be shown that the question violates a specific statute or regulation. "Common law ideas" are insufficient.

It is entirely possible that there exists a provincial or federal statute or regulation reflecting the idea of fiduciary obligation, or otherwise importing the concept. However, neither Council nor the D.I.E. Board is legally qualified to determine definitively whether or not this is the case. Further, ascertaining whether or not this particular question would in fact violate such a restriction is beyond the capabilities of either body.

When Council determines whether or not a question is illegitimate under s.4(b), it must act reasonably. There must be firm grounds on which to believe that the Question, if implemented, would violate SU bylaws or Federal or Provincial statute or regulation, before that question can be denied approval. The standard for acceptable grounds for dismissal are ones of reasonableness: could a reasonable student have come to the same conclusion that the petition question violated federal or provincial statutes or regulations?

Questions of straightforward illegality (e.g., a question proposing the execution of a member of the Students' Union) should not require legal counsel to deny approval.

Questions of highly uncertain legality, though, probably will. It is not acceptable that Council deny approval merely on the unsubstantiated suspicion of violation of s.4(b).

While several interveners questioned the procedural justification of the Speaker of Students' Council in ruling the question out of order, that matter was not addressed directly by the applicant. Insufficient argumentation was heard to rule definitively on the issue.

DISPOSITION AND REMEDY IMPOSED

As Council did not have sufficiently reasonable grounds to believe that the petition question necessarily violated the criterion of s.4(b), it acted wrongly in denying approval to the question.

Council's failure to approve the question in the timeframe specified by *Bylaw 2400* has caused material harm to the applicant; the time remaining to collect signatures has been depleted. To mitigate this damage, the board grants interim approval to the question submitted on November 29th. Mr. Langstone may, if he so chooses, begin collecting signatures on that question immediately. However, the question will not go on the ballot unless and until it receives the approval of Students' Council, as well as the requisite number of signatures. In the event that Students' Council justly denies approval to the question as written, the previously collected signatures will be void.

The Board rules that Students' Council must reconsider the petition question at its meeting on 11 January 2006. If Council wishes to deny approval on the grounds of breach of fiduciary obligation, it must have reasonable evidence to suggest that such a breach constitutes a violation of "Students' Union law or any federal or provincial statute or regulation." In this case, reasonable grounds would most likely constitute a legal brief indicating that implementing the proposed question would necessarily result in a breach of a particular federal or provincial statute or regulation.

The decision of Students' Council is, of course, subject to appeal to the D.I.E. Board under *Bylaw 1500* s.4(a).

The Board would further remind Students' Council that it has control over its own bylaws. If the bylaws lead to breaches of fiduciary obligations, or other Bad Things, the correct response is to change the bylaws, rather than ignore them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The lack of a clearly defined respondent present at the hearing was regrettable. While Councilor Kirkham and Vice President Tobias were able to provide perspective as sitting members of council, neither was designated to speak *for* Council. Council ought to appoint an individual to represent it before hearings of the Board. The panel would remind Council that under *D.I.E. Board Protocols* s.7(b), the board is entitled to “summarily rule against the Respondent where that party or his agent does not appear.”

If Students’ Council does not wish to approve questions that, if acted upon, would breach common law principles or otherwise subject the Students’ Union to liability, it ought to modify the bylaw to include these as grounds for dismissal under *Bylaw 2400* s.6.

When Students’ Council is unable to reasonably reach a definitive conclusion about a question’s compliance with s.4(b), it need not immediately deny that question approval. Instead, interim approval could be granted, pending legal counsel. If Council determines after the fact that the question was, in fact, a violation of s.4(b), it retains its power to reconsider the motion to approve the question.

The panel was surprised that no provision exists in SU bylaws to clarify the “fiduciary obligations” of Council relating both to petition questions and other orders. If Council wishes to refer to such a principle in the future, it should be enunciated clearly in bylaw.

Students’ Council is strongly encouraged to record more rigorous documentation of its meetings. It is not logistically feasible to expect applicants, interveners, and members of the board to go through MP3 minutes to seek background information for rulings on points of order and the like. While Orders and Procedures are certainly useful at times, it is imperative that the D.I.E. board have access to them in a timely manner.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judicial branch of the Student’s Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Students’ Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca .

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board
Ruling of the Board

Re: *Campaign Materials*

Ruling: # 11

Date heard: February 17 2006

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board:

Presiding Chair: Jaimie Gruman

Tribunes: Alan Cliff, Kanchana Fernando

Referring Party:

Rachel Woynorowski – Chief Returning Officer

Intervenors present:

None.

Case summary:

The referring party asks whether material produced by the elections office containing information about candidates, slates, and plebiscite sides (e.g., the Gateway supplement) constitute campaign materials. The panel finds that, in general, they do not. The panel further rules that costs associated with such materials are not considered to constitute campaign expenses. The panel also determines that the elections office is not restricted from distributing these materials during voting.

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS

Bylaw 2100 s.2(d) defines campaign activity as “any act, planned or organized on behalf of any candidate or slate, that is calculated to draw attention to that candidate or slate’s candidacy.”

Bylaw 2100 s.2(n) defines campaign materials as “physical or electronic media produced or distributed as part of campaign activities.”

Bylaw 2100 s.2(f) defines campaign expenses as “expenditures incurred in engaging in campaign activities.”

Bylaw 2100 s.106 states that “during voting, candidates shall not encourage members to vote or engage in any campaign activities.”

REFERRED QUESTIONS AND SHORT ANSWERS

Question 1: Are materials produced by the Elections Office considered campaign materials where each candidate (campaign side) in a race is given an equal opportunity to participate?

Short Answer: No.

Question 2: Are the materials mentioned above considered to be campaign expenses, and should these be included in a candidate's final budget?

Short Answer: No.

Question 3: Can the Elections Office distribute these materials during voting?

Short Answer: Yes.

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS

Under *Bylaw 2100* s.2(n), campaign materials are “produced or distributed as part of campaign activities,” which, under s.2(d) are “planned or organized on behalf of any candidate or slate [and] calculated to draw attention to that candidate or slate’s candidacy.” As long as materials produced by the Election Office are calculated to draw attention to the election as a whole, or a particular race, rather than any single candidate or slate, they are not campaign materials. As the production and dissemination of these materials does not constitute a campaign activity, costs incurred are not campaign expenses and need not be included in candidates’ budgets.

Bylaw 2100 s.106 restricts candidates from “encourag[ing] members to vote [and] engag[ing] in any campaign activities” during voting. As long as the elections staff are not candidates, s.106 does not prevent them from distributing election information and encouraging members to vote.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judiciary branch of the Student’s Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Student’s Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca .

Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board ***Ruling of the Board***

Style of Cause: *Michelle Kelly v. C.R.O.*

Ruling # 14 **Date heard:** March 7, 2006

Appearing for the D.I.E. Board: **Presiding Chair:** Alex Ragan, **Tribunes:** Justyna Herman, James Koizumi

Appearing for the Applicant: Michelle Kelly

Appearing for the Respondent: Rachel Woynorowski, C.R.O.

Interveners present:

Greg Harlow, Speaker of the Students' Council

Teresa Chapman, candidate in SU elections

CASE SUMMARY: Michelle Kelly, former Presidential Candidate, is appealing the ruling of the C.R.O. which denied her reinstatement as a candidate in the 2006 Executive Elections. The D.I.E. Board dismissed the appeal by Ms. Kelly on the grounds that the bottle of green paint was a campaign expense and could not be taken off the candidate's final budget. The purchase of the paint could not be characterized as a buffering expense.

FACTS

Michelle Kelly exceeded the allowed budget of \$500.00 in campaigning expenses and was disqualified by the C.R.O. pursuant to s.79 of Bylaw 2100. Ms. Kelly's internal and external expenditures totalled \$491.06. In addition to that sum, Ms. Kelly was fined \$5 for failing to set up a table and was further fined \$10 for failing to attend the Daily Candidates Meeting. As such, Ms. Kelly's budget reached \$506.06 and she was disqualified by the C.R.O. Ms. Kelly argued that the final budget submitted for her campaign was incorrect as it included the cost of one bottle of paint that was not used in her campaign. Ms. Kelly argues that she should be allowed to deduct the cost of the said bottle (\$8.80) because it is not a campaign expense incurred in engaging in campaign activities. This deduction would cause Ms. Kelly to fit within the prescribed \$500 campaign expense limit. Ms. Kelly argues that her candidacy should be reinstated.

The C.R.O. contends that Bylaw 2100 does not provide for amendment to the budget once submitted by the candidates. Further, the C.R.O. argues that it is not possible for her to verify that the bottle of paint that Ms. Kelly claims to have bought but not used in her campaign is in fact the same bottle that was purchased by Ms. Kelly and evidenced on the receipt, or whether the paint was acquired at a later date. The C.R.O. believes that she has no ability to reinstate a disqualified candidate.

RELEVANT LEGAL PROVISIONS*Bylaw 1500*

s.2 The Board is the organ of the Students' Union responsible for the interpretation and enforcement of Students' Union legislation.

Bylaw 2100

s.2(d) a "campaign activity" shall be any act, planned or organized by or on behalf of any candidate or slate, that is calculated to draw attention to that candidate or slate's candidacy;

s.2(f) a "campaign expense" shall be any expenditures incurred in engaging incampaign activities;

33. *On every weekday during the Campaign, the C.R.O. shall hold a daily meeting, at which he/she shall review complaints, rulings, regulations, procedures, and announcements.*

34. *Each candidate shall either attend each daily meeting himself/herself or designate, in writing, a representative who will attend.*

35. *Where a candidate contravenes Section 33, he/she shall be fined ten dollars (\$10.00) for each meeting at which he/she is in contravention, and he/she shall not be assessed any further penalty.*

63. *No candidate shall accrue more than five hundred dollars (\$500.00) in campaign expenses, all of which shall be paid by the Students' Union.*

s.78 *The C.R.O. shall review all campaign expense records, and shall post summaries of same more than twelve (12) working hours prior to the commencement of voting.*

s.79 ***Where the C.R.O. determines that a candidate or slate has exceeded or falsified its campaign expense limit, that candidate or slate shall be disqualified, and notice of this shall be posted with the campaign expense records, and communicated directly to the candidate or slate in question.***

s.80 *The D.I.E. Board shall convene a meeting less than twelve (12) working hours prior to the commencement of voting for the purpose of hearing and ruling on all appeals of the C.R.O.'s rulings.*

82. *The D.I.E. Board shall, at the meeting set out in Section 78, either:*

- a. *rule on all appeals; or*
- b. *order a delay to the Election*

128. *Penalties available to the C.R.O. shall include:*

- a. ***a fine, to be counted against the candidate's campaign expenses;***

132. *Any member shall be entitled to appeal a ruling of the C.R.O. to the D.I.E. Board.*

ANALYSIS

Issue: Is one bottle of unused paint, purchased with the intent to be used in a campaign activity, but not actually used in the candidate's campaign, a campaign expense for the purposes of Bylaw 2100?

Held: Yes.

Ms. Kelly concedes that she purchased the bottle of paint with the intent to use it in a campaign activity. She argues that she did not actually use that bottle of paint in her campaign activity, and therefore the paint should not be included in the budget as a campaign expense.

Bylaw 2100 defines “campaign expense” in s.2(f) as *any expenditures incurred in engaging in campaign activities*. “Campaign activities” is defined in s.2(d) as *any act, planned or organized by or on behalf of any candidate or slate, that is calculated to draw attention to that candidate or slate’s candidacy*. The D.I.E. Board holds that the bottle of paint, purchased on February 23, 2006 together with five other campaign expenses, is a campaign expense even though it was not actually used by the candidate. The definition of “campaign activity” is clearly set out in Bylaw 2100. It states “any act, ***planned or organized ... that is calculated to draw attention*** to that candidate.” The Bylaw does not require that the activity be actually carried out. Ms. Kelly bought the paint with the intent to use it in her campaign activities. In other words, the purchase of the disputed bottle of paint and other campaign expenses, was a planned act that was calculated to draw attention to Ms. Kelly as a Presidential Candidate.

Issue: Is the bottle of paint a buffering expense which can be taken off the budget if not used in the campaign activity?

Answer: No.

The C.R.O. concedes that candidates are allowed to buffer certain sums in the final budget. The two instances of buffering are (1) budgeting a sum for potential fines incurred in the campaign (2) budgeting a sum for last minute campaigning expenses to be used on the Monday and Tuesday before the elections. This means that candidates are allowed to budget an estimate amount for unforeseen or uncertain expenses. If the candidates do not, in fact, use the estimated amount, or use only a portion of it, the C.R.O. will adjust their budget accordingly. Clearly, the candidates are not allowed to exceed the allowed \$500.

Ms. Kelly argues that the bottle of unused paint was not used in her campaign, therefore the cost of the paint should be taken off the budget. She argues that this was an instance of buffering.

The D.I.E. Board holds that the purchase of the paint was not buffering. Ms. Kelly purchased the paint on February 23, 2006, therefore it is hardly a last minute campaigning expense. Moreover, Ms. Kelly wished to take off the cost of the bottle of paint of the budget after it exceeded the allowed \$500. Had Ms. Kelly not incurred the fines of \$5 and \$15, she would satisfy the requirement of s.63 of Bylaw 2100.

Issue: Should the \$10 fine for missing a campaign meeting have been a fine against materials in kind rather than a fine against campaign expenses?

Answer: No.

Ms. Kelly argues that the \$10 fine required under Bylaw 2100 for missing the Chief Returning Officer's daily meeting should have been levied in a manner that would not affect her campaign expenses. More specifically, Ms. Kelly suggests that the CRO should have fined her \$10 in kind (i.e. by denying her some campaign materials) rather than \$10 against her campaign expenses.

This avenue of argument is untenable in light of the wording of s. 35, which states "Where a candidate contravenes Section 33, he/she shall be fined ten dollars (\$10.00) for each meeting at which he/she is in contravention, and he/she shall not be assessed any further penalty." This specifically mandates a fine to the candidate to the exclusion of other remedies.

DISPOSITION

For all of the above reasons, Ms. Kelly's appeal of the C.R.O ruling is dismissed. The C.R.O. followed the rules which required her to disqualify a candidate who exceeds \$500 in campaigning expenses. Pursuant to s.79, the C.R.O was justified in disqualifying Ms. Kelly from the 2006 Executive Elections.

The Discipline, Interpretation And Enforcement (D.I.E.) Board functions as the judiciary branch of the Student's Union, and is responsible for interpreting and enforcing all Student's Union legislation. If anyone has any questions regarding the D.I.E. Board, feel free to contact the Chair, Alex Ragan, at ea@su.ualberta.ca

Appendix 4: 2006 Election Results & Statistics

Prepared by Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer 2005/2006

1 September 2005 By-Election

1.1 Students' Council Results

1.1.1 Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics

Round	Amanda Rajotte	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	25	3	28	15	0	28	Elected : Amanda Rajotte

Elected (1): Amanda Rajotte

1.1.2 Business

Round	Ryan Payne	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	50	4	54	28	1	55	Elected: Ryan Payne

Elected (1): Ryan Payne

1.1.3 Native Studies

Round	Matt Wildcat	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	24	1	25	13	0	25	Elected: Matt Wildcat

Elected (1): Matt Wildcat

1.1.4 Nursing

Round	Nadia Ickert	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	11	0	11	6	2	13	Elected: Nadia Ickert

Elected (1): Nadia Ickert

1.1.5 Open Studies

Round	Sabine Stephan	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	6	0	6	4	0	6	Elected: Sabine Stephan

Elected (1): Sabine Stephan

1.1.6 Science

Round	Chris Le	Brendan Trayner	Theresa Chapman	Keith Candersluis	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	91	32	33	16	6	178	90	1	179	Elected: Chris Le
2	Won	49	64	24	21	158	80	21	179	
3	Won	52	71	25	Elim	148	75	31	179	
4	Won	54	86	Elim	Elim	140	71	39	179	Councillor-in-Waiting (1): Theresa Chapman
5	Won	86	Won	43	25	154	78	25	179	Councillor-in-Waiting (2): Brendan Trayner
6	Won	Won	Won	108	37	145	73	34	179	Councillor-in-Waiting (3): Keith Vandersluis

Elected (1): Chris Le

Councillor-in-Waiting (1): Theresa Chapman

Councillor-in-Waiting (2): Brendan Trayner

Councillor-in-Waiting (3): Keith Vandersluis

1.2 General Faculties Council Results

1.2.1 Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics

Round	Amanda Rajotte	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	25	3	28	15	0	28	Elected: Amanda Rajotte

Elected (1): Amanda Rajotte

1.2.2 Arts

Round	Rachel Mwesigye	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	48	11	59	30	3	62	Elected: Rachel Mwesigye

Elected (1): Rachel Mwesigye

1.2.3 Medicine and Dentistry

Round	Wen Wen Shan	None of he Above	Total Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Spoiled	Total Physical Ballots	
1	20	1	21	11	0	21	Elected: Wen Wen Shan

Elected (1): Wen Wen Shan

1.3 Turnout Statistics

September 2005 By-Election

Faculty	Turnout	# Eligible Voters	% Turnout
Native Studies	25	182	13.7%
Science	178	6117	2.9%
Business	54	2095	2.6%
Med/Dent	21	889	2.4%
Ag/For/HE	28	1484	1.9%
Arts	59	6346	0.9%
Nursing	11	1500	0.7%
Open Studies	6	1041	0.6%
Total	382	19654	1.9%

Comparative Turnout

Faculty	% Turnout 2004 By-Election	% Turnout 2005 Councillor Election	% Turnout 2005 By-Election
Native Studies	-	-	13.7%
Science	1.5%	5.7%	2.9%
Business	-	0.8%	2.6%
Med/Dent	12.3%	8.3%	2.4%
Ag/For/HE	1.2%	2.0%	1.9%
Arts	1.0%	1.9%	0.9%
Nursing	-	-	0.7%
Open Studies	-	-	0.6%
Education	0.7%	0.7%	-
FSJ	13.9%	23.0%	-
Law	-	58.2%	-
Augustana	n/a	14.1%	-
Engineering	-	3.6%	-
Phys Ed	-	0.7%	-
Total	2.1%	5.1%	1.9%

2 March 2006 Main Campus Executive Election and Plebiscites

2.1 Results

2.1.1 President

Round	Greg German	Samantha Power	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	1864	3393	432	362	5689	2845	6051

Elected: Samantha Power

2.1.2 Vice President (Academic)

Round	Amanda Henry	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	4573	840	638	5413	2707	6051

Elected: Amanda Henry

2.1.3 Vice President (External)

Round	Bythe Morrow	Dave Cournoyer	Damini Mohan	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	1751	2036	981	632	651	5400	2701	6051
2	1790	2064	1022	*	1175	4876	2439	6051
3	2094	2513	*	*	1444	4607	2304	6051

Elected: Dave Cournoyer

2.1.4 Vice President (Operations & Finance)

Round	Chris Cunningham	Theresa Chapman	Cam Lewis	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	2021	1797	712	776	745	5306	2654	6051
2	2234	2089	*	804	924	5127	2564	6051
3	2292	2184	*	*	1575	4476	2239	6051

Elected: Chris Cunningham

2.1.5 Vice President (Student Life)

Round	Sarah Kalil	Amanda-Leigh Hanson	Omer Yusuf	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	1610	698	2721	453	569	5482	2742	6051
2	1628	717	2760	*	946	5105	2553	6051

Elected: Omer Yusuf

2.1.6 Undergraduate Board of Governors Representative

Round	Chris Samuel	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	4520	725	806	5245	2623	6051

Elected: Chris Samuel

2.1.7 Physical Activity Complex Fee Plebiscite

Round	YES	NO	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	2569	3329	153	5898	2950	6051

Elected: NO Side (Proposed Physical Activity Complex Fee Fails)

2.1.8 Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban Plebiscite

Round	YES	NO	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	3612	2306	133	5918	2960	6051

Elected: YES Side (Proposed Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban Plebiscite Passes)

2.2 Polling Station Statistics

2.2.1 How Statistics Were Compiled

CNS Questionnaire Services printed unique ballot identification numbers on each ballot. Election staff members then signed out the ballots to each polling station and recorded the ballot numbers. This allowed the ballots to be traced back to a specific polling station after they were aggregated for counting. This also allowed for results to be broken down by polling station.

The student identification numbers of voters were recorded in the voter authentication system when they cast a ballot. The secrecy of each voter's ballot is secure as there is never at any time a link between a student's identification number and the ballot identification number. Due to this security measure it is impossible to determine how the vote broke down for a specific faculty or year.

The total number of physical ballots counted was larger than the number listed here because these numbers (with the exception of Augustana) were derived from the electronic voters' list. There were five more physical ballots counted than names crossed off the electronic voters' list. The most likely reason for this discrepancy is election staff error when using the online voters' list.

2.2.2 Number of Votes at Polling Stations by Day

Location	Wed (8)	Thu (9)	N/A	Total	% Grand Total
Advance Poll			42	42	0.7%
AgFor	90	54		144	2.4%
Augustana			217	217	3.6%
BioSci	117	81		198	3.3%
CAB #1	208	133		341	5.6%
CAB #2	516	409		925	15.3%
CompSci	202	12		214	3.5%
CorbettHall	10	13		23	0.4%
Education	143	117		260	4.3%
ETLC	262	168		430	7.1%
FacStJean	55	50		105	1.7%
HUB-Mural	131	95		226	3.7%
Humanities	103	60		163	2.7%
Law	59	71		130	2.1%
Lister	105	78		183	3.0%
MedSci	60	24		84	1.4%
SUB #1	440	160		600	9.9%
SUB #2	141	249		390	6.4%
Tory Atrium	408	275		683	11.3%
VanVliet	288	149		437	7.2%
Vwing	128	75		203	3.4%
Online			53	53	8.8%
Grand Total	3466	2273	312	6051	100%

2.2.3 Number of Voters in Each Faculty by Polling Station

Location	Ag/For/IE	Arts	Augustana	Business	Education	Engineering	FSJ	Law	Med/Dent	Native Studies	Nursing	Open Studies	Pharmacy	Physed and Rec.	Science	Rehab Med	Grand Total
Advance	3	12	0	0	4	4	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	0	42
Ag/For	91	4	0	0	1	40	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	144
Augustana	0	0	217	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217
Bio Sci	6	28	0	2	6	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	146	0	198
CAB	67	227	0	45	50	115	9	0	3	3	3	15	14	23	691	1	1266
Comp Sci	0	90	0	22	7	24	1	0	2	1	1	2	2	3	59	0	214
Corbett Hall	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	15	23
Education	7	15	0	4	139	1	0	0	0	7	12	3	15	12	45	0	260
ETLC	4	3	0	1	0	399	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	20	0	430
Fac. St. Jean	0	1	0	1	0	8	88	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	105
HUB Mural	6	167	0	5	7	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	32	0	226
Humanities	4	95	0	17	5	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	29	0	163
Law	0	22	0	4	3	2	0	86	0	2	0	1	1	1	7	1	130
Lister	12	42	0	3	5	37	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	16	63	0	183
Med Sci	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	0	2	0	14	0	84
SUB	72	264	0	48	44	119	12	5	6	7	6	18	22	73	293	1	990
Tory Atrium	25	318	0	151	16	10	7	1	1	5	2	14	0	6	127	0	683
Van Vliet	21	65	0	21	35	25	5	2	3	4	8	9	6	158	74	1	437
V-Wing	11	19	0	2	5	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	125	0	203
Online	2	5	0	10	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	0	53
Grand Total	331	1377	217	336	329	851	129	95	86	34	44	75	68	308	1752	19	6051

2.3 Turnout Statistics

Faculty	Turnout	# Eligible Voters	% Turnout
Phys Ed	308	826	37.3%
Science	1752	5850	29.9%
Engineering	851	3202	26.6%
Ag/For/HE	331	1420	23.3%
Arts	1377	5925	23.2%
FSJ	129	601	21.5%
Augustana	217	1031	21.0%
Native Studies	34	181	18.8%
Law	95	508	18.7%
Business	336	1890	17.8%
Pharmacy	68	480	14.2%
Education	329	3125	10.5%
Rehab Med	19	187	10.2%
Med/Dent	86	865	9.9%
Open Studies	75	1111	6.8%
Nursing	44	1269	3.5%
Total	6051	28471	21.3%

2.4 Results by Polling Station

These results list the percentage of first place votes cast for each candidate in the first round of voting. The percentages are based on the total number of physical ballots cast, not the total number of valid ballots.

Detailed results for the advanced polling station operated out of SUB 306 are not reported. The availability of the advance poll was not advertised and many of the individuals who voted at this location were Election Staff members, therefore the results will not be disclosed.

2.4.1 President

Location	Greg German	Samantha Power	None of the Above	Spoiled
Ag/For	29.2%	54.9%	6.9%	9.0%
Augustana	30.9%	47.0%	9.2%	12.9%
BioSci	28.8%	59.1%	4.5%	7.6%
CAB	31.3%	57.9%	7.5%	3.4%
CompSci	41.8%	51.4%	3.6%	3.2%
Corbett	8.7%	73.9%	8.7%	8.7%
Education	21.2%	66.2%	5.4%	7.3%
ETLC	29.8%	53.7%	8.1%	8.4%
FSJ	50.0%	41.3%	4.8%	3.8%
HUB Mural	23.9%	61.9%	6.4%	7.8%
Humanities	21.7%	61.0%	7.7%	9.5%
Law	19.7%	57.6%	10.6%	12.1%
Lister	40.8%	50.0%	5.4%	3.8%
MedSci	24.7%	44.7%	14.1%	16.5%
SUB	32.4%	56.0%	7.4%	4.2%
Tory Atrium	28.2%	60.9%	6.6%	4.4%
Van Vliet	41.5%	42.7%	8.7%	7.1%
V-Wing	35.1%	49.0%	12.4%	3.5%
Online	30.2%	56.6%	5.7%	7.5%
Grand Total	30.8%	56.1%	7.1%	6.0%

2.4.2 Vice President (Academic)

Location	Amanda Henry	None of the Above	Spoiled
Ag/For	71.5%	15.3%	13.2%
Augustana	77.9%	13.4%	12.9%
BioSci	72.2%	11.6%	16.2%
CAB	75.9%	14.9%	9.2%
CompSci	86.0%	10.5%	3.5%
Corbett	78.3%	4.3%	17.4%
Education	74.6%	12.7%	12.7%
ETLC	73.7%	15.1%	11.2%
FSJ	87.5%	8.7%	3.8%
HUB Mural	73.2%	14.4%	12.4%
Humanities	75.6%	11.3%	13.1%
Law	72.0%	12.1%	15.9%
Lister	81.5%	10.9%	7.6%
MedSci	63.5%	18.8%	17.6%
SUB	79.5%	11.9%	8.6%
Tory Atrium	76.6%	14.5%	8.9%
Van Vliet	70.2%	15.1%	14.7%
V-Wing	73.3%	20.3%	6.4%
Online	73.6%	13.2%	13.2%
Grand Total	75.6%	13.9%	10.5%

2.4.3 Vice President (External)

Location	Blythe Morrow	Dave Cournoyer	Damini Mohan	None of the Above	Spoiled
Ag/For	23.6%	35.4%	11.8%	13.2%	16.0%
Augustana	27.2%	28.1%	23.0%	10.6%	11.1%
BioSci	25.3%	38.4%	16.7%	7.6%	12.1%
CAB	29.3%	34.6%	16.9%	9.5%	8.9%
CompSci	29.6%	42.8%	16.5%	6.8%	4.3%
Corbett	13.0%	21.7%	30.4%	17.4%	17.4%
Education	23.8%	28.1%	18.8%	13.5%	15.8%
ETLC	32.1%	28.4%	15.6%	11.6%	12.3%
FSJ	34.6%	30.7%	21.2%	7.7%	5.8%
HUB Mural	33.5%	29.9%	17.3%	8.4%	10.9%
Humanities	31.8%	31.5%	16.4%	7.4%	12.8%
Law	29.5%	32.6%	20.5%	6.8%	10.6%
Lister	37.0%	34.8%	11.4%	9.2%	7.6%
MedSci	16.5%	18.8%	7.1%	30.6%	27.1%
SUB	28.9%	37.1%	14.6%	10.3%	9.1%
Tory Atrium	29.3%	36.8%	17.1%	7.2%	9.6%
Van Vliet	21.1%	33.0%	11.2%	17.7%	16.9%
V-Wing	29.7%	38.6%	13.4%	11.9%	6.4%
Online	24.5%	32.1%	20.8%	7.5%	15.1%
Grand Total	28.9%	33.6%	16.2%	10.4%	10.8%

2.4.4 Vice President (Operations & Finance)

Location	Chris Cunningham	Theresa Chapman	Cam Lewis	None of the Above	Spoiled
Ag/For	28.5%	32.6%	10.4%	16.0%	12.5%
Augustana	21.7%	25.8%	28.6%	10.1%	13.8%
BioSci	36.4%	26.3%	10.1%	12.1%	15.1%
CAB	34.4%	32.6%	11.1%	12.2%	8.6%
CompSci	38.6%	37.0%	11.5%	9.5%	3.4%
Corbett	4.3%	56.5%	13.0%	8.7%	17.4%
Education	29.6%	28.8%	11.2%	15.4%	15.0%
ETLC	29.5%	26.7%	13.3%	15.8%	14.7%
FSJ	33.7%	40.4%	5.8%	11.5%	8.7%
HUB Mural	32.6%	29.0%	12.9%	11.5%	14.0%
Humanities	28.6%	30.1%	13.4%	12.8%	15.2%
Law	27.3%	29.5%	15.2%	13.6%	14.4%
Lister	41.3%	27.7%	13.6%	7.6%	9.8%
MedSci	10.5%	28.2%	7.1%	27.1%	27.1%
SUB	38.3%	28.3%	9.9%	12.8%	10.7%
Tory Atrium	38.2%	30.2%	10.5%	10.4%	10.7%
Van Vliet	28.0%	27.5%	10.8%	16.5%	17.2%
V-Wing	35.1%	29.7%	12.9%	13.4%	8.9%
Online	37.7%	26.4%	9.4%	9.4%	17.0%
Grand Total	33.4%	29.7%	11.8%	12.8%	12.3%

2.4.5 Vice President (Student Life)

Location	Sarah Kalil	Amanda-Leigh Hanson	Omer Yusuf	None of the Above	Spoiled
Ag/For	27.8%	21.5%	33.3%	8.3%	9.1%
Augustana	28.1%	13.8%	34.1%	8.3%	15.7%
BioSci	30.3%	8.6%	48.0%	5.1%	8.1%
CAB	25.0%	9.6%	53.4%	6.3%	6.7%
CompSci	26.3%	7.9%	53.5%	6.7%	5.6%
Corbett	26.1%	13.0%	43.5%	0.0%	17.4%
Education	26.5%	11.5%	38.8%	9.6%	13.5%
ETLC	27.7%	11.2%	41.2%	7.7%	12.3%
FSJ	29.8%	8.7%	51.0%	4.8%	5.8%
HUB Mural	26.2%	12.2%	44.1%	7.3%	10.2%
Humanities	25.6%	13.4%	42.0%	7.4%	11.6%
Law	34.1%	9.8%	30.3%	11.4%	14.4%
Lister	32.1%	16.3%	39.1%	4.9%	7.6%
MedSci	24.7%	4.7%	38.8%	15.3%	4.7%
SUB	28.4%	9.8%	46.9%	6.2%	8.7%
Tory Atrium	26.4%	10.9%	46.0%	8.0%	8.6%
Van Vliet	24.8%	13.5%	38.5%	11.9%	11.2%
V-Wing	25.2%	13.4%	48.5%	7.9%	5.0%
Online	28.3%	15.1%	37.7%	7.5%	11.3%
Grand Total	26.6%	11.5%	45.0%	7.5%	9.4%

2.4.6 Board of Governors Representative

Location	Chris Samuel	None of the Above	Spoiled
Ag/For	67.4%	16.6%	16.0%
Augustana	71.4%	12.0%	16.6%
BioSci	72.2%	11.1%	16.7%
CAB	76.0%	11.9%	12.1%
CompSci	82.1%	12.3%	5.6%
Corbett	69.6%	8.7%	21.7%
Education	72.3%	10.8%	16.9%
ETLC	72.1%	14.9%	13.0%
FSJ	80.8%	9.6%	9.6%
HUB Mural	71.2%	13.3%	15.5%
Humanities	73.2%	11.6%	15.2%
Law	68.9%	16.7%	14.4%
Lister	83.2%	6.0%	10.9%
MedSci	65.9%	16.5%	5.9%
SUB	78.5%	10.7%	10.8%
Tory Atrium	77.8%	10.2%	12.0%
Van Vliet	68.6%	14.2%	17.2%
V-Wing	75.2%	14.4%	6.4%
Online	81.1%	3.8%	17.8%
Grand Total	74.7%	12.0%	13.3%

2.4.7 Physical Activity Complex Fee Plebiscite

Location	YES	NO	Spoiled
Ag/For	41.7%	55.6%	2.8%
Augustana	38.7%	52.5%	8.8%
BioSci	37.4%	60.6%	2.0%
CAB	35.0%	62.7%	2.3%
CompSci	39.2%	54.9%	5.9%
Corbett	39.1%	56.5%	4.3%
Education	37.3%	59.2%	3.5%
ETLC	44.0%	52.8%	3.3%
FSJ	40.4%	55.8%	3.8%
HUB Mural	33.7%	63.0%	3.3%
Humanities	32.4%	64.9%	2.7%
Law	36.4%	61.4%	2.3%
Lister	54.3%	43.5%	2.2%
MedSci	57.6%	41.2%	1.2%
SUB	47.6%	51.2%	1.1%
Tory Atrium	36.2%	60.9%	2.9%
Van Vliet	79.1%	20.0%	0.9%
V-Wing	39.6%	58.9%	1.5%
Online	37.7%	62.3%	0.0%
Grand Total	42.5%	55.0%	2.5%

2.4.8 Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban Plebiscite

Location	YES	NO	Spoiled
Ag/For	60.4%	36.1%	3.5%
Augustana	68.7%	24.4%	6.9%
BioSci	53.5%	44.4%	2.0%
CAB	59.8%	38.2%	2.0%
CompSci	70.6%	27.5%	2.0%
Corbett	73.9%	26.1%	0.0%
Education	61.5%	35.8%	2.7%
ETLC	55.1%	42.6%	2.3%
FSJ	61.5%	36.5%	1.9%
HUB Mural	53.0%	44.3%	2.7%
Humanities	55.9%	42.9%	1.2%
Law	37.9%	60.6%	1.5%
Lister	58.2%	40.2%	1.6%
MedSci	81.2%	17.6%	1.2%
SUB	62.0%	36.6%	1.4%
Tory Atrium	55.8%	41.0%	3.2%
Van Vliet	71.8%	26.6%	1.6%
V-Wing	61.9%	37.1%	1.0%
Online	83.0%	15.1%	1.9%
Grand Total	59.7%	38.1%	2.2%

3 March 2006 Councillor Election

3.1 Students' Council Results

3.1.1 Arts

Round	Brock Richardson	Michael Janz	Cam Lewis	Cayley Chipuer	John Chandler	Chris Hill	Cardice Malcolm	Al-Amyr Sumar	Tim Schneider	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	14	24	5	6	3	5	1	14	8	8	18	88	45	106
2	14	24	5	6	3	5	*	14	8	8	19	87	44	106
3	14	25	5	6	*	5	*	14	8	9	20	86	44	106
4	14	25	*	6	*	5	*	16	8	10	22	84	43	106
5	14	28	*	6	*	*	*	17	8	10	23	83	42	106
6	14	29	*	*	*	*	*	18	9	11	25	81	41	106
7	20	30	*	*	*	*	*	20	*	11	25	81	41	106
8	20	32	*	*	*	*	*	21	*	*	33	73	37	106
9	*	45	*	*	*	*	*	22	*	*	39	67	34	106
10	19	WON	6	9	4	6	2	18	11	10	21	85	43	106
11	19	WON	6	9	5	6	*	18	11	10	22	84	43	106
12	20	WON	6	10	*	7	*	18	11	11	23	83	42	106
13	20	WON	*	10	*	7	*	20	12	12	25	81	41	106
14	20	WON	*	11	*	*	*	22	12	12	29	77	39	106
15	21	WON	*	*	*	*	*	24	14	14	33	73	37	106
16	21	WON	*	*	*	*	*	25	15	*	45	61	31	106
17	30	WON	*	*	*	*	*	31	*	*	45	61	31	106
18	20	WON	11	9	4	8	4	WON	15	12	23	83	42	106
19	21	WON	11	10	5	8	*	WON	15	12	24	82	42	106
20	22	WON	11	11	*	9	*	WON	15	13	25	81	41	106
21	24	WON	14	12	*	*	*	WON	15	13	28	78	40	106
22	25	WON	16	*	*	*	*	WON	18	15	32	74	38	106
23	26	WON	16	*	*	*	*	WON	20	*	44	62	32	106
24	30	WON	*	*	*	*	*	WON	25	*	51	55	28	106
25	WON	WON	16	9	6	8	5	WON	16	19	27	79	40	106
26	WON	WON	17	10	7	9	*	WON	16	19	28	78	40	106
27	WON	WON	18	11	*	10	*	WON	17	20	30	76	39	106
28	WON	WON	23	13	*	*	*	WON	17	20	33	73	37	106
29	WON	WON	26	*	*	*	*	WON	21	22	37	69	35	106
30	WON	WON	41	*	*	*	*	WON	*	25	40	66	34	106
31	WON	WON	WON	12	9	9	5	WON	18	23	30	76	39	106
32	WON	WON	WON	13	11	10	*	WON	18	23	31	75	38	106
33	WON	WON	WON	15	15	*	*	WON	19	23	34	72	37	106
34	WON	WON	WON	21	*	*	*	WON	24	24	37	69	35	106
35	WON	WON	WON	*	*	*	*	WON	36	28	42	64	33	106
36	WON	WON	WON	14	14	10	8	WON	WON	26	34	72	37	106
37	WON	WON	WON	17	17	11	*	WON	WON	26	35	71	36	106
38	WON	WON	WON	20	21	*	*	WON	WON	26	39	67	34	106
39	WON	WON	WON	*	32			WON	WON	29	45	61	31	106
40	WON	WON	WON	16	WON	14	12	WON	WON	29	35	71	36	106
41	WON	WON	WON	22	WON	17	*	WON	WON	30	37	69	35	106
42	WON	WON	WON	32	WON	*	*	WON	WON	32	42	64	33	106
43	WON	WON	WON	20	WON	17	15	WON	WON	WON	54	52	27	106
44	WON	WON	WON	26	WON	22	*	WON	WON	WON	58	48	25	106
45	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	23	28	WON	WON	WON	55	51	26	106

Elected (1): Michael Janz
Elected (2): Al-Amyn Sumar
Elected (3): Brock Richardson
Elected (4): Cam Lewis
Elected (5): Tim Schneider
Elected (6): John Chandler
Elected (7): None of the Above
Not Elected (1): Cayley Chipuer
Not Elected (2): Candice Malcolm
Not Elected (3): Chris Hill

3.1.2 Business

Round	Michael Cook	Eamonn Gamble	Ryan Payne	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	6	4	17	1	2	28	15	30
2	15	9	WON	3	3	27	14	30
3	WON	23	WON	4	3	27	14	30

Elected (1): Ryan Payne
Elected (2): Michael Cook
Elected (3): Eamonn Gamble

3.1.3 Education

Round	Harold Semenuk	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	30	0	3	30	16	33

Elected (1): Harold Semenuk

3.1.4 Engineering

Round	Curt Clark	Kory Mathewson	Paul Kirvan	Prem Eruvbetine	Ben Nearingburg	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	19	22	13	17	10	15	27	96	49	123
2	21	25	14	19	*	17	27	96	49	123
3	24	29	*	20	*	19	31	92	47	123
4	26	29	*	21	*	*	47	76	39	123
5	30	39	*	*	*	*	54	69	35	123
6	22	WON	16	25	15	15	30	93	47	123
7	25	WON	20	30	*	17	31	92	47	123
8	27	WON	20	31	*	*	45	78	40	123
9	33	WON	*	38	*	*	52	71	36	123
10	25	WON	21	WON	21	19	37	86	44	123
11	28	WON	21	WON	21	*	53	70	36	123
12	35	WON	30	WON	*	*	58	65	33	123
13	WON	WON	38	WON	23	22	40	83	42	123
14	WON	WON	41	WON	25	*	57	66	34	123
15	WON	WON	WON	WON	49	27	47	76	39	123

Elected (1): Kory Mathewson

Elected (2): Prem Eruvbetine

Elected (3): Curt Clark

Elected (4): Paul Kirvan

Elected (5): Ben Nearingburg

3.1.5 Faculté St. Jean

Round	Brittney Bugler	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	118	13	6	131	66	137

Elected (1): Brittany Bugler

3.1.6 Law

Round	Jonathan Tieman	Scot McAnsh	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	109	87	15	56	211	106	267
2	WON	173	18	76	191	96	267

Elected (1): Jonathan Tieman

Elected (2): Scott McAnsh

3.1.7 Medicine & Dentistry

Round	Carrie Ye	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	23	3	0	26	14	26

Elected (1): Carrie Ye

3.1.8 Physical Education & Recreation

Round	Darren Grey	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	15	1	4	16	9	20

Elected (1): Darren Grey

3.1.9 Science

Round	Bayan Hussein	Alamjit Singh	Greg German	Nassrein Hussein	Theresa Chapman	Steve Kirkham	Brendan Trayner	Damini Mohan	Sheena Aperocho	Christopher Le	Sylvia Shamanna	Steve Dollansky	Justin Kehoe	None of the Above	Spolied	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	37	27	48	4	21	28	24	11	14	34	31	14	66	16	50	375	188	425
2	39	27	48	*	23	28	24	11	14	34	31	14	66	16	50	375	188	425
3	39	27	52	*	23	29	26	*	15	34	33	14	66	17	50	375	188	425
4	41	27	53	*	23	31	26	*	15	35	33	*	69	19	53	372	187	425
5	42	27	53	*	24	31	27	*	*	36	35	*	76	19	55	370	186	425
6	42	27	54	*	24	32	28	*	*	36	35	*	76	*	71	354	178	425
7	42	29	60	*	*	36	29	*	*	38	37	*	80	*	74	351	176	425
8	42	29	64	*	*	40	*	*	*	39	45	*	85	*	81	344	173	425
9	48	*	72	*	*	40	*	*	*	42	45	*	85	*	93	332	167	425
10	50	*	77	*	*	*	*	*	*	45	51	*	99	*	103	322	162	425
11	53	*	82	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	54	*	119	*	117	308	155	425
12	*	*	98	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	63	*	128	*	136	289	145	425
13	*	*	117	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	154	*	154	271	136	425
14	37	28	56	5	27	38	26	17	25	40	33	18	WON	18	57	368	185	425
15	39	28	56	*	30	38	26	17	25	40	33	18	WON	18	57	368	185	425
16	39	29	61	*	31	40	28	*	26	41	35	18	WON	19	58	367	184	425
17	41	29	63	*	31	44	28	*	26	42	39	*	WON	21	61	364	183	425
18	41	30	64	*	31	45	29	*	26	42	39	*	WON	*	78	347	174	425
19	43	31	64	*	34	48	31	*	*	46	42	*	WON	*	86	339	170	425
20	44	31	69	*	38	53	*	*	*	47	51	*	WON	*	92	333	167	425
21	50	*	76	*	43	53	*	*	*	49	51	*	WON	*	103	322	162	425
22	50	*	87	*	*	64	*	*	*	52	57	*	WON	*	115	310	156	425
23	*	*	104	*	*	69	*	*	*	56	61	*	WON	*	135	290	146	425
24	*	*	114	*	*	83	*	*	*	*	72	*	WON	*	156	269	135	425
25	*	*	145	*	*	105	*	*	*	*	*	*	WON	*	175	250	126	425
26	41	29	WON	7	37	45	34	19	29	41	35	20	WON	20	68	357	179	425
27	43	29	WON	*	41	45	34	19	29	41	36	20	WON	20	68	357	179	425
28	43	30	WON	*	43	47	36	*	30	42	41	21	WON	21	71	354	178	425
29	46	30	WON	*	43	52	36	*	30	44	46	*	WON	24	74	351	176	425
30	46	31	WON	*	43	54	37	*	30	45	46	*	WON	*	93	332	167	425
31	49	32	WON	*	46	57	40	*	*	49	49	*	WON	*	103	322	162	425
32	57	*	WON	*	54	57	41	*	*	51	49	*	WON	*	116	309	155	425
33	59	*	WON	*	62	62	*	*	*	55	61	*	WON	*	126	299	150	425
34	67	*	WON	*	76	70	*	*	*	*	65	*	WON	*	147	278	140	425
35	77	*	WON	*	98	83	*	*	*	*	*	*	WON	*	167	258	130	425
36	*	*	WON	*	131	99	*	*	*	*	*	*	WON	*	195	230	116	425
37	42	32	WON	9	WON	50	38	24	33	42	40	21	WON	21	73	352	177	425
38	45	33	WON	*	WON	52	38	24	33	43	41	21	WON	21	74	351	176	425
39	47	33	WON	*	WON	57	38	25	33	44	46	*	WON	24	78	347	174	425
40	47	34	WON	*	WON	59	39	25	33	45	46	*	WON	*	97	328	165	425
41	48	34	WON	*	WON	63	43	*	35	47	52	*	WON	*	103	322	162	425
42	57	*	WON	*	WON	65	45	*	39	50	54	*	WON	*	115	310	156	425
43	60	*	WON	*	WON	71	51	*	*	54	60	*	WON	*	129	296	149	425
44	64	*	WON	*	WON	83	*	*	*	59	75	*	WON	*	144	281	141	425
45	77	*	WON	*	WON	96	*	*	*	*	83	*	WON	*	169	256	129	425
46	*	*	WON	*	WON	124	*	*	*	*	101	*	WON	*	200	225	113	425
47	43	32	WON	12	WON	WON	45	29	41	46	46	24	WON	28	79	346	174	425
48	46	33	WON	*	WON	WON	47	29	41	47	48	25	WON	29	80	345	173	425
49	49	33	WON	*	WON	WON	49	31	41	50	53	*	WON	32	87	338	170	425
50	51	34	WON	*	WON	WON	55	*	43	52	60	*	WON	37	93	332	167	425
51	60	*	WON	*	WON	WON	59	*	47	55	61	*	WON	39	104	321	161	425
52	60	*	WON	*	WON	WON	60	*	47	57	63	*	WON	*	138	287	144	425
53	65	*	WON	*	WON	WON	67	*	*	64	75	*	WON	*	154	271	136	425
54	80	*	WON	*	WON	WON	82	*	*	*	88	*	WON	*	175	250	126	425
55	*	*	WON	*	WON	WON	113	*	*	*	106	*	WON	*	206	219	110	425
56	47	32	WON	13	WON	WON	WON	36	43	49	56	32	WON	31	86	339	170	425
57	50	33	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	37	43	50	58	34	WON	32	88	337	169	425
58	51	34	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	37	43	51	58	36	WON	*	115	310	156	425
59	58	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	44	46	54	58	37	WON	*	128	297	149	425
60	61	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	46	46	60	69	*	WON	*	143	282	142	425

Round	Bayan Hussein	Alamjit Singh	Greg German	Nassrein Hussein	Theresa Chapman	Steve Kirkham	Brendan Trayner	Damini Mohan	Sheena Aperocho	Christopher Le	Sylvia Shamanna	Steve Dollansky	Justin Kehoe	None of the Above	Spolled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
61	69	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	*	56	64	78	*	WON	*	158	267	134	425
62	74	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	*	*	79	95	*	WON	*	177	248	125	425
63	*	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	*	*	108	111	*	WON	*	206	219	110	425
64	49	36	WON	15	WON	WON	WON	44	48	56	WON	43	WON	32	102	323	162	425
65	52	38	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	46	48	58	WON	45	WON	33	105	320	161	425
66	53	39	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	46	48	59	WON	47	WON	*	133	292	147	425
67	63	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	54	51	62	WON	48	WON	*	147	278	140	425
68	72	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	59	55	75	WON	*	WON	*	164	261	131	425
69	80	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	72	*	92	WON	*	WON	*	181	244	123	425
70	100	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	*	*	114	WON	*	WON	*	211	214	108	425
71	54	38	WON	20	WON	WON	WON	50	58	WON	WON	46	WON	37	122	303	152	425
72	58	41	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	53	59	WON	WON	50	WON	39	125	300	151	425
73	59	42	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	54	60	WON	WON	54	WON	*	156	269	135	425
74	70	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	65	64	WON	WON	55	WON	*	171	254	128	425
75	85	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	73	77	WON	WON	*	WON	*	190	235	118	425
76	108	*	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	*	105	WON	WON	*	WON	*	212	213	107	425
77	WON	58	WON	39	WON	WON	WON	53	61	WON	WON	47	WON	39	128	297	149	425
78	WON	67	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	61	62	WON	WON	51	WON	42	142	283	142	425
79	WON	70	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	63	63	WON	WON	56	WON	*	173	252	127	425
80	WON	84	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	72	76	WON	WON	*	WON	*	193	232	117	425
81	WON	104	WON	*	WON	WON	WON	*	101	WON	WON	*	WON	*	220	205	103	425
82	WON	WON	WON	63	WON	WON	WON	67	63	WON	WON	48	WON	43	141	284	143	425
83	WON	WON	WON	67	WON	WON	WON	68	64	WON	WON	51	WON	*	175	250	126	425
84	WON	WON	WON	79	WON	WON	WON	76	77	WON	WON	*	WON	*	193	232	117	425
85	WON	WON	WON	99	WON	WON	WON	*	110	WON	WON	*	WON	*	216	209	105	425
86	WON	WON	WON	73	WON	WON	WON	82	WON	WON	WON	58	WON	51	161	264	133	425
87	WON	WON	WON	79	WON	WON	WON	84	WON	WON	WON	62	WON	*	200	225	113	425
88	WON	WON	WON	101	WON	WON	WON	103	WON	WON	WON	*	WON	*	221	204	103	425
89	WON	WON	WON	100	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	81	WON	61	183	242	122	425
90	WON	WON	WON	107	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	89	WON	*	229	196	99	425
91	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	146	WON	69	210	215	108	425

- Elected (1):** Justin Kehoe
- Elected (2):** Greg German
- Elected (3):** Theresa Chapman
- Elected (4):** Steve Kirkham
- Elected (5):** Brendan Trayner
- Elected (6):** Sylvia Shamanna
- Elected (7):** Christopher Le
- Elected (8):** Bayan Hussein
- Councillor-in-Waiting (1):** Alamjit Singh
- Councillor-in-Waiting (2):** Sheena Aperocho
- Councillor-in-Waiting (3):** Damini Mohan
- Councillor-in-Waiting (4):** Nassrein Hussein
- Councillor-in-Waiting (5):** Steve Dollansky

3.2 General Faculties Council Results

3.2.1 Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics

Round	Leah Bennett	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	22	1	2	23	12	25

Elected (1): Leah Bennett

3.2.2 Arts

Round	Cam Lewis	Alan Cliff	Tim Schneider	Brock Richardson	The Inanimate Carbon Rod Named Fraser	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	9	15	8	10	22	12	30	76	39	106
2	11	18	*	11	23	12	31	75	38	106
3	*	25	*	13	24	12	32	74	38	106
4	*	25	*	14	26	*	41	65	33	106
5	*	30	*	*	30	*	46	60	31	106
6	14	22	10	13	WON	16	31	75	38	106
7	17	25	*	16	WON	16	32	74	38	106
8	19	30	*	*	WON	22	35	71	36	106
9	*	46	*	*	WON	23	37	69	35	106
10	18	WON	15	15	WON	21	37	69	35	106
11	25	WON	*	21	WON	22	38	68	35	106
12	33	WON	*	*	WON	31	42	64	33	106
13	WON	WON	22	23	WON	23	38	68	35	106
14	WON	WON	*	38	WON	25	43	63	32	106
15	WON	WON	33	WON	WON	32	41	65	33	106

Elected (1): The Inanimate Carbon Rod Named Fraser

Elected (2): Alan Cliff

Elected (3): Cam Lewis

Elected (4): Brock Richardson

Elected (5): Tim Schneider

Elected (6): None of the Above

3.2.3 Business

Round	Scott Nicol	Michael Cook	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	11	14	3	2	28	15	30
2	12	14	*	4	26	14	30
3	22	WON	5	3	27	14	30

Elected (1): Michael Cook

Elected (2): Scott Nicol

3.2.4 Engineering

Round	Stephen McFetridge	Mat Johnson	Scott Rebman	Prem Erubetine	Graeme Wicentowich	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	20	12	8	8	46	8	21	102	52	123
2	22	13	*	8	49	10	21	102	52	123
3	23	16	*	*	50	12	22	101	51	123
4	24	17	*	*	51	*	31	92	47	123
5	27	22	19	15	WON	13	27	96	49	123
6	28	22	19	17	WON	*	37	86	44	123
7	32	27	24	*	WON	*	40	83	42	123
8	46	36	*	*	WON	*	41	82	42	123
9	WON	32	29	19	WON	15	28	95	48	123
10	WON	32	30	21	WON	*	40	83	42	123
11	WON	41	39	*	WON	*	43	80	41	123
12	WON	WON	43	30	WON	17	33	90	46	123
13	WON	WON	45	32	WON	*	46	77	39	123
14	WON	WON	WON	56	WON	21	46	77	39	123

Elected (1): Graeme Wicentowich

Elected (2): Stephen McFetridge

Elected (3): Mat Johnson

Elected (4): Scott Rebman

Councillor-in-Waiting (1): Prem Erubetine

3.2.5 Law

Round 1	Jonathan Tieman		None of the Above			Spoiled			Valid Ballots		Needed to Win		Total Physical Ballots	
	162	26	79	188	95	267								

Elected (1): Jonathan Tieman

3.2.6 Medicine & Dentistry

Round 1	Mark Kearns		None of the Above			Spoiled			Valid Ballots		Needed to Win		Total Physical Ballots	
	22	2	2	24	13	26								

Elected (1): Mark Kearns

3.2.7 Physical Education & Recreation

Round 1	Stacey Badry		None of the Above			Spoiled			Valid Ballots		Needed to Win		Total Physical Ballots	
	16	1	3	17	9	20								

Elected (1): Stacey Badry

3.2.8 Science

Round	Damini Mohan	Sylvia Shamanna	Peter Gill	Bayan Hussein	Najam Mian	Nassrein Hussein	Steve Kirkham	Brendan Traymer	Alin Florea	Justin Kehoe	None of the Above	Spoiled	Valid Ballots	Needed to Win	Total Physical Ballots
1	30	26	53	22	30	8	40	24	21	76	27	68	357	179	425
2	30	27	54	24	32	*	40	24	22	76	27	69	356	179	425
3	33	27	55	25	33	*	41	25	*	79	29	78	347	174	425
4	38	28	57	*	37	*	41	26	*	80	29	89	336	169	425
5	39	37	63	*	38	*	45	*	*	83	30	90	335	168	425
6	39	37	63	*	38	*	46	*	*	87	*	115	310	156	425
7	46	*	75	*	39	*	49	*	*	96	*	120	305	153	425
8	53	*	83	*	*	*	52	*	*	100	*	137	288	145	425
9	59	*	92	*	*	*	*	*	*	119	*	155	270	136	425
10	*	*	116	*	*	*	*	*	*	137	*	172	253	127	425
11	33	35	58	23	32	11	61	31	31	WON	31	79	346	174	425
12	34	36	59	25	34	*	62	31	32	WON	31	81	344	173	425
13	39	37	61	*	38	*	62	32	33	WON	31	92	333	167	425
14	39	37	62	*	38	*	64	32	36	WON	*	117	308	155	425
15	41	47	69	*	39	*	71	*	38	WON	*	120	305	153	425
16	47	47	72	*	43	*	84	*	*	WON	*	132	293	147	425
17	54	53	82	*	*	*	89	*	*	WON	*	147	278	140	425
18	66	*	101	*	*	*	98	*	*	WON	*	160	265	133	425
19	*	*	128	*	*	*	118	*	*	WON	*	179	246	124	425
20	38	38	WON	27	33	14	72	42	36	WON	35	90	335	168	425
21	41	39	WON	29	35	*	73	42	37	WON	35	94	331	166	425
22	47	41	WON	*	40	*	73	44	39	WON	35	106	319	160	425
23	47	41	WON	*	40	*	75	45	42	WON	*	135	290	146	425
24	53	49	WON	*	*	*	81	49	44	WON	*	149	276	139	425
25	62	52	WON	*	*	*	86	60	*	WON	*	165	260	131	425
26	84	*	WON	*	*	*	95	70	*	WON	*	176	249	125	425
27	98	*	WON	*	*	*	128	*	*	WON	*	199	226	114	425
28	55	45	WON	28	34	16	WON	58	41	WON	44	104	321	161	425
29	59	46	WON	31	36	*	WON	58	42	WON	45	108	317	159	425
30	66	49	WON	*	42	*	WON	60	44	WON	45	119	306	154	425
31	72	60	WON	*	*	*	WON	65	45	WON	48	135	290	146	425
32	82	64	WON	*	*	*	WON	76	*	WON	52	151	274	138	425
33	83	64	WON	*	*	*	WON	82	*	WON	*	196	229	115	425
34	114	*	WON	*	*	*	WON	98	*	WON	*	213	212	107	425
35	WON	60	WON	35	36	21	WON	70	44	WON	47	112	313	157	425
36	WON	64	WON	41	39	*	WON	71	46	WON	48	116	309	155	425
37	WON	71	WON	49	*	*	WON	76	48	WON	52	129	296	149	425
38	WON	80	WON	54	*	*	WON	88	*	WON	56	147	278	140	425
39	WON	98	WON	*	*	*	WON	98	*	WON	61	168	257	129	425
40	WON	101	WON	*	*	*	WON	106	*	WON	*	218	207	104	425
41	WON	84	WON	40	40	26	WON	WON	52	WON	57	126	299	105	425
42	WON	90	WON	49	43	*	WON	WON	55	WON	58	130	295	148	425
43	WON	100	WON	57	*	*	WON	WON	59	WON	64	145	280	141	425
44	WON	121	WON	*	*	*	WON	WON	69	WON	67	168	257	129	425
45	WON	123	WON	*	*	*	WON	WON	75	WON	*	227	198	100	425
46	WON	WON	WON	70	46	32	WON	WON	61	WON	65	151	274	138	425
47	WON	WON	WON	84	50	*	WON	WON	66	WON	67	158	267	134	425
48	WON	WON	WON	100	*	*	WON	WON	75	WON	73	177	248	125	425
49	WON	WON	WON	103	*	*	WON	WON	84	WON	*	238	187	94	425
50	WON	WON	WON	WON	73	57	WON	WON	69	WON	67	159	266	134	425
51	WON	WON	WON	WON	94	*	WON	WON	80	WON	71	180	245	123	425
52	WON	WON	WON	WON	98	*	WON	WON	85	WON	*	242	183	92	425
53	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	94	WON	WON	79	WON	73	179	246	124	425
54	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	98	WON	WON	86	WON	*	241	184	93	425
55	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	WON	138	WON	80	207	218	110	425

Elected (1): Justin Kehoe

Elected (2): Peter Gill

Elected (3): Steve Kirkham

Elected (4): Damini Mohan

Elected (5): Brendan Trayner

Elected (6): Sylvia Shamanna

Elected (7): Bayan Hussein

Elected (8): Najam Mian

Councillor-in-Waiting (1): Nassrein Hussein

Councillor-in-Waiting (2): Alin Florea

3.3 Turnout Statistics

Faculty	Turnout	# Eligible Voters	% Turnout
Law	267	508	52.6%
FSJ	137	601	22.8%
Med/Dent	26	865	3.0%
Science	425	5850	7.3%
Engineering	123	3202	3.8%
Ag/For/HE	25	1420	1.8%
Arts	106	5925	1.8%
Business	30	1890	1.6%
Phys Ed	20	826	2.4%
Education	33	3125	1.1%
Total	1192	24212	4.9%

Appendix 5: Petition Verification Results

2005/06 Students' Union Petition



Attn: Students' Council

On Friday, January 13, 2006, the elections office received the PAC petition. It contained a grand total of 2202 signatures and the elections office verified a sample of 27% (588) of the signatures. We believe this to be a valid sample size that is representative of the document as a whole. The process of signature verification was completed over a period of 5 days, taking approximately 10 hours to complete.

Of this sample, 8.5% (50) of the signatures were invalid due to invalid ID numbers, or names that did not correspond to the ID number provided. Extrapolating the number of invalid signatures in the sample size to the petition as a whole, 188 of the signatures in the plebiscite would be considered invalid, leaving the total at 2014 valid signatures. The number of valid signatures determined by this method is significantly more than the 5% required for a plebiscite to be placed on the Students' Union Executive/BoG ballot.

As a precautionary measure, a second more stringent method of signature verification was enlisted. On any page that contained an invalid signature, the elections office deemed the entire page invalid. When this method was used, 24.7% (543) signature were considered invalid, leaving the total at 1659 valid signatures. Using this method of signature verification the PAC plebiscite once again achieved more than the required number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Additionally the PAC plebiscite also included 27 signatures that were missing information (either ID number, name, or signature), these were not included in any of the above calculations.

In conclusion we feel that the PAC petition has collected the required number of signatures to be placed before students on the Executive Election ballot on March 8 & 9. If any student has concerns with regards to the signature verification process we would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Andrew Kwan
Deputy Returning Officer

Florence Cheng
Deputy Returning Officer

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer

2005/06 Students' Union Petition



Attn: Students' Council

On Friday, January 27, 2006, the elections office received the Tobacco Ban petition. It contained a grand total of 2113 signatures and the elections office verified a sample of 28% (586) of the signatures. We believe this to be a valid sample size that is representative of the document as a whole. The process of signature verification was completed over a period of 3 days, taking approximately 10 hours to complete.

Of this sample, 6% (33) of the signatures were invalid due to invalid ID numbers, or names that did not correspond to the ID number provided. Extrapolating the number of invalid signatures in the sample size to the petition as a whole, 123.6 of the signatures in the plebiscite would be considered invalid, leaving the total at 1948.4 valid signatures. The number of valid signatures determined by this method is significantly more than the 5% required for a plebiscite to be placed on the Students' Union Executive/BoG ballot.

As a precautionary measure, a second more stringent method of signature verification was enlisted. On any page that contained an invalid signature, the elections office deemed the entire page invalid. When this method was used, 30.4% (629) signatures were considered invalid, leaving the total at 1443 valid signatures. Using this method of signature verification the Tobacco Ban plebiscite once again achieved more than the required number of signatures to be placed on the ballot.

Additionally the Tobacco Ban plebiscite also included 41 signatures that were missing information (either ID number, name, or signature), these were not included in any of the above calculations.

In conclusion we feel that the Tobacco Ban petition has collected the required number of signatures to be placed before students on the Executive Election ballot on March 8 & 9. If any student has concerns with regards to the signature verification process we would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Andrew Kwan
Deputy Returning Officer

Florence Cheng
Deputy Returning Officer

Rachel Woynorowski
Chief Returning Officer

Appendix 6 – Letters to Council Re: Results

 Students' Union Election Office Phone: (780) 492 7102 Email: cro@ualberta.ca	
To:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Mr. Gregory Harlow Speaker, Students' Council➤ Mr. Mathieu Johnson Vice President (Academic), Students' Union➤ Mr. Garry Bodnar University Secretariat
From:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Ms. Rachel Woynorowski Chief Returning Officer
Subject:	2005 Students' Council and General Faculties Council By-Election Results
Date:	Saturday October 1, 2005

I am pleased to announce the winners of this year's Students' Union By-Elections.

The Students' Council and General Faculties Council By-Election was held September 29th and 30th. Our elections were held in compliance with Bylaws 1500, 2200, and 2500, and I am satisfied that they were fair and that the results reflect the will of the electorate. There have been no appeals of any of my decisions or rulings and no recounts have been requested.

More detailed results, including breakdowns of each round of preferential voting, is available on the Elections website (www.su.ualberta.ca/vote). A final version of these detailed results will be published in my final report submitted to Students' Council.

Students Union Council

- | | |
|--|--|
| ➤ <i>Agriculture and Forestry</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ms. Amanda Rajotte | ➤ <i>Open Studies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ms. Sabine Stephan |
| ➤ <i>Business</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mr. Ryan Payne | ➤ <i>Science</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mr. Chris Le<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Councillor-in-Waiting (1)
Ms. Theresa Chapman• Councillor-in-Waiting (2)
Mr. Brendan Trayner• Councillor-in-Waiting (3)
Mr. Keith Vandersluis |
| ➤ <i>Native Studies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mr. Matt Wildcat | |
| ➤ <i>Nursing</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Ms. Nadia Ickert | |

General Faculties Council

- *Agriculture and Forestry*
 - Ms. Amanda Rajotte

- *Arts*
 - Ms. Rachel Mwesigye

- *Medicine and Dentistry*
 - Ms. Wen Wen Shan



Students' Union Election Office

Phone: (780) 492 7102 Email: cro@ualberta.ca

To:	➤ Mr. Gregory Harlow Speaker, Students' Council
From:	➤ Ms. Rachel Woynorowski Chief Returning Officer
Subject:	2006/07 Students' Union Executive, Board of Governors, and Plebiscite Results
Date:	March 27, 2006

I am pleased to announce the winners of this year's Students' Union Campus-Wide Election.

The Executive and Board of Governors Elections were held March 8th and 9th, during which time students also voted on two plebiscite questions. Our elections were held in compliance with Bylaws 1500, 2100, and 2500, and I am satisfied that they were fair and that the results reflect the will of the electorate.

More detailed results, including breakdowns of each round of preferential voting, are available upon request. A final version of these detailed results will be published in my final report submitted to Students' Council.

- *President*
 - Ms. Samantha Power
- *Vice President (Academic)*
 - Ms. Amanda Henry
- *Vice President (External)*
 - Mr. Dave Cournoyer
- *Vice President (Operations and Finance)*
 - Mr. Chris Cunningham
- *Vice President (Student Life)*
 - Mr. Omer Yusuf
- *Board of Governors Representative*
 - Mr. Chris Samuel
- *Physical Activity Complex Fee Plebiscite*
 - Defeated
- *Campus-Wide Tobacco Ban Plebiscite*
 - Passed



Students' Union Election Office

Phone: (780) 492 7102 Email: cro@ualberta.ca

To:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Mr. Gregory Harlow Speaker, Students' Council➤ Mr. Mathieu Johnson Vice President (Academic), Students' Union➤ Mr. Garry Bodnar University Secretariat
From:	➤ Ms. Rachel Woynorowski Chief Returning Officer
Subject:	2006/07 Students' Council and General Faculties Council Election Results
Date:	March 27, 2006

I am pleased to announce the winners of this year's Students' Union Councillor Elections.

The Students' Council and General Faculties Council Elections were held March 23rd and 24th. Our elections were held in compliance with Bylaws 1500, 2200, and 2500, and I am satisfied that they were fair and that the results reflect the will of the electorate. There have been no appeals of any of my decisions or rulings and no recounts have been requested.

More detailed results, including breakdowns of each round of preferential voting, are available upon request. A final version of these detailed results will be published in my final report submitted to Students' Council.

Students Union Council

- *Business*
 - Mr. Ryan Payne
 - Mr. Michael Cook
 - Mr. Eamonn Gamble
- *Education*
 - Mr. Harold Semenuk
- *Engineering*
 - Mr. Kory Mathewson
 - Mr. Prem Eruvbetine
 - Mr. Curt Clark
 - Mr. Paul Kirvan
 - Mr. Ben Nearingburg
- *Law*
 - Mr. Jonathan Tiemam
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (1)
Mr. Scott McAnsh
- *Medicine & Dentistry*
 - Ms. Carrie Ye
- *Physical Education & Recreation*
 - Mr. Darren Gray
- *Faculte St. Jean*
 - Ms. Brittney Bugler
- *Arts*
 - Mr. Michael Janz
 - Mr. Al-Amyn Sumar
 - Mr. Brock Richardson
 - Mr. Cam Lewis
 - Mr. Tim Schneider
 - Mr. John Chandler
- *Science*
 - Mr. Justin Kehoe
 - Mr. Greg German
 - Ms. Theresa Chapman
 - Mr. Steve Kirkham
 - Mr. Brendan Trayner
 - Ms. Sylvia Shamanna
 - Mr. Christopher Le
 - Ms. Bayan Hussein
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (1)
Mr. Alamjit Singh
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (2)
Ms. Sheena Aperocho
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (3)
Ms. Damini Mohan
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (4)
Ms. Nassrein Hussein
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (5)
Mr. Steve Dollansky

General Faculties Council

- *Agriculture, Forestry & Home Economics*
 - Ms. Leah Bennett
- *Business*
 - Mr. Michael Cook
 - Mr. Scott Nicol
- *Engineering*
 - Mr. Graeme Wicentowich
 - Mr. Stephen McFetridge
 - Mr. Mat Johnson
 - Mr. Scott Rebman
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (1)
Mr. Prem Eruvbetine
- *Law*
 - Mr. Jonathan Tiemam
- *Medicine & Dentistry*
 - Mr. Mark Kearns
- *Physical Education & Recreation*
 - Ms. Stacey Badry
- *Arts*
 - The Inanimate Carbon Rod Named Fraser (joke candidate)
 - Mr. Alan Cliff
 - Mr. Cam Lewis
 - Mr. Brock Richardson
 - Mr. Tim Schneider
- *Science*
 - Mr. Justin Kehoe
 - Mr. Peter Gill
 - Mr. Steve Kirkham
 - Ms. Damini Mohan
 - Mr. Brendan Trayner
 - Ms. Sylvia Shamanna
 - Ms. Bayan Hussein
 - Mr. Najam Mian
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (1)
Ms. Nassrein Hussein
 - Councillor-in-Waiting (2)
Mr. Alin Florea

Votes and Proceedings

University Policy Committee

Thursday August 3rd 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting called to order by KEHOE at 6:08 pm
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
ERUVS/JANZ moved that the agenda be approved as presented. 6/0/0 CARRIED
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
4. PRESENTATIONS – There were no presentations
5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORTS
 - a. Amanda Henry, Vice President (Academic)
 - b. Omer Yusuf, Vice President (Student Life)
6. QUESTION PERIOD
7. OLD BUSINESS
8. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. KEHOE/YUSUF moved to refer the Political Policy relating to SU Election Rally to the VPSL (to take back to the “magic world” of 2-900) for drafting. 6/0/0 CARRIED
 - b. YUSUF/ERUVS moved to refer the Political Policy relating to Co-op and Internship Programs to the VPA for drafting. 6/0/0 CARRIED
 - c. HENRY/JANZ moved to direct the Chair to investigate whether or not repealed political policies relating to Add/Drop Deadline need be vetted via committee. 5/0/0 CARRIED
 - d. JANZ/ERUVS moved to refer the Political Policy relating to Add/Drop Deadline to the VPA for drafting. 5/0/1 CARRIED
 - e. ERUVS/JANZ moved to refer Political Policy relating to Mandatory Non-Instructional Fees the draft back to the VPA to incorporate the changes discussed. 5/0/0 CARRIED
9. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - a. Health and Wellness-tabled
 - b. Teaching and Research Political Policies
 - c. Committee Strategic Planning
10. ADJOURNMENT
ERUVS/YUSUF MOVED TO adjourn at 7:59 pm 6/0/0 CARRIED

NEXT MEETING

August 17th, 2006

MINUTES

2006-July-25

Audit Committee

Date July 25, 2006

ATTENDANCE: Chapman, Janz, Eruvs

CALL TO ORDER: 5:07pm

**APPROVAL OF
AGENDA:** Eruvs/Janz
3/0/0

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS: Audit Committee Bill
Chapman/Eruvs 4/0/0

Amended Standing Orders
Eruvs/Chapman
5/0/0

Discussion of Bill that would change Audit Committee's Mandate

NEXT MEETING: July , 2006 @ 5pm

ADJOURNMENT: unanimous

CHAPMAN/ERUVS motion that upon the recommendation of the Audit Committee that the following Bill be read a first time:

Audit Committee Reformation—Principles (First Reading)

Changes to Bylaw 100:

Bylaw 100 will be amended as such that the mandate of the Audit Committee shall be struck and replaced with the following principals

1. The Audit Committee:

- (a) Shall review for compliance funding agreements and contracts between the SU and any DFU or Faculty Association;
- (b) Shall monitor the use of all Faculty Association Membership Fees and Faculty Membership Fees;
- (c) Shall monitor the use by AUFSJ the funds allocated to it by the Students' Union;
- (d) Shall withhold disbursements of funding to a DFU or Faculty Association that the Audit Committee has determined is not in material compliance with a funding agreement, Bylaw or contract, with regards to present or past disbursements of funding to that DFU or Faculty Association, provided that
 - i. A withholding decision shall be reviewed by the Audit Committee upon application by the DFU or Faculty Association;
 - ii. An appeal lies to DIE Board of any withholding decision.
- (e) Upon finding that the Students' Union is in breach of a contract, shall, in no particular order:
 - i. Inform Council and indicate to Council a proposed course of action to remedy or mitigate the breach;
 - ii. Inform and question the Executive Committee, as soon as reasonably prudent, concerning the circumstances of the breach, its causes, and the actions being taken by the Executive to remedy or mitigate the breach.
- (f) Shall monitor the Grant Allocation Committee's allocation of the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund, the Eugene L. Brody Fund, the Golden Bear and Panda Legacy Fund, and the Refugee Student Fund;
- (g) Shall review the proposed uses and make a decision on the disbursement of funds for DFUs not listed in section (g), no later than August 31 of each year or within 4 weeks of their submission of documents required in Bylaw 6000(1), whichever is later;
- (h) Shall annually select the Students' Union auditor and oversee the Students' Union's external audit;
- (i) Shall review the Students' Union's audited financial statements in advance of their presentation to Students' Council;
- (j) Shall review all alterations made to the Students' Union's budget for the

- purpose of verifying compliance with Students' Union legislation;
- (k) Shall review, for appropriateness and compliance with the Students' Union's budget, the transactions of the Students' Union organizational units;
 - (l) Shall review all expenditures made on Students' Union credit cards;
 - (m) Shall investigate any inappropriate transactions or significant variances against the Students' Union's budget;
 - (n) Has the authority to require to appear before it, in a reasonable period of time, any Students' Union employee(s) and/or member(s) of the Executive Committee;

Changes to Bylaw 6000

2. In addition to the provisions in Bylaw 6000(2), the DFU must provide the Audit Committee with:
 - (a) Copies of any contracts with the Students' Union
 - (b) Evidence of compliance with all contracts with the Students' Union
 - (c) Evidence that they are fulfilling their mandate as described in Bylaw 6000

Audit Committee Standing Orders

(Approved July 25, 2006)

The Audit Committee shall consist of two sub-committees, viz. the "External Audit Committee" and the "Internal Audit Committee" subject to the following:

1. Definitions:
 - (a) Primary member of a sub-committee: shall be a member of Audit Committee who is assigned to that sub-committee;
 - (b) Chair: the Chair of Audit Committee is also the Chair of both sub-committees.
2. The entire Audit Committee shall meet as a whole:
 - (a) Once at the beginning of the year to
 - i. Elect a Chair;
 - ii. Approve Standing Orders;
 - iii. Assign members to sub-committees.
 - (b) To make decisions regarding:
 - iv. Removal and/or replacement of the Chair;
 - v. Changes to Standing Orders.
 - (c) Whenever called for by any member with 72 hours notice or agreement by all members of the committee as a whole.
 - (d) For the first meeting of the Committee in May, September and January, set out a meeting schedule for the following four months.
3. The Committee will assign the task of recording minutes to a member of the Committee.
4. Each member shall hold a seat on either the External or Internal Audit Committee but not both, with exception to the Chair;
5. Section (4) shall not limit members of Audit Committee from attending and voting at meetings of the sub-committee to which they are not primary members;
6. The External Audit Committee:
 - (a) Shall consist of three (3) primary members:
 - vi. The Chair of Audit Committee
 - vii. Two other members selected from the Audit Committee
 - (b) Shall have quorum of three (3) members;
 - (c) Shall review the proposed uses and make a decision regarding disbursement of funds for DFUs not listed in section 6(j), no later than August 31 of each year or within 4 weeks of their submission of documents required in Bylaw 6000(1) whichever is later subject to the following:
 - viii. The committee shall review the disbursement of a dedicated fee unit when:
 1. The Students' Council representative on that dedicated fee's board is present;
 2. All conditions set out in Bylaw 6000(2) have been met.
 - (d) Shall monitor the use of all Faculty Association Membership Fees and Faculty Membership Fees.
 - (e) Shall, when there is no other business, review, for appropriateness and compliance with the Students' Union's budget, the transactions of the Students' Union organizational units and report, through the Chair, any findings to the Internal Audit Committee;
 - (f) Shall communicate directly with the Internal Audit Committee wherever necessary
7. The Internal Audit Committee:

- (a) Shall consist of three (3) primary members:
 - i. The Chair of Audit Committee
 - ii. Two other members selected from the Audit Committee
- (b) Shall have quorum of three (3) members;
- (c) Shall annually select the Students' Union auditor and oversee the Students' Union's external audit;
- (d) Shall review the Students' Union's audited financial statements in advance of their presentation to Students' Council;
- (e) Shall review all alterations made to the Students' Union's budget for the purpose of verifying compliance with Students' Union legislation;
- (f) Shall, each month, review, for appropriateness and compliance with the Students' Union's budget, the transactions of the Students' Union organizational units;
- (g) Shall review all expenditures made on Students' Union credit cards;
- (h) Shall investigate any inappropriate transactions or significant variances against the Students' Union's budget;
- (i) Has the authority to require to appear before it, in a reasonable period of time, any Students' Union employee(s) and/or member(s) of the Executive Committee;
- (j) Shall monitor the Grant Allocation Committee's allocation of the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund, the Eugene L. Brody Fund, the Golden Bear and Panda Legacy Fund, and the Refugee Student Fund;
- (k) Shall at the first meeting of the Committee in May, September and January, set out a meeting schedule for the following four months
- (l) Shall communicate directly with the External Audit Committee wherever necessary

8. The Chair:

- (a) Shall ensure that there is an agenda for each meeting that will include, at minimum:
 - i. Call to order
 - ii. Attendance
 - iii. Items of Business (Based on the Sub-Committee's mandate)
 - iv. Adjournment
- (b) Shall, after each meeting of the committee, submit to Students' Council a report to appear on the main agenda including:
 - i. any decisions made by the standing committee acting under authority delegated to it by Students' Council,
 - ii. any recommendations made by the standing committee to Students' Council,
 - iii. any standing orders adopted by the committee, and
 - iv. a document titled "Summary of Proceedings" summarizing the activities of the committee at the meeting in question.
- (g) Notwithstanding Section 7(a), if the meeting occurs after that deadline, the Chair shall submit minutes of the Committee as soon as possible so that they appear on the late additions agenda of Students' Council
- (h) Shall be responsible for booking meeting rooms for meetings of the Committee;
- (i) May institute Robert's Rules of Order if the meeting would benefit from the imposition of structure;
- (j) Shall be responsible for ensuring the security of all financial documents;

Shall ensure that all electronic communication between a dedicated fee unit and the Committee will be forwarded to the Students' Council representative on the dedicated fee unit's board

9. Members of a subcommittee are encouraged to assign a proxy from within the committee as a whole before asking another Councillor.

10. The Chair shall request to be added to the GAC mailing list and to receive all minutes and agendas from GAC.

MINUTES

2006-August-1

Budget and Finance Committee

ATTENDANCE: Chapman
Kehoe
Cunningham
Cook

CALL TO ORDER: 5:42 pm

OLD BUSINESS: Recommended Changes to Standing Orders of Students' Council
Chapman/Kehoe
5/0/0

NEXT MEETING: August 15, 2006; 17:30; SUB 606

ADJOURNMENT: Kehoe/Cook
5/0/0

Edited Excerpt from Standing Orders of Students' Council

PART 10: LEGISLATIVE PROCESS FOR BUDGET

Vice President (Operations and Finance) Recommends Budget Principles

16(1) The Vice President shall submit or cause to be submitted a proposed set of budget principles to the Budget and Finance Committee no later than November 1.

Budget and Finance Committee Amends and Recommends Budget Principles

16(2) The Budget and Finance Committee shall recommend a set of budget principles to Students' Council no later than November 30.

First Reading of Budget in Council

16(3) Students' Council shall approve a set of budget principles no later than December 15.

Executive Committee to Recommend Budget

16(4) The Executive Committee shall submit an Operating and Capital Budget, which shall reflect the set of budget principles approved by Council, to the Budget and Finance Committee no later than January 15.

Budget and Finance Committee to Amend and Recommend Budget

16(5) The Budget and Finance Committee shall recommend an operating and Capital Budget to Students' Council no later than January 31.

Second Reading of Budget in Council

16(6) When the budget is being read a second time:

- (a) Students' Council shall either:
 - (i) approve the Operating and Capital Budget, or
 - (ii) refer the Operating and Capital Budget with amended budget principles back to the Executive Committee no later than February 15;
- (b) the budget will be presented in a three part document consisting of:
 - (i) the budget principles passed on 1st reading,
 - (ii) the estimates numerical breakdown of the budget, and
 - (iii) additional written instruction on how money within budget categories is to be spent;
- (c) debate is confined to:
 - (i) technical merits and whether the committee properly interpreted the budget principles passed in First Reading,
 - (ii) Fiscal prudence of the proposed budget, and
 - (iii) Whether the budget principles passed on first reading should be retained or altered based on the numerical breakdown and the merits of the budget principles.

Executive Committee to Recommend a Final Budget

16(7) Where Council refers the Operating and Capital Budget back to the Executive Committee with amended budget principles, the Executive Committee shall submit a revised Operating and Capital

Budget, which shall reflect the amended set of budget principles approved by Council, to the Budget and Finance Committee no later than March 15.

Budget and Finance Committee to Amend and Recommend Budget

16(8) The Budget and Finance Committee shall recommend an Operating and Capital Budget to Students' Council no later than March 31.

Third Reading of Budget in Council

16(9) When the budget is being read a third time:

- (a) Students' Council shall vote to approve the Operating and Capital Budget no later than April 30;
- (b) the budget will be presented in a three part document consisting of:
 - (i) the budget principles passed on 1st reading,
 - (ii) the numerical breakdown of the budget, and
 - (iii) additional written instruction providing further instruction on how money within budget categories is to be spent;
- (c) debate is confined to technical merits and whether the committee properly interpreted the budget principles referred to the Executive Committee in Second Reading.

Chris Cunningham, Vice President – Operations & Finance
Report to Students' Council
August 8, 2006

Good evening Council,

PowerPlant

Our focus has now shifted away from the logistics and on to marketing. How are we going to ensure that the new PowerPlant concept will be a success? Talks are now underway to develop a marketing strategy that will ensure students not only know about the changes but will line up to eat at the new PowerPlant Buffet. We're also counting on council to start spreading the word... word of mouth goes a long way.

Sponsorship

Confirmed Platinum sponsors: Labatt, U of A Bookstore, Ikea, Chianti's/Fiore's, Shaw, Bell, Sonic, The Gateway

Non Returning Platinum sponsors: Quality Colour Press, Pizza 73

Confirmed Gold sponsors: Royal Bank, ETS, Travel Cuts, United Cycle

Kiel Owen (Sponsorship Coordinator) is still working hard to pursue a number of potential sponsors. So far we're looking pretty good on the sponsorship end of things despite loosing two platinum sponsors from last year.

Eugene L. Brody Fund

Ah yes... I'm hoping the bill on today's Agenda won't be as contentious as I fear it will be. This is a good bill people... just vote in favor, and everything will be just fine.