

2021 BOARD OF DIRECTORS ELECTION REPORT

SAIT Students' Association (Saitsa)

Prepared By: Ilene Burns – Chief Returning Officer

Prepared For: Saitsa Board of Directors

April 15, 2021



Contents

Executive Summary..... 3

Candidates Elected to the 2021 Board of Directors 4

Overview 4

Election Process, Oversight and Governance Committee Recommendations 4

 Issues and Recommendations 6

Election Promotion..... 8

 Issues and Recommendations 8

Nominations and Candidates’ Meetings..... 9

 Issues and Recommendations 9

Meet & Greet and Panel Night 10

 Issues and Recommendations 11

Campaign Period & Demerit Issuance 12

 Issues and Recommendations 12

Voting, Poster Tear Down and Expense Forms..... 13

 Issues and Recommendations 14

Official Results..... 15

Executive Summary

The 2021 Board of Directors Election was the first election under the new governance model approved by the student body at the Board of Directors AGM on February 23, 2021. The new model now consists of a board of 9 directors who will choose from within, their President and Vice President. A new voting process, Single Transferable Voting, was another procedural change with the incorporation of the new governance model. The election policies & procedures as well as the bylaws were revised by the sitting board to reflect the governance changes.

There were many challenges faced with this election. The Chief Returning Officer (CRO) along with the Governance and Advocacy office and the Marketing and Communications department had to prepare for two different election campaigns based on the potential outcomes of the vote at the AGM on the new governance model. Nominations opened 5 days after the AGM which left little time for the election to be rolled out. That coupled with a virtual election format due to continued COVID-19 restrictions in place on campus resulted in many more hours of planning and election preparation in comparison to a typical election.

There were initially 12 candidates in the running for the 9 board of director spots. Very early on 2 of these candidates withdrew for personal reasons resulting in only 10 individuals seeking election as a director.

Voter turn out was a mere 5.4%, with 696 students out of 12,938 casting their ballots. Of the 696 voters, 15 chose to abstain from voting for a candidate. The majority of the students who voted continue to be full time students. Voter breakdown was as follows; 648 full time students, 35 part time students, 7 apprentice, and 3 other. Restricted access to SAIT campus due to COVID-19 continues to be seen as the biggest factor in the low voter turn out. Students commented on not having enough direct access to the candidates to get to know them and to understand their campaign platform.

In total, 2 demerits were issued this election for campaigning via unsolicited emails. After investigating the CRO deemed this to be a misunderstanding on behalf of the candidate involved and was resolved without further issue.

Saitsa is committed to maintaining the highest standards of fairness, equality, transparency and student interest in its elections. This report will highlight the candidate results, election process, issues encountered as well as recommendations to the Board of Directors and more.

All recommendations made within this report have been made in consultation with Saitsa's Manager of Governance and Advocacy, and are based on observations and experiences of the CRO. In efforts to continually improve Saitsa's election processes and to establish best practices, the CRO encourages the Saitsa Board of Directors to strongly consider all recommendations contained within this report.

Candidates Elected to the 2021 Board of Directors

Congratulations to all the candidates and their supporters of the 2021 Board of Directors Election. The following are the 9 successful candidates in this year's election in alphabetical order, by last name.

Tomi Aroge

MacLean Jarvis

Jasmin K. Bhatti

Truc Than

Arek Gellatly

Dawson Andrew Thomas

Hana Hossain

Jaira Velasco

Liam Hunter

Overview

This report will provide an overview of the changes to the election process and oversight, election promotion, nominations, Candidates' Meetings, Panel Night, campaign period, demerit issuance, voting, candidate expenses, and results. Issues encountered as well as recommendations are included at the end of each section.

Election Process, Oversight and Governance Committee Recommendations

Changes to Saitsa's governance model resulted in several changes to the election process. There is now only one election each winter semester to elect one board of directors. This new board consists of 9 directors and from within these directors a President and Vice President will be elected by the directors themselves.

Voting is now done by way of Single Transferable Voting (STV). STV is a voting method where voters rank the candidates in order of preference from most preferred to least preferred on one ballot. Candidates are either elected to or eliminated from the election in several rounds of counting ballots until all positions have been filled. To be elected, candidates are to receive a minimum number of votes, which is the quota. The quota is calculated using the Droop formula; number of voters having cast a valid ballot divided by the number of options (number of director positions) plus 1 and then adding 1 to this number. An independent third-party company, Simply Voting, processes the ballots, calculates the quota, and calculates the results. The CRO verifies the quota and the results prior to the provisional results being announced.

In addition to STV, governance changes mean there will no longer be elections where electors choose candidates by way of a Yes/No vote if there are uncontested elections. This system has been replaced with an acclamation style voting procedure. If there is an election where there are

an equal number of candidates or fewer running for the available director positions, these candidates will now be acclaimed.

Candidate expense limit for all elections was adjusted to \$300. This is an average of the previous amounts of \$200 for the Board of Director election limit and the \$400 Executive Council election limit.

Under the previous governance model there was a Political Committee, comprised of 4 members, which was tasked with overseeing the election process. Now the CRO, assisted by the Governance and Advocacy staff, is responsible for administering Saitsa's elections and enforcing Saitsa's Policies and Procedures, reporting to the Executive Director.

Another change is the addition of an Election Oversight Panel (EOP). The EOP consists of 3 disinterested parties appointed by the board. This panel exists independently and acts as an adjudication panel in the event of someone appealing the decision of the CRO or the election results.

Together the CRO and the EOP are in place to oversee the general conduct and implementation of elections on behalf of Saitsa in a manner that upholds the guiding principles, policies and bylaws.

Future recommendations included in the Governance Report commissioned by the Saitsa Board of Directors that apply to the election process and have not already been incorporated into the Saitsa election procedures are paraphrased as follows. Nomination, campaign and voting periods should be lengthened, and the simplicity and permissiveness of the election procedures should be enhanced. Discussion between the CRO and Manager of Governance and Advocacy need to take place to discuss the viability of the above recommendations to be able to put forward recommendations to the Saitsa Board of Directors.

2021 Election Administration:

Ilene Burns – Chief Returning Officer

Rachel Paris – Manager of Governance and Advocacy

Rio Valencerina – Governance and Advocacy Coordinator

Angela Walgren – Governance and Advocacy Administration Coordinator

2021 Election Oversight Panel

Jim Clarkson – Chair

AnneMarie Darichuk – Panel Member

Erin Navarro – Panel Member

The CRO and Saitsa staff had to prepare for two different election processes based on the potential outcomes of the vote on the new governance model at the BOD AGM on February 23, 2021. This amounted to a significant amount of work for all involved and an extremely tight

timeframe to get all the pieces in place as the start of the election was only 5 days after the AGM. Restricted access to SAIT campus due to COVID-19 once again had to be factored into the election planning.

The time and effort that was put into the preparation of an online election format in the fall semester for the Board election paid dividends in this election. Online forms and submission platforms that were created for that election were utilized this election with minimal changes required.

The CRO and the Governance and Advocacy staff hosted two virtual Candidates' Meetings as well as a virtual Panel Night, responded to candidate's questions, enforced and provided direction pertaining to the Election Policies & Procedures, and monitored voting activities.

Issues and Recommendations

- Due to the many changes incurred to the election process with the acceptance of a new governance model, board and election information posted on the Saitsa website is not consistent and needs to be updated.

It is recommended that Marketing and the Governance and Advocacy office review board and election information on the website and update it to reflect the new Election Policies & Procedures and Bylaws.

- In an effort to increase voter turnout, simplify the voting process, and reduce costs associated to the voting process, **it is suggested that the board consider, as part of their strategic planning, if Saitsa should continue to utilize the services of Simply Voting or partner with SAIT to develop their own voting platform.** Other student associations/unions have found it beneficial to partner with their post secondary institutions to develop their own voting platforms. Partnering with SAIT may allow students to vote by way of their student ID number at kiosks located across SAIT's main campus as well as the satellite campuses. This would require a capital investment by Saitsa to purchase the kiosks. These kiosks would then be available for the whole Saitsa organization to use for surveys, student engagement as well as voting, just to name a few. Things to consider when looking at a new voting platform are how to simplify the voting process for the students without compromising the integrity of the vote, that is accessible to all students on both the main campus as well as satellite locations. The board should consult with the CRO to ensure any changes align with the election policies & procedures and guiding principles.
- With only 5 days between the acceptance of the new governance model and the start of the election, the Board was unable to hire and have in place the EOP before the opening of nominations.

The CRO advises the board to create a hiring process for the EOP members so that the members are in place prior to the start of each election.

- The EOP email was not set up until late in this year's election as it could not be set up until it was confirmed that Saitsa would be moving forward with a new election format. It is now set up and this should not be an issue next election.
- **It is recommended that section 12.4.1 of the Policies & Procedures be reworded to include an end time for the appeal process. Currently the appeal process ends 10 days after the close of polls. The CRO recommends the wording be changed to "All appeals must be submitted to the Oversight Panel by 4:00pm of the 10th day following the announcement of the provisional results".**
- **It is recommended that the EOP Chair announce the close of the appeal process at 4pm on the 10th day following the announcement of the provisional results by way of email to the Executive Director, the Board of Directors, Manger of Governance and Advocacy and the CRO provided there are no open appeals at that time. If an appeal is still open, then the EOP Chair will announce the close of the appeal process once that appeal has been closed.**
- **The CRO shall review the EOP appeal procedures with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy to make sure they are in alignment with the policies & procedures and bylaws, and they include the recommended changes included in this report.**
- The CRO is in agreement with the governance report recommendation on lengthening the election timeframe.

The nomination period should be reduced from the current practice of two nomination periods to one, that should be open for 21 days. A minimum of 2 Candidates' Meetings would be hosted during this timeframe with additional meetings if required.

The CRO also recommends extending the campaign period to 3 weeks from the end of the nomination period to the start of voting. This will allow more time for Saitsa to host events, Meet & Greet and Panel Night, and provide the candidates more time to interact with the students and present their campaign while still managing their academic workload.

Consultation with other post secondary institutions who have longer voting periods is needed to determine if this would be a beneficial change to Saitsa's election procedures.

- Further discussion is required in consideration of simplifying the election procedures. The election procedures that are currently in place, in large part, are there due to situations that occurred in past elections that resulted in rules being created surrounding those situations. The Manager of Governance and Advocacy, the CRO and the board need to consider what are essential rules that need to be in place to host an election that maintains the highest standards of fairness, equality, transparency and student interest while allowing the candidates the freedom to run an effective campaign. It is further

recommended that the Executive Director begin consultations with SAIT to review current restrictions in the procedures to see if they are still relevant.

Election Promotion

Saitsa Marketing department worked diligently on election promotion. Promo blasts on Saitsa's social media accounts, advertising on the Saitsa website, and communication with SAIT faculty during classroom talks were all utilized to get election information out to the students.

Marketing recorded on the Saitsa website, over 1900 views of the Candidate Endorsement page, 885 views of the Candidate page and 750 views of the Decide page. Candidates' videos, 8 of the 10 candidates submitted videos, were viewed 1793 times. There were just over 2000 unique engagements of the 55 posts posted on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and LinkedIn. Candidate videos posted on YouTube received a record number of views this election with over 200 views for each candidate.

Students indicated that they missed the physical, in person campaign promotions of past elections. Online promotion of candidates' campaigns, although still effective, was not able to provide the students with a chance to engage directly with the candidates to get to know them or their campaign well enough. Voters were left with unanswered questions due to the restricted access they had to the candidates.

Issues and Recommendations

- Continued restricted access to SAIT campus prevented direct interaction with the student body to encourage students to become involved in running for a director position, actively support a candidate and even vote.

Once physical restrictions are relaxed on campus and the ability to physically promote the election combined with the current online approach is able to be incorporated, there should be an increased interest in the election process within time. Students will need some time to adjust to being back on campus but once they get back into a routine, things should normalize and improve regarding election awareness and involvement.

Promotion of Saitsa events on the Saitsa website should be scaled back during the election period to allow the election to be highlighted. Marketing should communicate to Saitsa departments/groups to request their cooperation in this area during the election period.

- **It is recommended that Marketing undertake media spots throughout the academic year to highlight different components of the election process and governance of the association. This is intended to educate the student population on why Saitsa exists, its purpose, as well as to inform them of the leadership opportunities that exist within the Board.**

Informed students are more likely to participate in the election process by being candidates, supporting candidates and voting.

- **A modified version of the Candidates' Meeting hosted throughout the academic year should be used to promote interest in students to run for a director position in future elections.** The focus of this meeting should be more on what is involved in the role and responsibilities of a director, the requirements of the position, time commitment, etc. This would provide the student with an understanding of the position and how to prepare their campaign if they choose to become a candidate in the next election. Individuals who attend these meetings would be contacted prior to the next election to see if they were still interested in running for a position on the board.
- As elections are now only once per year and in the winter semester, Marketing will have more time to promote election events throughout the academic year. Marketing will benefit from having event details provided to them sooner, allowing them to better prepare for election event promotion.
- Online election promotion has its limits as it only reaches the students who choose to read the posts and can be easily ignore if it does not catch the student's interest. Efforts to find new and innovative ways to attract the student body's attention to get them interested in the election process and to get them to vote needs to be continued.

Nominations and Candidates' Meetings

In order for a nomination to be considered valid, students have to be members of Saitsa in good standing who have paid their Saitsa and SAIT fees in full. They have to obtain 20 signatures from active Saitsa member students and they must attend at least one Candidates' Meeting. Due to continued COVID-19 on-campus restrictions and online learning environments, nomination packages for the Board of Directors election were available online only.

Nominations opened on March 1 and ended on March 16. Nominees were required to have their nomination packages submitted to the CRO by 12pm, noon, on March 9, for the first nomination period, and 12pm, noon, on March 16, for the second nomination period. There were 12 nomination packages completed and submitted by the close of the nomination period.

There were 9 nominees in attendance for the first Candidates' Meeting and 3 attending the second Candidates' Meeting. Both Candidates' Meetings were hosted virtually via Teams and well received.

After the second Candidates' Meeting, 2 candidates withdrew due to personal reasons resulting in only 10 candidates remaining in the running for the 9 director positions.

Issues and Recommendations

- When the candidates have obtained the required 20 nominator signatures on their nomination form, their name is removed from the nomination signature page. As nominators must be Saitsa members, candidates are encouraged to collect extra signatures above the minimum 20 in case one or more of the obtained signatures is not a Saitsa member.

It is recommended that candidate's names are not removed from the nomination signature page until they have reached 25 signatures to allow candidates to collect extra nominator signatures to account for the possibility of any invalid signatures on their form.

- **The CRO recommends only 1 nomination period for future elections that will open on the first day of the election period and close at 12pm, noon, on the 21st day of the election period. A minimum of 2 Candidates' Meeting will be hosted by the last day of the nomination period with the option of extra Candidates' Meetings being hosted if necessary. This is in alignment with a recommendation from the Governance Review Committee.**

Discussions will need to take place between the CRO, Manager of Governance and Advocacy, and Marketing to determine how to promote this change and to inform the candidates. If multiple Candidates' Meetings are planned then deadlines will be in place for nomination packages to be submitted to qualify to attend a scheduled Candidates' Meeting; i.e.: Candidates' Meeting on day 10 of the election would require nomination packages to be submitted by 12pm, noon, the day of the meeting.

Meet & Greet and Panel Night

It was decided to forego the Meet & Greet this election as a result of continued restricted physical access on-campus and proceed only with a virtual Panel Night. The intent is to continue with hosting both the Meet & Greet as well as Panel Night in future elections, providing access to on-campus events is not still restricted for future elections.

The Governance and Advocacy office, in consultation with the CRO, worked with the Events department to organize Panel Night via a relatively new platform to Saitsa, AirMeet. Of the 10 candidates running, 9 participated in this year's Panel Night. Candidates were asked a variety of questions, presented by a moderator, pertaining to Saitsa's present day issues, challenges faced by student associations, changes to Saitsa's governance structure, and some just for fun. Several of these questions were provided to the candidates 3 days in advance of the event to help them prepare. During the event, candidates were presented the opportunity to introduce themselves and respond to varying questions to help inform the voters about their views. Candidates were divided into 2 groups and each group was brought up on stage for 2 Q&A sessions per group. To keep the candidates and audience engaged and to cover a wider range of topics, the moderator presented different questions to each group throughout the evening.

There were several issues encountered with this year's Panel Night. Technology issues with a candidate's microphone and speakers, lack of active audience members, and only one question from the audience presented during the event. The CRO, Manager of Governance and Advocacy, Marketing and Events will need to work together to strategize on how to improve these issues for the next election.

Panel Night was livestreamed on Facebook with a peak of 9 viewers over 4 streams. Due to the Airmeet platform, every time there was a break in between the Panel Night sessions, the Events

team had to reset the livestream on Facebook. The overall viewing time of the 4 sessions was 140 minutes.

Issues and Recommendations

- Restricted access to SAIT campus prevented Saitsa from hosting Meet & Greet this election. It is expected this event will resume when campus is once again open to all students and staff.
- Panel Night was hosted virtually via AirMeet. The structure of the event worked well but there were issues with technology and it was not well received by the student population this year.

The CRO, Manager of Governance and Advocacy, Marketing and Events will need to take the next few months to analyze this past Panel Night and discuss ways in which to improve upon for the next election in 2022.

The CRO recommends hosting a rehearsal for Panel Night the night prior to the event to go over the rules of the event, make sure candidates are connecting via the recommended browser (Chrome is the recommended browser for AirMeet) and to perform a check of candidates' microphones and speakers. A review of the script and candidates names, as well as the pronunciation of the candidates names, should also be conducted with staff and the moderator.

- Live audience attendance was very low and resulted in only one question from the audience for the candidates.

Governance and Advocacy should work with Marketing to develop a system where students are able to submit questions prior to Panel Night for the candidates to respond to during the event. If the Board were to decide to purchase kiosks for Saitsa, as mentioned previously in this report under 'Election Process, Oversight and Governance Committee Recommendations', these could be used to gather this information from the student population.

- Saitsa has only been using AirMeet since February of this year and not all students are familiar with this platform. AirMeet requires you to register before you are able to access any of the events being hosted. This is a one-time registration but still a requirement if a student wants to attend an event on AirMeet.

Unfamiliarity with this platform coupled with the extra step of having to register with AirMeet is thought to be a factor in the low student audience participation for Panel Night, only 4 students attended. If Saitsa continues to utilize AirMeet, it is anticipated that most students will have registered with AirMeet and will be familiar with the platform by the next election period and this should not be a deterrent for future election event participation.

- The start of live streaming of Panel Night on Facebook was delayed this election due to a backstage oversight.

It is recommended that the Panel Night program script include the streaming of the event on Facebook and a member of the Events department is assigned to be in charge of starting the livestreaming of the event to prevent future events from not going live on time.

Campaign Period & Demerit Issuance

Upon completion of all eligibility requirements, candidates were permitted to begin their campaign. The campaign period began on March 9 and ended at the close of polls on March 31. As attendance of a Candidates' Meeting is part of the requirement to become a candidate, only candidates who had attended the first Candidates' Meeting were able to begin their campaign on March 9 while the remaining candidates had to wait until they had attended the second Candidates' Meeting on March 16 to begin their campaign.

Once again, SharePoint was used to store relevant election documentation for the candidates to access. Election documents were also available on the Saitsa website. Candidates were reminded of important election events by way of calendar invites.

The candidate profile format created last year continued to provide voters with an even platform to compare the candidates. As well, the form submission platforms continued to be an effective way for the candidates to submit required documents to the CRO and Saitsa staff.

Candidates were responsible for taking their profile picture and creating their campaign video, and then submitting them via a drop box on the Saitsa website to Marketing. All candidates provided a profile picture and 8 out of 10 candidates created and submitted a video. Posters from all the candidates were also submitted and posted along with their pictures and videos on the Saitsa website.

As with the previous election in the fall, candidates were faced with having to run a completely virtual campaign. They presented virtual classroom talks and posted their platform on D2L with the permission of the individual instructors for those classes. Candidates also posted on various social media platforms including Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.

There were 2 demerits issued this election for campaigning via email. The issue was investigated and found to be a misunderstanding of the rules surrounding campaigning through email and was resolved without further issue.

Issues and Recommendations

- **Policies & Procedures section 10.3 Social Media and Email should be relocated to section 9.0 Campaigning & Campaign Materials as it does not belong under section 10.0 Campaign Funding.**
- The submission platforms for candidate forms proved once again to be a successful way for candidates to submit their election documents and will continue to be used for future elections.

- **It is recommended for Saitsa to consider continuing the self-submission process for candidate videos;** previously, Saitsa established the staff-run photo and video shoot process for candidates to keep the presentation platform equal and consistent. With candidates having access to quality recording devices via personal Smart Phones they are able to relax and practice their videos in an environment they are comfortable in which provides the opportunity for increased creativity. The CRO should be consulted in this review to ensure any changes align with the guiding principles of the election.
- As with the last election, students were not able to physically campaign on campus due to COVID-19 restrictions. Campaigning was done solely by way of virtual means. This can be a difficult concept for some candidates and can cause confusion on how a candidate may or may not campaign. This misunderstanding resulted in demerits being issued this election.

It is recommended that continued efforts are made to assist candidates to understand the Election Policies and Procedures through open communication between the candidate and the CRO.

- **It is recommended that the campaign period be extended to 3 weeks from the close of the nomination period to the start of voting.** This is to provide more time for election activities to take place and to alleviate some of the stress encountered by the candidates having to balance running a campaign while still staying on top of their academic workload. The extended period will afford more time for Saitsa to host election events such as Meet & Greet and Panel Night. It will also provide voters with a few days in between campaign events and voting days for them to process the information received and follow up with any questions they may still have for the candidates before they cast their ballot.

Voting, Poster Tear Down and Expense Forms

Simply Voting, an independent third-party company, was again utilized for this year's election. Polls opened at 8am on March 30 with no issues and closed at 4pm on March 31.

The List of Electors was received by the Manager of Governance and Advocacy from SAIT with only a minor issue of some non-fee-paying students being included in the original list. There were 3 electors who requested assistance in locating their ballot. Of these, 2 electors were not included on the List of Electors and once it was verified they were eligible to vote, they were provided with the link to their ballot and successfully cast their ballot. The 3rd individual was found not to be a Saitsa member and was unable to vote.

Voter turnout was a mere 5.4%. Only 696 students out of 12,938 opted to vote, with 15 of the 696 voters choosing to abstain from voting for any of the candidates. It is the belief of the CRO that restricted access to SAIT campus and the inability of providing physical polling stations was a major contributor to the low voter turnout. COVID-19 fatigue is also a factor as students are tired of the online realm and had a hard time understanding the importance of voting in the election when the majority of the students are not able to utilize on-campus Saitsa resources.

Again, as with the last election, there was an increase in voting on the 2nd day of voting after a 'reminder to vote' email was sent to those students who had still not voted.

Poster tear down was not required this election as candidates were not permitted to post posters on campus due to continued restricted access to SAIT campus.

The expense form submission platform created by Saitsa's Marketing department last election was used again this election for candidates to submit their campaign expenses to the CRO. Candidates had until 4pm on March 31 to submit their expense forms. It was strongly advised that candidates submit their expense forms and receipts no later than 3:30pm to make sure there were no issues with late submissions.

With the new election format based off of the new governance model, the candidate's expense limit was adjusted this year to \$300 all inclusive from the previous amount of \$200 for the BOD election limit and \$400 for the EC election limit.

At the close of polls, 4:00pm March 31, election results were tabulated by Simply Voting. The voting quota was calculated by Simply Voting and later confirmed by the CRO. The quota, minimum number of votes required for a candidate to be elected, was 69. To exhaust all ballots, 11 rounds of counting ballots were required. Each round a candidate was either elected or eliminated from the election with the last round exhausting any remaining ballots. The candidate with the highest number of votes each round was elected provided they reached the quota. If there were no candidates who reached the quota in a round, the candidate with the fewest votes was eliminated and their votes were redistributed to the remaining candidates. This process was repeated until all ballots were exhausted.

The quota is calculated using the Droop formula as follows:

$$((696 \text{ voters} - 15 \text{ abstain}) / (9 \text{ board positions} + 1)) + 1 = 69$$

$$(681 / 10) + 1 = 69$$

Election results were emailed to the candidates shortly after the close of polls on March 31. After which Marketing posted the results on the Saitsa website as well as on Saitsa's social media accounts.

Issues and Recommendations

- The email that is sent out providing the students with the link to their ballot is sent through the Simply Voting system and the return email address attached to this email is the Saitsa Info email.

It is recommended that Governance and Advocacy have Marketing change the email associated with the voting link email from the Saitsa Info email to the Saitsa Election email and ensure the Saitsa Election email is whitelisted with SAIT IT in September each year.

- Low voter turnout continues to be an issue. Voter apathy, voter inexperience and no access to on-campus voting stations were contributing factors this election. Satellite campuses, trade and apprentice programs continue to be under represented groups among the voters. Creative solutions need to be developed to garner interest within the student community to motivate them to vote.

It is recommended, provided physical restrictions are not in place on SAIT campuses, that polling stations are located at all Satellite campuses and all trade and apprentice buildings during pre-set times on the voting days. It will be necessary to provide adequate promotion of the date, time and location of these mobile polling stations. Communication with faculty at these locations will be necessary to get their support to allow their students time to vote when the mobile polling station is at their location.

With the change in the governance of the board resulting in directors taking on more ownership linkage with the student body, it is expected that the directors will be able to better promote the board, Saitsa and the election process and this will result in higher student engagement in the voting process.

- **The CRO recommends to continue sending out email reminders to Saitsa members on both voting days reminding the electors to vote, as it once again resulted in an increase in voting after each email was sent this election.**
- Election results were emailed to candidates and then posted on the Saitsa website and on social media. **It is recommended that this process is used for any future virtual election results announcements.**
- Most candidates submit their expense forms close to the deadline which can make it difficult to verify all the expense forms in the current timeframe allotted for this part of the election process. It can be quite time consuming to verify expense forms if there is missing or incorrect information on them which could delay the announcement of the provisional results.

The CRO recommends changing the expense form deadline from 4pm on the last day of voting to 12pm, noon, on the last day of voting.

Official Results

Candidates

Votes required to elect an option: 69

| ROUND1 | |
|----------------------|--------------|
| Liam Hunter | 154.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | 146.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | 64.00 votes |
| Hana Hossain | 63.00 votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | 52.00 votes |

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Arek Gellatly | 48.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | 44.00 votes |
| Truc Than | 40.00 votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 36.00 votes |
| Jide Akinwale | 34.00 votes |
| Elected Liam Hunter due to: highest 1st preference | |
| Liam Hunter next preference votes redistributed at 0.55 discount | |
| ROUND2 | |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | 159.80 (+13.80) votes |
| Hana Hossain | 72.38 (+9.38) votes |
| Tomi Aroge | 69.52 (+5.52) votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 (-85.00) votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | 62.49 (+10.49) votes |
| Arek Gellatly | 55.18 (+7.18) votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | 51.18 (+7.18) votes |
| Truc Than | 44.97 (+4.97) votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 41.52 (+5.52) votes |
| Jide Akinwale | 37.86 (+3.86) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 17.11 (+17.11) votes |
| Elected Jasmin K. Bhatti due to: highest 1st preference | |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti next preference votes redistributed at 0.57 discount | |
| ROUND3 | |
| Hana Hossain | 82.92 (+10.54) votes |
| Tomi Aroge | 78.10 (+8.58) votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | 73.83 (+11.35) votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 (-90.80) votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | 65.75 (+14.58) votes |
| Arek Gellatly | 62.37 (+7.19) votes |

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Truc Than | 54.94 (+9.97) votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 47.01 (+5.49) votes |
| Jide Akinwale | 41.59 (+3.72) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 36.49 (+19.38) votes |
| Elected Hana Hossain due to: highest 1st preference | |
| Hana Hossain next preference votes redistributed at 0.17 discount | |
| ROUND4 | |
| Tomi Aroge | 79.24 (+1.14) votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | 78.60 (+4.76) votes |
| Hana Hossain | Elected 69.00 (-13.92) votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | 67.11 (+1.36) votes |
| Arek Gellatly | 63.70 (+1.33) votes |
| Truc Than | 56.16 (+1.22) votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 48.39 (+1.38) votes |
| Jide Akinwale | 42.88 (+1.29) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 37.92 (+1.44) votes |
| Elected Tomi Aroge due to: highest 1st preference | |
| Tomi Aroge next preference votes redistributed at 0.13 discount | |
| ROUNDS | |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | 79.19 (+0.59) votes |
| Hana Hossain | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | Elected 69.00 (-10.24) votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | 68.05 (+0.94) votes |
| Arek Gellatly | 65.59 (+1.89) votes |
| Truc Than | 57.04 (+0.89) votes |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Jaira Velasco | 49.46 (+1.07) votes |
| Jide Akinwale | 45.44 (+2.56) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 40.23 (+2.31) votes |
| Elected Dawson Andrew Thomas due to: highest 1st preference | |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas next preference votes redistributed at 0.13 discount | |
| ROUND6 | |
| MacLean Jarvis | 69.81 (+1.76) votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | Elected 69.00 (-10.19) votes |
| Hana Hossain | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Arek Gellatly | 67.39 (+1.80) votes |
| Truc Than | 58.46 (+1.42) votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 50.63 (+1.17) votes |
| Jide Akinwale | 46.99 (+1.54) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 42.72 (+2.48) votes |
| Elected MacLean Jarvis due to: highest 1st preference | |
| MacLean Jarvis next preference votes redistributed at 0.01 discount | |
| ROUND7 | |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Hana Hossain | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | Elected 69.00 (-0.81) votes |
| Tomi Aroge | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Arek Gellatly | 67.54 (+0.15) votes |
| Truc Than | 58.81 (+0.35) votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 50.70 (+0.07) votes |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Jide Akinwale | 47.19 (+0.21) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 42.76 (+0.04) votes |
| Eliminated Jide Akinwale due to: lowest 1st preference | |
| ROUND8 | |
| Arek Gellatly | 77.89 (+10.35) votes |
| Truc Than | 69.29 (+10.49) votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Hana Hossain | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 65.14 (+14.44) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 54.68 (+11.92) votes |
| Elected Arek Gellatly due to: highest 1st preference | |
| Arek Gellatly next preference votes redistributed at 0.11 discount | |
| ROUND9 | |
| Truc Than | 72.23 (+2.93) votes |
| Arek Gellatly | Elected 69.00 (-8.89) votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Hana Hossain | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jaira Velasco | 68.78 (+3.64) votes |
| Exhausted votes | 56.99 (+2.31) votes |
| Elected Truc Than due to: highest 1st preference | |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Truc Than next preference votes redistributed at 0.04 discount | | |
| ROUND10 | | |
| Jaira Velasco | | 71.51 (+2.72) votes |
| Arek Gellatly | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Hana Hossain | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Truc Than | | Elected 69.00 (-3.23) votes |
| Exhausted votes | | 57.49 (+0.50) votes |
| Elected Jaira Velasco due to: highest 1st preference | | |
| Jaira Velasco next preference votes redistributed at 0.04 discount | | |
| ROUND11 | | |
| Arek Gellatly | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Dawson Andrew Thomas | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Hana Hossain | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Jaira Velasco | | Elected 69.00 (-2.51) votes |
| Jasmin K. Bhatti | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Liam Hunter | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| MacLean Jarvis | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Tomi Aroge | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Truc Than | | Elected 69.00 votes |
| Exhausted votes | | 60.00 (+2.51) votes |

VOTER SUMMARY

| | |
|---------|-----------|
| Total | 696 |
| Abstain | 15 (2.2%) |