



2023
GENERAL ELECTION REPORT
SAIT Students' Association (Saitsa)

Prepared By: Ilene Burns – Chief Returning Officer

Prepared For: Saitsa Board of Directors

April 13, 2023



**Governance &
Advocacy Office**

Contents

Executive Summary..... 3

Candidates Elected to the 2023 Saitsa Board of Directors 5

Overview 5

Election Process and Oversight..... 5

 Issues and Recommendations 7

Election Promotion..... 9

 Issues and Recommendations 10

Nominations and Candidates’ Meetings..... 11

 Issues and Recommendations 13

Meet & Greet and Panel Night 15

 Issues and Recommendations 15

Campaign Period, Demerit Issuance and Appeals 16

 Issues and Recommendations 17

Voting, Poster Tear Down and Expense Forms..... 18

 Issues and Recommendations 20

Official Results..... 21

2023 Saitsa General Election..... 21

Results 21

Executive Summary

The 2023 Saitsa General Election was the first on-campus election without restrictions since the Saitsa Executive Council Election in the winter semester of 2020. There was a total of twenty-seven eligible candidates on the ballot running for the nine board of director positions. Voting was conducted by way of Single Transferable Voting and it took twenty-eight rounds of counting to fill the nine positions.

Interest in the election this year was unprecedented. This was evident with the record number of nomination packages that were submitted, resulting in a record number of candidates on the ballots, along with tremendous volunteer participation with election events and processes. There were forty-eight students who expressed interest in participating in the election. Of these forty-eight students, thirty-nine followed through and submitted nomination packages.

The CRO and the Manager of Governance and Advocacy hosted three Candidates' Meetings during the nomination period. Thirteen nominees attended the first Candidates' Meeting, eleven attended the second meeting, and eleven attended the final meeting to fulfill the last eligibility requirement of becoming a candidate. There were four nominees who did not attend a Candidates' Meeting thus not fulfilling the final eligibility requirement to qualify to become a candidate.

Six people withdrew from the election due to personal reasons and two candidates were disqualified leaving twenty-seven candidates for students to rank on the ballot.

Many complaints were submitted this year beginning as early as the nomination period through to the final voting day. The CRO was greatly tasked with assessing each complaint to see if it was valid and then following through with a more thorough investigation of the complaint, if the complaint was deemed valid. This turned out to be an extremely time-consuming aspect of the election. The CRO attempted to educate the candidates rather than discipline, where possible. In the end the CRO still found reasonable grounds to issue several candidates with demerits and disqualify two candidates prior to the opening of voting.

The Election Oversight Panel (EOP) received their first appeal this election. While the EOP found the appeal did not warrant a hearing, it was a good learning curve for the panel. Minor adjustments will be made to some documents utilized by the EOP to better assist the panel with processing any future appeals.

Election events saw a large turnout of students eager to learn about the candidates running in the election. There was a high level of engagement between students and the candidates at Meet & Greet. The Political Committee modified the panel event from a Panel Night to Panel Lunch in hopes of obtaining better audience attendance and participation. While audience attendance was greater than in previous elections for Panel Lunch, it was observed that very few students stayed for the entire event. A couple of things that can be seen as contributing factors to students leaving early were the length of the event, just under three hours, and, though no fault of the Events Team, poor sound quality due to the open concept of the Stan Grad Atrium. This event was live streamed to Facebook, so students with access to Facebook

were able to watch the entire event on their own time, but very few people took advantage of this option. Overall Meet & Greet was viewed as being a better function for candidates to engage with the student population to promote their campaign message and it also saw higher student participation than Panel Lunch.

Preparing for the election had its challenges with the majority of campus activities, including the election, being back on-campus. The Political Committee had to reconfigure the election process back to an in-person event from the online format of the past couple of years. Since 2020 we have had to adapt and learn how to conduct our lives in a digital world. There have been many positives that have come out of the new digital skills we have acquired. However, conducting successful student association elections entirely online is not one of them as was evident with the 2021 election concluding in acclamation. For the 2023 election, the Political Committee moved forward with a hybrid election process blending both digital and in-person election processes. Overall, this was a successful model that will continue to be used in future elections with several modifications to improve upon for next year's election.

Due to unforeseen circumstances, staffing issues were encountered leaving the CRO with very little assistance to conduct the election. The Executive Director was able to call upon staff from other Saitsa departments to assist with election events and activities. The CRO and Political Committee are extremely grateful to these staff members as well as the volunteers who stepped up to assist in this crucial time to ensure the success of the election. A very special thank you to the Manager of Student Experience and their staff, the Resources & Services Student Experience Coordinator and their staff and volunteers, and the Governance & Advocacy Research Coordinator. The CRO & Political Committee would also like to acknowledge the hard work of the departments who assist with election processes every election – Marketing, Events, Governance & Advocacy, as well as the Executive Director.

When considering next year's election, more resources should be planned for to assist the CRO in the event that there is a high level of interest in the election again. The Manager of Governance and Advocacy should have extra staff, a.k.a. support staff, they can call upon to assist with the higher workload during peak times in the election process. Having members of the Political Committee along with support staff cross trained on different aspects of the election process would prove useful if unforeseen circumstances were to arise again during a future election period. At the very least, having election processes detailed in writing to provide instruction on how to complete election tasks should be on file.

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, and more.

All recommendations made within this report have been made in consultation with Saitsa's Executive Director in lieu of the Manager of Governance and Advocacy, as they are currently out of office, 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 all recommendations contained within this report to be strongly considered.

Candidates Elected to the 2023 Saitsa Board of Directors

Congratulations to the nine successful candidates of the 2023 Saitsa General Election. The following are the director elects in alphabetical order, by last name.

Mansoor Ali

Jatin Joshi

Gurnoor Brar

Ryan Ng

Auginne Bunado

Benjamin Nwachukwu

Marina Butenko

Aaron Ramos

Bella Espiritu

Overview

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

Election Process and Oversight

The Saitsa General Election is conducted each winter semester to elect the representatives for the board. The board consists of nine directors who will choose from within a President and Vice President.

Voting is conducted 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 one, and then adding one 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.

The CRO, assisted by the Governance and Advocacy staff, is responsible for administering Saitsa's elections and enforcing Saitsa's Policies & Procedures, reporting to the Executive Director. For convenience purposes, this group of individuals is referred to as the Political Committee.

The Election Oversight Panel (EOP) is an oversight body to the election process. The EOP consists of three 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.

2023 Election Administration/Political Committee:

Ilene Burns – Chief Returning Officer

Rio Valencerina – Manager of Governance and Advocacy

Sunra Sunra – Governance and Advocacy Administrative Assistant

2023 Election Oversight Panel

David McIntyre – Chair

Michael Watterston – Panel Member

Cherry Sham – Panel Member

Preparation for the election began in October giving the Political Committee two months to work on pre-election activities before the winter break and two weeks post the break before election activities commenced. During this time, election events were organized, election material was reviewed and finalized, election promotion was planned for, along with many other tasks were completed. The committee was challenged with how to present an in-person election after being online for a couple of years, and what if any online components should still be incorporated into this election. It was decided that most election applications and submissions would continue to be submitted using the online submission platforms. A hybrid technique was used for the collection of signatures on the nomination form. For the convenience of the nominees, Candidates' Meetings were all online. Meet & Greet, was successfully presented in-person and Panel Lunch was changed from the previous Panel Night hosted in the evening to a mid day in-person event in an attempt to attract more audience participation which successfully resulted in higher student attendance than in past years.

There were three Candidates' Meetings throughout the three-week nomination period that saw a record number of nominees attend. Candidates had just short of three weeks after the close of nominations to promote their campaigns and engage with the voters.

The complaint and appeal processes were put to the test with several complaints and one appeal being submitted. Work needs to be done on how to more effectively process complaints and appeals especially when there is a large number of complaints submitted.

Due to circumstances beyond our control key individuals, part of and working with the Political Committee, were unable to assist with election activities during a prime time in the election process. The Executive Director was instrumental in pulling resources from other Saitsa departments to assist the CRO with conducting essential election activities up to and including voting days and election results. All the pre-election work that the Political Committee undertook, combined with the help of Saitsa staff from various Saitsa departments, and volunteers, provided for a successful election. It is recognized that more staffing resources are required in the Governance and Advocacy office during

peak times in the election process to assist with the greater workload experienced by the members of the Political Committee who work in the Governance and Advocacy office. Cross training of members of the Committee as well as the extra support staff on certain election procedures would be beneficial if unforeseen circumstances were to occur again in a future election. Election processes should also be documented in the event of an emergency so individuals tasked with assisting the Political Committee understand what the process is to complete a required election task or activity.

With such an overwhelming interest and participation in this year's election, and the expectation that this will continue into next year, the CRO will need more resources made available to assist with the greater work load the Political Committee will be faced with. Outsourcing some of the work and relying on volunteers will aid with some of the workload.

Applications for the EOP opened in November and several candidates were presented to the board for their consideration. During the January Board of Directors meeting, the board chose the three individuals who would be the panel members for the EOP, and designated which member would act as the chair of the panel.

IT issues with election emails were once again encountered. Back in October and November the CRO and Manager of Governance and Advocacy thoroughly tested all election emails to ensure all IT issues from the previous year had been corrected. Despite these efforts, at the beginning of the nomination period, a last-minute change to the Saitsa election email was required due to an error by the SAIT IT department deleting the Saitsa election email. The committee was forced to update all election content to reflect the change that was necessary to the email address due to this error. Individuals in the Marketing department were tasked with updating this on the Saitsa website as well. The EOP members again had issues accessing the EOP email and a work-around was put in place for the members to receive any emails sent to this email.

Issues and Recommendations

- Currently the Election Policies & Procedures section 4.1.2 states that the EOP is appointed by the Board. With changes that have been made to the Saitsa Board of Directors Policy Manual the Executive Director is now responsible for appointing the three members of the EOP.

The CRO recommends changing Election Policies & Procedures section 4.1.2 from "...third-party experts appointed by the Board..." to "...third-party experts appointed by the Executive Director..."

- The CRO and Manager of Governance and Advocacy will continue to have as much election preparation completed as possible before the launch of election activities to allow for time during the election period to deal with unforeseen issues that may occur.
- To better adhere to the Guiding Principles of Equality, **the CRO recommends that campaigning does not begin until the day following the close of nominations creating a set timeframe for the campaign period that is equal in length for all candidates.**

As efforts are made to host more than one Candidates' Meeting each election to accommodate student's schedules, and with the current practice of allowing candidates to begin campaigning

after they have met all eligibility requirements including having officially attended a Candidates' Meeting, some candidates have been provided with a longer campaign period over a candidate who had attended the last Candidates' Meeting. A defined campaign period would create an equal timeframe for candidates to campaign which would align better with the election guiding principles of equality.

- Discussions have already begun within the Political Committee and some of the parties involved in election preparation to problem solve issues encountered this election. Details regarding these issues are included in the appropriate sections of this report.
- **It is recommended that the Manager of Governance and Advocacy in consultation with the CRO create an appeal checklist to assist the EOP in the processing of an appeal.**

While the EOP navigated the appeal process as intended, they found it would have been useful if there was a checklist for them to follow to ensure all steps were followed.

- No one could have predicted the unfortunate issues that arose within the Governance and Advocacy office that resulted in little to no staff available to work within the office and assist with overseeing the election process. The Executive Director stepped in to help out with election activities and was able to enlist several individuals from other Saitsa departments to assist the CRO. Some of the activities they assisted with were election events as well as the day-to-day election tasks. These individuals along with many volunteers were instrumental in the election proceeding on schedule.

The CRO recommends that election processes are better outlined in the event that individuals, outside of the Political Committee, are once again required to assist with election processes in future elections. The Manager of Governance and Advocacy in consultation with the CRO should be tasked with creating this documentation. This should include an outline of what the CRO's and Manager of Governance and Advocacy's roles are, as well as providing instructions to follow in the event of an emergency where either the CRO, or Manager of Governance and Advocacy, or both are unable to fulfill their roles during the election period.

The CRO has already begun working on better documenting of election activities.

- **The CRO recommends more support staff be made available to assist the Political Committee with the day-to-day election activities, especially if there is a high level of interest in the election again. The Manager of Governance and Advocacy should have at their avail, other members of the Governance and Advocacy office, not currently working with the Political Committee, or other Saitsa staff that can be assigned a few hours each week to assist with specific election tasks as directed by the Manager of Governance & Advocacy or the CRO.**

Currently, the Political Committee is comprised of three individuals, the CRO, the Manger of Governance and Advocacy, and the Governance and Advocacy Administrative Assistant. The committee works closely with members of the Marketing department, who assists with election promotion, online content and social media. For the day-to-day election work, the three-person

committee is left relatively on their own to complete the majority of the election work along with their regular assigned duties related to their daily jobs.

- **It is the recommendation of the CRO to outsource work related to the setup of election events and activities.** This would cut down on some of the workload experienced by the Political Committee and allow for better use of volunteer resources with election activities.
- The hiring process for the EOP began in early November which provided sufficient time to interview the applicants and put forward qualified applicants for the board's consideration during the January board meeting.

The CRO recommends to continue with this timeline for hiring of the EOP to ensure all members are in place prior to the start of the election.

- **The CRO recommends the Manager of Governance and Advocacy begin discussions with the SAIT IT department to find a solution to the continual email issues encountered with election emails. These discussions should occur during the summer semester in order to have a solution in place for when the emails need to be set up in October/November of 2023. Testing of all election emails should occur in October/November and again just prior to the opening of the nomination period.**
- **The CRO recommends the Executive Director assign someone to review the Election Policies & Procedures to fix all the formatting issues including but not limited to the table included in section 12.1.4. Many section numbers and some wording under Election Violation are incorrect and need to be updated.**

Election Promotion

Election promotion was conducted both on-campus and online. On-campus posters and flyers were used to communicate election information to the students. Volunteers assisted with flyer distribution at booths during Saitsa and SAIT events as well as while conducting walk-about on campus. Social media outlets such as Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter were used to promote all stages of the election as was the weekly Saitsa student bulletin. Online election posts began mid January and ended mid March. There were 16 posts on Instagram, 5 on Facebook, 1 on LinkedIn, and 1 on Twitter.

Instagram proved to be the most effective online platform due to Saitsa's large student audience, and frequent and consistent engagement on Instagram. The highest performing Instagram post was the BOD election results post that reached 3235 accounts, had 374 likes, 19 comments, 38 shares, and 12 bookmarks. The lowest performing Instagram Post was the BOD Candidates' Meeting promo that reached 494 accounts, had 11 likes, 0 comments, 0 shares, and 1 bookmark. Facebook was used to livestream Panel Lunch but few people took advantage of this option to watch the event.

More needs to be done to connect with students to educate them on what Saitsa and the BOD are, what they do, and how they benefit the student population. Improvements on how to communicate the election process to students who are interested in getting involved in the election are needed.

Issues and Recommendations

- On-campus/in-person election promotion continues to be the most effective way to reach the most students compared to online promotions. Marketing has already begun planning ways to build on the existing printed promotion material from this election and will work with the Manger of Governance and Advocacy over the summer months to have in print promotion ready to role out for next election.

The CRO recommends the Manager of Governance and Advocacy collaborate with Marketing to work on creating a larger on-campus presence to promote all stages of the election beginning with orientation week in the Fall semester. This should incorporate a more visible presence at booths for most if not all events held on campus through out the year to inform students about what Saitsa and the BOD are, what governance and advocacy is, what are the roles of the directors, what it means to run for a spot as a director in the election, as well as what the steps to get involved and run in the election are.

- A recommendation from the Marketing department suggests that in print promotion that features student faces resonates better with the student population. “Students enjoy seeing other students and resonate better with familiar content.”

The CRO advises Marketing should look into incorporating student faces on in print election promotion material.

- Instagram continues to be the most effective social media platform to promote the election. It has a larger student audience than other platforms. While some Facebook followers are current students, it is believed that the majority are graduates and former Saitsa employees making it a less effective platform to communicate with the current student body.

It is recommended that during the summer semester Marketing looks into what social media platforms are expected to reach the greatest number of the intended target, current Saitsa students, for next year’s election, and develop election posts for these platforms.

- **The CRO recommends creating a short and concise video that would be a pre-requisite for students to watch before they can submit a nomination package. The video should include an explanation of Saitsa’s governance and policies, an overview of the roles of the directors, and outline the steps to the election process.** Such a video is intended to provide candidates with a greater knowledge about what Saitsa is and what Saitsa does for the student body, and to better prepare them for a potential future role as a director.

A discussion has already been had between the CRO and the Marketing department regarding the creation of such a video and the plan is to work on this over the summer semester so it is ready to be used for the next election.

- **The CRO also recommends a printed version of the content in the video be created that can be posted on the Saitsa website.**
- **It is recommended that Marketing continue to undertake media spots throughout the academic year to highlight different components of the election process and governance of the association. Through these efforts students will become informed 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.

- **Promotion of Saitsa events on the Saitsa website should continue to be scaled back during the election period to allow the election to be highlighted. Marketing should communicate this to Saitsa departments/groups to request their continued cooperation with this during the election period.**
- In previous years, sitting board members promoted the election on their social media accounts.

It is recommended that board members continue with this practice and this should begin prior to the start of the election to encourage students to continue to submit nomination packages.

- **The CRO recommends the board directors, as part of their ownership linkage, communicate with the deans and instructors of all SAIT departments to inform them of the election timeline, and to ask for their co-operation with election activities.**
- **The CRO suggests the Manager of Governance and Advocacy create an election calendar/timeline for the Board to use as a guide for director involvement with election activities. This should include items such as nomination promotion, when to reach out to the deans and instructors, election event dates, etc.**
- The request for volunteers to assist with election promotion was very well received this year. Student Experience did a great job organizing volunteers to assist with election promotion as well as election activities.

It is recommended that the Manager of Governance and Advocacy continue to work closely with Student Experience to continue using volunteers to assist with election promotion and activities.

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 twenty signatures from active Saitsa member students and they must officially attend at least one Candidates' Meeting. Nomination packages were available both online and in print from the Governance and Advocacy office.

Nominations opened on January 23rd and ended on February 13th. There were three submission deadlines within the one nomination period. Nominees were required to have their nomination packages submitted to the CRO by 12pm, noon, on January 30th, to attend the first Candidates' Meeting, 12pm, noon, on February 7th, to attend the second Candidates' Meeting, and 12pm, noon, on February 13th, to attend the third Candidates' Meeting.

Interest in the election this year was an all time high. Forty-eight people expressed some form of interest in running in the election. A record number of nomination packages, thirty-nine, were submitted. Of these thirty-nine nomination packages, four people did not attend a Candidates' Meeting, six withdrew from the election, and 2 were disqualified. This left a record twenty-seven candidates running for a position on the board.

The first Candidates' Meeting on January 30th had thirteen nominees attend, the second Candidates' Meeting on February 7th had eleven nominees attend, and there were eleven nominees who attended the final Candidates' Meeting on February 13th. Attendance of the Candidates' Meeting was the final eligibility requirement for nominees to qualify to become a candidate. Four nominees did not attend a Candidates' Meeting so they were not eligible to continue in the election.

Candidate profiles, photos, and videos were uploaded to the Saita website if they were submitted by the final deadline of 12pm, noon, on February 17. The profiles and photos were also available via a link on the ballot for the voters to access when they were marking their ballots. Candidates were required to produce and submit their own photos and videos again this election. Having them produce their own videos allows the candidates more creative freedom in how they can present their campaign message. It also provides them more flexibility with their timelines, allowing them to produce the video during a time that is convenient to them. This approach of having candidates take their own photos and produce their own videos according to set guidelines has been a successful endeavour with this election activity that should continue for future elections.

A hybrid approach to collecting nomination signatures was used this election, meaning nominees were able to collect digital signatures as well as in-person signatures. Most nominees took advantage of this and collected nominator signatures by both means. Twice daily, Marketing exported online nominator signature submission data to the Political Committee so they could verify that each signature was valid. This was very time consuming for Marketing and a new approach to the sharing of this data needs to be considered. With the sheer volume of signatures that were collected, with so many nominees collecting signatures, the Political Committee found it overwhelming to verify all the signatures in a timely manner and more resources need to be made available in future elections if there is high interest in the election again. Once the committee had verified all the signatures that were submitted that day, both online and in print, they provided these numbers to Marketing to post online so the nominees knew how many signatures they had collected to date.

Even though instructions for when and how to submit election documents were provided to the nominees on the Saita website election pages, nominees still struggled with this process. How nominees and candidates are provided access to election information and materials, as well as when and how they are to submit election documents needs to be reviewed and changes need to be implemented to improve this process.

As there are so many forms and documents that are required to be submitted throughout the nomination period, it resulted in issues with the online submission platform. When a student submitted a form, the system would send a submission received auto response to the student as well as forward the submission to several emails for the Political Committee to process the submission. With so many

students submitting election documents there were several occasions when the system was overloaded causing delays in submissions being sent to the Political Committee. These delays were experienced early on in the election process when multiple documents were being submitted within the same timeframe. Fortunately, as this occurred early on it did not pose any issues with submission deadlines. This is something that needs to be addressed for future elections regardless of the level of interest. Finding a more effective way to share election documents and submissions should be considered and should decrease the risk of having these issues reoccur.

Once a nominee had attended a Candidates' Meeting, provided all other eligibility requirements had been met, they were able to begin campaigning. This meant anyone who attended the first Candidates' Meeting was able to start their campaign two weeks before anyone attending the final Candidates' Meeting. This created an unequal campaign period for the candidates. To conform with the Saitsa Guiding Principles of Equality, this should be changed so the campaign period is an equal timeframe for all candidates.

Issues and Recommendations

- With elections back to being an on-campus/in-person event, the CRO will need to consider what an appropriate number of endorsements a nominee is required to collect should be.

The CRO will monitor the next election to determine if any changes are necessary to the number of endorsements a nominee must collect to be eligible to submit their nomination package.

- Per the Saitsa Policies & Procedures, the CRO must host one Candidates' Meeting each nomination period. As student schedules vary, the CRO hosted three Candidates' Meetings this election on different weeks and days in the week in an attempt to accommodate these varying schedules.

The CRO will continue to strive to host more than one Candidates' Meeting for the next election.

- With the high quality of cameras on students' personal electronic devices, having them produce and submit their own campaign photos and videos has proven to be successful and more convenient for the students.

The CRO recommends changing section 8.6.1 of the Policies & Procedures to read "Candidates will produce and submit their own candidate photo and/or short video to use for their campaign; this is not a required election activity but is recommended."

Amend section 8.6.2 by removing "; if requested, Saitsa shall also provide the Weal with candidate photos and/or videos for publication or sharing purposes."

Remove sections 8.6.3, 8.6.4, 8.6.5, 8.6.6, and changing 8.6.7 to 8.6.3.

- As some programs of study still have many of their courses online and with some classes not being on the main campus, it is beneficial to continue to allow nominees to continue being able to collect some or all of their nominator signatures online to gain access to these students who a nominee may not be able to obtain a signature from if they were only permitted to collect in print signatures. Conversely, if you limited the collection of signatures to online only, it has been

proven that this system can be very difficult to gather the required number of signatures, thus not an effective way to solely collect signatures.

The CRO recommends continuing to allow nominees to collect nominator signatures both online, via the online endorsement page, and in print, via the printed endorsement page from the paper nomination package.

- The online endorsement page had to be manually updated daily by Marketing once the Political Committee had verified the online and in print signatures were valid.

The CRO recommends Marketing look into how to incorporate a live endorsement page that would show the number of signatures collected by a nominee in real time. A live page would limit the manual updates required of Marketing to in print signatures and the removal of any invalid online signatures.

- There are too many individual forms that need to be submitted throughout the nomination period. Students find it confusing to know what forms need to be submitted and when, and they find it hard to keep track of what forms they have submitted.

It is recommended that the CRO work with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy to simplify this process and combine all three sign-off forms into one document. This should streamline the process for the nominees as well as greatly reduce the strain on the submission platform, by reducing the number of sign off form submissions by one-third.

The CRO will continue to discuss with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy and Marketing on how to improve the process of providing students access to election documents and improving instructions on submissions. One recommendation is to provide access to the forms and documents in stages. When one stage has been completed then nominees/candidates will be provided with access to the next set of forms and documents. The CRO recommends the Manager of Governance and Advocacy work with Marketing and look into DocuSign as a possible solution to this issue.

- The current method of sharing online submissions with the Political Committee is time consuming for both Marketing and the Political Committee, and, at times, creates delays in processing submissions. A new way to share this information is needed.

The CRO recommends Marketing look into more effective and efficient ways of sharing submission information with the Political Committee. One suggestion from Marketing to date is to utilize a shared document such as Google Sheets. Marketing should have a new system ready to implement when election planning begins again in the fall.

- **Marketing will also notify Flywheel that higher volumes of emails are to be expected during the election period to avoid delays in emails being sent and received if daily email limits are exceeded.**
- Past practice of allowing a candidate to begin campaigning after attending a Candidates' Meeting, provided they had met all other eligibility requirements, has resulted in some candidates having a longer campaign period than others. A defined campaign period for all candidates would create an equal timeframe for candidates to campaign which would align better with the election guiding principles of equality.

To better adhere to the Policies & Procedures Guiding Principles of Equality, the CRO recommends campaigning not be allowed to begin until the start of the campaign period, the day following the close of nominations. To accommodate this recommendation the CRO advises changing Policies & Procedures section 9.1.2 a) from “Before the end of the Candidates’ Meeting;” to “Before the start of the campaign period, which is the day immediately following the close of nominations;”.

Meet & Greet and Panel Night

Meet & Greet was hosted in the Stan Grad atrium on March 1st from 11am to 2pm. Due to the sheer volume of candidates in the election this year, it was quite the task for the Political Committee to organize and set up this event. Twenty-seven candidate booths, along with promotional booths packed the atrium. The event was well attended by electors who visited the many stations to learn about all the different campaign platforms. It was the most well received election event in many years.

In an effort to attract more audience attendance, the Political Committee hosted a Panel Lunch instead of a Panel Night on March 7th in the Stan Grad atrium from 11am to 2pm. With twenty-nine candidates scheduled to attend Panel Lunch, the Political Committee had to restructure the format of Panel Lunch to accommodate this large number of candidates. Candidates were randomly divided into three groups with each group actively participating in a one-hour panel session. The event was also live streamed to Facebook.

While higher audience numbers were evident for Panel Lunch, it was also observed that the majority of students did not stay for the entire event. This resulted in electors only hearing from a select few candidates who happened to be responding to questions during the time they were at the event. The length of the event combined with poor sound quality of the event are two possible factors to students not staying for the entire event. With so many candidates there was little that could be done to shorten the event. Poor sound quality had to do with the location of the event and no fault of the audio/visual team.

Overall, even with more students attending Panel Lunch than in elections past, it was evident that Meet & Greet was a much more effective means for students to engage with candidates than Panel Lunch. Meet & Greet allowed for students to move from booth to booth to speak directly with the candidates to hear what each candidate was campaigning on. Access to candidates at Panel Lunch was limited to hearing responses only from the candidates who were responding to questions from the moderator during the time that the elector was present at the event. Although the panel event allows for students to be able to hear a candidate’s view point on issues relative to Saitsa and the student body experience, the Political Committee believes this event is no longer an effective way for candidates to be able to present their responses on these issues to their fellow students. The Political Committee will need to discuss what, if anything, can replace the Panel Lunch.

Issues and Recommendations

- With such a large number of candidates this year, the logistics of hosting a panel event was very difficult. The Political Committee had to find a bigger venue in an area that would still attract students to attend. The Stan Grad atrium fit that bill, unfortunately, the layout of the atrium was not conducive to good sound quality and at times it was difficult to hear what was

being said. While the location of the atrium did attract higher audience attendance, most students did not stay for the entire event missing out on hearing from all the candidates.

While Stan Grad atrium is a centralized location on campus with a steady flow of students making it an ideal location to host Meet & Greet, it is not a great location for Panel Lunch.

The CRO recommends any future panel events not be hosted in Stan Grad atrium.

- It was evident that candidates had spent time preparing their answers and were eager to present their view points to the student body at Panel Lunch. While the concept of providing pertinent questions regarding current Saitsa issues to the candidates to respond to still holds value, doing so by way of a panel event does not seem like the logical way to approach this going forward. Discussions have been ongoing to find a better solution to present this Q&A portion of the election in a way that best benefits the candidates.

One suggestion is to host a second Meet & Greet event in lieu of Panel Lunch. If the CRO chose to host another event they would be tasked with making sure all candidates were informed of such an event with sufficient time to arrange their schedules to be able to attend as well as sufficient time for the candidates to prepare for the event.

Another suggestion is to incorporate a Q&A component to the Meet & Greet event or a second Meet & Greet event where candidates would be able to present their answers to questions relating to Saitsa issues and the student body, posed to them by the Political Committee.

The CRO recommends removing section 8.3 Candidate Forum Panel from the Policies & Procedures eliminating the panel event and replace it with the addition of section 8.2.3 “Saitsa may organize another opportunity for students to meet with all candidates. The hosting of such an event will be at the discretion of the CRO and will be a mandatory event for all candidates to participate in.”

Campaign Period, Demerit Issuance and Appeals

Upon completion of all eligibility requirements, candidates were permitted to begin their campaign. As official 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 January 30th while the remaining candidates had to wait until they had attended either the second Candidates’ Meeting on February 7th or the third Candidates’ Meeting on February 13th to begin their campaign.

The end of the campaign period closed with the close of polls on March 9th, at 4pm. This was the first year that candidates experienced the extended campaign period, an extension of one week from previous elections. The extended timeframe provided more time between election events for candidates to interact with the student body and respond to questions received from their fellow students. It was also intended to allow candidates to better handle the stress of balancing election activities with their academic studies.

Election documentation was available on SharePoint and the Saitsa website for candidates to access. Details on important election events were sent to candidates by way of calendar invites and reminder emails. Candidates were required to submit required documents to the CRO and Political Committee via submission platforms located on the Saitsa website.

Candidates were responsible for taking their profile picture, producing their campaign video, and then submitting them via a drop box on the Saitsa website to Marketing. Guidelines were provided to the candidates on how to do this. This is a relatively new process for candidates coming about as a result of COVID restrictions. Previously candidates had to book a timeslot on set dates for Marketing to take their photo and record their campaign video. With students having access to decent quality cameras and recording equipment on their personal devices these days, the need for Marketing to be involved to ensure a decent quality product is no longer necessary. Candidates are able to be more creative with their videos when recording it themselves. They also have control over when and where they will shoot their videos and take their photos.

There were many election policy violations this election. The majority were due to candidates using something other than the permitted green or blue painter's tape to affix their campaign material to the walls on campus. During the Candidates' Meetings, it was strenuously discussed that candidates were only permitted to use green or blue painter's tape and nothing else. Unfortunately, this seems to be an issue every election, more so this election than in past elections, and the Political Committee needs to figure out a way to get the candidates to abide by this very simple policy. Other violations were for campaigning before attending a Candidates' Meeting, campaigning through email, posters too close to a Saitsa or SAIT operation, as well as missed attendance at election events and failing to notify the CRO. It was evident that some candidates did not read or refer to the Saitsa Election Policies & Procedures throughout their campaign as just under half of all the candidates were issued demerits over the course of the campaign period. If candidates had referenced this document most would have avoided having demerits issued. There were some complaints that were submitted where after investigation by the CRO, it was evident that the candidate misunderstood the policies and no intent was evident in the violation. In these cases, the CRO used discretion and chose to educate the candidate and not issue the maximum number of demerits for their misunderstanding. With so many complaints being received this election, the CRO found it difficult to stay on top of investigating each complaint within a timely manner. If interest in future elections continues on the level experienced this election, the CRO will require more assistance to process complaint submissions.

There were two candidates who were issued with ten or more demerits for various election violations and were disqualified.

There was one appeal that was submitted to the EOP. After an initial investigation the EOP determined the appeal did not warrant a hearing and the appeal was closed. This was the first appeal the EOP encountered since its inception. The panel found the process to be fairly straightforward however did request the CRO look into the creation of a formal appeal form. An appeal form would be used to document and track appeals to help ensure appeal timelines are met as well as ensure all steps in the appeal process have been completed.

Issues and Recommendations

- Permitting candidates to campaign after they have attended a Candidates' Meeting prior to the last Candidates' Meeting is held, at the close of the nomination period, allows these candidates the benefit of a longer campaign period than those who attend the last meeting. A defined

campaign period would create an equal timeframe for candidates to campaign which would align better with the election guiding principles of equality.

To better adhere to the Policies & Procedures Guiding Principles of Equality, the CRO recommends campaigning not be allowed to begin until the start of the campaign period, the day following the close of nominations. To accommodate this recommendation the CRO recommends changing Policies & Procedures section 9.1.2 a) from “Before the end of the Candidates’ Meeting;” to “Before the start of the campaign period, the day immediately following the close of nominations;”.

- Candidates continue to struggle with where to locate election materials and forms. During the Candidates’ Meeting, candidates are informed that election materials can be located in SharePoint as well as on the Saitsa website. The Political Committee provides all candidates with access to SharePoint after they have attended a Candidates’ Meeting and provides the links to election pages on the website.

The CRO will work with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy and Marketing to find a more effective way to communicate to candidates where they can find election forms and materials.

- This election, the majority of the complaints had to do with candidates using something other than the permitted green or blue painter’s tape to affix their campaign material on campus. There almost always is one person each election who commits this infraction but this year several candidates were found in violation of this policy.

The Political Committee will continue to stress that only green or blue painter’s tape is permitted to use to hang campaign materials up on campus during the Candidates’ Meetings and will endeavour to remind candidates throughout the campaign period of this policy.

- With the sheer volume of complaints received by the CRO, it was difficult to process the complaints in a timely manner. Investigating complaints can be very time consuming, especially if an in-depth investigation required.

The CRO recommends the Executive Director make available more resources to assist with election activities, including the investigation of complaints. This could be redirecting Saitsa staff from other departments to assist with election activities or additional hours added to existing Governance and Advocacy staff’s hours for election work.

- To assist the EOP and the CRO in documenting and tracking complaints and appeals, **the CRO will work with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy to create complaint and appeal forms.**

Voting, Poster Tear Down and Expense Forms

Polls opened at 8am on March 8th and closed at 4pm on March 9th. Students were able to cast their ballot via a secure link provided to them in their student email. They could vote on their own personal

devices (ie: cell phone, computer, tablet) or at one of the two voting stations set up on campus. Polling stations were located outside of MC107 and in the Senator Burns cafeteria area. On the first day of voting, the polling location in Senator Burns experienced IT issues for more than an hour before voters were able to vote using one of the laptops provided at this voting station. Both voting stations were manned by volunteers, and supervised by the Resources and Services Student Experience Coordinator and the CRO.

Voting was conducted by way of Single Transferable Voting using the Droop Formula via Simply Voting, an independent third-party provider.

Very simply, with Single Transferable Voting, electors cast a ballot ranking their preferred candidates from most preferred to least preferred. The quota of votes is calculated using the Droop formula. Simply Voting calculates the formula and the CRO verifies the calculation. The quota of votes is calculated as follows:

In this example there are 1000 valid ballots cast for 9 board positions.

$$(1000 \text{ voters} / (9 \text{ board positions} + 1)) + 1 = 101$$

$$(1000 / 10) + 1 = 101 \text{ quota}$$

Candidates are elected or eliminated during rounds of counting votes. In order to be elected in a round of counting, a candidate must meet or exceed the quota of votes and must receive the highest number of votes. If no candidates receive the minimum number of votes to meet or exceed the quota of votes then the candidate with the least number of votes in that round will be eliminated. This will continue until all seats have been filled.

Voter turnout for the 2023 Saita General Election was 12.8% with 2395 Saita members submitting their ballots. Forty-eight students abstained from ranking any of the candidates resulting in 2347 valid ballots cast. Based on 2347 valid ballots cast the quota was calculated to be 235. At the close of polls, the CRO verified the election results confirming the quota was correctly calculated by Simply Voting. To fill all nine positions on the board and exhaust all valid votes cast, it took twenty-eight rounds of counting.

Candidates and their supporters were invited to attend Results Night on March 9th between 5pm and 6pm on the second floor of the Johnson Cobb building. This event was hosted by the Executive Director and the provisional election results were announced by the Resources and Services Student Experience Coordinator. Marketing posted the unofficial results on the Saita website and the CRO followed up with emails to all the candidates announcing the results. At the close of the appeal process, 4pm on March 19th, the election results became official.

Poster Tear Down took place between 4pm-5pm on March 9th. Candidates and their supporters worked together to remove all campaign material from SAIT campus before returning to Johnson Cobb for a light reception to await the results.

Expense forms were submitted via the submission platform on the Saita website and verified by the CRO and the Executive Director. Issues with expense forms being completed and submitted properly was experienced again this election. The Political Committee will need to continue working to find a better way to explain the process of completing and submitting these forms. This is another very time-consuming task for the CRO to undertake, especially when there was such a large number of candidates this year.

Issues and Recommendations

- The internet ports in Senator Burns where the polling location was set up were not live for the beginning of voting resulting in the polling location not opening on time. IT had to be called in to investigate and problem solve the issue which took over an hour to resolve.

The CRO recommends the Manager of Governance and Advocacy have the IT department check the internet ports where the polling locations will be located to make sure they are live a week prior to the polls opening preventing a delay in the opening of the polls.

- Voter turnout this election was great. Although not a record turnout, it far surpassed the voter participation of the past few years. A trend the CRO hopes will continue in future elections.
- With so many candidates to rank on the ballot, it was observed by the CRO that some electors seemed overwhelmed when accessing their ballots. This may have attributed to some electors only ranking one or only a handful of candidates rather than ranking all twenty-seven.
- **The CRO recommends to continue sending out email reminders to Saitsa members on both voting days reminding the electors to vote, as it has been shown to result in an increase in votes cast after each email has been sent.**
- **The CRO recommends the Executive Director encourage directors to take on more ownership linkage with the student body to better promote the board, Saitsa, and the election process in order to keep a high level of student engagement in the voting process.**
- Poster Tear Down was well attended by the candidates. Although, some did not follow instructions on checking in with election volunteers prior to conducting poster tear down and risked having demerits issued before results were announced.

The CRO will engage in discussions with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy to determine if anything more can be done to communicate instructions on poster tear down.

- Each election candidates struggle with how to complete election expense forms and how to submit them.

The CRO will continue working with the Manager of Governance and Advocacy to find a better way for candidates to process and submit their campaign expenses.

- **The CRO will consider adjusting the candidate expense form deadline to 12pm or 4pm the day prior to the first day of voting to provide more time for the Political Committee to verify expense forms. If interest in elections continues at the level encountered this election, it will necessitate a change to this deadline.**

Official Results

Candidates Elected at Close of Voting on March 9th, 2023

2023 Saitsa General Election

Results

Turnout: 2395 (12.8%) of 18782 electors voted in this ballot.

I am enrolled at SAIT as a:

Option	Votes
Full Time Student	2254 (94.7%)
Part Time Student	97 (4.1%)
Apprentice	24 (1.0%)
Other	4 (0.2%)

VOTER SUMMARY

Total	2395
Abstain	16 (0.7%)

Candidates

Option Gagandeep Kaur has been withdrawn from this ballot.

Option Harsingh Sekhon has been withdrawn from this ballot.

Option Jas Jassar has been withdrawn from this ballot.

Option Lisa Cooper has been withdrawn from this ballot.

Votes required to elect an option: 235

ROUND 0		
	Aaron Ramos	312.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	251.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	190.00 votes
	Auginne Bunado	167.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	160.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	147.00 votes
	Ryan Ng	129.00 votes
	Mansoor Ali	105.00 votes
	Jatin Joshi	102.00 votes
	Gur Sodhi	81.00 votes
	Pranjal Jain	78.00 votes

	Heaven Deschamps	69.00 votes
	Usama Javaid	63.00 votes
	Khadija Fatima	59.00 votes
	Tomi Aroge	53.00 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	50.00 votes
	Mark Peigan	50.00 votes
	Arianna Atkins	43.00 votes
	Sadaf Naeem	42.00 votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	41.00 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	40.00 votes
	Samreet Kaur	22.00 votes
	Shubham Bhatia	21.00 votes
	Gurkamaljit Singh Grewal	19.00 votes
	Kushi Grewal	18.00 votes
	Ankit Poddar	15.00 votes
	Inder Thandi	12.00 votes
	Harsingh Sekhon	5.00 votes
	Lisa Cooper	2.00 votes
	Jas Jassar	1.00 votes
	Gagandeep Kaur	0.00 votes
	Eliminated withdrawn candidates	
ROUND 1		
	Aaron Ramos	312.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	251.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	190.00 votes
	Auginne Bunado	169.00 (+2.00) votes
	Bella Espiritu	160.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	147.00 votes
	Ryan Ng	129.00 votes
	Mansoor Ali	105.00 votes
	Jatin Joshi	102.00 votes
	Gur Sodhi	81.00 votes
	Pranjal Jain	78.00 votes
	Heaven Deschamps	69.00 votes
	Usama Javaid	63.00 votes
	Khadija Fatima	59.00 votes
	Tomi Aroge	53.00 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	50.00 votes
	Mark Peigan	50.00 votes
	Arianna Atkins	43.00 votes

	Sadaf Naeem	42.00 votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	41.00 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	40.00 votes
	Samreet Kaur	24.00 (+2.00) votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 (+2.00) votes
	Gurkamaljit Singh Grewal	19.00 votes
	Kushi Grewal	18.00 votes
	Ankit Poddar	16.00 (+1.00) votes
	Inder Thandi	12.00 votes
	Exhausted votes	1.00 (+1.00) votes
	Elected Aaron Ramos due to: highest 1st preference	
	Aaron Ramos next preference votes redistributed at 0.25 discount	
ROUND 2		
	Gurnoor Brar	251.49 (+0.49) votes
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 (-77.00) votes
	Marina Butenko	194.20 (+4.20) votes
	Bella Espiritu	180.48 (+20.48) votes
	Auginne Bunado	176.16 (+7.16) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	147.25 (+0.25) votes
	Ryan Ng	132.95 (+3.95) votes
	Mansoor Ali	106.73 (+1.73) votes
	Jatin Joshi	104.71 (+2.71) votes
	Gur Sodhi	81.25 (+0.25) votes
	Pranjal Jain	78.49 (+0.49) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	70.73 (+1.73) votes
	Usama Javaid	63.00 votes
	Khadija Fatima	59.74 (+0.74) votes
	Tomi Aroge	54.48 (+1.48) votes
	Mark Peigan	52.96 (+2.96) votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	50.49 (+0.49) votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	45.44 (+4.44) votes
	Arianna Atkins	44.97 (+1.97) votes
	Sadaf Naeem	42.49 (+0.49) votes

	Sukhsimrat Brar	40.49 (+0.49) votes
	Samreet Kaur	24.25 (+0.25) votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 votes
	Kushi Grewal	20.96 (+2.96) votes
	Gurkamaljit Singh Grewal	19.00 votes
	Ankit Poddar	18.22 (+2.22) votes
	Inder Thandi	12.00 votes
	Exhausted votes	16.05 (+15.05) votes
	Elected Gurnoor Brar due to: highest 1st preference	
	Gurnoor Brar next preference votes redistributed at 0.07 discount	
ROUND 3		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 (-16.49) votes
	Marina Butenko	194.67 (+0.48) votes
	Bella Espiritu	180.75 (+0.26) votes
	Auginne Bunado	176.16 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	147.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	132.95 votes
	Mansoor Ali	107.19 (+0.46) votes
	Jatin Joshi	105.37 (+0.66) votes
	Gur Sodhi	81.38 (+0.13) votes
	Pranjal Jain	78.95 (+0.46) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	70.99 (+0.26) votes
	Usama Javaid	63.33 (+0.33) votes
	Khadija Fatima	59.81 (+0.07) votes
	Tomi Aroge	54.55 (+0.07) votes
	Mark Peigan	52.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	50.49 votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	45.46 (+0.02) votes
	Arianna Atkins	44.97 votes
	Sadaf Naeem	42.62 (+0.13) votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	41.41 (+0.92) votes
	Samreet Kaur	25.76 (+1.51) votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 votes
	Kushi Grewal	21.09 (+0.13) votes

	Gurkamaljot Singh Grewal	19.33 (+0.33) votes
	Ankit Poddar	18.29 (+0.07) votes
	Inder Thandi	12.20 (+0.20) votes
	Exhausted votes	26.09 (+10.03) votes
	Eliminated Inder Thandi due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 4		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	195.67 (+1.00) votes
	Bella Espiritu	180.75 votes
	Auginne Bunado	177.16 (+1.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	147.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	133.95 (+1.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	107.19 votes
	Jatin Joshi	106.37 (+1.00) votes
	Gur Sodhi	84.38 (+3.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	78.95 votes
	Heaven Deschamps	70.99 votes
	Usama Javaid	63.39 (+0.07) votes
	Khadija Fatima	59.81 votes
	Tomi Aroge	54.55 votes
	Mark Peigan	52.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	50.49 votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	45.46 votes
	Arianna Atkins	44.97 votes
	Sadaf Naeem	42.62 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	41.41 votes
	Samreet Kaur	27.82 (+2.07) votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 votes
	Gurkamaljot Singh Grewal	21.33 (+2.00) votes
	Kushi Grewal	21.09 votes
	Ankit Poddar	18.29 votes
	Exhausted votes	27.15 (+1.07) votes
	Eliminated Ankit Poddar due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 5		

	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	196.67 (+1.00) votes
	Bella Espiritu	182.49 (+1.74) votes
	Auginne Bunado	177.16 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	148.25 (+1.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	135.20 (+1.25) votes
	Mansoor Ali	107.19 votes
	Jatin Joshi	106.62 (+0.25) votes
	Gur Sodhi	84.38 votes
	Pranjal Jain	80.02 (+1.07) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	70.99 votes
	Usama Javaid	63.39 votes
	Khadija Fatima	60.81 (+1.00) votes
	Tomi Aroge	54.55 votes
	Mark Peigan	53.96 (+1.00) votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	50.49 votes
	Arianna Atkins	45.97 (+1.00) votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	45.95 (+0.49) votes
	Sadaf Naeem	43.62 (+1.00) votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	41.41 votes
	Samreet Kaur	27.82 votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 votes
	Gurkamaljit Singh Grewal	21.33 votes
	Kushi Grewal	21.09 votes
	Exhausted votes	34.65 (+7.49) votes
	Eliminated Kushi Grewal due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 6		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	196.67 votes
	Bella Espiritu	183.73 (+1.25) votes

	Auginne Bunado	178.16 (+1.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	148.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	135.20 votes
	Mansoor Ali	109.19 (+2.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	108.11 (+1.49) votes
	Gur Sodhi	85.38 (+1.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	80.02 votes
	Heaven Deschamps	73.03 (+2.04) votes
	Usama Javaid	64.39 (+1.00) votes
	Khadija Fatima	62.81 (+2.00) votes
	Tomi Aroge	55.55 (+1.00) votes
	Mark Peigan	53.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.49 (+1.00) votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	46.20 (+0.25) votes
	Arianna Atkins	45.97 votes
	Sadaf Naeem	43.62 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	41.48 (+0.07) votes
	Samreet Kaur	27.82 votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 votes
	Gurkamaljit Singh Grewal	21.33 votes
	Exhausted votes	41.65 (+7.00) votes
	Eliminated Gurkamaljit Singh Grewal due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 7		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	196.67 votes
	Bella Espiritu	183.73 votes
	Auginne Bunado	178.16 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	148.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	135.20 votes
	Mansoor Ali	111.19 (+2.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	111.11 (+3.00) votes
	Gur Sodhi	86.44 (+1.07) votes
	Pranjal Jain	81.02 (+1.00) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	73.03 votes

	Usama Javaid	65.39 (+1.00) votes
	Khadija Fatima	62.87 (+0.07) votes
	Tomi Aroge	55.55 votes
	Mark Peigan	53.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.49 votes
	Arianna Atkins	47.97 (+2.00) votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	47.20 (+1.00) votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	44.54 (+3.07) votes
	Sadaf Naeem	43.62 votes
	Samreet Kaur	30.89 (+3.07) votes
	Shubham Bhatia	23.00 votes
	Exhausted votes	45.71 (+4.07) votes
	Eliminated Shubham Bhatia due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 8		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	196.67 votes
	Bella Espiritu	184.73 (+1.00) votes
	Auginne Bunado	179.16 (+1.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	149.25 (+1.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	135.20 votes
	Jatin Joshi	112.11 (+1.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	111.19 votes
	Gur Sodhi	86.44 votes
	Pranjal Jain	81.02 votes
	Heaven Deschamps	73.03 votes
	Usama Javaid	65.39 votes
	Khadija Fatima	62.87 votes
	Tomi Aroge	56.55 (+1.00) votes
	Mark Peigan	53.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.49 votes
	Arianna Atkins	47.97 votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	47.20 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	45.54 (+1.00) votes
	Sadaf Naeem	44.62 (+1.00) votes
	Samreet Kaur	31.89 (+1.00) votes

	Exhausted votes	60.71 (+15.00) votes
	Eliminated Samreet Kaur due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 9		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	196.74 (+0.07) votes
	Bella Espiritu	184.73 votes
	Auginne Bunado	180.16 (+1.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	149.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	135.20 votes
	Jatin Joshi	115.57 (+3.46) votes
	Mansoor Ali	113.19 (+2.00) votes
	Gur Sodhi	88.44 (+2.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	84.02 (+3.00) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	73.10 (+0.07) votes
	Usama Javaid	66.46 (+1.07) votes
	Khadija Fatima	64.94 (+2.07) votes
	Tomi Aroge	58.55 (+2.00) votes
	Mark Peigan	53.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.49 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	49.20 (+3.66) votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	48.20 (+1.00) votes
	Arianna Atkins	47.97 votes
	Sadaf Naeem	44.62 votes
	Exhausted votes	71.22 (+10.51) votes
	Eliminated Sadaf Naeem due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 10		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	197.80 (+1.07) votes

	Bella Espiritu	185.73 (+1.00) votes
	Auginne Bunado	181.40 (+1.25) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	149.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	137.20 (+2.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	116.82 (+1.25) votes
	Mansoor Ali	113.19 votes
	Gur Sodhi	95.44 (+7.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	84.02 votes
	Heaven Deschamps	76.10 (+3.00) votes
	Usama Javaid	68.46 (+2.00) votes
	Khadija Fatima	65.94 (+1.00) votes
	Tomi Aroge	60.55 (+2.00) votes
	Mark Peigan	53.96 votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.49 votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	51.20 (+2.00) votes
	Arianna Atkins	50.97 (+3.00) votes
	Shawna LeBlanc	50.20 (+2.00) votes
	Exhausted votes	87.29 (+16.07) votes
	Eliminated Shawna LeBlanc due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 11		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	203.28 (+5.48) votes
	Bella Espiritu	190.23 (+4.49) votes
	Auginne Bunado	186.40 (+5.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	150.25 (+1.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	140.95 (+3.76) votes
	Jatin Joshi	118.82 (+2.00) votes

	Mansoor Ali	115.19 (+2.00) votes
	Gur Sodhi	99.44 (+4.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	84.02 votes
	Heaven Deschamps	81.10 (+5.00) votes
	Usama Javaid	69.46 (+1.00) votes
	Khadija Fatima	66.18 (+0.25) votes
	Tomi Aroge	60.79 (+0.25) votes
	Mark Peigan	56.21 (+2.25) votes
	Arianna Atkins	54.97 (+4.00) votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.74 (+0.25) votes
	Sukhsimrat Brar	51.20 votes
	Exhausted votes	96.77 (+9.48) votes
	Eliminated Sukhsimrat Brar due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 12		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	203.28 votes
	Bella Espiritu	190.23 votes
	Auginne Bunado	186.47 (+0.07) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	151.25 (+1.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	141.45 (+0.49) votes
	Jatin Joshi	125.95 (+7.13) votes
	Mansoor Ali	121.51 (+6.33) votes
	Gur Sodhi	103.77 (+4.33) votes
	Pranjal Jain	84.08 (+0.07) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	83.29 (+2.20) votes
	Usama Javaid	74.59 (+5.13) votes
	Khadija Fatima	67.32 (+1.13) votes
	Tomi Aroge	60.79 votes
	Arianna Atkins	58.97 (+4.00) votes
	Mark Peigan	57.21 (+1.00) votes
	Chimdi Ilonze	51.74 votes

	Exhausted votes	115.10 (+18.33) votes
	Eliminated Chimdi Ilonze due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 13		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	203.28 votes
	Bella Espiritu	191.72 (+1.49) votes
	Auginne Bunado	187.47 (+1.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	162.25 (+11.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	142.45 (+1.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	126.95 (+1.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	122.51 (+1.00) votes
	Gur Sodhi	103.77 votes
	Pranjal Jain	85.08 (+1.00) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	84.29 (+1.00) votes
	Tomi Aroge	82.79 (+22.00) votes
	Usama Javaid	76.59 (+2.00) votes
	Khadija Fatima	68.32 (+1.00) votes
	Arianna Atkins	58.97 votes
	Mark Peigan	58.21 (+1.00) votes
	Exhausted votes	122.34 (+7.25) votes
	Eliminated Mark Peigan due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 14		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	209.02 (+5.74) votes

	Bella Espiritu	197.71 (+5.99) votes
	Auginne Bunado	188.47 (+1.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	166.25 (+4.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	145.45 (+3.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	132.19 (+5.25) votes
	Mansoor Ali	122.51 votes
	Gur Sodhi	106.02 (+2.25) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	89.54 (+5.25) votes
	Pranjal Jain	85.08 votes
	Tomi Aroge	84.04 (+1.25) votes
	Usama Javaid	76.59 votes
	Khadija Fatima	68.32 votes
	Arianna Atkins	62.22 (+3.25) votes
	Exhausted votes	143.59 (+21.25) votes
	Eliminated Arianna Atkins due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 15		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	215.27 (+6.25) votes
	Bella Espiritu	203.45 (+5.74) votes
	Auginne Bunado	196.72 (+8.25) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	171.25 (+5.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	148.69 (+3.25) votes
	Jatin Joshi	138.19 (+6.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	126.51 (+4.00) votes

	Gur Sodhi	108.02 (+2.00) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	94.54 (+5.00) votes
	Tomi Aroge	89.04 (+5.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	87.08 (+2.00) votes
	Usama Javaid	77.59 (+1.00) votes
	Khadija Fatima	70.32 (+2.00) votes
	Exhausted votes	150.33 (+6.74) votes
	Eliminated Khadija Fatima due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 16		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	216.52 (+1.25) votes
	Bella Espiritu	211.94 (+8.49) votes
	Auginne Bunado	199.78 (+3.07) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	171.25 votes
	Ryan Ng	151.69 (+3.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	142.19 (+4.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	135.58 (+9.07) votes
	Gur Sodhi	108.08 (+0.07) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	95.85 (+1.31) votes
	Usama Javaid	93.59 (+16.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	91.08 (+4.00) votes
	Tomi Aroge	89.04 votes
	Exhausted votes	170.40 (+20.07) votes
	Eliminated Tomi Aroge due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 17		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes

	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	221.52 (+5.00) votes
	Bella Espiritu	216.25 (+4.31) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	203.25 (+32.00) votes
	Auginne Bunado	200.78 (+1.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	153.43 (+1.74) votes
	Jatin Joshi	146.19 (+4.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	137.83 (+2.25) votes
	Gur Sodhi	111.08 (+3.00) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	100.85 (+5.00) votes
	Usama Javaid	95.59 (+2.00) votes
	Pranjal Jain	91.33 (+0.25) votes
	Exhausted votes	198.89 (+28.49) votes
	Eliminated Pranjal Jain due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 18		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	226.52 (+5.00) votes
	Bella Espiritu	219.25 (+3.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	204.49 (+1.25) votes
	Auginne Bunado	200.78 votes
	Jatin Joshi	155.26 (+9.07) votes
	Ryan Ng	154.68 (+1.25) votes

	Mansoor Ali	144.07 (+6.25) votes
	Gur Sodhi	117.28 (+6.20) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	102.98 (+2.13) votes
	Usama Javaid	100.66 (+5.07) votes
	Exhausted votes	251.02 (+52.13) votes
	Eliminated Usama Javaid due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 19		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	231.52 (+5.00) votes
	Bella Espiritu	227.25 (+8.00) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	211.49 (+7.00) votes
	Auginne Bunado	203.78 (+3.00) votes
	Jatin Joshi	166.26 (+11.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	159.07 (+15.00) votes
	Ryan Ng	158.68 (+4.00) votes
	Gur Sodhi	118.41 (+1.13) votes
	Heaven Deschamps	108.98 (+6.00) votes
	Exhausted votes	291.55 (+40.52) votes
	Eliminated Heaven Deschamps due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 20		
	Marina Butenko	250.18 (+18.66) votes
	Bella Espiritu	237.50 (+10.25) votes

	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	218.49 (+7.00) votes
	Auginne Bunado	213.09 (+9.31) votes
	Jatin Joshi	171.39 (+5.13) votes
	Ryan Ng	170.68 (+12.00) votes
	Mansoor Ali	168.14 (+9.07) votes
	Gur Sodhi	122.48 (+4.07) votes
	Exhausted votes	325.04 (+33.50) votes
	Elected Marina Butenko due to: highest 1st preference	
	Marina Butenko next preference votes redistributed at 0.06 discount	
ROUND 21		
	Bella Espiritu	239.79 (+2.29) votes
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 (-15.18) votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	219.86 (+1.37) votes
	Auginne Bunado	214.11 (+1.02) votes
	Ryan Ng	172.23 (+1.55) votes
	Jatin Joshi	172.01 (+0.62) votes
	Mansoor Ali	169.57 (+1.43) votes
	Gur Sodhi	123.51 (+1.03) votes
	Exhausted votes	330.91 (+5.87) votes

	Elected Bella Espiritu due to: highest 1st preference	
	Bella Espiritu next preference votes redistributed at 0.02 discount	
ROUND 22		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 (- 4.79) votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	219.99 (+0.13) votes
	Auginne Bunado	215.63 (+1.52) votes
	Ryan Ng	172.83 (+0.60) votes
	Jatin Joshi	172.27 (+0.26) votes
	Mansoor Ali	169.93 (+0.35) votes
	Gur Sodhi	123.82 (+0.31) votes
	Exhausted votes	332.53 (+1.62) votes
	Eliminated Gur Sodhi due to: lowest 1st preference	
ROUND 23		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	229.12 (+9.12) votes
	Auginne Bunado	226.84 (+11.22) votes
	Jatin Joshi	187.64 (+15.36) votes

	Mansoor Ali	181.41 (+11.48) votes
	Ryan Ng	178.44 (+5.62) votes
	Exhausted votes	403.55 (+71.01) votes
	Elected Benjamin Nwachukwu due to: number of options equals number of winners, highest 1st preference	
ROUND 24		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	Elected 229.12 votes
	Auginne Bunado	226.84 votes
	Jatin Joshi	187.64 votes
	Mansoor Ali	181.41 votes
	Ryan Ng	178.44 votes
	Exhausted votes	403.55 votes
	Elected Auginne Bunado due to: number of options equals number of winners, highest 1st preference	
ROUND 25		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	Elected 229.12 votes
	Auginne Bunado	Elected 226.84 votes
	Jatin Joshi	187.64 votes
	Mansoor Ali	181.41 votes

	Ryan Ng	178.44 votes
	Exhausted votes	403.55 votes
	Elected Jatin Joshi due to: number of options equals number of winners, highest 1st preference	
ROUND 26		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	Elected 229.12 votes
	Auginne Bunado	Elected 226.84 votes
	Jatin Joshi	Elected 187.64 votes
	Mansoor Ali	181.41 votes
	Ryan Ng	178.44 votes
	Exhausted votes	403.55 votes
	Elected Mansoor Ali due to: number of options equals number of winners, highest 1st preference	
ROUND 27		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	Elected 229.12 votes
	Auginne Bunado	Elected 226.84 votes
	Jatin Joshi	Elected 187.64 votes
	Mansoor Ali	Elected 181.41 votes

	Ryan Ng	178.44 votes
	Exhausted votes	403.55 votes
	Elected Ryan Ng due to: number of options equals number of winners, highest 1st preference	
ROUND 28		
	Aaron Ramos	Elected 235.00 votes
	Bella Espiritu	Elected 235.00 votes
	Gurnoor Brar	Elected 235.00 votes
	Marina Butenko	Elected 235.00 votes
	Benjamin Nwachukwu	Elected 229.12 votes
	Auginne Bunado	Elected 226.84 votes
	Jatin Joshi	Elected 187.64 votes
	Mansoor Ali	Elected 181.41 votes
	Ryan Ng	Elected 178.44 votes
	Exhausted votes	403.55 votes
VOTER SUMMARY		
	Total	2395
	Abstain	48 (2.0%)