

## UNIVERSITY SECRETARIAT

MEMO

Office of the President

mailing address  
 8888 University Drive  
 Burnaby, BC V5A 1S6

tel 778 782 3924  
 fax 778 782 4860

ATTENTION	<b>Senate</b>
FROM	Ian Forsyth University Secretary
RE	Report of the Electoral Standing Committee
DATE	May 16, 2016

The following report covers the period May 2015 to April 2016.

During the Spring 2016 undergraduate student elections for Senate and Board of Governors, the Electoral Standing Committee received and considered six complaints alleging that three election rules were violated during the campaigning and/or voting period. The cases involved five complainants, three respondents and an SFSS student club.

#### **Election Rule #1**

The Committee decided in two cases that candidates violated the election rule that:

“The SFU email system must not be used for campaign purposes during the campaign and voting period. This includes both sending from and sending to SFU emails, ‘@sfu.ca’”.

Two email messages were sent to a large number of SFU email accounts during the voting period and could have affected the outcome of the election. Therefore, in order to ensure the fair administration of the election, the Committee disqualified two undergraduate student candidates for Senate and Board of Governors in the Spring 2016 election.

#### **Election Rule #2**

The Committee decided in three other cases that there was insufficient direct information to proceed with the complaints that a candidate violated the election rule that:

“Candidates (or their agents) must not approach voters during the balloting period with their personal laptop computer and ask them to cast a vote”.

In these cases there was an absence of complainants and witnesses with first hand knowledge, who were approached by or observed the respondent act in the way alleged.

**MEMO: Report of the Electoral Standing Committee**

**Election Rule #3**

The Committee decided in the final case that there was no violation by a candidate of the election rule that:

“Candidates are discouraged from such practices as unauthorized removal of, and obscuring or damaging the campaign material of other candidates.”

In this case, one campaign poster was re-positioned but not removed, which did not obscure or otherwise interfere with a candidate's campaign materials. In another incident where a campaign poster was obscured, the person responsible was unknown. Therefore, there was insufficient information to proceed with the complaint.