SCSU 2020 Spring General Election

By: Dan O'Hara

Chief Returning Officer

Introduction

As stated in the By-laws section of the SCSU Constitution, the Elections Procedure Code is the document that governs the administration of SCSU elections. The Chief Returning Officer is hired by the Elections Referenda Committee and charged with upholding the spirit and principles of this document. The CRO is responsible for conducting interviews with, and training, the polling clerks who will staff the polling stations during the election. Additionally, the CRO is responsible for hiring a Deputy Returning Officer.

Below is a rough timeline of tasks performed by the CRO and DRO according to the following timeline:

Jan. 19, 2020 – review, call & set-up interviews for DRO hiring + poll clerks
Jan. 20, 2020 – nomination period starts
Jan. 20, 2020 – hire + train DRO
Jan. 27, 2020 – ensure enrollment list is received from the registrar
Jan. 27, 2020 – CRO to verify all nomination packages
Jan. 27, 2020 – CRO e-mails candidates about All-Candidates Meeting
Jan. 27, 2020 – nomination period ends
Jan. 29, 2020 – All-Candidates Meeting (5pm), distribute campaign expense forms + statement of understanding forms
Jan. 30, 2020 – campaign period begins at midnight
Jan. 31, 2020 – hire poll clerks + schedules completed
Jan. 30-Feb. 13, 2020 – campaign period starts, register campaigner names
Feb. 1, 2020 – contact IC for supplies
Feb. 5, 2020 – poll clerk manual completed
Feb. 5, 2020 – retrieve poll clerk employment packages from ED/IC
Feb. 6, 2020 – poll clerk training
Feb. 6, 2020 – provide candidate list to IC to print ballots
Feb. 6, 2020 – print/cut ballots, setup election kits, register scrutineers
Feb. 11, 2020 – voting day 1
Feb. 12, 2020 – voting day 2
Feb. 13, 2020 – voting day 3 + ballot counting
Feb. 13, 2020 – provide unofficial result to Elections Referenda Committee

Much of the information that will follow is a basic summary of the day-by-day tasks that comprise administering the elections process. However, the 'Problems & CRO Recommendations' section beginning on page 13 contains some personal reflections on what I believe to be some of the more serious issues that arose, as well as some suggestions to make the process run more smoothly in the future.

Notice of Elections

Notice of the SCSU 2020 By-Elections was published on the SCSU website.

Notices were reposted to include dates and locations for the nomination period, campaign period, and the voting period.

Nominations and Eligible Candidates Executive Elections

Nomination packages were made available for candidates and returned either to the Internal Coordinator or CRO, at which point the CRO ensured that all packages were complete and all prospective candidates eligible, mainly by ensuring that all relevant information was present in the package, and through a process of verifying the status of students that had provided their names, student numbers, and signatures to the prospective candidates (a minimum of 50 for director candidates, and 100 for executive candidates).

Every prospective candidate that handed in a nominations package qualified to proceed to the next phase. Candidates were identified as part of one of two teams (VISION UTSC or WEnited), or independent.

Candidates

In total, six executive positions, and seventeen director positions were open for election:

- President
   Caluag, Claire (independent)
   Mohamed, Sarah (VISION UTSC)
   Sahagian, Carly (WEnited)

- VP Academics & University Affairs
   Gemma, Lulu (VISION UTSC)
   Uthayan, Yathu (WEnited)

- VP External
   Chaudhry, Eesha (VISION UTSC)
   Mirembe, Jordan (independent)
   Sahagian, Annie (WEnited)

- VP Equity
   Mohamed, Nadifa (WEnited)
   Uthayakumar, Kanitha (VISION UTSC)

- VP Operations
	Chan, Bruce (VISION UTSC)
	Jayakumar, Niroban (WEnited)

- VP Campus Life
	Ho, TJ (WEnited)
	Turingan, Kevin (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Anthropology
	Kashif, Aimen (WEnited)

- Dir. Arts, Culture & Media
	Macatangay, Robert (WEnited)
	Tabobondung, Tianna (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Biological Sciences
	Singh, Rajveer (VISION UTSC)
	Syed, Sulayman (WEnited)

- Dir. Computer & Mathematical Sciences
	Graham, Samantha (WEnited)
	Rautela, Janvi (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Critical Development Studies
	Dey, Divya (WEnited)
	Mumin, Amran (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. English
	Mendis, Angelesha Nandini (WEnited)

- Dir. French & Linguistics
	Chaudhry, Dhuha (VISION UTSC)
	Chia, Claire (WEnited)

- Dir. Health Studies
	Abdel Kader, Waad (WEnited)
	Jamal, Omer (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Historical & Cultural Studies
	Samuel, Dinah (WEnited)
	Warsame, Muna (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Human Geography
	Hung, Mei (WEnited)
	Yayan, Aybuke (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Philosophy
     Juneja, Devesh (VISION UTSC)
     Lo, Brandon (WEnited)
     Yousufi, Zo (independent)

- Dir. Physical & Environmental Science
     Clement, Michael (VISION UTSC)
     Zaman, Tahsina (WEnited)

- Dir. Political Science
     Alarcon, Jacob (independent)
     Boztas, Esma (WEnited)
     Johnson, Kiana (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Psychology
     Barakat, Stephanie (WEnited)
     Gunarajah, Gubetha (VISION UTSC)

- Dir. Sociology
     Genereux, Caeley (VISION UTSC)
     Resurreccion, Anto (independent)
     Sevilleno, Jeanine (WEnited)

- Dir. International Students
     Amin, Abhimanyu (VISION UTSC)
     Obano, Osaretin (WEnited)

- Dir. Management Studies
     Mai, Andy (VISION UTSC)
     Tsoi, Alex (WEnited)

All-Candidates Meeting

The All-Candidates Meeting was held on Wednesday, January 29 in Room SL-232, Student Centre at 5pm. It was attended by all candidates, except for one, with whom I met within 24 hours of the ACM. The importance of the Elections Procedure Code was discussed thoroughly, and an overview of the document was presented in the context of the SCSU Constitution and By-laws. All candidates signed a statement of understanding.

Two positions – Dir. Anthropology, and Dir. English – were uncontested. The sole candidates for these two positions were declared acclaimed. As per the EPC, while

uncontested executive positions must be subject to a yes/no vote, uncontested director positions are ruled acclaimed after they attend the ACM.

Campaign Period

The campaign period began on January 30 at midnight, and extended through the voting period, ending on February 13, with the final closing of the polling stations.

Candidates submitted posters and other campaign materials both electronically and in-person for approval after the All-Candidates Meeting. The CRO and DRO remained in the SCSU office throughout the evening of January 29 in order to ensure that all candidates would have approved material for midnight sharp, at which point campaign material was returned to the teams to begin campaigning immediately. The CRO was present in the office during the afternoon for every day through the campaign period.

Candidates appropriately registered volunteers as they joined the campaigns throughout the campaign period, except in one instance, for which demerit points were awarded.

Polling Clerk Hiring Procedure

Job openings for polling clerks were also advertised on the SCSU website. The DRO conducted interviews with all applicants. Successful applicants (selected primarily on the basis of availability and experience) were scheduled for the polling clerk training session conducted by the CRO on Sunday, February 9 at 5:00pm in room SL-232 in the Student Centre. Several polling clerks indicated that they would not be able to attend this meeting, and so a second meeting was scheduled off-campus for 9:00pm on the same day. All polling clerks were trained by the end of the day on February 9.

Altogether, twelve polling clerks were trained and hired for a total of thirty-six shifts over the three days of voting (i.e. two polling clerks at each station at all times), and several polling clerks were scheduled as 'floaters' that would be on call throughout the day when others went on break. All polling clerk employment forms were handed out to the polling clerks on their first shifts, and all relevant information was gathered from them by the CRO and submitted to the SCSU Executive Director for processing.

Ballot Design/Printing

All ballots were designed and printed in-house at the SCSU office in cooperation with the Internal Coordinator and staff. No ballots were necessary for the two acclaimed positions. Polling clerks and SCSU staff members assisted with the preparation of the ballots throughout the voting period. On the last day of voting, turnout was higher than anticipated, and ballots were running low. However, emergency ballot production was undertaken primarily by SCSU staff. Although the pace of production meant that there were some minor instances of error and subsequent spoiling, no station ever ran out of ballots, and any errors were dealt with by polling clerks marking the ballots spoiled and providing voters with valid ballots. The last day ballot shortage did not interfere with the voting process.

Voting Period

A total of three polling stations were made available to voters from February 11 to 13, from 10am-6pm on each voting day. The polling stations were located in the Student Centre (SC), the Bladen Wing atrium (BW), and the Instructional Centre atrium (IC). They were staffed by two polling clerks at all times during the allotted voting periods. Morning shifts ran from 9:00am-2:00pm. Afternoon shifts ran from 2:00pm-7:00pm. At all times, either another polling clerk, the DRO, or the CRO were on call to act as 'floater' to take the place of clerks that were on break or had to briefly leave their station.

Polling clerks were provided with polling clerk training manuals as well as other helpful instructions so that they were able to consult the manual regarding what instructions they were to follow, and so that they might adequately inform voters with questions about procedure.

Morning polling clerks were instructed that their shifts would begin one hour prior to the opening of the polls at 10am. Each voting day, polling clerks met the CRO at the SCSU office at 9am, and proceeded, with the CRO, to first set up the SC polling station, followed by the BW polling station, and then the IC polling station. After the polling stations were set up, the CRO constructed, sealed (where weaknesses were identified), and signed the ballot boxes with the polling clerks shortly before opening the polls.

After the closing of the polls at 6:00pm, the polling clerks closed their stations, and the CRO first visited the IC station to seal and sign the ballot box with the closing polling clerks. The CRO and the polling clerks travelled collectively (with all polling station

materials and the ballot box) to the SC station, where this was repeated. Afterwards, the CRO and all poll clerks travelled together (again, with polling station materials from both stations and the two ballot boxes) to the BV station, where this was again repeated, and then to the Campus Police station, where the ballot boxes would be stored for security over the voting period until the ballot count.

This was repeated over each day of voting, so that all votes were spread between ten ballot boxes in total (BV required an extra box on the final day of voting).

Ballot Count

Eleven ballot counters were hired by the CRO (one to help sort the ballots, and ten to count). After the ballot boxes from the final day of voting were delivered to the Campus Police station for storage, there was a short break before the count began at approximately 7:30pm the Student Centre, room SL-232.

Teams VISION UTSC and WEnited both provided five scrutineers each.

The ballot boxes were sorted according to day, and five tables were set up to act as counting stations. Each counting station was staffed by two ballot counters, who sat across from the scrutineers. As the first ballot box was emptied, the counters sorted the ballots according to position. The sorted ballots were then distributed across counting stations to be tallied. The ballot counters would verify the validity of each ballot by ensuring that two polling clerks had signed the back, and then declare the candidate for which the vote had been cast, according to clear criteria set out at the start of the count. The result of each ballot would be marked on a tally sheet. The scrutineers would intervene if they wanted to contest the counters' decisions, with the CRO or DRO making the final call. The ballots would then be placed into a 'counted' pile, the tally sheet completed, and then the ballots would be rolled up inside the tally sheet, secured with an elastic band, and deposited back into their respective box. This process would be repeated, box by box.

These initial results were reported to the Elections & Referenda Committee on the morning of Friday, February 14, except for seven positions that required a recount, due to the margin between the initially victorious candidate and their opponent being less than 5%. The recount for these positions occurred on Saturday, February 15. There were four ballot counters present, and each team sent two scrutineers (for the two counting tables).

Lastly, there were twenty-three 'double-enveloped' ballots that were cast by students whose registration status required verification from the university administration.

Ballots are double-enveloped when a voter claims they are a registered student and has their student card, but their name is not present in the voter registration database. These voters' registration status and program enrollment has to be verified by the university administration before their votes can be counted. The double-enveloping process is to protect the anonymity of the voter. After the vote is cast, it is placed in a small blank envelope, which is then placed in a large envelope on which the voter's information is written (name, student ID, and departments). After the university administration provides the information necessary to determine which of these voters are registered students, all envelopes containing votes from non-students are discarded and destroyed. During the counting process, the long envelopes containing votes from registered students are opened (with the CRO ensuring that any information written on them is visible to them alone), and the (unmarked) short envelopes are revealed and opened. The ballots are then passed to the counters to be tallied.

Twenty of these voters were deemed verified, and their ballots counted at noon on Thursday, February 20. There were two ballot counters present, and each team sent one scrutineer (for the single counting table)

The updated, finalized results were sent to the Elections & Referenda Committee the same day, and published on the SCSU website.

Rule Violations and Demerit Points

Claire Caluag (Independent – President)
- 8 points – improper distribution of campaign materials, misrepresentation of facts, campaigning for an opponent on the ballot

Michael Clement (VISION UTSC – Dir. Physical & Environmental Studies)
- 3 points – horizontally-placed poster preventing opposing team from postering

TJ Ho (WEnited – VP Campus Life)
- 3 points - poster overlapping with poster of an opposing candidate's

Andy Mai (VISION UTSC – Dir. Management)

- 3 points – horizontally-placed poster preventing opposing team from postering

Sarah Mohamed (VISION UTSC – President)
- 3 points – horizontally-placed poster preventing opposing team from postering

WEnited (entire team)
- 4 points to each team member – unregistered campaigner, improper distribution of campaign material, campaigning with opponent on the ballot

Janvi Rautela (VISION UTSC – Dir. Computer & Mathematical Sciences)
- 4 points – posters remaining up 72hrs after close of polls

No candidate or team received enough demerit points to warrant disqualification. There were, however, many allegations of violations made. This will be discussed below.

Election Results

Below are the *final counts* for each position:

President
Caluag, Claire - 146
Mohamed, Sarah - 957
Sahagian, Carly - 698
Spoiled - 161

VP Academics & UA
Gemma, Lulu - 958
Uthayan, Yathu - 806
Spoiled - 207

VP External
Chaudhry, Eesha - 860
Mirembe, Jordan - 158
Sahagian, Annie - 704
Spoiled - 226

VP Equity

Mohamed, Nadifa - 849

Uthayakumar, Kanitha - 867

Spoiled - 220

VP Operations

Chan, Bruce - 898

Jayakumar, Niroban - 861

Spoiled - 168

VP Campus Life

Ho, TJ - 882

Turingan, Kevin - 837

Spoiled - 235

Health Studies

Abdel Kader, Waad - 87

Jamal, Omer - 99

Spoiled - 12

Arts, Culture and Media

Macatangay, Robert - 77

Tabobondung, Tianna - 47

Spoiled - 13

Biological Sciences

Singh, Rajveer - 151

Syed, Sulayman - 144

Spoiled - 13

Comp & Math Sciences

Graham, Samantha - 67

Rautela, Janvi - 79

Spoiled - 19

Critical Development Studies

Dey, Divya - 58

Mumin, Amran - 28

Spoiled - 7

French & Linguistics
Chaudhry, Dhuha - 51
Chia, Claire - 53
Spoiled - 11

Human Geography
Hung, Mei - 30
Yayan, Aybuke - 32
Spoiled - 6

Historical and Cultural Studies
Samuel, Dinah - 47
Warsame, Muna - 38
Spoiled - 2

Philosophy
Juneja, Devesh - 22
Lo, Brandon - 29
Yousufi, Zo - 15
Spoiled - 2

Physical & Enviro Science
Clement, Michael - 93
Zaman, Tahsina - 76
Spoiled - 13

Political Science
Alarcon, Jacob - 24
Boztas, Esma - 101
Johnson, Kiana - 74
Spoiled - 6

Psychology
Barakat, Stephanie - 263
Gunarajah, Gubetha - 215
Spoiled - 37

Sociology
Genereux, Caeley - 11
Resurreccion, Anto - 37
Sevilleno, Jeannine - 27
Spoiled - 6

International
Amin, Abhimanyu - 151
Obano, Osaretin - 121
Spoiled - 69

Management Studies
Mai, Andy - 231
Tsoi, Alex - 133
Spoiled - 25

The *Director positions for Anthropology* (Aimen Kashif) and *English* (Angelesha Nandini Mendis) were ACCLAIMED.

The CRO sent the unofficial results to the Chair of the Elections and Referenda Committee in the early morning after the night of the ballot count to be published on the SCSU website.

However, the counts for the candidates for seven positions (VP Equity, VP Operations, VP Campus Life, Dir. Health, Dir. Biological Sciences, Dir. French & Linguistics, and Dir. Human Geography) were within the 5% margin for a recount stipulated by the EPC, and were not posted. Candidates were notified that the recount occurred on Saturday, Feb. 15. The recount occurred as scheduled, but before the final tallies could be released, the double-enveloped ballots would be counted.

The counting of the double-enveloped ballots occurred on Thursday, Feb. 20. This was due to a delay in the university administration's response in verifying voter information (the recount took place on the weekend, and the Monday kicking off Reading Week was Family Day), and the necessity of once again recruiting ballot counters and providing the candidates time to provide scrutineers one final time. As stated above, out of

twenty-three double enveloped ballots, twenty were valid. The votes were counted and recorded.

The final tally was released later the same day, and posted to the SCSU website.

Campaign Expense Forms

The CRO reminded the candidates several times over the campaign period, and both during and after the voting period, that campaign expense forms were to be submitted either in-person or over email within 72hrs of the polls closing. All candidates complied.

Problems & CRO Recommendations

Though there were minor administrative and procedural difficulties that I encountered over the course of the election, by far the most substantial and glaring issue was the consistently staggering volume of allegations of violations that I received from candidates. I strongly suspect, based both on my experience as CRO and through informal discussions with both current and former candidates from opposing teams, as well as others familiar with past SCSU elections, that this was due to the way that prior elections have been administered. It appears to me that the way in which demerit points were allocated and distributed in the past has produced an environment in which candidates are incentivized to attempt to win elections by directing their energy towards getting their opponents disqualified rather than focusing on on-the-ground campaigning and turning out the vote.

The situation is further worsened by the vague guidelines provided by the governing document of the elections process, the Elections Procedure Code, which leave ample room for interpretation, and an over-reliance on precedent (thus making the adjudication process difficult for a new CRO). This was a fact that candidates often – and understandably – attempted to manipulate to their advantage, making outrageous claims, exaggerating minor incidents, and attempting to bend rules as far as possible in their direction.

To be clear, the candidates themselves are not mainly to blame here – the environment and incentive structure created over the course of several previous election cycles lends itself to such behaviour. But, in any case, the scale of the problem became apparent mere moments after the campaign period officially began during the initial postering rush, when multiple violations were immediately reported. I quickly let it be known that

any allegations of violations must be accompanied by hard video or photo evidence, but this did little or nothing to stem the flow of complaints.

Furthermore, the tinderbox produced by this environment resulted in a situation in which some candidates and volunteers subjected others to virtually constant video surveillance. Though this kind of surveillance is, indeed, legal, it resulted in a situation that made many candidates feel uncomfortable and harassed, with some claiming to have felt like they were being subjected to a social experiment.

My further commentary on issues is below, as well as some suggestions:

1. Additional polling station in BV
   - Polling clerks stationed at BV consistently reported long lines and trouble handling the volume of voters at peak traffic times. I suggest an extra polling station be set up in BV to make the flow of voters more manageable.

2. Clarify to polling clerks that voters wearing face masks/coverings of any sort do not require verification
   - Polling clerks were faced with this situation a number of times and dealt with it differently. Seeing as students are highlighted in the voter registration database the moment they vote, any kind of mismatch when it comes to photo identification could easily be dealt with later in the case of a dispute arising (i.e. cases of voter impersonation, of which there would likely be few to none).

3. No stapling of executive position ballots
   - The polling clerks noted that the fact that the ballots for executive were stapled together made the process of signing each ballot and ensuring all ballots were correct more time consuming, and that the act of handing voters ballots in a stack of six was confusing for some voters.

4. Itemized list of position acronyms provided to polling clerks
   - Based on feedback from polling clerks, I suggest that they be provided with an itemized list of the acronyms for the positions appearing on ballots to allow them to familiarize themselves with departments more easily.

5. <u>Allowing voters to waive their right to vote privately</u>
    - Polling clerks noted that many voters didn't appear to care whether or not their vote was cast in private (i.e. behind the voting screen). This issue was compounded during period of high voter traffic, where the priority of many students was simply voting quickly, and then heading to their next class. Polling clerks suggested that voters be allowed to waive their right to vote privately, should they choose. However, this ought to be a last resort, and always prioritized second behind facilitating a more streamlined and efficient voting process so that students don't feel pressured to waive their right to privacy if they are in a hurry.

6. <u>More consistent ballot printing and clarifying rules around what happens with spoiled ballots</u>
    - Ballots were running low during the final day of voting, a situation that led to the pace of ballot production having to be sped up, and the occasional error being made. As a result, polling clerks noted that both themselves and voters noticed the occasional incorrect ballot in the stapled stack of Executive position ballots. Upon being notified of this, I instructed the polling clerks to spoil the entire stack of six ballots and place them in the ballot box, and to then hand an entire new stack of Executive position ballots to the voter. This was a solution, that, while having no impact on the vote tallies (because voters were handed a new stack upon the spoiling of the old stack), did have the effect of artificially inflating the count of spoiled ballots. A better way of dealing with spoiled ballots and a means of immediately disposing of them ought to be considered to avoid this result in the future;

7. <u>Budget for ballot counter food and transportation</u>
    - There should be a budget line created to provide the ballot counters with food and transportation, as the ballot count can run notoriously late, into the early hours of the following morning.

8. <u>Hourly wage for the DRO</u>
    - The DRO took on a substantial workload, ranging from frequently filling in for polling clerks on break, to hearing and reporting candidate complaints, to validating candidate material, to cutting, printing and distributing ballots.

The DRO is also present many days during campaign period, every day during voting hours, as well as during the long hours counting ballots. I am proposing that future DROs be paid an hourly wage.

9. Debate preparation
   - The CRO and DRO took the decision to cancel a debate that was scheduled between the presidential candidates near to the voting period. The reason for this was late scheduling, lack of preparation, technical difficulties, and an expectation of very weak turnout. I am certainly willing to take some responsibility for this myself, as I underestimated the amount of organization necessary for holding a successful debate, and it was not prioritized. Complicating matters further is the fact that the campus paper elected to schedule numerous debates of their own on key days throughout the campaign period. I suggest that future CROs prioritize organizing a debate from the start of their contract, and that any debate be scheduled well in advance, before the campaign period schedule becomes increasingly crowded. It is entirely possible for the SCSU to organize a successful and well-attended debate, without relying on other organizations.

10. Production of an updated and more detailed CRO manual explaining step-by-step how to organize the election, including useful tips, and an annually updated formal record of precedent (all rulings made) starting from this fall
    - Not much needs to be said about this – I would have found this quite useful, and would be happy to work on this myself.

11. Campaign period to begin in morning rather than midnight sharp
    - The reason for this suggestion is the safety of candidates and volunteers. Candidates and volunteers stay very late to ensure that their material is distributed. They should not have to worry about walking or getting a ride home in the early hours of the morning.

12. Removal of financial penalties for accrual of demerit points
    - The fact of wealth inequality means that some candidates will be able to financially handle being awarded demerit points better than others, and so more willing to break the rules in order to put their less wealthy opponents

at a disadvantage. For this election, I awarded financial penalties in line with the clear instructions in the Elections Procedure Code. However, in future elections, I propose that financial penalties be stricken from the code and replaced with a more egalitarian way of penalizing candidates for breaking the rules.

13. <u>Convening an Elections Procedure Code subcommittee to revise, clarify, and add additional content to the document. Subject matter for discussion would include:</u>
    - Provision of clear rules and stern penalties for candidates attempting to game the election rules in obvious ways meant to take advantage of gaps in the Elections Procedure Code;
    - Penalties awarded by the CRO to candidates whose complaints might be deemed frivolous and vexatious, as there must be some clear disincentive for candidates so as to stem the constant flow of complaints;
    - Seriously revising the postering policy to avoid the current situation, in which candidates are incentivized to aggressively compete for scarce resources (wall space, in this case), i.e. to stake out a few areas deemed most favourable to postering, leading to inevitable conflict and lasting tension on the first day of campaigning, and a flood of complaints (possible considerations – designated areas, limiting numbers of posters in same areas, etc.);
    - Clarifying rules around SCSU official social media featuring candidates and tags that link to candidate campaign material;
    - Clarifying rules around face-to-face campaigning, and what candidates are allowed to speak with voters about (i.e. ensuring that campaigning does not veer into gossip, rumour-mongering, unproven allegations, slander, misinformation, and what constitutes the above);
    - Clarifying what exactly counts as 'campaign material' and what does not – for example, university-provided tables in BV;
    - Outlines ensuring the candidates are aware what does and does not constitute admissible evidence of an alleged violation;
    - Seriously thinking about at what point surveillance of candidates constitutes harassment (though this is difficult, because of the need for evidence when it comes to allegations of violations).

It is my view that all modifications to the Elections Procedure Code discussed above be made with an eye to disincentivizing candidates from fighting the election through trying to compel the CRO to disqualify their opponents, and to incentivizing candidates to fight the election through campaigning and voter engagement. This is, without a doubt, the overarching theme under which most other problems encountered by the CRO fall. I would gladly aid the process of restructuring the Elections Procedure Code should the board desire.

The CRO respectfully asks the SCSU Board of Directors to accept this report as presented