



ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA COMMITTEE

CASE:	Appeal 2: Krause v. CRO
APPEALED DECISION:	Ruling 1.3 of the CRO
HEARING DATE:	10 April 2019
DECISION:	Appeal allowed. Ruling 1.3 of the CRO overturned.

CONTENTS

KEY ARGUMENTS.....	2
MEETING MINUTES	3

KEY ARGUMENTS

1. The UTSU is a democratic institution whose representative structure seeks to install elected officials that represent the whole of the electorate. The constituencies set out in the UTSU's governing documents manifest that structure.
2. There is reasonable cause to believe that the University's record-keeping or program classification methodology does not accord with the UTSU's or individual students' understanding of intending nominators' program area enrolment.
3. There is a reasonable possibility that the CRO, in relying on potentially misleading enrolment information from the University, invalidated Krause's nomination form on grounds that contravene the spirit and intent of the UTSU's representative structure.



MINUTES - ELECTIONS AND REFERENDA COMMITTEE

Thursday, 10 April 2019 | 11:00
Tower Meeting Room, 12 Hart House Circle, U of T St. George Campus

METADATA

STATUS: Draft
APPROVED AT: N/A. Pending board approval.
PREPARED BY: Aidan Cole Currie, AVP Administration
NOTES: N/A

AGENDA OUTLINE

1. Commencement
 - 1.1 About This Meeting
 - 1.2 Call to Order
 - 1.3 Approval of Agenda
2. Primary Business
 - 2.1 Appointment of Deputy Chair
 - 2.2 Appeal 1: Licalalde v. CRO
 - 2.3 Appeal 2: Krause v. CRO
3. Conclusion
 - 3.1 Other Business
 - 3.2 Adjournment

ATTENDANCE

Present

Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life
Usman Sadiq, Victoria College
Lisa Zaher, Applied Sciences and Engineering
Alexandra Robertson, Law

Regrets

Absent

Appellant(s):

Bryan Licalalde
Keenan Krause

Anne Boucher, President

Guest(s):

Jayne Blackburn, Deputy Returning Officer
Aidan Cole Currie, AVP Administration

MINUTES

[1. COMMENCEMENT]

[1.1 ABOUT THIS MEETING]

TYPE: Information

Elections and Referenda Committee Membership

CONTENTS:

1. Anne Boucher, President
2. Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
3. Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life
4. Usman Sadiq, Victoria College
5. Alexandra Robertson, Law
6. Lisa Zaher, Applied Sciences and Engineering

[1.2 CALL TO ORDER]

TYPE: Procedure

The meeting is called to order at 11:35.

[1.3 APPROVAL OF AGENDA]

TYPE: Resolution
MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
SECONDED: Lisa Zaher, Applied Sciences and Engineering

CONTENTS: BE IT RESOLVED that the agenda be approved as presented.

[1.3 CARRIED]

[2. PRIMARY BUSINESS]

[2.1 APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIR]

TYPE: Resolution
MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
SECONDED: Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life

CONTENTS: BE IT RESOLVED that *Firstname Lastname* is appointed as Deputy Chair of the Elections and Referenda Committee until the end of the term.

Zaher nominates Biswurm.

Biswurm accepts the nomination.

Biswurm notes that the current Chair of the committee, Boucher, is currently indisposed due to illness. The Deputy Chair is able to fulfill all those responsibilities that would otherwise fall to the Chair.

With one vacancy and one nomination, the blank is duly filled with Tyler Biswurm's name. The motion now reads: BE IT RESOLVED that Tyler Biswurm is appointed as Deputy Chair of the Elections and Referenda Committee until the end of the term.

[2.1 CARRIED]

[2.2 APPEAL 1: LICERALDE V. CRO]

TYPE: Resolution
MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
SECONDED: Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life

WHEREAS the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) of the UTSU ruled B. Licalerde's nomination form invalid on 5 April 2019, thereby denying their candidacy in the 2019 Spring By-Elections; and

WHEREAS Licalerde appealed the CRO's ruling in the form of a request to review on 8 April 2019; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Elections and Referenda Committee *overturn/uphold* the CRO's ruling.

NOTES

CONTENTS: The following format will be adopted in the hearing for this appeal:

1. A summary of facts as understood by the Elections and Referenda Committee to date;
2. An eight (8) minute defense presented by the complainant;
3. An eight (8) minute defense presented by the Chief Returning Officer;
4. Allotted time for the complainant and Chief Returning Officer to address each other's points;
5. Allotted time for the Elections and Referenda Committee members to ask questions to both the complainant and Chief Returning Officer;
6. Allotted time for the Elections and Referenda Committee to consider all materials and arguments in closed session;
7. A notice of the Elections and Referenda Committee's decision and reasoning to the candidate in question.

Biswurm explains that the committee will follow the process outlined in the notes for the agenda item. Biswurm states that the ERC received information from Mr. Licalalde and the CRO which are attached in the appendices of the agenda item. Biswurm states that in addition to the public appendices, there are confidential appendices which will be elaborated upon during closed session.

Biswurm begins with a summary facts as understood thus far by the committee. Biswurm explains that Mr. Licalalde sought candidacy for the Social Sciences Director position in the UTSU By-Elections, and as such Mr. Licalalde was required to obtain and submit twenty-five (25) nominators on a submission form. Biswurm states that Mr. Licalalde submitted his nomination form before 5:00 PM on Friday, April 5, the rewuired deadline, however did not meet the threshold of nominators according to the CRO and DROs. Mr. Licalalde is disputing the decision to invalidate the submitted nomination form based on his claim that the CRO relayed false information as to who counts as an eligible nominator. Biswurm states that Mr. Licalalde now has an eight (8) minute period in which to offer his defence.

Mr. Licalalde states that he emailed the CRO to ask whether any Faculty of Arts and Science student could sign his nomination form, which the CRO confirmed to be true. Mr. Licalalde states that he double-checked the number of signatures he obtained on his nomination package before submitting it to ensure he reached the twenty-five (25) signature threshold. Mr. Licalalde states that when he was emailed by the CRO and was told he had not reached the threshold and was therefore ineligible to run for election, he demanded the numbers from the CRO stating how many signatures were qualified versus not qualified, to which the CRO responded that Mr. Licalalde's nomination package could not be discussed further. Mr. Licalalde states that he believed he was entitled to know the deficit in terms of reaching the threshold because the nomination package belonged to him. Mr. Licalalde states that on Sunday, April 7, he was barred from entering the All-Candidates Meeting due to the fact that he had been deemed ineligible as a candidate, despite having an exam the next day. Mr. Licalalde states that he ensured he was in compliance with all elections regulations, and that whenever he was in doubt he asked questions of the CRO. Mr. Licalalde states that if the CRO's verification process was completed through student numbers, then that information should suffice despite misspelled or illegible names.

Biswurm notes that the committee will separately consider the question of whether candidates will be provided access to their submitted nomination forms.

Ms. Blackburn states that she had a conversation with Mr. Licalalde when he handed in his nomination package, where she recommended he obtain more signatures so as to ensure that he had reached the twenty-five (25) signature threshold. Ms. Blackburn states that Mr. Licalalde expressed that he was confident in the amount of signatures he had obtained. Ms. Blackburn states in regard to the conversation that took place between the CRO and Mr. Licalalde, she was not privy to that and as such cannot comment on what transpired at that point. Ms. Blackburn states that the UTSU's elections officials verify forms based on the membership data received from the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students, checking nominators' programs. Ms. Blackburn states that whenever a nominator does not pass, it is verified by another member of the elections team. Ms. Blackburn states that the elections team searches based on last name, first name, and different combinations to try to exhaust every possibility before voiding any nominator, in recognition of how critical this can be to a package passing.

Mr. Licalalde states that he appreciates the steps taken by the CRO and DROs to verify nominators, however he believes there was a miscommunication between himself and the CRO that caused Mr. Licalalde to not obtain the required signatures from the Social Sciences academic division. Mr. Licalalde states that he followed the rules of the elections, and believes each person must be on the same playing field when participating in elections procedures. Mr. Licalalde states that since he was given misinformation from the CRO, it can be determined that he was unfairly disadvantaged when obtaining signatures from nominators.

Zaher asks if she can discuss the details of Mr. Licalalde's nomination package, since the committee has not ruled on whether Mr. Licalalde can view his nomination package or not.

Biswurm responds that since the committee has not reached a decision on disclosure of nomination package decisions to candidates, the committee should not discuss the details of them except in closed session.

Zaher asks if Ms. Blackburn suggested that Mr. Licalalde obtain more signatures.

Ms. Blackburn responds in the affirmative.

Zaher asks if Mr. Licalalde submitted an extra sheet as well, or only his original nomination package.

Mr. Licalalde responds that he did not, however he double-checked that he obtained twenty-five (25) signatures.

Zaher states that often candidates are encouraged to obtain more than the minimum signature requirement in case some nominators fall through, and wanted to confirm that information was relayed to Mr. Licalalde by the elections team.

Ms. Blackburn states that she discussed the signature amount with Mr. Licalalde and suggested he obtain more signatures because of potential issues with illegibility and verification of nominators.

Zaher asks if Mr. Licalalde felt confident enough in his package that he did not feel it necessary to obtain more signatures.

Mr. Licalalde confirms, and adds that he obtained twenty-five (25) because he needed to complete an assignment. Mr. Licalalde reiterates that he believes his nomination should be reconsidered and confirmed based on the miscommunication of information from the CRO.

Biswurm asks when Mr. Licalalde's completed nomination package was submitted.

Ms. Blackburn states that Mr. Licalalde picked up his nomination package in the morning of Monday, April 1 and returned it in the afternoon at around 4:00 PM, however the exact time would be on the receipt of the package.

Biswurm asks what the rationale was behind not taking extra time to obtain signatures, seeing as Mr. Licalalde had four more days to complete the process.

Mr. Licalalde states that he had other assessments in the next few days of the Nomination Period, and he knew that twenty-five (25) signatures could be obtained within a day. Mr. Licalalde states that in the interest of not risking detriment to his GPA, he obtained the bare minimum amount of signatures required.

Zaher states that she understands that Mr. Licalalde was barred from attending the All-Candidates Meeting where he intended to speak to the CRO. Zaher asks if Mr. Licalalde expressed that he was going to come to the meeting to speak to the CRO, and further

asks what the rationale was behind not allowing Mr. Licalalde the opportunity to speak to the CRO.

Mr. Licalalde states he was not given a reason as to why he could not speak with the CRO, nor was he given an explanation that he should not attend the All-Candidates Meeting. Mr. Licalalde states that he took the initiative to go to the All-Candidates Meeting to speak to the CRO despite having an exam the next day. Mr. Licalalde states that he wasted time and money commuting to the meeting. Mr. Licalalde states that Biswurm told him he could be compensated for the money he spent on the commute. Mr. Licalalde states that he wanted to know whether he could speak to the CRO during the All-Candidates Meeting as he found the ruling to be preposterous.

Ms. Blackburn asks if Mr. Licalalde attended the All-Candidates Meeting for the previous Spring 2019 Elections and, if so, he was sent a copy of the Elections Procedures Code and UTSU Bylaws.

Mr. Licalalde states that he was sent those copies of the referenced documents, and read them multiple times.

Biswurm states that this concludes the open session of the hearing, and that the committee will now enter closed session to discuss the evidence presented and reach a decision.

Biswurm states that he sent the committee a PDF document prepared by the CRO to give the committee more clarity on the exact grounds of nominator invalidation involved in the appeals being heard today. Biswurm states that, in Mr. Licalalde's case, his sense is that due diligence was done to avoid the issue at hand, as it was emphasized by elections officials that it is the candidate's responsibility to submit complete nominations forms and to go above and beyond obtaining the minimum required signature amounts in order to avoid situations such as this one. Biswurm states that the fact that Mr. Licalalde did not heed that advice is indicative of some level of negligence on his part. Biswurm states that the committee can fairly expect that Mr. Licalalde knew the risks when submitting the bare minimum amount of signatures, and that his decision not to obtain more than twenty-five (25) was made in due knowledge of what that entailed.

Biswurm states that Mr. Licalalde's account was not completely accurate in terms of what took place at the All-Candidates Meeting. Biswurm states that he was not entirely aware of the situation when he spoke to Mr. Licalalde during the All-Candidates Meeting, and through correspondence with elections officials, Biswurm confirmed that Mr. Licalalde was informed on the evening of Friday, April 5 that his nomination form had not passed, and he was informed that he was not invited to attend the All-Candidates Meeting due to his not being a candidate. Biswurm states that Mr. Licalalde came to the All-Candidates Meeting nonetheless to dispute the decision to invalidate his nominations form, and the reason he was unable to speak to the CRO was because she was not in attendance.

Biswurm states that looking at the nomination form overall, he is inclined to accept Mr. Licalalde's argument as it pertains to miscommunication of information. Biswurm states that the CRO has encouraged potential candidates to clarify rules with the elections team, and Mr. Licalalde has done his due diligence in that regard. Biswurm states that the CRO miscommunicated the requirements in terms of what academic division nominators for the Academic Director candidates needed to come from. Biswurm states that on those grounds, the ERC could justifiably rule in Mr. Licalalde's favour, however it seems as though there is one (1) nominator out of twenty-five (25) that would not be reverted to a valid nominator. Biswurm recommends a potentially reasonable course in this case: refer the nomination form back to the CRO for reassessment, and make an exceptional directive for the elections team to include all Faculty of Arts and Science students as eligible nominators.

Alfaro states that, going off of the last question asked by Ms. Blackburn to Mr. Licalalde, after the All-Candidates Meeting all candidates sign a paper before leaving stating that they understand all of the rules outlined in the Elections Procedures Code. Alfaro states that the rule regarding eligible nominators referred to by Mr. Licalalde is clearly stated on Page 10 of the Elections Procedures Code that signatures are required from the relevant constituency. Alfaro states that Mr. Licalalde clearly demonstrated that he understood the entire Elections Procedures Code, and can reasonably be assumed to have understood the rule regarding eligible nominators prior to asking the CRO for clarification.

Robertson states that Mr. Licalalde relied on the information provided by the CRO, however he should have collected more signatures.

Alfaro agrees with Robertson.

Zaher states that regardless of the incorrect information relayed to Mr. Licalalde, and the validation process undertaken by the elections officials, there is still one potentially invalid signature on the package itself and as such this discussion may be moot.

Biswurm states that he can provide clarity on the depth of the verification process for the committee. Biswurm states that the elections officials begin with the student number and may sometimes transpose numbers to determine if a nominator accidentally placed one number in front of the other. Biswurm states that they will then search by last name, searching initials, combinations of first names and last names, shorten the names, and go through multiple permutations. Biswurm states that the elections officials will sometimes ignore names as some individuals use different names than their official names that appear on their transcripts with the university. Biswurm states that the elections team goes above and beyond the call of duty to confirm candidacies. Biswurm states that the question is which weighs more heavily in the committee's judgement: the fact that Mr. Licalalde did not do his due diligence in gathering more signatures after he was made aware that would be the prudent decision; or that the CRO relayed misinformation on which Mr. Licalalde relied during the nomination process.

Zaher states that she would feel more secure going with the latter, seeing as there was some miscommunication and part of the responsibility falls on the CRO. Zaher states, however, that even if the committee accepts the miscommunication, there is still a lack of signatures and due diligence on Mr. Licalalde's part.

Biswurm states that he would recommend referring Licalalde's nominations form back to the elections team and requiring them to act in accordance with the provided information, and count all members of the Faculty of Arts and Science as an eligible nominator for Mr. Licalalde due to the miscommunication.

Alfaro states that she does not believe the CRO's misinformation was the only reason for Mr. Licalalde's unsuccessful nomination, and he has demonstrated that he knew what the rules were prior to obtaining signatures.

Biswurm states that Mr. Licalalde asked for clarification from the CRO and was given false information, on which he relied for the nomination period. Biswurm states that Mr. Licalalde sought nominations with the misinformation provided by the CRO.

Sadiq agrees that the committee should refer the case back to the CRO as Biswurm suggested.

[2.2.1 MOTION TO AMEND]

TYPE: Resolution
MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
SECONDED: Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life

BE IT RESOLVED that the operative clause of the resolution is substituted with the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Elections and Referenda Committee overturn the CRO's ruling; and

CONTENTS: *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Licalde's nomination form is referred to the UTSU's elections officials for re-processing; and*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Licalde's nomination form is re-processed under the condition that all students enrolled in the Faculty of Arts & Science are counted as eligible nominators.

[2.2.1 CARRIED]

[2.2 CARRIED]

[2.3 APPEAL 2: KRAUSE V. CRO]

TYPE: Resolution
MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
SECONDED: Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life

WHEREAS the Chief Returning Officer (CRO) of the UTSU ruled K. Krause's nomination form invalid on 5 April 2019, thereby denying their candidacy in the 2019 Spring By-Elections; and

WHEREAS Krause appealed the CRO's ruling in the form of a request to review on 8 April 2019; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Elections and Referenda Committee *overturn/uphold* the CRO's ruling.

NOTES

The following format will be adopted in the hearing for this appeal:

- CONTENTS:**
1. A summary of facts as understood by the Elections and Referenda Committee to date;
 2. An eight (8) minute defense presented by the complainant;
 3. An eight (8) minute defense presented by the Chief Returning Officer;
 4. Allotted time for the complainant and Chief Returning Officer to address each other's points;
 5. Allotted time for the Elections and Referenda Committee members to ask questions to both the complainant and Chief Returning Officer;
 6. Allotted time for the Elections and Referenda Committee to consider all materials and arguments in closed session;
 7. A notice of the Elections and Referenda Committee's decision and reasoning to the candidate in question.

Biswurm begins with a summary of facts. Biswurm states that Mr. Krause is seeking candidacy for the Humanities Director position, and as such, is subject to the nomination rules set out in the Elections and Procedures Code. All intending candidates must submit nomination forms with a certain number of students signing, which is cross-referenced with enrolment data provided by the university.

Biswurm states that Mr. Krause did not obtain the necessary number of eligible signatures, so was not confirmed as a candidate by elections officials. Biswurm invites Mr. Krause to make his case to the Committee.

Mr. Krause states that he collected signatures and returned his completed nomination form before the Friday deadline, which included several signatures from students he believed to belong to the Humanities constituency. Mr. Krause states that he checked the form to ensure readability and eligibility. He states that he was told Friday night that he did not receive a sufficient number of signatures, and as such, was not able to run. Mr. Krause says that he came to the Committee to verify the nominators and their status. Mr. Krause states that he had signatures from International Relations students, a program that is considered both a Social Sciences and Humanities program by the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Ms. Blackburn explains the process of validating signatures, stating that they use student data provided by the University that describes their enrollment status. She states that if they are not able to find a specific student number in a subset of members, in this case, Humanities, they will look under a wider scope of members to determine the program in which the student is enrolled.

Ms. Blackburn states that if a student is deemed ineligible, the CRO will review the information to ensure accuracy and review the data.

Mr. Krause asks if the ERC is able to disclose the evidence of disqualification directly, or if this is beyond the purview of the ERC.

Biswurm responds that the Committee has considered this question, but that it has not yet decided how to make the data available and to whom.

Biswurm invites members of the ERC to ask questions.

Zaher asks if Ms. Blackburn can confirm or deny if the International Relations program falls within Humanities programs, stating that it appears as Humanities online. Ms. Blackburn responds that the data is provided by the administration, but if you are in multiple program areas, you appear in the list multiple times.

Biswurm asks if this enrolment data describes students' individual programs of study, or instead their broader program area.

Ms. Blackburn responds that it shows categories such as Humanities, but not specific programs. Ms. Blackburn states that the elections officials are given an Excel sheet with a full membership list that does not provide any indication of majors or minors. Ms. Blackburn states they also have a categorized list, that classifies students based on their specific program area. Ms. Blackburn explains that if a student does not appear in the categorized list, they will expand the search to check which category they are enrolled, as well as to verify if they belong to the membership at all.

Biswurm asks what happens if a signatory is confirmed as a member, but elections officials are unable to determine their program area.

Ms. Blackburn responds that this applies to students who have not yet declared a program. Ms. Blackburn states that undeclared students are not included in the segmented list describing their program area.

Biswurm declares that the committee will proceed with the discussion in closed session, and invites Mr. Krause and Ms. Blackburn to exit the meeting.

Biswurm states the Committee should rely on the Appendix provided by the CRO. This case seems to revolve around administrative questions. He says this seems to be the result of a complex classification methodology used by the University, classifying students on their admissions category.

Biswurm states that he was admitted as a Humanities students, but then switched to a program in Computer Science. He states that he would have considered himself to be a Computer Science student, but is not sure if the University updates its records to represent this switch. He speculates that students may not be aware of their classification under the University's system, and it's also possible that the University does not update their system to represent program changes.

Alfaro agrees that the University has a confusing classification structure. She says it's unclear if a program like International Relations would be listed as both a Humanities and Social Sciences program.

Zaher asks if the CRO could clarify whether a student in the full membership list but not the segmented list would still count as an eligible signature.

Biswurm states that there is no way for the Committee to reach out to students to determine their specific program of study. He states that all that is made available is their program area, as determined by the University.

Zaher says it's also important to note that there was effort on the candidate's part to ensure there were more signatures than required.

Biswurm speculates that the CRO could make an exceptional request to the University to receive the individual program enrolment of invalidated nominators, allowing them to bypass the University's internal classification methodology and verify their constituency manually. Biswurm flags a potential issue of fairness with this approach: it is possible that some of the other intending candidates whose forms were invalidated might have been placed on the ballot if this process had been followed in their cases as well.

Robertson says it would be unfair to rule against the Candidate as the procedure is obviously very unclear, and the Candidate made substantial effort to do what was required.

Zaher states that this situation is very confusing, saying it's unfair to expect students to know this classification ahead of time.

Biswurm suggests the ERC refers Krause's nomination form back to the CRO to reassess all invalidated nominators and request information from the administration to verify their programs of study.

Biswurm states that the classification is also inconsistent between websites. He states he will ask the CRO to include this issue in their transition report to address the problem for future elections.

[2.2.1 MOTION TO AMEND]

TYPE: Resolution

MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations

SECONDED: Lisa Zaher, Applied Sciences and Engineering.

BE IT RESOLVED that the operative clause of the resolution is substituted with the following:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Elections and Referenda Committee overturn the CRO's ruling; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Krause's nomination form is referred back to the UTSU's elections officials for re-processing; and

CONTENTS:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU's elections officials solicit, from the University, the current program enrolment of nominators deemed to have not been members of the Humanities constituency; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UTSU's elections officials re-process Krause's nomination form in light of this additional information.

[2.2.1 CARRIED]

[3. CONCLUSION]

[3.1 OTHER BUSINESS]

TYPE: Discussion
MOVED: Tyler Biswurm, VP Operations
SECONDED: Yolanda Alfaro, VP Student Life

Biswurm asks what information should be provided to candidates. Biswurm states the ERC can provide the appendix solicited from the CRO indicating the exact grounds for individually invalidated nominators. This approach would require that certain information in the appendix is redacted to preserve confidentiality.

Alfaro states that the Committee can provide a summary of what was presented, but does not want to give scanned copies of nomination lists for privacy purposes.

Zaher asks what stops candidates from scanning their forms before handing them in.

Biswurm agrees, saying that they were privy to the same information before they submitted it.

Alfaro states that Candidates do not do this, and adds that she does not feel good about doing this to every candidate in case information is lost.

Biswurm asks if there is consensus that a summary is best. He says this would include information about how many were valid and how many were not, but would not include information about which particular signatures were deemed invalid.

Biswurm states the Committee must also decide whether or not to hear the appeal of intending candidate M. Boyd. He asks if anyone would like to discuss this issue at this time.

Zaher states that she does. Zaher says she is not accepting of wanting to review it, since there is insufficient information provided by the candidate. However, she says that in light of Kraus's case, it might be necessary to review this information as well.

Biswurm states that Boyd's case is different, as they were running for an Executive position and could receive signatures from members in any constituency.

Alfaro believes that Boyd provided insufficient grounds for the ERC to hear their appeal.

Biswurm asks if the request is substantial enough to grant an appeal. Boyd's most significant argument seems to relate to accommodation. Biswurm personally believes that the evidence for this argument is insufficient.

Zaher and Alfaro agree.

Zaher suggests releasing the details of the unverified signatures, as the Committee discussed earlier.

Zaher states that she is not convinced that the committee should hear the appeal, and does not think that the nomination period falling during the exam period is a valid reason for an exception.

Alfaro agrees.

[3.2 ADJOURNMENT]

TYPE: Resolution
MOVED: Usman Sadiq, Victoria College
SECONDED: Lisa Zaher, Applied Sciences and Engineering

CONTENTS: BE IT RESOLVED that the meeting be adjourned.

[3.2 CARRIED]

The meeting adjourns at 13:31.