

Chief Returning Officer

Final Report

KSA General Election 2005

In this report the C.R.O. is reporting on the last communications received in relation to the 2005 General Election followed by the results of the election with disqualifications noted. Thank you for your patience.

The C.R.O. recommends that Council immediately appoint an *ad hoc* committee to review the Election Regulations. The C.R.O. in his role as Policy Analyst should be consulted. It is very likely that some revisions are required and these must be in place before the usual fall by-election.

Decision Report Concerning Recently Received Communications

Issued 25 April 2005

Communication 1A

Summary:

This communication suggests that, although individual decisions by the C.R.O. were correct, that taken as a whole, and given that many of the polling results were close, the number of issues requires a finding that the election results are not trustworthy. The signers refer specifically to communications 39, 32, 47, 22, 31, 29b, and 2A (discussed below). The signers suggest disqualifying the R.A.F. Party and the Progressive Party on the ground that most of the communications refer to these groups or rerunning the election in its entirety with completely different election officials. Signed by Ken McIntyre, Laura Anderson, Kailee Bruce, and Philip Sun.

Comments:

The R.A.F. Party comments as follows:

- That this communication is past the 72 hour time limit for complaints
- That the signers are close to, or in, last place in the unofficial vote totals
- That at least part of the fault for irregularities lies with Laura Anderson and the electoral staff
- That another election is not feasible during the summer
- That the winners are clear
- That the defeated are frustrated
- That previous rulings have not established that the R.A.F. Party or the Progressive Party have committed serious offences.

Ken McIntyre comments essentially that the membership must have confidence in the electoral process and that, given that there have been a number of complaints and rulings, it would better level the playing field if the election was re-run in its entirety.

Analysis:

- Decisions have been rendered in all of the communications cited except 2A which relates to alleged unauthorized campaign materials.
- A decision relating to communication 2A will be issued separately.

- Other than regarding communication 2A, no new allegations are disclosed by this communication.
- No general authority for the C.R.O. to review his own decisions is found in the Regulations. The prescribed route for review is through the appeal process.

Decision:

- No decision regarding communication 2A had been published prior to this communication, so there was no decision to review regarding that matter.
- Further, as there is no authority found for the review of previous decisions, **the complaint is dismissed in its entirety.**
- This specifically does not mean that the C.R.O. will not consider any candidate or slate's record of violations when reviewing new communications and information that comes to his attention as part of the election review process.

Communication 2A

Summary:

This communication alleges that unapproved campaign material was distributed in Langley and then posted at the Newton re-polling contrary to Regulation X 4 (iv). It is alleged that Matt Huff produced the material in question on the evening of 23 March [likely an error because the rest of the complaint refers to events in February]. The complainant points out that she only realized that the C.R.O. was not aware of the Langley posting as a result of a conversation with the C.R.O. on 11 April. The complainant suggests essentially that the time allowed for this complaint should start from when the violation was discovered – 11 April 2005. **Signed by Laura Anderson, Jeff Hansled, Stafford Richter, and Jack Nicholson.**

Comments:

The R.A.F. Party comments as follows:

- The communication is submitted past the 72 hour time limit in the Regulations
- That there is a date discrepancy in the communication
- That there was no campaign material distributed
- That Matt Huff did not say that the C.R.O. had approved the material in question.
- That the material was approved by Erin Minor and Pavan Bassi who approved material for other candidates including Laura Anderson
- That the C.R.O. had indicated that Erin Minor and Pavan Bassi were working on the election at the all-candidates meeting
- That senior management of the KSA is at fault and that the candidates should not be held accountable for any misconduct of the electoral / administrative staff.

Analysis:

- The poster in question was provided by Aaron Takhar to the C.R.O. for posting at the Newton re-polling on the evening of 1 April. When specifically asked if this material was previously approved by the C.R.O., Mr. Takhar replied that it was approved by the C.R.O. The C.R.O. chose to believe Mr. Takhar's statement at the time.
- The C.R.O. noticed that the poster in question contained a statement that he would not normally approve when he had an opportunity to look at the poster during the Newton balloting. The C.R.O. decided again to believe that Mr. Takhar but to

- review his file and question Mr. Takhar about the poster at the earliest opportunity.
- Laura Anderson noticed the poster in Newton during the re-polling period. The C.R.O. discouraged a complaint at that time in the belief that what harm may have been done had already happened and on the understanding that the campaign was virtually over by that time. The C.R.O. again decided to review the poster with Mr. Takhar at the earliest opportunity after the re-polling and ballot counting process.
 - In an interview with Mr. Takhar on 14 April, he admitted that the poster was not approved by the C.R.O. but stated that it was produced by Matt Huff who he believed had approval.
 - In a discussion on 15 April 2005, Mr. Takhar stated that Matt Huff had Erin Minor approve the poster in question on the morning of 25 February “over the computer”.
 - Regulation X 5 4 (iv) requires that all campaign material must be approved by the C.R.O. before it is used.
 - Regulation X 5 4 (vi) allows an appeal of the C.R.O.’s decisions regarding campaign materials to be appealed to the Elections Committee.
 - As decided in communications 9 and 11b, in this election, this appeal authority is vested in the C.R.O. and is the authority under which he reviewed certain campaign material decisions made in the course of the election.
 - As Ms Minor is not the C.R.O., Ms Minor did not have the actual or apparent authority to grant approval of any materials.
 - The poster in question would not have been approved as it contains a promise to use the Lobby Fund for purposes that are not allowed by the terms of the referendum establishing the fund, as understood by the C.R.O.
 - Regulation X 11 2 allows complaints to be submitted within 72 hours after the occurrence or the discovery of the occurrence to which it relates. No protest or complaint shall be submitted more than 72 hours after the end of balloting.
 - Balloting ended in this election at 3PM on 5 April 2005.
 - The C.R.O., in this election, has the general power to administer the election in a fair and impartial manner pursuant to Regulation X 2 2 (i).

Decision:

- As this communication was submitted later than 72 hours after the end of balloting and pursuant to regulation X 11 2 **this complaint is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.**
- This finding specifically does not prevent the C.R.O. from considering the information obtained in the course of this investigation pursuant to Regulation X 2 2 (i) – the authority to administer a fair and impartial election

Communication 3A

Summary:

This communication states that several witnesses saw the remains of Progressive Party posters on the floor under a bulletin board in D Building on the Surrey Campus. The signers further state that members of the R.A.F. Party have openly claimed that their

supporters and members have destroyed campaign materials. They further suggest that the R.A.F. Party should be disqualified based on the habitual destruction of Progressive Media. The signers suggest that this complaint was actually submitted in a timely manner but was apparently misplaced by the KSA office staff or the C.R.O. and was not reviewed as part of the main group decisions found in the Decision Report issues on or about 31 March 2005. **Signed by Jeff Nelson, Rigel Vincent, and Kristina Kearley.**

Comments:

The R.A.F. Party comments that:

- It is unusual for a complainant to not notice that their communication was not included in the posted communications,
- The destruction of posters is uncalled for and inappropriate,
- Jeff Nelson should be able to identify the members of the R.A.F. Party that allegedly removed the Progressive Party poster,
- The Progressive Party is challenged to provide the remains of the poster and to bring forward witnesses to the allegations in the communication,
- They would like to know exactly where the posters in question were posted,
- They consider the communication defamatory

Analysis:

- The C.R.O., in this election, has the general power to administer the election in a fair and impartial manner pursuant to Regulation X 2 2 (i).
- This allows the C.R.O. to review irregularities that come to his actual attention and to determine if the election was conducted in a fair and impartial manner or not.
- The C.R.O. has interviewed Jeff Nelson, Kristina Kearley, Sammy Chau, Danish Butt, and Aaron Takhar in connection with this communication.
- The C.R.O. has seen the remains of Progressive Party posters identified as being destroyed in the area in question
- The C.R.O. is satisfied that there were at least three Progressive Party posters destroyed in the area in question at the approximate times indicated in the communication.
- Except for the poster mentioned in communication 31, there is no conclusive evidence that the posters were removed by the R.A.F. Party or its supporters.
- Jeff Nelson stated that he wanted to avoid a confrontation with the R.A.F. Party supporter he saw and photographed. He further stated that he believed that the photograph referred to in communication 31 would speak for itself.
- In every case posters were removed from the same location in the D building of the Surrey Campus where the picture used in communication 31 was taken.
- There is absolutely no cogent evidence that this complaint was not submitted on time and misplaced as the signers have stated.

Decision:

- The C.R.O. agrees with the R.A.F Party that the destruction of posters is uncalled for and inappropriate.
- Jeff Nelson made a reasonable decision when he decided not to confront the R.A.F. Party supporter when he saw the supporter removing the Progressive Party poster

- However, there is no direct evidence that the posters other than the one mentioned in communication 31 were removed by the R.A.F. Party or its supporters.
- **The complaint is dismissed in its entirety**
- This finding specifically does not prevent the C.R.O. from considering the information obtained in the course of this investigation pursuant to Regulation X 2 2 (i) – the authority to administer a fair and impartial election

Issues relating to Candidate Eligibility

In the 19 April Progress Report issued by the C.R.O. he included a report on the eligibility of candidates in the 2005 General Election. It demonstrated the following:

- there that no candidates running with the C.S.I. slate were found ineligible,
- 4% (one candidate) of the candidates running for the Progressive Party had not demonstrated his eligibility, and
- 32% (10 candidates) of the candidates running for the R.A.F. Party had not demonstrated eligibility. The C.R.O. stated that he was considering whether the ineligibility of a significant number of candidates of a given slate impacts the overall eligibility of the slate and if there is an impact, the remedy that is appropriate.

Comments:

Steve Lee comments:

- Suggests that ineligible candidates should be disqualified but the rest of the slate's candidates should be eligible
- He bases his reasoning on past practice where the all-candidates meeting was held 24 hours after the close of nominations so that eligibility could be checked.
- He points out that in this case, the dates set by council did not allow this delay
- He goes on to suggest that if the C.R.O. decides that the disqualification of individual candidates affects the entire slate, then all parties who ran ineligible candidates, regardless of how many, should be disqualified
- This he suggests would send a strong message to future slates to be careful who they chose to put forward as candidates.

Jeff Nelson comments that he is amazed at the number of ineligible R.A.F. Party candidates. He further suggests that this is likely to have a material effect on the election. Running ineligible candidates gives a slate extra campaigning ability. He refers to the “straw that broke the camel’s back” analogy.

The R.A.F. Party comments:

- They point out that a report like this has never been issued before
- They withdrew their Newton Campus candidates in advance of the re-polling on that campus
- They suggest that if the names had been on the ballot, it would have been misleading
- They suggest that all winning candidates have been shown to be eligible.
- They suggest that they have tracked down all winning candidates to prove their eligibility pursuant to an agreement with the C.R.O.

- They suggest that this information was only requested because there had been complaints of ineligible candidates.
- The further suggest that the report is misleading because they could prove their eligibility.

Analysis:

- The C.R.O., in this election, has the general power to administer the election in a fair and impartial manner pursuant to Regulation X 2 2 (i).
- All of the comments received suggest that, at least in some circumstances, running ineligible candidates can be misleading to the electorate
- Current regulation X 5 3 (i) states that it is preferable to have the all-candidates meeting on the same day that nominations close. It may be appropriate for Council to reconsider this Regulation in the future but, as it stands, following this rule makes pre-screening of candidates difficult
- This particular election had a very short time frame, making any pre-screening particularly difficult.
- It is not unreasonable for the C.R.O. to expect that candidates and slates take responsibility for determining eligibility and the consequences if they are found not to be eligible
- If the candidates withdrawn by the R.A.F. Party are removed from the calculations, there are 5 / 26 candidates for whom eligibility has not been established – 19%.
- For the vast majority of the balloting, voters would have had no way of knowing that the withdrawn candidates had actually withdrawn.
- Political parties run candidates in ridings they are not expected to win to, among other things, create the impression that they are broadly based and attract more support than they otherwise might get.
- Candidate eligibility was checked from the top polling candidates down. Mr. Takhar was asked to provide proof of eligibility for more than the 10 candidates that withdrew of who did not establish eligibility. The C.R.O. simply decided it was pointless to continue to chase Mr. Takhar for more information. It was entirely Mr. Takhar's choice for whom he provided confirmation of eligibility. Any agreement by the C.R.O. was simply agreeing that he had or had not provided proof of eligibility.
- No other slate required the C.R.O. to check any significant number of candidates for eligibility nor did any other slate require multiple reminders that information was required concerning eligibility.
- A review of the vote status of the R.A.F. Party candidates that have not established eligibility finds that there is a mix of candidates who might have polled enough votes to lead and those who did not.

Decision:

- In this case it is more likely than not that running a large number of ineligible candidates created an impression with the electorate that the R.A.F. Party was a more broadly based coalition than was actually the case.
- It is highly unlikely that a slate would nominate 32% candidates who cannot reasonably establish eligibility without being negligent or deliberately attempting to mislead the electorate

- It is also unlikely that running 4% candidates who cannot reasonably establish eligibility is anything more than carelessness or inadvertence
- Running candidates on campuses where they were not eligible has a material effect in that it allowed these candidates to campaign and encourage the electorate at those campuses to vote for multi-campus candidates with whom they were running.
- The sheer number of candidates that did not establish eligibility shows an intention to mislead the electorate.
- If the C.R.O. had relied on the representation of the R.A.F. Party slate that their candidates were properly nominated and had these people been declared elected, the KSA may have had directors who are not members which could have serious legal implications.
- It is not unreasonable to impose some obligation on slates to ensure their members are eligible because of the serious consequences if they are not eligible.
- In this case the R.A.F. Party had lots of time to demonstrate their eligibility.
- It is possible for slates to benefit from running candidates even where they don't poll the most votes. It is a false representation of their breadth of support and it allows more campaign expenditure.
- In this case the R.A.F. Party slate was given every opportunity to establish eligibility and they chose not to. Their only comment was that they are eligible without more information.
- The C.R.O. in this case checked the registrar's list of registered students which fulfills his obligation to check registration pursuant to Regulation X 5 2 (vi).
- The onus switches to the candidates once the initial check is completed.
- The R.A.F. Party slate has failed to discharge their onus.
- Pursuant to the authority granted to the C.R.O. in this election under regulation X 2 2 (i) to administer a fair and impartial election the **C.R.O. finds that the R.A.F. Party is in breach of the election regulations, in particular for submitting a significant number of ineligible nominations.**
- **The C.R.O. further finds that was intentional or deliberate and likely to have a material impact on the results. It is therefore a serious offence.**
- A review of previously sustained complaints finds that the R.A.F. Party committed the following campaign violations:
 - Wearing campaign T-shirts in the KSA office – communication 41
 - Tearing down a Progressive Party poster – communication 31
 - Harassing candidates campaigning in an allowed area – communication 29b
 - Failing to submit their slate registration form in time – communications 12a, 17, 12b, 38, and 50
- Of the sustained complaints against the R.A.F. Party, communications 31 and 29b could, in some circumstances, represent very serious offences.
- Regulation X 6 11 specifically states, among other things, that slates, as a whole, are responsible for the electoral conduct of their members. In particular, if the entire slate has received a material advantage in the election from the actions of one or more members of the slate, the entire slate may be penalized.

- It is difficult to imagine a case where the entire slate is more likely to have benefited from campaign violations. **Therefore the entire R.A.F. Party slate is disqualified.**
- The C.R.O. notes further that this decision is consistent with decisions that he reviewed from the 2004 General Election in that slates can be disqualified for the actions of their members. It is also noted that, as in 2004, the R.A.F. Party had intricate systems in place to manage their campaign. It is more likely than not that candidates on the R.A.F. Party slate were well aware of the activities of their fellow candidates on the R.A.F. Party slate.

Issues relating to Election Expenses

The C.R.O. has reviewed expense returns received to date. He makes the following observations:

- The C.S.I. Slate submitted a single expense report showing a total of \$198.53 spent. No individual candidate reports were received. Steve Lee is designated as the slate contact on the C.S.I. slate registrations form.
- The Progressive Party submitted individual expense reports for all of their candidates. The expense reports show total spending of \$705.05. All reports were signed by Jeff Nelson on behalf of candidates running for the Progressive Party. All Progressive Party Candidates signed forms designating Jeff Nelson as their campaign manager. Jeff Nelson is also noted as the slate contact on the Progressive Party slate registration form.
- The R.A.F. Party submitted individual expense reports signed by the candidates. The expense reports show total spending of \$538.80. No receipts were included with the reports. Aaron Takhar submitted one receipt for T-shirts on Friday 15 April purporting to be from Creative Insignia Ltd. Other expenses are shown as “Office Depot Pricing” which is the default source of price information for many items.
- There is no documentation, other than the expense reports themselves, verifying the quantity of printing that was done by the R.A.F. Party.
- Stafford Richter has submitted an expense report showing a total of \$24.20 spent. Receipts are attached.
- Laura Anderson has submitted an expense report showing \$9.46 spent. One receipt for copying is attached.
- In this election expenses were limited to \$30 for campus specific positions and \$75 for multi-campus positions.
- The C.R.O. calculates that 19 R.A.F. Party candidates were eligible to campaign – and spend money on campaigning. Based on the expense reports submitted, they spent \$28.36 per candidate.
- A review of the R.A.F. Party expense returns finds a declared value of T-shirts of \$7.21 per shirt. The progressive Party declared a value of \$13.00 per shirt. T-shirt.ca quotes a base price of \$9.50 per shirt for 25, 1 colour print shirts. T-ShirtKing.com quotes a price of \$13.00 per shirt based on a total order of 30 shirts with one colour front and one colour back.
- The R.A.F. Party declares that it had 30 T-shirts made for this campaign.

- The C.R.O. notes that the \$9.50 price plus 14% tax would total \$10.83 per shirt.
- The C.R.O. notes that it is generally more expensive to have printing on both sides of a T-shirt.
- In response to an inquiry from the C.R.O., the lowest price that Creative Insignia Ltd quoted was \$10.85 per shirt plus tax for 30 red shirts with text on their front and back. The C.R.O. calculates that this would result in a total price of \$12.37.
- Regulation X 5 7 (ii) requires the C.R.O. to assess each candidate the market cost or the actual cost, whichever is higher, for each declared campaign expenditure.
- Market value of the R.A.F. Party T-shirts is determined to be \$12.37 per shirt.
- This results in a recalculated total declared expenditure by the R.A.F. Party of \$693.60 – an increase of \$154.80 or \$5.16 more per shirt.
- The C.R.O. calculates that declared spending per R.A.F. Party candidate then is \$36.51 per candidate.
- The C.R.O. calculates that 18 Progressive Party Candidates were eligible to campaign – and spend money on campaigning. Based on the expense reports submitted, they spent \$39.17 per candidate.
- The C.R.O. calculates that 10 C.S.I. Party candidates were eligible to campaign – and spend money on campaigning. Based on the expense reports submitted, they spent \$19.85 per candidate.
- As both the R.A.F. Party and the Progressive Party have spent more per candidate than allowed for single campus positions, it is necessary to interpret the expense reports submitted by these slates in regard to Regulation X 5 7 (vi) which states that where candidates incur expenses jointly as members of a slate, the expenses shall be divided equally amongst them. No other distribution of jointly incurred expenses shall be permitted.
- The C.R.O. stated at the all-candidates meeting and elsewhere that he would interpret this ruling to mean that slate materials would indeed need to be attributed to all candidates but that individual candidates could also spend on their own behalf.
- A review of the Progressive Party expense returns shows that the single campus candidates declared expenses of \$24.60 per candidate except Tristan Thompson – who declares \$27.00 based on “home printing” instead of printing done at Staples or Photo-experts.
- The Progressive Party multi-campus candidates all declared expenses of \$66.81 per candidates.
- The main difference in expenses between Progressive Party single and multi-campus reports appears to be that each multi-campus candidate declared an additional \$31.21 for key chains.
- As a result of discussions with Jeff Nelson, Rigel Vincent, and Matt Vu concerning the key chains the C.R.O. finds that it is more likely than not that the Progressive Party multi-campus candidates contributed more to the campaign than multi-campus candidates but the key chains themselves only refer to the Progressive Party slate and not the executive candidates. Therefore Regulation X 5 7 (ii) requires that this expense must be divided equally amongst the Progressive Candidates.

- As a result the C.R.O. determines that spending per Progressive Party candidate is \$39.17 per candidate. As this amount exceeds \$30 – the amount allowed for single campus candidates, **pursuant to Regulation X 5 7 (ii) all Progressive Party single campus candidates are disqualified.**
- A review of the R.A.F. Party expense returns shows that the single campus candidates declared expenditures of \$14.21. To this \$5.16 (for the market value of T-shirts) must be added for a total of \$19.37 each.
- The R.A.F. Party multi-campus candidates all declared expenses of \$36.71. To this \$5.16 (for the market value of T-shirts) must be added for a total of \$41.87 per candidate.
- The main difference in expenses between R.A.F. Party single and multi-campus reports appears to be that each multi-campus candidate declared an additional \$22.50 for the “Party Poster”. The only R.A.F. Party Poster that the C.R.O. is aware of is the poster that was the subject of communication 2A. Although it does list the directors of the Reduce All Fees in its last line, it is clearly intended to promote the entire R.A.F. Party slate.
- As a result, the C.R.O. is required to attribute this expense to all R.A.F. Party candidates.
- As a further result the C.R.O. determines that spending per R.A.F. Party candidate is \$36.51 per candidate. As this amount exceeds \$30 – the amount allowed for single campus candidates, **pursuant to Regulation X 5 7 (ii) all R.A.F. Party single campus candidates are disqualified.**
- The C.S.I. slate chose to submit a single form to cover all 10 of its member candidates. Regulation X 5 7 (i) clearly states that every candidate must submit a statement of expenses. The C.R.O. finds that a single form does not meet this requirement. Therefore, **the C.R.O. finds that the C.S.I. slate violated this regulation. The C.R.O. further finds that in this case, this was likely not to have a material impact on the results and therefore finds that this is a minor violation. The penalty that is imposed is to withhold one half of the reimbursement for campaign expense incurred by the C.S.I slate pursuant to Regulation X 5 6 7.**
- The decision concerning the C.S.I. slate specifically considers that the total expenses claimed and attributed to all C.S.I candidates equally could not exceed the spending limits set in this election.

Issues relating to conduct of the election campaign and the take-over of the KSA offices

On the evening of 27 April 2005, it came to the attention of the C.R.O. that persons acting on behalf of the R.A.F. Party including Aaron Takhar and working in cooperation with Kwantlen University College (KUC) staged what can only be seen as an attempted take over of the KSA offices.

This action was taken without any authorization whatsoever. It demonstrates a total lack of respect for the rules under which the Society operates. It has exposed the KSA to

incalculable harm and was an attempt to encourage KUC to interfere in the internal affairs of the KSA.

The R.A.F. Party essentially declared themselves elected without waiting for the C.R.O. to complete his report. This shows a blatant disregard for the election rules.

This action is probably the ultimate campaign violation. It is impossible to imagine that the R.A.F. Party leadership is capable of following any of the Societies rules. **Therefore, pursuant to the C.R.O.'s authority under the Regulations to conduct the election, all R.A.F. Party candidates are disqualified.**

In the course of investigating the numerous communications received during the election review process, the C.R.O. has found that the R.A.F. Party has consistently circumvented the prescribed campaign approval process as set out in the Regulations. It is now quite apparent in light of the decisions made above regarding improper nominations, regarding improper election expenses, and especially in light of what can only be described as an unauthorized take-over of the Society that there was a concerted attempt to undermine the electoral process and that Aaron Takhar and the R.A.F. Party were the principal actors behind the attempt to undermine the process.

In view of the above, **the C.R.O. lodges a complaint to Council pursuant to Regulation X 6 5 against Aaron Takhar and the entire slate of R.A.F. Party candidates with a view to having Council suspend some or all of the candidate's Society privileges. Specifically, the C.R.O. suggests that Council suspend Mr. Takhar's membership privileges for a period of two years from 1 May 2005. The C.R.O. further suggests that Council suspend the membership privileges of the remaining R.A.F. Party candidates for a period of one year from 1 May 2005.**

Declaring themselves elected without waiting for the C.R.O. to make his final report.

Communication 4A, 5A, and 6A

As none of these communications were submitted within 72 hours of the end of balloting and none of these communications disclose any new issues, **all three of these communications are dismissed in their entirety for lack of jurisdiction.**

Final Results of the KSA 2005 General Election

The following results reflect the decisions made in the 2005 General Election. Candidates that are recommended for election are bolded. Disqualifications are noted throughout the report. At this time, the C.R.O. must also disqualify all candidates that haven't submitted expense reports. These are noted in the report.

Multi-Campus Positions:

Director of Operations

Coan, Lisa (C.S.I.)	130
Huff, Mat (R.A.F. Party) Disqualified	297
Nelson, Jeff (Progressive)	256

Director of Finance

Arndt, Troy Michael (C.S.I.)	123
Chau, Sammy (Progressive)	263
Takhar, Aaron (R.A.F. Party) Disqualified	294

Director of External Affairs;

Khatri, Jaivin (R.A.F. Party) Disqualified	343
Vincent, Rigel W. (Progressive)	335

Director of Events and Student Life;

Atwal, Joey (R.A.F. party) Disqualified	361
Aguasin, Marlene (Progressive)	310

Director of Academic Affairs

Kearley, Kristina A. (Progressive)	264
---	------------

McIntyre, Ken (C.S.I.)	130
------------------------	-----

Nakhla, Mariana (R.A.F. Party)	290
Disqualified	

Surrey Campus:**Campus Director**

Dhaliwal, Manny (R.A.F. Party)	238
Disqualified	

Vu, Matt (Progressive)	198
Disqualified	

Campus Representative – 4 positions

Butt, Madiha (progressive)	126
Disqualified	

Hannah, Matt	90
Disqualified (no expense report submitted)	

Mann, Raman (R.A.F. Party)	225
Disqualified	

Meehan, Patrick / Superman	125
Disqualified (no expense report submitted)	

Gaudry, Rachel (Progressive)	145
Disqualified	

Sandhu, Satinder (R.A.F. Party)	219
Disqualified	

Sanker, Kyle (Progressive)	148
Disqualified	

Singh, Amrita (R.A.F. Party)	225
------------------------------	-----

Campus Representative – 3 positions

Basra, Harj (R.A.F Party) 101
Disqualified

Fareed Sakima, Shameel (R.A.F. Party) 92
Disqualified

Hopwood, Kayce (C.S.I.) 129

Koonja, Ashveen (C.S.I.) 97

Mann, Harvey (R.A.F. Party) 109
Disqualified

Woo, Johnny (C.S.I.) 125

Campus Officer – 3 positions

Bains, Jas (R.A.F. Party) 113
Disqualified

Bliek, Samantha (Progressive) 120
Disqualified

Dieudonne, Cassandra (Cass) (C.S.I.) 124

Kakish, James (R.A.F Party) 104
Disqualified

Mann, Rumin (R.A.F. Party) 104
Disqualified

Rona, Togan (C.S.I.) 103

Newton Campus:**Campus Director**

Khan, Jamsheed (R.A.F. Party)

Withdrew before balloting

Movsessian, Arka (C.S.I.)**Yes 19**

No 4

Campus Representative – 2 positions

Prasad, Shiva (R.A.F. Party)

Withdrew before balloting

Tiwana, Tappy (R.A.F. Party)

Withdrew before balloting

Campus Officer – 3 positions

Atwal, Narinder (R.A.F. Party)

Withdrew before balloting

Harry, Gudi

Disqualified (no expense report submitted)

Yes 17

No 6

Langley Campus:**Campus Director**

Dhami, Raju (R.A.F. Party)

34

Disqualified

Richter, Stafford**48**

Campus Representative – 2 positions

Anderson, Laura	49
------------------------	-----------

Dhami, Sabrina (R.A.F. Party) Disqualified	43
---	----

Dhillon, Sat (R.A.F. Party) Disqualified	34
---	----

Campus Officer – 3 positions

Cheema, A.J. (R.A F Party) Disqualified	30
--	----

Helton, Jeremy (Progressive) Disqualified	27
--	----

Niddery, Liana Francis Disqualified (no expense report submitted)	26
--	----

Robson, Michael (R.A.F. Party) Disqualified	33
--	----

Thompson, Tristan (Progressive) Disqualified	28
---	----

Tiedeman, Dan (Progressive) Disqualified	20
---	----

Multi-Campus Liaison Positions:**First Nations Liaison;**

Van Fleet, Michael (Progressive)	Yes	322
	No	157

Students with Disabilities Liaison;

Kaur, Gurpreet Tina (Progressive)	256
--	------------

Sanghera, Arvinder (R.A.F. Party)	251
-----------------------------------	-----

Students of Colour Liaison;

Ghuman, Harpreet (Progressive)	237
---------------------------------------	------------

Thaliwal, Sanj (R.A.F. Party)	275
-------------------------------	-----

Disqualified	
--------------	--

Mature Students Liaison;

Dosanjh, Tanveer (R.A.F. Party)	Yes	393
---------------------------------	-----	-----

disqualified	No	117
--------------	----	-----

Women's Liaison

Henry, Emily (Progressive)	Yes	377
-----------------------------------	------------	------------

No	144
----	-----

LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered) Liaison

No Candidate	
--------------	--

International Students Liaison

Daoud, Deana (R.A.F. Party)	263
-----------------------------	-----

Disqualified	
--------------	--

Li, Xiang (Forrest) (Progressive)	220
--	------------