



**DECISION OF THE APPEALS PANEL OF THE RYERSON UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS ELECTION PROCEDURES COMMITTEE**

Members of the Panel: J. Hanigsberg (Chair), D. MacLellan (Secretary, Election Procedures Committee).

Also in attendance: C. Redmond (Returning Officer [REDACTED] (complainant) (on date) [REDACTED] (on date)

April 9, 2008 and April 21, 2008.  
Room 1312 Jorgenson Hall  
Ryerson University

J. Hanigsberg wrote the decision on behalf of the Appeals Panel:

**Decision of the Appeals Panel**

This is a decision of the Appeals Panel on two complaints. We are issuing one decision given that both complaints relate to the identical events. The complaints came from a candidate ([REDACTED]) and a campaigner for the same “team” [REDACTED]. The complaints in both instances were that students from another team ([REDACTED]) were using laptop computers to coerce students to vote for them.

At the time that the complaints were originally made the Returning Officer advised candidates that there had been a complaint and asked that anyone misusing laptop computers cease and desist. A member of the [REDACTED] “team,” responded to the complaint by indicating that laptops had only been used to play music and check email during campaigning and denied any failure to comply with the election procedures.

The Returning Officer decided that no evidence of “non-compliant activity” had taken place (that term is defined in the “Policies and Procedures related to Board of Governors Elections and University Referenda” ([http://www.firefly.ryerson.ca/governors/elections\\_referenda/ryepolicy.htm](http://www.firefly.ryerson.ca/governors/elections_referenda/ryepolicy.htm))).

[REDACTED] appealed that decision.

In support of their appeals [REDACTED] submitted written statements, photographs of laptops and of unnamed students taken by another student (also unnamed) on [REDACTED] cell phone, and verbal confirmation of the details that had been submitted in writing. [REDACTED] indicated no witnesses to the complained behaviour would come forward out of fear or intimidation.

Fairness during Board elections is of the utmost importance. Student candidates, and those who campaign on their behalf, are expected to conduct themselves with integrity to ensure not only that the election procedures are followed to the letter and to avoid non-compliant activity, but also to do everything in their power to enhance the appearance of fairness and to follow the spirit of the procedures. The University counts on students to value fairness of elections and to conduct themselves honourably during Board elections. It could not possibly police every action taken by candidates and their supporters.

Taking into consideration all of the information provided by [REDACTED], the absence of corroborating evidence, and the fact that the evidence provided did not clearly demonstrate improper use of laptops, the Appeals Panel finds insufficient evidence of non-compliant activity in this case. The appeal is therefore dismissed and the election results stand.



---

Julia E. Hanigsberg  
Chair, Appeals Panel of the  
Election Procedures Committee  
Dated: May 5, 2008