

**University of Melbourne Student Union  
Annual Elections, 2025  
C&S Council Elections, 2025  
Byelection (Burnley positions), Nov 2025**

**1-5 September 2025**

## **Report of the Returning Officer**



**Above Quota Elections Pty Ltd  
[abovequota.com.au](http://abovequota.com.au)**

## Table of Contents

Summary.....	4
Staffing.....	5
Election process.....	5
Timetable.....	6
Nominations.....	7
Polling.....	9
Clubs & Societies Committee.....	10
Burnley.....	11
Complaints and issues.....	13
Ballot secrecy.....	13
Intimidation, after hours campaigning, and residential colleges.....	14
Other complaints.....	15
Recommendations.....	16
1) Stop using online voting as the default for UMSU general elections.....	16
2) Address issues of campaigning at student residencies.....	16
3) Update the rules for by-elections, particularly for restricted constituencies.....	16
4) Update the list of polling places and details about them.....	17
5) Translate the regulations and constitution into languages common among students enrolled at Melbourne.....	18
6) Restore regulations about the use of logos and colours associated with UMSU.....	18
7) Address the issues with classification of students by campus.....	18
8) Reduce the size of Burnley Campus Committee.....	19
9) Provide a definition for disability identification.....	19
10) Prevent the danger an emergency council meeting would be inquorate during election week.....	20
11) Technical changes to make nominations easier to manage.....	20
Declaration.....	21
Acknowledgements.....	21
Appendix A: List of nominations.....	22
Officebearers.....	22
Students' Council.....	25
Committees.....	28
Southbank.....	34
Burnley.....	35
National Union of Students.....	35
2025 Byelection.....	36
Provisional list of tickets registered.....	36
Appendix B: Declaration of results.....	38
President.....	38
General Secretary.....	38
Education (Academic Affairs) Officer.....	39
Education (Public Affairs) Officer.....	39

Activities Officer.....	39
Environment Officer.....	40
Welfare Officer.....	40
Creative Arts Officer.....	40
Media Officer.....	41
Clubs & Societies Officer.....	41
Women's Officer.....	41
People of Colour Officer.....	41
Indigenous Officer.....	42
Disabilities Officer.....	42
Queer Officer.....	42
Southbank Students Campus Co-ordinator.....	42
Southbank Activities Officer.....	42
Southbank Education Officer.....	42
Students' Council — Students of Colour Representative.....	42
Students' Council — Students with Disabilities Representative.....	44
Students' Council — Queer Students' Representative.....	44
Students' Council — International Students' Representative.....	44
Students' Council — Graduate Students' Representative.....	44
Students' Council — Southbank Representative.....	45
Students' Council — General members.....	45
Women's Committee.....	48
People of Colour Committee.....	49
Queer Committee.....	50
Activities Committee.....	51
Creative Arts Committee.....	52
Disabilities Committee.....	53
Education Committee.....	54
Environment Committee.....	55
Welfare Committee.....	56
Southbank Students Committee.....	57
National Union of Students Delegates.....	58
Burnley Campus Co-ordinator.....	59
Burnley Students Committee.....	59
Indigenous Committee member (2025 byelection).....	59
Burnley Campus Committee member (2025 byelection).....	59
Appendix C1: Ruling in relation to UMSU SGM.....	60
Appendix C2: Ruling (1) of the Returning Officer.....	61
Appendix C3: Ruling (2) of the Returning Officer.....	63
Appendix D: Complaints.....	64
Appendix E: Electoral Tribunal minutes.....	90

## **Summary**

Above Quota Elections Pty Ltd (AQE) were engaged to run elections for the University of Melbourne Student Union (UMSU) in 2025. This report relates to the UMSU annual election (September), the UMSU Clubs & Societies (C&S) Committee election (October) and a second-semester byelection for Burnley campus positions (November).

The bulk of this report relates to the annual election; the other two elections are covered in their respective sections and are subject of some recommendations.

The dominant theme of this year's September election was, sadly, poor behaviour from candidates: breaches of the secrecy of the ballot were rife, and a number of other serious issues made the election difficult for the Returning Officer's team, and even harder for the candidates themselves. We feel it important to make the point up-front that most of this misbehaviour is a consequence of holding the election online (rather than the candidates or campaigners themselves being particularly offensive). This matter is discussed in a number of sections below, and is a particular focus in "Complaints and issues". We also draw attention to the recommendations, where we outline an approach (reintroducing attendance voting) that we believe will almost totally resolve the bulk of this year's issues.

The annual elections were held in the first full academic week of September, which this year was the 1st to 5th September.

As with previous years, nominations and ticket registrations were accepted electronically, and this year all nominations, and the majority of ticket registrations and other forms, were submitted electronically via our web system, rather than by email. We expanded the availability of the ticket portal (which allows ticket registrants to review the status of nominations made on their ticket) and recommend ways the Regulations could be amended to reduce the work for both us and registrants.

BigPulse were used as the electronic polling provider, and ballots were sent to the student email addresses of all eligible students. We ran five polling help points, three on the Parkville campus and one each on the Southbank and Burnley campuses. A total of 6,490 students voted, which is somewhat below last year's but still the second highest voter number in the last 15 years.

After closing polling stations on Friday, we conducted a preliminary scrutiny and showed the results to scrutineers. Due to delays dealing with affirmative action and our need to assure the results, we released count updates on the 7th, 12th and 16th September, with the provisional declaration of results made on the 17th September.

Three appeals were made against the declaration of results. As they traversed similar subject matter, the Electoral Tribunal heard all three on 14th October. The appeals are discussed below,

but resulted in disqualification of certain elected candidates, and accordingly the provisional declaration was reissued on 14th October, followed by the finalisation of results on 21st October.

## **Staffing**

After observing the extent of possible violations of the secrecy of the ballot in 2024, Above Quota Elections concluded that additional staff were necessary to have any chance of the problem being controlled. We raised our tender price to cover the cost of three additional assistant Returning Officers, as well as extra undercover staff.

The new assistant Returning Officers certainly reduced the scale of the problem. Campaigners brought complaints to them, easing the workload on the Returning Officer and Deputy Returning Officers, who were able to spend more time on the more difficult matters. Without them we would have been entirely overwhelmed by the volume, and in some cases, complexity, of the complaints. Moreover, campaigners were on their best behaviour when the AROs were around, creating a sort of zone of safety.

Unfortunately, there are simply too many places for breaches to occur for three, or even ten, additional staff to police all of them. One of the AROs saw campaigners pointing her out to others and apparently warning them to stop campaign breaches while she was around, and even following her so they could warn their teammates. We think this was a more-widespread practice than we observed.

Our hope was that undercover staff would address this issue. Recruitment of suitable staff is difficult: they must be look like university students, be willing to work short shifts, and be thoroughly unconnected to any political faction. We recruited some staff that fit this description and they provided some useful evidence, but found it less decisive than last year, and we also found that it was not as effective deterrent as hoped. We therefore conclude that, although useful, undercover staff are insufficient to address the scale of the problem.

As required by the regulations, we also provided poll clerks to run help desks for students with questions or a wish to use the Ipads provided, rather than their own phones. Once again we question the value of this for the main election, with a possible exception for the Baillieu, while voting was held online, although through no fault of the staff themselves. As discussed in its own section, however, polling help during the Burnley by-election turned out to be considerably more useful.

## **Election process**

There have not been substantial changes to the Regulations or our election processes since last year's election.

One matter that did arise was a change to the Council Charter, which now seems to extend the traditional rule, that paid officebearers could not campaign unless they had taken leave during election week, to cover voting Council representatives. There is some justification for this, as Council representatives now receive sitting fees (although presumably do not receive such fees in relation to election week, as no meeting of Council is ordinarily held that week). While strictly outside electoral matters, we note that this might place the organisation in a difficult position if an emergency Students' Council meeting did have to be held during election week. We suggest the policy objective might be instead achieved by making any Students' Councillor who campaigns during election week is not eligible for a sitting fee in the extraordinarily unlikely event a meeting is required that week.

In any case, all Council members who wished to campaign did take leave, so the application of this rule was not directly tested.

## **Timetable**

The timetable was as follows:

- 21 July — notice of election, opening nominations and ticket registrations
- 5.30pm, 29 July — information session for prospective candidates and ticket organisers
- Noon, 8 August — close of nominations and ticket registration
- 1.30pm, 11 August — draw for order on the ballot paper
- 11.59pm, 11 August — deadline for candidate photographs, ticket “order of candidates” forms, and declaration of eligibility forms
- 6pm, 26 August — information session for candidates and tickets
- 10am, 1 September — opening of polling
- 5pm, 5 September — close of polling
- 17 September — provisional declaration of results
- 22 September — deadline for requests for recount and appeals against the result of the election
- 13 October — C&S Council including C&S Committee election
- 14 October — Electoral Tribunal hearing
- 21 October — declaration of results
- 27 October — C&S Committee election recount
- 27 October — Notice and opening nominations for Burnley byelection

- 5 November — Close of nominations for Burnley by-election
- 17 November — open of polling for Burnley by-election
- 19 November — close of polling for Burnley by-election

This year, the University's calendar (and that the first full week in September was the earliest it could be) meant that nominations were opened during O-week, rather than Week 1 of semester. This appears to have caught some ticket registrants and candidates unaware (perhaps contributing to low turnout at our first information session). There are some options here (for example, changing the Regulations so the election falls in the second week of September if opening of nominations would fall before Week 1) although we do not think change is necessarily needed here.

However, the timing may also have contributed to Burnley students, already out of the loop, not being aware that nominations were open. In future, if nominations do open in O-Week, extra care should be given to ensure students at Burnley and other campuses are aware the elections are approaching.

## **Nominations**

Both nominations and ticket registrations opened on 21st July, which as noted above was during O-week, meaning that relatively few nominations (or indeed inquiries) were received during the first week.

This meant that again a significant fraction of nominations were received close to the deadline, giving for many only a small window of opportunity to correct mistakes with the nominations. We were able to work with candidates to correct most things prior to the deadline but there were nevertheless a handful of nominations that were rejected for reasons that could probably have been resolved if submitted further before the deadline.

One recommendation that would help with this, which we restate from last year, would be to amend the Regulations to permit the Returning Officer to set the deadline for candidate statements (as we already can for candidate photos). While this is unlikely to resolve the issue, it will reduce pressure on tickets juggling candidates between positions at the last minute as they will have an extra few days to write statements for those positions. Similarly, it will allow the Returning Officer to focus solely on nomination queries in the final hours before nominations close, without also needing to answer questions about statements.

A total of 425 nominations were received. Of these 376 were accepted and 49 were reserved for further checks. Ultimately by polling week, three nominations had been rejected, eight had been withdrawn, and the rest proceeded to the election, of whom 23 were elected unopposed. During the election and before close of polling, a further five candidates withdrew.

This is marginally fewer candidates than last year, although still rather higher than in 2023. A marginally larger fraction of candidates had nomination issues.

There were seven applications for tickets this year, of which six were accepted. The final application could not be accepted because there were not 15 General Members of UMSU on the ticket's application form.

Once again for efficiency we provided electronic forms that could be completed without needing to email the Returning Officer (except for withdrawals), as well as the facility to edit candidate statements without needing to contact us. As the system has now been used for three years people are starting to get used to it, which has reduced the volume of email we receive and freed our time to deal with non-routine matters. We continue to provide a password-protected link to ticket authorising officers so they can see the status of candidates on their tickets. In the recommendations we discuss ways these can be made more useful for ticket registrants.

We held two briefing sessions for candidates and tickets. One was held before close of nominations and was for prospective candidates/tickets, and this was offered by both in-person and online delivery. Attendance at this was very poor. Partly this can be attributed to timing (first week of semester), but given the consequent administrative issues during nominations, in future we will endeavour to further incentivise attendance.

The second briefing session was held the week before the election, and we expected a representative from each ticket and, where possible, independent candidates to attend. This session was much better attended, and gave us an opportunity to meet candidates, introduce ourselves, and explain our approach to dealing with the election. We are pleased that last year's efforts to increase attendance have carried forward to this year.

The Electoral Regulations give the Media Office responsibility for producing the election guide. We would acknowledge that the Media Officers were very helpful throughout this process. As is now standard practice, this was produced as a separate publication, rather than a Farrago insert, and published online. We printed a handful of copies for the polling help points.

Last year, as a test we uploaded all candidate statements and photos so they appear on the ballot itself, although this is neither required by the Electoral Regulations nor formally included in our quote. The response was sufficiently positive that we were persuaded to do the same thing again, and this year were able to get all statements and photos uploaded in time for the test ballot, so they could be checked by candidates and ticket authorising officers. Once again we received positive feedback on this.

One unfortunate matter involved a candidate who had nominated as part of a ticket, but then contacted that ticket to indicate they wished to withdraw. On voting, they discovered that not only were they still on the ballot, but the ticket in question had submitted a statement on their

behalf which seriously misrepresented them. We had them withdrawn quickly from the ballot and their statement removed from the election guide. We also imposed a penalty on the ticket, although this was reduced after they provided evidence that the request they had been sent to withdraw was ambiguous and easily misunderstood.

## Polling

Links to the ballot were sent out to all eligible students at 10am on Monday 1st September. The mailout is handled by BigPulse, and as the University has changed email providers since last year (from Google to Microsoft) we had some concern that deliverability of the email may have changed. It appears that the new mail servers are slower than the old ones, but it also seems (although we cannot be certain) that all emails were received within two hours of polling opening, and we had no reports of ballot links ending up in students' junk mail folders.

One issue with this year's poll was a short period of downtime (no more than 45 minutes) for BigPulse during the Monday of polling week. (We also received a report of around five minutes of downtime on Wednesday, although there was some uncertainty attached to this.) This appeared to be a systemic issue with BigPulse rather than a problem with the University of Melbourne specifically (as the problem was also reported at other universities that also use BigPulse). Although unfortunate, given the short downtime we do not think it likely any students were denied the opportunity to vote. We posted a notice on the website regarding the issue.

The Electoral Regulations require “polling places” which we brand as “polling help points” to assist students who have issues with the voting platform. This year, Murrup Barak has moved to the upper floors of Building 168, so we interpret the relevant regulation as allowing the Building 168 polling place to cover Murrup Barak as well (and to avoid the cost to UMSU of having two polling help points a few floors away from each other).

The opening hours were as follows:

	<b>Monday</b>	<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>Wednesday</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>
<b>Building 168</b>	10am–5pm	10am–5pm	10am–5pm	10am–5pm	10am–5pm
<b>Baillieu Library</b>	11.30 am–4.30 pm	10.30 am–4.30pm	10.30am–4.30pm	10.30am–4.30pm	10.30am–5pm
<b>FBE Building</b>			11.30am–2.30pm	11.30am–2.30pm	11.30am–2.30pm
<b>Southbank</b>		11.30am–	11.30am–	11.30am–	

<b>— the Hub</b>		2.30pm	2.30pm	2.30pm	
<b>Burnley — cafeteria</b>		11am–2pm		11am–2pm	

Like last year, turnout was heavy, with a total turnout of 6,867. While not as high as last year, it is comfortably the second-highest in UMSU's history and we do not read much into the reduction in turnout. As well as the initial email on Monday, we send reminder emails to students on Wednesday and Friday, and as a consequence these three days have the highest turnout. Interestingly, this year Monday was the highest turnout day, beating Friday.

Once again most students did not vote for all, or indeed many, of the positions on the ballot. We view the order and way that positions are laid out as likely to have a substantial impact on the pattern of which positions students vote for. For that reason we paid special attention to the design this year, and also sought tickets' and candidates' views on the matter, although we are ultimately constrained by the features BigPulse offers.

Given the difficulties encountered in 2023 and 2024 managing ballot secrecy, this year we were proactive in appointing three additional Assistant Returning Officers (AROs) whose main objective was patrolling, providing a point of contact for voters and campaigning, and providing fast response to trouble spots. Our view is that this was effective, but AROs can provide positive assurance only the area in their eyeline, and campus is large enough we will never be able to appoint enough AROs to monitor everywhere students are.

We also continued our 2024 experiment in employing students (usually from other universities and in all cases vetted to ensure no partisan affiliation) to be present on campus and, if they are campaigned to, report to us if any campaign behaviour was out of bounds.

## Clubs & Societies Committee

For the second year in a row the C&S committee election presented unusual difficulties, but for a much more innocent reason this year than last.

The election was held on 13th October in conjunction with the Clubs Council in the ABP building. Following the issues experienced last year two changes were made. Three staff members were present, rather than the two used previously, and polling booths were brought in to provide privacy while people voted.

There was no repeat of the controversial questions and allegations made last year, and the number of nominations was well down. Indeed, initially only eight people nominated, but once it was pointed out this would barely create a contest, the number increased to ten.

Speeches and questions were respectful, in contrast to last year. The major challenge during the meeting itself, was that there were also two motions on the agenda, and questions needed to be closed early in order to allow time for these to be discussed.

The presence of an extra staff member from AQE was helpful for smooth management of the day. The provision of polling stations also had benefits, but it was clear that two booths, while better than none, were not adequate for the number of people wishing to vote in private.

A more substantial problem was that the vote was simply exceptionally close. When Michael Werden was elected to the sixth position he was just 0.053 votes ahead of Yifan (Roger) Cao on the initial count. Under most circumstances this would not matter, as both would get elected. However, affirmative action rules required that the last position go to a woman, and both Michael and Roger are men, so the last position went to Yunyi Chan.

Understandably, with such a close margin, a request for a recount was received and accepted. Careful recounting without the pressure of time or the effects of fatigue saw the result corrected. It was now even closer – with Roger passing quota at the relevant elimination by 0.001577 votes. Had he failed to do so, he would have been elected sixth at the following round by the still fine margin of 0.182. As a result, the outcome was overturned.

This is one of the closest outcomes in the history of UMSU – probably the closest in absolute terms, and nearly so by percentage.

Although it is unfortunate to have got the wrong result in the first case, recounts exist for a reason, and the outcome is an indication of the robustness of the process for electing Clubs and Societies Committee.

## **Burnley**

No nominations were received for either Burnley Campus Coordinator, or Burnley Campus Committee, during the nomination period for the general election. Subsequently, the Returning Officer was contacted by the incumbent Campus Coordinator, asking when the nomination period would open. Although he, like all students, had received the email from the University giving notice of the election, he had missed it. It seems other students on the campus had as well, and the disconnect between Burnley and Parkville meant they had not heard through other channels.

The Campus Coordinator pushed for a by-election to be held, rather than the campus left without representation and a body to run events. UMSU agreed to this, and nominations were reopened on 27th October.

Surprisingly, given the historic low numbers of nominations at Burnley, two nominations were received for the Coordinator, and four for the Committee. The Committee nominees were declared elected unopposed, and a by-election was held for the Coordinator.

The election regulations describe how to run an election in conjunction with the annual election, and how to run one during first semester, but do not cover one held later in second semester. We adopted the first semester rules in all matters, other than the question of polling places. With the Electoral Tribunal's endorsement, we decided there was no point in holding polling places other than at Burnley for an election in which only students based there could vote. With only 115 students eligible to vote, we also did not consider it appropriate to have a polling place at Burnley from 10am to 5pm of the first two days of voting, as the by-election rules require for a first semester by-election. However, we also thought it would be inadequate to adopt the usual three hours of a polling place at Burnley, and instead provided assistance for a total of nine hours.

Although only 27 students voted, as a proportion (23.5%) this is far higher than in the general election, and indeed we believe it is the highest proportional turnout for any election in UMSU's history, other than those such as Clubs Council that involve voters pre-screened for engagement.

Although this is encouraging, and there were no reports of misbehaviour, one problem did arise. A remarkable number of students expressed a wish to vote to the polling official, complaining that they had not received the email linking to the ballot. One also contacted the Returning Officer directly, and some spoke to a candidate.

These students' non-receipt of the emails did not reflect an IT failure. Instead, these were students who are classified by the University as being enrolled at Parkville. Those we spoke to once this had been established were astonished to learn this. All their studies are at Burnley, and they regard themselves as having at least as much of a stake in the campus as those who could vote. Discussions with a staff member based at Burnley indicate there are probably 45 students in this situation - amounting to a substantial portion of those who would be eligible to vote if they were included.

Moreover, it appears this classification is relatively new. One former Burnley Campus Coordinator is now ineligible to vote, despite being enrolled in the same course he was in when he was elected.

The situation is problematic not only in the rare case of a contested election at Burnley, but because there is often a struggle to fill the campus committee. Expanding the pool of who is eligible to nominate would presumably help this.

## **Complaints and issues**

As discussed in the summary above, we would rate candidate behaviour in the annual election as amongst the worst in our 25+ years of administering elections. As we discuss below, breaches of ballot secrecy were the most common issue we encountered, but we also had credible allegations of intimidation, complaints going to the honesty and integrity of candidates, as well as the other issues we expect to deal with in any election campaign. At risk of belabouring the point, as an appendix to the report we list the complaints we received, as well as their disposition, in summary form.

The above is not to suggest that we had the amongst worst set of candidates in 25+ years. In fact we do not regard this year's candidates as much worse than average. As will become a recurring theme, the problem was with the structure of the election, specifically, with it being online. When conditions enhance the incentives for misbehaviour, we should not expect to find some people responding to those incentives.

### **Ballot secrecy**

For an online election, students can vote at any Internet-connected computer or device. At one time, when home Internet access was expensive and tied up a phone line, perhaps most students' Internet access would be at University computer laboratories. Even in those days, another Victorian University that experimented with online voting reported frequent harassment of students when using the computer labs, as campaigners sought to pressure them to vote, or even lured them away from their machine so that a teammate could jump in and vote on the student's behalf if they had left their email open.

Nowadays, virtually every student has Internet access on their smartphone, and as we have said in previous reports, therefore carries a polling booth in their pocket. This is in stark contrast to traditional attendance polling, where students would enter an area under control of the Returning Officer, and the Returning Officer would arrange for that area to be secluded, secure and free of coercion.

A student voting from their smartphone can do so from anywhere, and there is no way the Returning Officer can ensure the same seclusion and non-coercive environment. Without that environment, it is easy (and indeed natural) for a student to—willingly or not—vote in front of a campaigner, which we regard as a grave breach of democratic norms. This is in the best case: we also received reports of campaigners taking students' phones, or watching them until they had

voted “correctly”, or seeking screenshots to make sure the student had voted for them; and in most cases have no reason to doubt these reports.

A particular difficulty is that campaigning can take place anywhere there is a reasonable volume of students: although this year we engaged extra staff for patrolling, we have no prospect of being able to cover the entire campus. (By contrast, when polling takes place at particular polling places, entrances near those places naturally attract campaigners, and are easier to police.) Our staff are identifiable, and naturally campaigners are better behaved when staff are in the area.

With some reluctance, over the past three years we have accepted submission of photographs as evidence of violations of ballot secrecy. While evidence from our staff accounts for a substantial minority of ballot secrecy penalties, the majority flow from evidence submitted by campaigners (from opposing tickets): this is not too surprising, when considering the motivation, coverage on ground, and that it’s easier to notice our staff than it is to notice opposing campaigners.

We acknowledge that taking these photos as evidence produces two significant negative impacts. First, it means we have students following each other around on campus, photographing and recording each other, with obvious risks of escalation. Second, it produces a volume of complaints (not all of which establish a violation), which for procedural fairness need to be shown to the tickets’ leaderships, inevitably meaning a late-evening series of meetings for each ticket contesting the election, so ticket leadership (and the Returning Officer) may not leave campus until after 10pm.

We regard this as a threat to the integrity and outcome of the election. Although we can (and do) cancel votes where a voter reports they were watched or coerced, we expect the most common response from a voter is to want nothing more to do with the election (or UMSU).

Our view is that the only effective control to this problem is attendance voting, where voters (other than those who are sick or off campus during election week) attend a polling place under control of the Returning Officer, and cast their vote in a safe and known-secure environment.

### **Intimidation, after hours campaigning, and residential colleges**

We also received a number of complaints of intimidation during campaigning. The most serious of these related to an incident that took place on Wednesday evening in a restricted area of a University building; other complaints were received of campaigners being followed after hours in University buildings; campaigners entering and (apparently in violation of house rules) campaigning in halls of residence; campaigners threatening each other physically; and campaigners making offensive or discriminatory statements to each other.

In each case the Returning Officer made a determination and, where appropriate, imposed penalties or took other action. The quantity, breadth and seriousness of the complaints made is

deeply worrying. Even assuming every complaint was fabricated, that such complaints are made at all indicates a breakdown of trust in the system, and enough complaints were supported with evidence to confirm many are real.

Not all of these issues are a direct result of online voting, but we believe online voting in some cases caused and in other cases exacerbated them, for these reasons. First, our inability to effectively police the ballot secrecy rule devalued the rest of the rules and eroded trust between teams. Second, campaigners attempting to get photographic evidence of other campaigners breaching the rules created a confrontational atmosphere, and licensed campaigners to follow each other around (this was the justification we were given for many of the “being followed” complaints, including the most serious). Third, as the ballot is open 24 hours a day, there was no chance for campaigners to debrief, rest and sleep, meaning often decisions were taken by fatigued individuals whose judgement was impaired.

Residential colleges are another area that had more prominence this year than in previous years. This is an area that is challenging for us because, although campaigning might breach a residence’s rules, it does not breach the Electoral Regulations and so often we have no power to enforce rules. Similarly, they are spaces we (rightly) have no access to, so we rely on contested reports from campaigners and other students. It is clear as well that there is some work to do on our end in proactively engaging with house managers to inform them of the election, and what we can and can’t police under the regulations.

## **Other complaints**

One other area of concern related to eligibility for restricted constituencies (Women’s, Queer, Disabilities, Students of Colour). Each of these is based on self-identification and therefore students must (in the privacy of their ballot) decide if they identify and if so, receive a vote. We received substantiated complaints that at least one campaigner instructed students they could and should vote in all four constituencies, regardless of whether they so identified (or, alternatively, by construing the categories so broadly as to include virtually everyone). We regard this as worrying as it strikes at the basis of democratic representation of those constituencies, and will investigate ways of prominently displaying the definitions in the UMSU Constitution on the ballot.

Otherwise, although we received the usual range of complaints, none were significantly outside what we would normally expect.

## Recommendations

### **1) Stop using online voting as the default for UMSU general elections**

By far the most important point to make from this election is that online voting must cease for the majority of voters in UMSU general elections. The rampant violations of ballot secrecy that occurred in this election alone are grounds to justify the extra cost and potentially lower turnout of alternatives. In our response to the appeals against the result of this election we added numerous further problems with online voting in circumstances such as these, some major, some minor but all adding to the case. We were very pleased that the Electoral Tribunal indicated they agreed.

This does not mean that there is no place for online voting in UMSU elections. The Burnley by-election would have been more expensive and less democratic if held using alternative methods. Online voting should also be available to students who are out of Melbourne for the whole of election week and wish to vote, and who have other circumstances that made attendance impractical (e.g., illness). Online voting should be a supplement, cheaper and more reliable than postal votes, to a secure attendance ballot. However, it is essential that in such cases online voting is restricted to those for whom the need is genuine. This can be best achieved by adopting a system where online votes are available only to those who request them, as was previously done with postal votes. Regulation 31 should be adjusted to refer to online votes instead of, or as an alternative to postal votes to avoid any ambiguity about the legality of this option.

### **2) Address issues of campaigning at student residencies**

Campaigning in student residencies became a major cause for concern in this election, and may have contributed to the most serious abuses. Removing online voting will decrease this problem substantially, but may not eliminate it entirely. Complaints relating to campaigning in residential colleges and halls surfaced occasionally in the years prior to online voting, very seriously in one case, even if they did so much less often. The events this year make it a particularly good time to address the question of what, if any, campaigning should be allowed in student residencies.

### **3) Update the rules for by-elections, particularly for restricted constituencies**

The electoral regulations include significant provisions in relation to the conduct of a by-election in first semester, or one held in second semester that coincides with the general election. They do not deal with what should happen if a by-election is required after the general election, as occurred this year with Burnley. We attempted to follow the regulations for first semester by-elections, except where that would add clearly unnecessary cost by having polling places at campuses where students were ineligible to vote, but it would be better if the regulations specifically allowed this.

#### 4) Update the list of polling places and details about them

Regulation 28.9 is out of date in several respects, while 28.10 includes what is probably a typo. While polling has been online, and the polling places merely little-used help desks, this has not mattered. However, if, as we hope, there is a return to in-person polling, the location and timing of these polling places becomes much more important.

Specifically 28.9 requires polling at Union House, which is now closed, and near Tram Stop 1 in Swanston St. The Electoral Tribunal has ruled that a polling place in Building 168 meets these requirements, but an update that removes these clauses and instead refers to Building 168 would prevent the possibility for confusion.

The regulations also state “polling must be conducted in or near the ground level of” certain buildings. There is probably no suitable location on the ground floor of Building 168. There is, however, at least one suitable location on the first floor, which is moreover directly accessible from Monash Road without stairs. If this is to become the primary polling place, it would be unfortunate if questions were to be raised as to whether it complies with the regulation, even though “near” offers an escape clause, as does the “where possible” at the start of the regulation.

The regulations also require a polling place “at or near Murrup Barak”. With Murrup Barak now located within Building 168, it is our interpretation that a polling location within the building meets that requirement, but again, updating the regulations could avoid questions as to whether this is the case.

Regulation 28.10(c) requires: “for an annual election, polling at the Polling Places named in 28.9 and 28.9(e) may not be restricted to less than three days.” Read literally, this would say that all polling places must be open for at least three days. We have interpreted the regulation to read “28.9(d) and 28.9(e)”. We have requested before the regulation be updated to confirm this, and the issue is now more pertinent with the anticipated return to in-person voting.

We would also argue that the requirements for by-elections be made more flexible. The Electoral Tribunal has agreed that for a by-election open only to Burnley students, polling is not required on Parkville or Southbank campuses. Again, it would be preferable that the regulations reflect this, both for Burnley and Southbank. We would also argue that if a by-election were to occur for Indigenous Officer or Committee, where only a few hundred students can vote, the requirement for a polling place at FBE should be waived, and consideration given to whether any students at Burnley and/or Southbank were eligible to vote before polling places were required there. We note that each extra polling place significantly adds to the cost of a by-election

**5) Translate the regulations and constitution into languages common among students enrolled at Melbourne**

In the course of the election ticket registers blamed a number of breaches on their candidates not understanding the regulations because their English reading skills were insufficient. In one case the breaches were sufficient to lead to the candidate's disqualification. We cannot confirm that this excuse was accurate – people may have been faking poorer English comprehension than they have in the hopes of a lighter punishment. Nevertheless, when it was proposed to us that the regulations should be translated into languages widely spoken on campus, we could see the merits of the idea.

If English comprehension really is the problem this could avoid future such abuses. If it is not, it would strip students who read and speak those languages of a false excuse. Meanwhile, having the regulations available in other languages may make students considering nominating feel welcome, if they prefer those languages to English. At minimum, it might also save some students time.

We leave it to UMSU to identify which languages are sufficiently widely read by students to make such a project worthwhile for them.

**6) Restore regulations about the use of logos and colours associated with UMSU**

Our recollection is that the regulations used to contain an explicit ban on the use of the UMSU logo and colours, particularly the purple UMSU uses heavily in publicity. Certainly, other student organisations have this ban. This is a valuable rule, because sometimes voters see logos or colours associated with the organisation as a sign of official endorsement, or at least incumbency. We have continued to treat publicity of this sort as misleading, but with the clause not in the regulations, campaigners are often confused, and spend time making publicity that then needs to be altered. This would be avoided if it was made explicit.

**7) Address the issues with classification of students by campus**

In the last two annual elections we have been contacted by students who consider themselves to be based at Southbank, doing most of their studies there, but are classified by the University as Parkville students. Under the definition used in the UMSU Constitution, it is at least arguable that these students are eligible to vote, nominate and hold positions at Southbank.

We have now discovered the situation is even more extreme at Burnley, with students who have no connection to Parkville astonished to discover they are listed as enrolled there, and consequently not eligible to serve on the Burnley Campus Committee or to vote for the Coordinator.

This situation might be addressed by having the University change the way it categorizes students' enrolment. Alternatively, the Constitution or regulations of UMSU could be rewritten to deal with it.

At the same time, one reading of the definition of "Southbank Students" in the Constitution ("Members who are...") suggests that non-members of UMSU are not "Southbank Students" and are not entitled to vote for Southbank positions. This is presumably a drafting error (as it is inconsistent with the clear expression elsewhere in the Constitution that they are) and should be corrected.

We also draw attention to the second recommendation in our report in 2023, which raised some other technical issues with how "student" is defined.

## **8) Reduce the size of Burnley Campus Committee**

Burnley Campus Committee has struggled to gain enough members to operate in most years recently. This is not surprising given the number of students studying there – already small – has shrunk in recent years. The committee has seven positions, and therefore requires at least four members to operate.

There is no rational reason for Burnley Committee to have seven members, other than that this is the number used for other UMSU committees. We suggest a smaller size is more practical, is more likely to produce a genuine democratic contest, and is unlikely to meaningfully reduce oversight. Reduction to 3 might be a step too far, but a 5-member committee would almost certainly operate just as well, and would be quorate more often.

As the Burnley Campus Committee does have membership in 2026, now is the time to engage with the Burnley student base to propose this change.

## **9) Provide a definition for disability identification**

A major issue in this election involved at least one – and probably several more – students encouraging people to vote in the self-identification positions who do not normally identify as part of those groups. This is most relevant for Disabilities Officer, Committee and Representative, where turnout is lowest and therefore a vote has the most influence.

The situation is exacerbated by the lack of a definition that can be pointed to, other than a somewhat legalistic list in the Constitution. It is unlikely that any definition of disability will satisfy everyone. Nevertheless, when the question of disability definition came up some years ago at Monash, a member of the Tribunal there noted that the University had a definition, which was very helpful. We are not sure if the University of Melbourne has such a definition. If so, it should be incorporated into the regulations. If not, perhaps just this once University of Melbourne students could adopt Monash's work.

We suggest that important features of this definition are: wide acceptance, concision (so it can be printed on the ballot and read quickly), being easy to read and comprehend, and consistency with the definition of “Disability” in the Constitution.

## **10) Prevent the danger an emergency council meeting would be inquorate during election week**

Although council meetings during election week are undesirable, and historically rare, it has sometimes happened that urgent issues have blown up, leaving little alternative to holding a meeting during the week of the election. The changes to the Council Charter would prevent this, or at least make any such Council highly unrepresentative, since so many voting Council members are likely to be on leave.

To prevent this unusual, but potentially disastrous, situation, we suggest a modification should be made. We have proposed that voting Council representatives not be forced to take leave, but instead not be paid the usual sitting fee for a meeting in election week if they are campaigning, but other solutions are possible.

## **11) Technical changes to make nominations easier to manage**

The UMSU nomination process seems to work well and we do not recommend major changes. However, a few things could work more smoothly.

- Allow the Returning Officer to set the deadline for policy statements (rather than requiring them with nominations). This would allow us to co-ordinate the deadline for photos and statements, and will mean we don’t need to deal with policy statement issues at the same time as more serious nomination defects.
- Amend the Regulations to permit the Returning Officer to communicate with ticket registrants about candidates on their ticket, prior to the nomination deadline. Regulation 12.3, as presently written, seems to prohibit this.
- Nominations open six weeks before the first day of the election. This year, that day was during O-week. Perhaps this is because the first week in September was the first five days of that month, or perhaps the University has changed how it makes its timetable. This is no problem for us, but appears to have been unexpected for some candidates. Consideration should be given to a provision delaying the election to the second week if nominations would otherwise open in O-week (perhaps only if the election starts no later than 10th September).
- Amend Regulation 11.3 so that the declaration can be included on the nomination form.

## **Declaration**

I declare that the 2025 University of Melbourne Student Union annual elections, C&S election, and November byelection were conducted and administered with impartiality by myself and the directors and staff of Above Quota Elections Pty Ltd

Stephen Luntz  
Returning Officer

## **Acknowledgements**

The UMSU elections remain a complex undertaking, and this year's election required a particularly resilient team to deliver a successful election event.

From UMSU, a big thanks to our staff contacts: Mary Kin Chan, Sara Pheasant, Fiona Sanders, Josh Davis, Lachie James, Jess Andriono, the Info Desk team, the C&S team and the Communications team. From the University, the University Secretary and her team, particularly Gabrielle Östberg, the student enrolments team and University Security. Thanks to the Farrago editors Mathilda Stewart, Sophie He, Ibrahim Muan Abdulla and Marcie Di Bartolomeo for putting together the election guide.

We finally register our appreciation for the participants of the election. Ultimately an election must be about the expression of a democratic will, and the candidates, campaigners and voters are ultimately who must judge it.

## Appendix A: List of nominations

Below is a provisional list of nominations received by the deadline. Candidates are listed in ballot paper order, based on a random draw made on Monday 11 August.

Please draw any errors to our attention, and please also check the spelling of your name.

### Officebearers

#### President

Tarish Kadam		
Ezra Bangun		
Lushy (Lushomo) Chinganya	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Lachlan Greenwood	Rebuild our UMSU	
Yash		
Rhea Sankar	Growth For UMSU	
Lottie Jenkins	Activate - Left Action	
Amirali Zareie Shab Khaneh		

#### General Secretary

Chris Vassiliadis	Activate - Left Action	
Filia Cahyadi	Growth For UMSU	
Daniel Motika	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Dylan Jay Moody		
Ezra Bangun		

#### Education (Academic Affairs) Officer

Corbin Afanasyev	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Hesheya T Anandan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ramin Ghasemishayan		
Ezra Bangun		
Ananya Dhaka	Growth For UMSU	
Jack Sara	Growth For UMSU	
David Trevorrow	Activate - Left Action	
Sophia Chu	Activate - Left Action	
Nandini Bhagwat		

#### Education (Public Affairs) Officer

Meghna Mallik	Growth For UMSU	
---------------	-----------------	--

Nishka Chopra	Growth For UMSU	
Amaya Castro Williams	Activate - Left Action	
Reema Ababneh	Activate - Left Action	
Hridey Kapoor	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Rutvi tolani	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ezra Bangun		

**Welfare Officer**

Abhie Gupta	Growth For UMSU	
Chloe Lim	Growth For UMSU	
Alexander Hams	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Tsun Ying (Cynthia) Wong	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ezra Bangun		
Rajvir Singh		
Nadine Chantelle Salita	Activate - Left Action	
Rosie Hyett	Activate - Left Action	
Nandini Bhagwat		
Mrittika Dey		

**Women's Officer**

Eya Takrouni	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Manika Birmiwal	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Nandini Bhagwat		
Roni Corby	Activate - Left Action	
Tamanna Rathi	Activate - Left Action	
Anaya Chhabra	Growth For UMSU	
Syna Sodhi	Growth For UMSU	

**Creative Arts Officer**

Ezra Bangun		
Ethan McNeil	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Yashesvi Verma	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Anisha Gupta	Growth For UMSU	
Hiya Thacker	Growth For UMSU	

**Activities Officer**

Ramin Ghasemishayan		
Ella-Mei Graham	Activate - Left Action	

Nathan Van Langenberg	Activate - Left Action	
Nandini Bhagwat		
Ezra Bangun		
Chuanqing (Louis) Huang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Saaisha Vohra	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

**Queer Officer**

Lyton Namawanda	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Sharvendra Nair	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Mabel Shelley	Activate - Left Action	
Ronglin Hou	Activate - Left Action	

**Environment Officer**

Atharva Lad		
Ezra Bangun		
Bella Beiraghi	Activate - Left Action	
Kay Pritchard	Activate - Left Action	
Nandini Bhagwat		
Amira Bilqis	Growth For UMSU	
Mags Umbach	Growth For UMSU	
Max Richards	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Qing (Alice) Dong	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

**Media Officer**

Chiaki Chng	Independent Media	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Maria Carolina Lourenco Quartel	Independent Media	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Ruby Weir-Alarcon	Independent Media	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Sabine Pentecost	Independent Media	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>

**Clubs & Societies Officer**

Johar Malik		
Dylan Jay Moody		
Ezra Bangun		
Alex Gwynn	Activate - Left Action	

Seamus Donnellan	Activate - Left Action	
------------------	------------------------	--

**Indigenous Officer**

Noah Kellett		<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
--------------	--	--

**Disabilities Officer**

Maehula Datta	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Marc Khor	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Thomas Hofer	Activate - Left Action	
Della Johnston	Johnston/Thakkar	
Jigar Thakkar	Johnston/Thakkar	

**People of Colour Officer**

Anushka Sachdeva	Growth For UMSU	
Yifan (Roger) Cao	Growth For UMSU	
Anyang Wal	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Chengyang (Eason) Gu	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Oskar Martin	Activate - Left Action	
Yasmeen Atieh	Activate - Left Action	

**Students' Council****General representative (15 to elect)**

Dominic Lam Xuan Jun	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Shrreyas Saluja	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
James Duncan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Daksh Nikhilbhai Vyas	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Holly Kalns	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Somaya Qasimi	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Jinyan (Vivian) Chen	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Vaanya Sharma	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Tina yang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Vivika Bansal	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Devashree Kathale	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Juhi Kiran Gosai	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Amy Peters	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Disha Zutshi	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	Withdrawn

Sounak Bhandari	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Soham Das	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Elizabeth Grosshans		Nomination rejected
Casey Forsyth		
Roger Zhang	Growth For UMSU	
Siddhanth Subbaiah	Growth For UMSU	
Belliappa		
Khush Shah	Growth For UMSU	
Symona Jian	Growth For UMSU	
Victoria Jade Pan	Growth For UMSU	
Mysha Siddiqui	Growth For UMSU	
Shoham Khandekar	Growth For UMSU	
Bhavin Garg	Growth For UMSU	
Zhihao Zhong	Growth For UMSU	
Yizhang(Benson) Pan	Growth For UMSU	
Kunal Dewani	Growth For UMSU	
Ted Bowers		
Grace Arnold		Withdrawn
Madison Lee		
Junyi Li		
Thomas Poynton	Rebuild our UMSU	
Sparsh Sethi	Rebuild our UMSU	
Zoe Warren	Rebuild our UMSU	
Vedangi Khanna	Rebuild our UMSU	
William Main	Rebuild our UMSU	
Zachary Reid	Rebuild our UMSU	
Sebastion Glassel	Rebuild our UMSU	
Percy Taylor	Rebuild our UMSU	
Lachlan Eliau	Rebuild our UMSU	
Gevindu Wickramanyake	Rebuild our UMSU	
Kai Bowie	Rebuild our UMSU	
Rongrong Jian		
Vishwajeet Dhanashekaran		
Tess Worley		Withdrawn
Lohit Roy		Withdrawn

Dhanvi Sharma		
Ezra Bangun		
Congyue Mao		
Felicity Bayne	Independent Media	
Lachie Carroll	Independent Media	
Nathan Pham	Independent Media	
Upeka Gunarathne		
Alexandre Fratty		
<del>Sridevi Chandra Subash-Chandran</del>		Withdrawn
Divyansh Jain		
Ramin Ghasemishayan		
Maya MacNamara		
Reema Ababneh	Activate - Left Action	
Hannah Roseman-Gannon	Activate - Left Action	
Toby Putland	Activate - Left Action	
Mathieu Dacruz	Activate - Left Action	
Sophie Conlan	Activate - Left Action	
Lucy Rachman Vascotto	Activate - Left Action	
Avjay Bhar	Activate - Left Action	
Hugh Collins	Activate - Left Action	
Oscar North	Activate - Left Action	
Tom Palmer	Activate - Left Action	
Kerry Sun	Activate - Left Action	
Sam Karabogias	Activate - Left Action	
Ruby Craven	Activate - Left Action	
Caitlin Spizzirri	Activate - Left Action	
Felix Sharkey	Activate - Left Action	

#### Graduate students' representative

Upeka Gunarathne		
Ezra Bangun		
Ramin Ghasemishayan		
George Wood		
Mohammad Anas	Growth For UMSU	
Chengmin Shi	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

Hanmeng Zhu	Activate - Left Action	
Dylan Jay Moody		

**Indigenous students' representative**

No nominations received.

**International students' representative**

Zhaohui Wu		
Arati Chandrakant Chaskar		
Divyansh Jain		
Prayag Sethia	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Xingyu Liu		
Kai Page	Activate - Left Action	
Cherry Jain		Withdrawn
Ramin Ghasemishayan		
Udit Jain	Growth For UMSU	
Qiao Ma		

**Queer students' representative**

Rowan U.	Growth For UMSU	
Binderiya Batzorig	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Pippa Jackson	Activate - Left Action	

**Students of colour representative**

Lorjel Sia	Activate - Left Action	
Uday Sidhu	Growth For UMSU	
Rongrong Jian		
Cinrey Liu	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Varisha Ariadna		

**Students with disabilities representative**

Catherine Duong	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Elli Paulding	Activate - Left Action	
Leon Nguyen van Tri	Growth For UMSU	

**Committees****Activities Committee (7 to elect)**

Cheewoo Park		
--------------	--	--

Divyansh Jain		
Eunice Huang		
Ezra Bangun		
Vincent Chen	Activate - Left Action	
Imogen Woodger	Activate - Left Action	
Callum Rees	Activate - Left Action	
Alessandra Soliven	Activate - Left Action	
Avjay Bhar	Activate - Left Action	
Flynn Slater	Activate - Left Action	
Kerry Sun	Activate - Left Action	
laurence hang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Dhyey Desai	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Kay Khine Kyaw	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Chirmi Detha	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Niyathi Premarajan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
dikshita malhotra	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Romain Fournier-Breen	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
YiWei Wang	Growth For UMSU	
Arianna Kugendran	Growth For UMSU	
Shayla Nguyen	Growth For UMSU	
Saumyaa Sarup	Growth For UMSU	
Prajwal Tiwary	Growth For UMSU	
Jhanvi Raghav	Growth For UMSU	

**Creative Arts Committee (7 to elect)**

Ezra Bangun		
Sissel Huo		
Vincent Chen	Activate - Left Action	
Alice O'Connor	Activate - Left Action	
Ella Wernert	Activate - Left Action	
Joseph ZY Li-Sculli	Activate - Left Action	
Muhammad Riyan Yahya	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
XuanYu Zhao	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Aahna Kamboj	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Prishita Shethia	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Praniti Kukreja	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

Audrey Mueller	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Keerthana Karthik	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Neel Bhatia	Growth For UMSU	
Manhar arora	Growth For UMSU	
Mansis Kaur	Growth For UMSU	
Priyanshi Jain	Growth For UMSU	
Alisha Joan Philip	Growth For UMSU	
Alayna Tyagi	Growth For UMSU	

**Disabilities Committee (7 to elect)**

Bhumit Mehta	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Evelyn Yang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Langyue Zhu	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Madeline Currant	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Minidhu Paranhewa	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Nasheeta Khandoker	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Yuktha Reddy Gopalakrishna	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>

**Education Committee (7 to elect)**

Divyansh Jain		
Ezra Bangun		
Ramin Ghasemishayan		
Sophie Conlan	Activate - Left Action	
Declan Carlton Mark Chan	Activate - Left Action	
Caitlin Spizzirri	Activate - Left Action	
Khoa Nguyen Bao Le	Activate - Left Action	
Sam Karabogias	Activate - Left Action	
Joseph ZY Li-Sculli	Activate - Left Action	
Emma Dynes	Activate - Left Action	
Prayag Sethia	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

Kevin Phan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Bolortuya Batzorig	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Danmin Zhang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Anisa Prajitno	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Sarah Lazzaro	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Deepti Srinivasa	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
<del>Eleanor Armstrong</del>	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	Withdrawn
<del>Shrey Bafna</del>	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	Withdrawn
Leon Nguyen van Tri	Growth For UMSU	
Edmond Sim	Growth For UMSU	
Sreeya Penmetsa	Growth For UMSU	
Eunice Zi Hui Ng	Growth For UMSU	
Pranay Maheta	Growth For UMSU	
Ananya Jha	Growth For UMSU	
Chenfei(Juniper) Jin	Growth For UMSU	

**Environment Committee (7 to elect)**

Ezra Bangun		
Loh Ting Fang		
Pippa Jackson	Activate - Left Action	
Elle Ivery	Activate - Left Action	
Tom Palmer	Activate - Left Action	
Emma Niggl	Activate - Left Action	
Elli Paulding	Activate - Left Action	
Finn Bernard	Activate - Left Action	
Emma Dynes	Activate - Left Action	
David Adebiyi	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Joseph Thompson	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Rishika Daga	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Chanumi Nakandala	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Angelica Rode	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ada Drylie	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Alec Garrisson	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Hemang Dilip Rathod	Growth For UMSU	
Saharsh Jain	Growth For UMSU	
Chu Zhang	Growth For UMSU	

Jayna Kotecha	Growth For UMSU	
Priyanshi Jain	Growth For UMSU	

**Indigenous Committee (7 to elect)**

No nominations received.

**People of Colour Committee (7 to elect)**

Rahini Pandey		
Oskar Martin	Activate - Left Action	
Qiyuan Su	Activate - Left Action	
Aisha Nazim	Activate - Left Action	\
Emily McCrohon	Activate - Left Action	
Anuki Pandithakoralege	Activate - Left Action	
Ashwin Lunn	Activate - Left Action	
Siri Hendrata	Activate - Left Action	
Leon Lu	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ted Yang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Avisi Bhasin	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Haram Atif	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Yunshu (Alexandra) Yan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Hermina Weldyesus	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Yuqi Ma	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Son Thai Bui	Growth For UMSU	
Swayam Seth	Growth For UMSU	
Chenfei(Juniper) Jin	Growth For UMSU	
Arianna Kugendran	Growth For UMSU	
Aarush Yadav	Growth For UMSU	

**Queer Committee (7 to elect)**

Allie Lee	Activate - Left Action	
Elle Ivery	Activate - Left Action	
Cian Blake Murphy	Activate - Left Action	
Keiyona Shankar	Activate - Left Action	
Holly Smallacombe	Activate - Left Action	
Eli Kelly	Activate - Left Action	
Flynn Slater	Activate - Left Action	
Kenway Sheridan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

Christine Warnakula	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Harshene Janarthan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Qiutong(Tina) Wu	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Clarissa Sothy	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Zen Lam	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	

**Welfare Committee (7 to elect)**

Divyansh Jain		
Ezra Bangun		
Ebby Davis	Activate - Left Action	
Cian Blake Murphy	Activate - Left Action	
Isabelle Lewis	Activate - Left Action	
Pryce Starkey	Activate - Left Action	
Khoa Nguyen Bao Le	Activate - Left Action	
Connor Darling	Activate - Left Action	
Catherine Baker	Activate - Left Action	
Yash Shukla	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Deniz Daymen	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Catherine Duong	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Madhuri Talim	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Viera Chas	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Joyce Zheng	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Avenir Zhang	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Udit Jain	Growth For UMSU	
Shing Hei Elton Lee	Growth For UMSU	
Mun Szuen	Growth For UMSU	
Shivani Hemant Yadav	Growth For UMSU	
Victoria Jade Pan	Growth For UMSU	
Julie Tran	Growth For UMSU	
Kunal Dewani	Growth For UMSU	

**Women's Committee (7 to elect)**

Rahini Pandey		
Rongrong Jian		
Imogen Woodger	Activate - Left Action	
Keiyona Shankar	Activate - Left Action	
Sophia Smith	Activate - Left Action	

Holly Smallacombe	Activate - Left Action	
Ebby Davis	Activate - Left Action	
Isabelle Lewis	Activate - Left Action	
Alessandra Soliven	Activate - Left Action	
Catherine Baker	Activate - Left Action	Withdrawn
Holly Kalns	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ruslana Tarauniekh	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Liza Azizi	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Zainab Kazmi	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Utsavi Kohli	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Baani Kochhar	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Katie Thuy Tien Vo	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ellena Tan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	Nomination rejected
Sarah Shing	Growth For UMSU	
Saumya Sarup	Growth For UMSU	
Dhriti Budhwar	Growth For UMSU	
Nicole Wang	Growth For UMSU	
Simar Kohli	Growth For UMSU	
Yaya(Caroline) Duan	Growth For UMSU	

## Southbank

### Southbank Students Campus Co-ordinator

Caleb Jarcevic	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Tirion Luff-White	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>

### Southbank Activities Officer

Charlotte Dickinson	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
---------------------	----------------------------	--

### Southbank Education Officer

Elizabeth Victoria Pardallis	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
------------------------------	----------------------------	--

### Southbank Students Committee (7 to elect)

Gus Morrison		<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
--------------	--	--

Imogen Perrett		Nomination rejected
Matthew Bradwell		<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Amelia Evans	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
David Stockwell	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Jake Newman	Independents for Southbank	Eligibility not yet confirmed
Sasha Wee	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>
Zoriana Krupa	Independents for Southbank	<i>Provisionally elected unopposed</i>

#### Voting Students' Council representative elected by Southbank Students

Riley Hogan		
Matteo Bonson	Independents for Southbank	
Niyathi Premarajan	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
William Kennedy		
Tom Palmer	Activate - Left Action	

#### Burnley

##### Burnley Campus Co-ordinator

No nominations received.

##### Burnley Students Committee (7 to elect)

No nominations received.

#### National Union of Students

##### National Union of Students delegate (7 to elect)

Abbie Gupta	Growth For UMSU	
Rhea Sankar	Growth For UMSU	
Jack Sara	Growth For UMSU	
Kunal Dewani	Growth For UMSU	
Syna Sodhi	Growth For UMSU	
Filia Cahyadi	Growth For UMSU	

Suhas Agrawal	Growth For UMSU	
Daniel Motika	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ethan McNeil	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Chengyang(Eason)Gu	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Catherine Duong	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Holly Kalns	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Alexander Hams	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Marc Khor	COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	
Ramin Ghasemishayan		
Divyansh Jain		
Ezra Bangun		
Reema Ababneh	Activate - Left Action	
Chris Vassiliadis	Activate - Left Action	
Aidan Hawe	Activate - Left Action	
Isabella McRae McLeod	Activate - Left Action	
Sophie Conlan	Activate - Left Action	
Lottie Jenkins	Activate - Left Action	
Hugh Collins	Activate - Left Action	

## 2025 Byelection

### Indigenous Committee member (2025) (6 to elect)

No nominations received.

### Burnley Campus Committee member (2025) (2 to elect)

No nominations received.

## Provisional list of tickets registered

Name of ticket	Registrant
COMMUNITY FOR UMSU	Disha Zutshi
Growth For UMSU	Joshua James Stagg
Rebuild our UMSU	Lachlan Greenwood
Independent Media	Chiaki Chng

Activate - Left Action	Lucy Rachman Vascotto
Independents for Southbank	Caleb Jarcevic
Fight 4 Palestine: Cut The Ties *	Casey Forsyth

\* Application not accepted (not 15 members of the ticket who are General Members of UMSU)

Stephen Luntz  
Returning Officer  
[returningofficer@union.unimelb.edu.au](mailto:returningofficer@union.unimelb.edu.au)



2 September 2025

## Appendix B: Declaration of results

This document contains the declaration of results following the Electoral Tribunal's consideration of all appeals.

This document contains first preferences and, where necessary, a distribution of preferences for single-member positions. For multi-member positions it contains primary votes. A full distribution of preferences is available here: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=1354190EEgRKG5xAkWaF9RK6QJ3> and the revised distribution of preferences, for Environment Officer only and following the Tribunal's decision, can be found here: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=13545804xgr6xDndjjcJqpYGKv9>

### President

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Lushy (Lushomo) Chinganya (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1931	2232
Lottie Jenkins (Activate - Left Action)	1552	1774
Rhea Sankar (Growth For UMSU)	1097	
Lachlan Greenwood (Rebuild our UMSU)	232	
Tarish Kadam	193	
Yash	95	
Ezra Bangun	78	
Amirali Zareie Shab Khaneh	44	

*Lushy (Lushomo) Chinganya declared elected.*

### General Secretary

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Daniel Motika (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1833	2137
Chris Vassiliadis (Activate - Left Action)	1445	1639
Filia Cahyadi (Growth For UMSU)	1334	
Dylan Jay Moody	142	
Ezra Bangun	137	

*Daniel Motika declared elected.*

**Education (Academic Affairs) Officer**

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Corbin Afanasyev & Hesheya T Anandan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1948	2187
David Trevorrow & Sophia Chu (Activate - Left Action)	1408	1616
Ananya Dhaka & Jack Sara (Growth For UMSU)	1143	
Ramin Ghasemishayan	163	
Ezra Bangun	141	
Nandini Bhagwat	85	

*Corbin Afanasyev & Hesheya T Anandan declared elected.*

**Education (Public Affairs) Officer**

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Hridey Kapoor & Rutvi tolani (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1799	2050
Amaya Castro Williams & Reema Ababneh (Activate - Left Action)	1584	1751
Meghna Mallik & Nishka Chopra (Growth For UMSU)	1235	
Ezra Bangun	173	

*Hridey Kapoor & Rutvi tolani declared elected.*

**Activities Officer**

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Chuanqing (Louis) Huang & Saaisha Vohra (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	2097	2142
Ella-Mei Graham & Nathan Van Langenberg (Activate - Left Action)	1645	1739
Ezra Bangun	241	289
Ramin Ghasemishayan	216	
Nandini Bhagwat	170	

*Chuanqing (Louis) Huang & Saaisha Vohra declared elected.*

**Environment Officer**

	First preferences	Distribution
Bella Beiraghi & Kay Pritchard (Activate - Left Action)	1537	1583
Amira Bilqis & Mags Umbach (Growth For UMSU)	1270	1285
Atharva Lad	199	211
Ezra Bangun	160	
Nandini Bhagwat	87	

*Bella Beiraghi & Kay Pritchard declared elected.*

**Welfare Officer**

	First preferences	Distribution
Alexander Hams & Tsun Ying (Cynthia) Wong (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1879	2167
Nadine Chantelle Salita & Rosie Hyett (Activate - Left Action)	1411	1587
Abhie Gupta & Chloe Lim (Growth For UMSU)	1132	
Ezra Bangun	134	
Mrittika Dey	98	
Rajvir Singh	70	
Nandini Bhagwat	49	

*Alexander Hams & Tsun Ying (Cynthia) Wong declared elected.*

**Creative Arts Officer**

	First preferences	
Ethan McNeil & Yashesvi Verma (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	2214	
Anisha Gupta & Hiya Thacker (Growth For UMSU)	1489	
Ezra Bangun	403	

*Ethan McNeil & Yashesvi Verma declared elected.*

## Media Officer

*Chiaki Chng, Maria Carolina Lourenco Quartel, Ruby Weir-Alarcon & Sabine Pentecost declared elected unopposed.*

## Clubs & Societies Officer

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Alex Gwynn & Seamus Donnellan (Activate - Left Action)	2126	
Ezra Bangun	486	
Dylan Jay Moody	419	
Johar Malik	257	

*Alex Gwynn & Seamus Donnellan (Activate - Left Action) declared elected.*

## Women's Officer

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Eya Takrouni & Manika Birmiwal (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1111	
Roni Corby & Tamanna Rathi (Activate - Left Action)	523	
Anaya Chhabra & Syna Sodhi (Growth For UMSU)	481	
Nandini Bhagwat	34	

*Eya Takrouni & Manika Birmiwal declared elected.*

## People of Colour Officer

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Anyang Wal & Chengyang (Eason) Gu (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	918	966
Anushka Sachdeva & Yifan (Roger) Cao (Growth For UMSU)	523	577
Oskar Martin & Yasmeen Atieh (Activate - Left Action)	427	

*Anyang Wal & Chengyang (Eason) Gu declared elected.*

## Indigenous Officer

*Noah Kellett declared elected unopposed.*

## Disabilities Officer

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Maehula Datta (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	579	
Thomas Hofer (Activate - Left Action)	170	
Della Johnston & Jigar Thakkar	157	

*Maehula Datta declared elected.*

## Queer Officer

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Lyton Namawanda (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	747	
Mabel Shelley & Ronglin Hou (Activate - Left Action)	617	

*Lyton Namawanda declared elected.*

## Southbank Students Campus Co-ordinator

*Caleb Jarcevic & Tirion Luff-White declared elected unopposed.*

## Southbank Activities Officer

*Charlotte Dickinson declared elected unopposed.*

## Southbank Education Officer

*Elizabeth Victoria Pardallis declared elected unopposed.*

## Students' Council – Students of Colour Representative

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Cinrey Liu (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	868	
Uday Sidhu (Growth For UMSU)	432	
Lorjel Sia (Activate - Left Action)	268	
Rongrong Jian	67	

Varisha Ariadna	58	
-----------------	----	--

*Cinrey Liu declared elected.*

### Students' Council – Students with Disabilities Representative

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Catherine Duong (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	584	
Elli Paulding (Activate - Left Action)	180	
Leon Nguyen van Tri (Growth For UMSU)	176	

*Catherine Duong declared elected.*

### Students' Council – Queer Students' Representative

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Binderiya Batzorig (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	706	
Pippa Jackson (Activate - Left Action)	428	
Rowan U. (Growth For UMSU)	245	

*Binderiya Batzorig declared elected.*

### Students' Council – International Students' Representative

	<b>First preferences</b>	
Prayag Sethia (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	726	
Udit Jain (Growth For UMSU)	362	
Kai Page (Activate - Left Action)	87	
Zhaohui Wu	46	
Xingyu Liu	24	
Ramin Ghasemishayan	29	
Qiao Ma	20	
Arati Chandrakant Chaskar	15	
Divyansh Jain	14	

*Prayag Sethia declared elected.*

### Students' Council – Graduate Students' Representative

	<b>First preferences</b>	<b>Distribution</b>
Chengmin Shi (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	401	460
Hanmeng Zhu (Activate - Left Action)	243	288

Mohammad Anas (Growth For UMSU)	216	
Ramin Ghasemishayan	33	
Upeka Gunarathne	32	
George Wood	32	
Ezra Bangun	30	
Dylan Jay Moody	17	

*Chengmin Shi declared elected.*

### Students' Council – Southbank Representative

	First preferences	Distribution
Matteo Bonson (Independents for Southbank)	58	60
Tom Palmer (Activate - Left Action)	34	36
Niyathi Premarajan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	19	19
Riley Hogan	9	
William Kennedy	2	

*Matteo Bonson declared elected.*

### Students' Council – General members

Initial quota: 196.06

Candidate	Primary votes
Dominic Lam Xuan Jun (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1079
Reema Ababneh (Activate - Left Action)	833
Rodger Zhang (Growth For UMSU)	590
Felicity Bayne (Independent Media)	85
Thomas Poynton (Rebuild our UMSU)	80
Vishwajeet Dhanashekaran	36
Jinyan (Vivian) Chen (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	33
Junyi Li	28
Khush Shah (Growth For UMSU)	21
Ezra Bangun	20
Casey Forsyth	19

Vaanya Sharma (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	16
Kerry Sun (Activate - Left Action)	16
Yizhang(Benson) Pan (Growth For UMSU)	14
Victoria Jade Pan (Growth For UMSU)	13
Nathan Pham (Independent Media)	13
Toby Putland (Activate - Left Action)	11
Daksh Nikhilbhai Vyas (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11
Sounak Bhandari (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11
Shrreyas Saluja (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11
Hannah Roseman-Gannon (Activate - Left Action)	11
Vivika Bansal (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11
Madison Lee	10
Bhavin Garg (Growth For UMSU)	10
Holly Kalns (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	9
Symona Jian (Growth For UMSU)	9
Zachary Reid (Rebuild our UMSU)	8
Rongrong Jian	8
Ramin Ghasemishayan	7
Zoe Warren (Rebuild our UMSU)	7
James Duncan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	7
Somaya Qasimi (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	6
Soham Das (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	6
Mathieu Dacruz (Activate - Left Action)	5
Avjay Bhar (Activate - Left Action)	5
Upeka Gunarathne	5
Lachie Carroll (Independent Media)	5
Hugh Collins (Activate - Left Action)	5
Sparsh Sethi (Rebuild our UMSU)	5
Kai Bowie (Rebuild our UMSU)	4
Amy Peters (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	4
Sophie Conlan (Activate - Left Action)	4

Oscar North (Activate - Left Action)	4
Gevindu Wickramanyake (Rebuild our UMSU)	3
Dhanvi Sharma	3
Mysha Siddiqui (Growth For UMSU)	3
Tina yang (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Vedangi Khanna (Rebuild our UMSU)	3
Tom Palmer (Activate - Left Action)	3
Felix Sharkey (Activate - Left Action)	2
Caitlin Spizzirri (Activate - Left Action)	2
Ted Bowers	2
Alexandre Fratty	2
William Main (Rebuild our UMSU)	2
Maya MacNamara	2
Shoham Khandekar (Growth For UMSU)	2
Lachlan Eliau (Rebuild our UMSU)	1
Congyue Mao	1
Divyansh Jain	1
Zhihao Zhong (Growth For UMSU)	1
Lucy Rachman Vascotto (Activate - Left Action)	1
Ruby Craven (Activate - Left Action)	1
Juhi Kiran Gosai (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1
Kunal Dewani (Growth For UMSU)	1
Sebastian Glassel (Rebuild our UMSU)	1
Siddhanth Subbaiah Belliappa (Growth For UMSU)	1
Sam Karabogias (Activate - Left Action)	0
Percy Taylor (Rebuild our UMSU)	0

The following are declared elected:

1. Dominic Lam Xuan Jun
2. Reema Ababneh
3. Rodger Zhang
4. Shrreyas Saluja

5. Hannah Roseman-Gannon

6. Siddhanth Subbaiah Belliappa

7. James Duncan

8. Toby Putland

9. Khush Shah

- *Affirmative action applied*

10. Sophie Conlan

11. Holly Kalns

12. Somaya Qasimi

13. Jinyan (Vivian) Chen

14. Felicity Bayne

15. Lucy Rachman Vascotto

## Women's Committee

Initial quota: 247.63

Candidate	Primary votes
Holly Kalns (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	871
Imogen Woodger (Activate - Left Action)	459
Sarah Shing (Growth For UMSU)	380
Zainab Kazmi (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	40
Rongrong Jian	29
Sophia Smith (Activate - Left Action)	24
Baani Kochhar (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	24
Keiyona Shankar (Activate - Left Action)	20
Rahini Pandey	18
Ebby Davis (Activate - Left Action)	17
Isabelle Lewis (Activate - Left Action)	14
Alessandra Soliven (Activate - Left Action)	12
Saumya Sarup (Growth For UMSU)	11
Ruslana Tarauniekh (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	10

Nicole Wang (Growth For UMSU)	9
Katie Thuy Tien Vo (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	9
Dhriti Budhwar (Growth For UMSU)	8
Holly Smallacombe (Activate - Left Action)	8
Simar Kohli (Growth For UMSU)	6
Utsavi Kohli (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	6
Liza Azizi (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Yaya(Caroline) Duan (Growth For UMSU)	3

The following are declared elected:

1. Holly Kalns
2. Imogen Woodger
3. Sarah Shing
4. Ruslana Tarauniekh
5. Liza Azizi
6. Keiyona Shankar
7. Zainab Kazmi

## People of Colour Committee

Initial quota: 226.62

Candidate	Primary votes
Leon Lu (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	790
Oskar Martin (Activate - Left Action)	406
Son Thai Bui (Growth For UMSU)	396
Haram Atif (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	36
Rahini Pandey	27
Aisha Nazim (Activate - Left Action)	17
Avisi Bhasin (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	16
Swayam Seth (Growth For UMSU)	16
Qiyuan Su (Activate - Left Action)	15
Hermina Weldyesus (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	14

Aarush Yadav (Growth For UMSU)	14
Yunshu (Alexandra) Yan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	13
Arianna Kugendran (Growth For UMSU)	11
Siri Hendrata (Activate - Left Action)	11
Yuqi Ma (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	7
Chenfei(Juniper) Jin (Growth For UMSU)	6
Emily McCrohon (Activate - Left Action)	6
Ashwin Lunn (Activate - Left Action)	6
Ted Yang (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Anuki Pandithakoralege (Activate - Left Action)	3

The following are declared elected:

1. Leon Lu
2. Oskar Martin
3. Son Thai Bui
  - *Affirmative action applied*
4. Avisi Bhasin
5. Haram Atif
6. Chenfei(Juniper) Jin
7. Aisha Nazim

## Queer Committee

Initial quota: 163.00

Candidate	Primary votes
Kenway Sheridan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	647
Allie Lee (Activate - Left Action)	500
Flynn Slater (Activate - Left Action)	39
Qiutong(Tina) Wu (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	38
Clarissa Sothy (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	16
Keiyona Shankar (Activate - Left Action)	12
Christine Warnakula (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11

Zen Lam (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11
Harshene Janarthan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	8
Eli Kelly (Activate - Left Action)	8
Cian Blake Murphy (Activate - Left Action)	6
Elle Ivery (Activate - Left Action)	5
Holly Smallacombe (Activate - Left Action)	3

The following are declared elected:

1. Kenway Sheridan
2. Allie Lee
3. Christine Warnakula
4. Elle Ivery
5. Harshene Janarthan
6. Cian Blake Murphy
7. Qiutong(Tina) Wu

## Activities Committee

Initial quota: 286.88

Candidate	Primary votes
laurence hang (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1016
Vincent Chen (Activate - Left Action)	564
YiWei Wang (Growth For UMSU)	550
Chirmi Detha (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	28
Ezra Bangun	27
Flynn Slater (Activate - Left Action)	16
Arianna Kugendran (Growth For UMSU)	11
Cheewoo Park	11
Callum Rees (Activate - Left Action)	8
Divyansh Jain	8
Romain Fournier-Breen (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	7
Eunice Huang	7

Dhyey Desai (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	6
Avjay Bhar (Activate - Left Action)	6
Imogen Woodger (Activate - Left Action)	5
Kay Khine Kyaw (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	4
Shayla Nguyen (Growth For UMSU)	4
Kerry Sun (Activate - Left Action)	4
Niyathi Premarajan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Saumyaa Sarup (Growth For UMSU)	3
Alessandra Soliven (Activate - Left Action)	3
Prajwal Tiwary (Growth For UMSU)	3
Jhanvi Raghav (Growth For UMSU)	1
dikshita malhotra (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	0

The following are declared elected:

1. Laurence Hang
2. Vincent Chen
3. YiWei Wang
  - *Affirmative action applied*
4. Imogen Woodger
5. Kay Khine Kyaw
6. Chirmi Detha
7. Arianna Kugendran

## Creative Arts Committee

Initial quota: 277.50

Candidate	Primary votes
Muhammad Riyan Yahya (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	974
Vincent Chen (Activate - Left Action)	543
Neel Bhatia (Growth For UMSU)	525
Prishita Shethia (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	39
Ezra Bangun	29

Manhar arora (Growth For UMSU)	26
Sissel Huo	13
XuanYu Zhao (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	10
Ella Wernert (Activate - Left Action)	9
Alayna Tyagi (Growth For UMSU)	8
Alice O'Connor (Activate - Left Action)	7
Keerthana Karthik (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	7
Praniti Kukreja (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	7
Priyanshi Jain (Growth For UMSU)	6
Joseph ZY Li-Sculli (Activate - Left Action)	4
Mansis Kaur (Growth For UMSU)	4
Aahna Kamboj (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Audrey Mueller (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Alisha Joan Philip (Growth For UMSU)	3

The following are declared elected:

1. Muhammad Riyam Yahya
2. Vincent Chen
3. Neel Bhatia
  - *Affirmative action applied*
4. Aahna Kamboj
5. Prishita Shethia
6. Alice O'Connor
7. Mansis Kaur

## Disabilities Committee

The following are declared elected unopposed:

- Bhumit Mehta
- Evelyn Yang
- Langyue Zhu
- Madeline Currant

- Minidhu Paranahewa
- Nasheeta Khandoker
- Yuktha Reddy Gopalakrishna

## Education Committee

Initial quota: 318.88

Candidate	Primary votes
Prayag Sethia (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	978
Sophie Conlan (Activate - Left Action)	803
Leon Nguyen van Tri (Growth For UMSU)	533
Danmin Zhang (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	36
Edmond Sim (Growth For UMSU)	32
Eunice Zi Hui Ng (Growth For UMSU)	27
Declan Carlton Mark Chan (Activate - Left Action)	24
Ezra Bangun	24
Ramin Ghasemishayan	17
Kevin Phan (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	15
Bolortuya Batzorig (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	10
Anisa Prajitno (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	9
Divyansh Jain	9
Sarah Lazzaro (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	7
Chenfei(Juniper) Jin (Growth For UMSU)	6
Emma Dynes (Activate - Left Action)	5
Khoa Nguyen Bao Le (Activate - Left Action)	4
Pranay Maheta (Growth For UMSU)	3
Ananya Jha (Growth For UMSU)	3
Caitlin Spizzirri (Activate - Left Action)	2
Deepti Srinivasa (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	2
Joseph ZY Li-Sculli (Activate - Left Action)	1
Sreeya Penmetsa (Growth For UMSU)	1
Sam Karabogias (Activate - Left Action)	0

The following are declared elected:

1. Prayag Sethia
2. Sophie Conlan
3. Leon Nguyen van Tri
4. Kevin Phan
  - *Affirmative action applied*
5. Bolortuya Batzorig
6. Caitlin Spizzirri
7. Sreeya Penmetsa

## Environment Committee

Initial quota: 310.25

Candidate	Primary votes
David Adebiyi (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	945
Pippa Jackson (Activate - Left Action)	826
Hemang Dilip Rathod (Growth For UMSU)	520
Chanumi Nakandala (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	31
Ezra Bangun	24
Emma Niggl (Activate - Left Action)	21
Saharsh Jain (Growth For UMSU)	20
Loh Ting Fang	15
Priyanshi Jain (Growth For UMSU)	13
Joseph Thompson (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	12
Elle Ivery (Activate - Left Action)	12
Alec Garrison (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	10
Angelica Rode (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	8
Chu Zhang (Growth For UMSU)	7
Finn Bernard (Activate - Left Action)	6
Rishika Daga (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	5
Elli Paulding (Activate - Left Action)	2

Jayna Kotecha (Growth For UMSU)	2
Emma Dynes (Activate - Left Action)	2
Tom Palmer (Activate - Left Action)	1
Ada Drylie (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	0

The following are declared elected:

1. David Adebiyi
2. Pippa Jackson
3. Hemang Dilip Rathod
4. Joseph Thompson
  - *Affirmative action applied*
5. Rishika Daga
6. Emma Niggl
7. Chu Zhang

## Welfare Committee

Initial quota: 288.62

Candidate	Primary votes
Yash Shukla (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	985
Udit Jain (Growth For UMSU)	559
Ebby Davis (Activate - Left Action)	547
Madhuri Talim (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	32
Joyce Zheng (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	28
Ezra Bangun	24
Victoria Jade Pan (Growth For UMSU)	21
Shing Hei Elton Lee (Growth For UMSU)	21
Divyansh Jain	13
Kunal Dewani (Growth For UMSU)	11
Viera Chas (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	11
Catherine Duong (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	9
Julie Tran (Growth For UMSU)	9

Pryce Starkey (Activate - Left Action)	6
Isabelle Lewis (Activate - Left Action)	6
Deniz Daymen (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	5
Khoa Nguyen Bao Le (Activate - Left Action)	4
Mun Szuen (Growth For UMSU)	4
Cian Blake Murphy (Activate - Left Action)	4
Shivani Hemant Yadav (Growth For UMSU)	3
Catherine Baker (Activate - Left Action)	3
Connor Darling (Activate - Left Action)	3
Avenir Zhang (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	1

The following are declared elected:

1. Yash Shukla
2. Udit Jain
3. Ebby Davis
4. Deniz Daymen
  - *Affirmative action applied*
5. Catherine Duong
6. Mun Szuen
7. Isabelle Lewis

## Southbank Students Committee

The following are declared elected unopposed:

- Gus Morrison
- Matthew Bradwell
- Amelia Evans
- David Stockwell
- Jake Newman
- Sasha Wee
- Zoriana Krupa

## National Union of Students Delegates

Initial quota: 308.38

Candidate	Primary votes
Daniel Motika (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	922
Reema Ababneh (Activate - Left Action)	822
Abhie Gupta (Growth For UMSU)	521
Catherine Duong (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	31
Lottie Jenkins (Activate - Left Action)	24
Ezra Bangun	22
Alexander Hams (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	22
Ramin Ghasemishayan	16
Chris Vassiliadis (Activate - Left Action)	11
Rhea Sankar (Growth For UMSU)	11
Jack Sara (Growth For UMSU)	10
Holly Kalns (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	10
Isabella McRae McLeod (Activate - Left Action)	9
Filia Cahyadi (Growth For UMSU)	8
Hugh Collins (Activate - Left Action)	6
Syna Sodhi (Growth For UMSU)	4
Ethan McNeil (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Chengyang(Eason)Gu (COMMUNITY FOR UMSU)	3
Suhas Agrawal (Growth For UMSU)	3
Divyansh Jain	3
Aidan Hawe (Activate - Left Action)	2
Sophie Conlan (Activate - Left Action)	2
Kunal Dewani (Growth For UMSU)	2

The following are declared elected:

1. Daniel Motika
2. Reema Ababneh
3. Abhie Gupta
4. Ethan McNeil

5. Chris Vassiliadis
6. Chengyang(Eason)Gu
7. Rhea Sankar

### **Burnley Campus Co-ordinator**

*No nominations received.*

### **Burnley Students Committee**

*No nominations received.*

### **Indigenous Committee member (2025 byelection)**

*No nominations received.*

### **Burnley Campus Committee member (2025 byelection)**

*No nominations received.*

Stephen Luntz  
Returning Officer  
Above Quota Elections  
21st October 2025



## Appendix C1: Ruling in relation to UMSU SGM

Dear Registering Officers and Independents,

We have been asked about the SGM to be held on Thursday and any election-related campaigning.

Since this is a little bit different from the sort of events we usually need to deal with, we have to make a specific ruling, and I'm getting it out now for maximum time.

1. There must be no election related campaigning within the SGM. No mention of any tickets, for example, whether positive or negative. If it is necessary to talk about the actions of an office-holder in UMSU, they should be discussed by their position, without their ticket mentioned. Naturally, all such discussion must be truthful - any misleading or deceptive statements about someone in the course of the SGM can lead to penalties.
2. I'm extending this ban on election related campaigning to North Court, where the event will be held, for half an hour before the start and after the finish of the meeting. This seems safest.
3. It is however, allowed to campaign to people approaching the SGM, provided this is done outside North Court, and all normal election regulations apply. North Court is defined as including everywhere between the old Union House and the raised garden beds to the north.

Stephen Luntz  
Returning Officer

27 August 2025

## Appendix C2: Ruling (1) of the Returning Officer

This ruling codifies the Returning Officer's approach to various situations that are not adequately covered by the Regulations.

### ***Endorsements by clubs, societies and other groups***

1. Clubs and societies by and for University of Melbourne students are permitted to endorse candidates or tickets on whatever terms they see fit. UMSU-affiliated clubs are presumed to have sufficient student members to be student clubs. For clubs that are not UMSU-affiliated, candidates and tickets may rely on a club's endorsement only if that group is predominantly University of Melbourne students.
2. Clubs endorsements must be decisions made by the club by their usual decision-making processes (e.g. a motion of the committee). A copy of this motion must be provided to us by an appropriate officer of the club (President, Secretary, or equivalent) before the endorsement is advertised.
3. Publicity produced by clubs that relates to the election must be registered in the usual way, and carry the name and student number of the person who takes responsibility for the material.

### ***Bulk contact lists***

4. Subject to the exception below, bulk electronic messages can be sent only to lists where explicit consent has been obtained from each recipient. Electronic messages include emails, SMS messages, and direct messaging features (however described) on social media. Campaigners, tickets and candidates must be able to demonstrate, on request, to the Returning Officer that they have obtained explicit consent from the recipients.
5. Nothing in this ruling affects obligations a campaigner has under University policy (or the law). Compliance with this ruling does not relieve you from obligations to comply with University rules. In particular, the Returning Officer draws campaigners' attention to the *Rules for Student Email* and the *Provision and Acceptable Use of IT Policy*. Enforcement of this policy, and therefore questions regarding it, are a matter for the University.
6. Clubs may email their membership using the appropriate UMSU facilities. Any such bulk email must carry a clear statement that inclusion of the election message is approved by the club's committee. As with all election material, a copy must be sent to the Returning Officer for registration.
7. Clubs relying on this exception may not send more than two emails to their members relating to their endorsement before or during the voting period.

8. Any bulk message must have an effective unsubscribe feature.

***Phonebanking***

9. Based on the number of complaints received last year about phonebanking (that is, systematically calling a list of phone numbers to canvass for votes), our default position is that phonebanking is not permitted.
10. A ticket or candidate wishing to phonebank must discuss their plan in advance with us, in which case we may make a supplementary ruling laying out acceptable parameters for phonebanking.

***Adhesives used in postering***

11. If postering, do not use wheatpaste, or any adhesive that damages the surface to which the poster is applied, or which means the poster cannot be easily removed without damage to the underlying surface.
12. Compliance with this ruling does not relieve the posterer from the requirement to comply with University policy in relation to postering.

Stephen Luntz  
Returning Officer  
28 August 2025

## Appendix C3: Ruling (2) of the Returning Officer

This ruling relates to campaigning in colleges, halls of residence, student accommodation, apartment buildings and other multi-household dwellings however described.

1. No electoral regulation prohibits campaigning off campus.
2. The Returning Officer has received a large number of complaints relating to campaigning in student accommodation. These are being progressed on a case-by-case basis, but clearly more guidance is needed for campaigners.
3. From 6pm tonight (Thursday 4 September), any campaigning proposed to be done in-person in multi-household dwellings (including colleges, halls of residence, student accommodation, apartment buildings) must (a) have a campaign plan in a form approved by the Returning Officer; and (b) the plan must be approved by the Returning Officer.
4. The form is available on request from the Returning Officer.
5. As with all campaigning, campaigners must respect voters' requests not to engage with them; not menace, intimidate or harass voters or other campaigners; comply with requests from event organisers; not violate the secrecy of the ballot; and otherwise obey the Electoral Regulations.

Stephen Luntz  
Returning Officer  
4 September 2025

## Appendix D: Complaints

This appendix lists complaints made in relation to the election, with the view of providing a qualitative illustration of what the Returning Officer regards as an unacceptably low standard of conduct.

The list, although it covers the majority of complaints, is not comprehensive as some complaints would have been dealt with summarily and in times of high workload were not recorded in our complaints system.

For each complaint we provide when it was made (before, during or after the election), a short summary (which is meant to capture the flavour of the complaint but not full details), and the main outcome.

<b>When made</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Primary outcome</b>
Before election	A campaigner's material represented volunteering for that campaign as an "internship"	Penalty imposed
Before election	A campaigner's material took full credit for an activity for which the ticket could claim only partial credit	Penalty imposed
Before election	A campaigner's material did not contain the required "published by" line	Penalty imposed
Before election	A campaigner's material was not registered	Penalty imposed and material removed
Before election	A campaigner's material implied that campaigners should be directly helping students vote	Penalty imposed
Before election	Election material promised to deliver a new programme that was in fact already in place	The promise was removed
Before election	Election material claimed credit for a programme that was delivered by a different department of UMSU	The wording was changed
Before election	Election material claimed credit for a programme that was not delivered by that ticket	The respondent disputed the claim but changed the wording
Before election	Election material claimed involvement in a Department they were not involved in	The respondent disputed the claim but changed the wording
Before election	Election material claimed credit for an achievement that had in fact not been achieved	The respondent conceded the claim was incorrect
Before election	One ticket's publicity materials were too close to UMSU's branding	The respondent was asked to be mindful of the issue
Before election	Concerns about the use of the UMSU Special General Meeting for campaign purposes	The RO made a ruling relating to campaign

		activity at the event
Before election	Non-students with significant social media reach reshared a ticket's material	The respondent control over either party. Penalty imposed
Before election	A campaign claimed credit for a University policy that had not in fact been implemented	The wording was changed
Before election	A registered pamphlet made claims about UMSU that were untrue	The complainant declined to particularise which claims were untrue
Before election	That, if the RO registers material and a subsequent complaint is made about that material, it is a breach of procedural fairness for the RO to require the publisher to respond to the complaint and/or deregister the material	The RO disagrees
Before election	The RO failed to register material that should have been registered	The RO believes the material is not registerable
Before election	A ruling of the RO breaches the Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities	The complainant withdrew the claim
Before election	Campaign material prominently showed UMSU branding near a candidate	The material was withdrawn
Before election	A campaign's social media page obscured the link between the page and the election	The authorisation was made prominent and a disclaimer was added
Before election	Campaign material conveyed a false imputation about their opponent's actions	The respondent denied the imputation but reworded the material
Before election	Campaign material was shared by a non-student	Penalty imposed
Before election	Campaign material that should have been removed was not	The respondent conceded the breach but fairly pointed out that it had been made less prominent and the RO had mistakenly suggested this was OK. Penalty applied, acknowledging that unclear direction from the RO had partially contributed to the breach.
Before election	Campaign material claimed credit for an outcome that was in fact not delivered	The respondent provided material that satisfied the RO that the outcome was delivered and that the respondent can claim

		credit
Before election	Material posted on an official UMSU Instagram effectively endorsed a certain ticket	The Officebearer concerned agreed to remove the material during election week
Before election	An official UMSU Instagram page had its colour scheme changed to that of a ticket	Investigation showed the colour scheme had been used throughout the year
Before election	Campaign material claimed credit for an outcome that was in fact not delivered	The respondent provided material that satisfied the RO that the outcome was delivered and that the respondent can claim credit
Before election	Campaign material unfairly claimed credit for a change to University policy	The respondent provided material that satisfied the RO that the outcome was delivered and that the respondent can claim credit
Before election	A complaint was upheld, but the translation into English used by the Returning Officer lost nuance and led the Returning Officer to impose too lenient a penalty	Both parties were offered the opportunity to supply an NAATI-accredited translation; however this matter was rendered moot by subsequent events
Before election	An anonymous Instagram account re-posted campaign material	Evidence was provided to the RO satisfying him that the account was controlled by a student
Before election	Campaign material appeared to breach a Victorian law relating to the service of food and beverages	Despite considerable investigation, the RO was not able to form a view on whether a law had been broken and if so, what the consequences should be under the Electoral Regulations
Before election	Campaign material claimed unfair claimed credit for an outcome	The respondent provided material that satisfied the RO that the respondent can claim credit
Before election	UMSU Instagram pages followed campaign pages	Investigation did not substantiate the complaint

Before election	UMSU Instagram pages followed campaign pages	Investigation did not substantiate the complaint
Before election	Campaign material was misleading in that it suggested an UMSU programme had achieved more than it actually had	The respondent adjusted their material
Before election	Campaign material unfairly claimed credit for an UMSU programme	Despite considerable investigation, the RO was satisfied that the programme had been delivered by UMSU but could not form a view on whether the programme could be complained by one, both, or neither of the complainant and respondent
Before election	Campaign material for a ticket was shared by a non-student group	Investigation did not substantiate the complaint
Before election	Campaign material was misleading	The RO was not satisfied it was misleading
Before election	Campaign material was posted without the required “published by” line	The candidate was warned
Before election	UMSU staff were involved in production of campaign material	Investigation did not substantiate the complaint
Election week	An AQE staff member had instructed a campaigner that they must wear a T-shirt to campaign	Investigation did not substantiate the complaint
Election week	No more campaign lanyards were available from the UMSU Info desk	Investigation did not substantiate the complaint
Election week	The campaign material subject of a previous substantiated complaint was not removed	The respondent provided compelling evidence they had done all that they could to prevent the material being reshared. Further penalty imposed.
Election week	A voting council representative was campaigning despite not being on leave for election week	The individual concerned provided satisfactory evidence that leave had been taken
Election week	Two campaigners observed a student who was voting	Ticket warned although they denied the behaviour
Election week	Three campaigners from two tickets observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election	A campaigner acted aggressively towards another	Ticket warned

week	campaigner	
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Ticket warned and told to adjust their training
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO that campaign activity was occurring
Election week	A club endorsed a ticket without having made a decision in accordance with its constitution	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	Campaign material was misleading	The RO was not satisfied it was misleading
Election week	Campaign material used UMSU resources	The RO was satisfied the resources were generally available to students
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning in a way that violated the secrecy of the ballot	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner suggested a voter must vote for them on the basis of shared ethnic background	The ticket concerned was warned
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed

Election week	Election material was not printed on recycled paper	The RO was provided with evidence the paper was recycled
Election week	Election material used UMSU resources	Penalty imposed
Election week	Campaign material unfairly claimed credit for an UMSU programme	The RO was not satisfied it was misleading
Election week	Campaign material unfairly claimed credit for an UMSU programme	The RO was not satisfied it was misleading
Election week	Campaign material unfairly claimed credit for an UMSU programme	The RO was not satisfied it was misleading
Election week	Election material used UMSU resources	Penalty imposed
Election week	A translation into English was not accurate	Material deregistered until revised translation supplied
Election week	A translation into English was not accurate	Material deregistered until revised translation supplied
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Election material used UMSU resources	Penalty imposed
Election week	Campaign material unfairly claimed credit for an UMSU programme	Penalty imposed
Election week	Campaigners were campaigning to close to the entrance to the Campus Canteen	The conduct complained of did not breach the Regulations, but the RO imposed an exclusion zone
Election week	Campaigner talking to individual on the phone	Campaigner convinced returning officer the person was not a student and was lost. Warned for future
Election week	A campaigner observed two students who were voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket was asked to ensure their campaigners

		wore student ID
Election week	A campaigner claimed to be exempt from displaying student ID while campaigning on the basis of friendship with the RO	The respondent denied the claim had been made
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning in a building containing a polling place	There was no polling place that day
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A ticket failed to pass on a withdrawal from a candidate	Although the facts of the matter were disputed, it is in any case the candidate's responsibility to inform the RO of the withdrawal
Election week	A ticket submitted a policy statement on behalf of a candidate which had not been checked by that candidate and contained a false and distressing statement about them	Penalty imposed
Election week	A ticket forced a candidate to nominate	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	Three campaigners observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A non-student published election material	Complaint upheld
Election week	A campaigner approached a voter and attempted to vote on their behalf	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	Misleading campaign material was circulated	The RO was not satisfied it was misleading
Election week	Campaign material was printed on non-recycled paper and did not include "Please recycle"	Complaint upheld
Election week	A campaigner made misleading statements in person to a voter	Penalty imposed
Election week	A club endorsed a ticket without having made a decision in accordance with its constitution	Although it seemed likely that appropriate meeting procedure was not followed, investigation showed it was clear the club's committee

		supported the endorsement with a comfortable majority
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner verbally harassed members of another ticket	There was insufficient evidence to impose a penalty but the campaigner was warned
Election week	A campaigner verbally harassed members of another ticket	There was insufficient evidence to impose a penalty but the campaigner was warned
Election week	A campaigner verbally harassed members of another ticket	There was insufficient evidence to impose a penalty but the campaigner was warned
Election week	A campaigner harvested student contact details from group chats	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner displayed a banner that was unregistered	Investigation showed the banner was registered
Election week	A campaigner campaigned too close to an UMSU event	The campaigner was warned
Election week	Campaigner campaigning too close to polling place	Complaint deemed not urgent to deal with, and campaigner not seen in the area again
Election week	Two campaigners observed two students who were voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward
Election	A voter reported that a campaigner had watched	The ticket was warned but,

week	while the voter voted	while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A club endorsed a ticket without having made a decision in accordance with its constitution	The endorsement seemed valid on its face and the complainant did not supply contradictory evidence
Election week	Campaigners campaigning too close to an UMSU event	Staff sent to police the boundaries around the event
Election week	Campaigners campaigning too close to an UMSU event	Staff sent to police the boundaries around the event
Election week	Campaigners campaigning too close to an UMSU event	Staff sent to police the boundaries around the event
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward
Election week	A campaigner acted aggressively towards another campaigner	Ticket warned
Election week	A ticket sent a fake voter to lure a campaigner for another ticket into a prohibited area	The RO did not have enough information to progress the complaint
Election week	Election material contained a misleading statement	A University decision published during election week arguably made previously-permissible material misleading. While the respondent made a strong argument the material was not misleading, they agreed to amend it in future printings
Election week	A ticket could not fairly take credit for a change in University policy	The ticket did not claim credit so the complaint was not tested

Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The video submitted as evidence showed a lanyard apparently containing student ID
Election week	A campaigner displayed a banner that was unregistered	The banner had been registered
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward
Election week	Two campaigners observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Campaigner was reported to be telling people to vote in restricted constituencies even if they were not eligible	Complaint not substantiated at that time, but subsequently same person caught on tape saying the same thing
Election week	Campaigner observed not wearing a lanyard	Complaint deemed not a priority
Election week	Two campaigners observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	Two campaigners observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The RO was satisfied with the measures taken to display identification
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not

		enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner verbally abused another campaigner	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner campaigned in a prohibited area	Penalty imposed
Election week	Certain material should have been registered as election material	Although the RO would have preferred if it was, there was a satisfactory argument that it should not be regarded as election material
Election week	Unauthorised campaign material was published	Complaint upheld. As no election participant could be identified, matter referred to University
Election week	A campaigner made a derogatory, sexually charged and offensive comment to another campaigner	There was insufficient evidence to impose a penalty but the campaigner was warned
Election week	Voter observed while voting, told to vote on positions for which they were not eligible	Penalty applied
Election week	A campaigner directed voters to vote for self-identified positions, despite those voters being ineligible	Penalty imposed. Additionally, the ticket was directed no campaigner was to provide any advice on eligibility for self-identified positions
Election week	A voter reported that a campaigner had watched while the voter voted	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A non-student published election material that was misleading	Complaint upheld
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Complaint deemed not a priority
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Complaint deemed not a priority
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear

		lanyards going forward
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner campaigned in a prohibited area	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Election material was not printed on recycled paper	The evidence on the provenance of the paper was equivocal but the respondent agreed to reprint the material and not campaign at all until reprinted
Election week	A voter reported that a campaigner had watched while the voter voted	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A candidate took an opposing leaflet out of the had of a voter	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner interfered in another candidate's publicity	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed

Election week	A campaigner voted using a voter's phone	The evidence submitted was not sufficiently persuasive to ask the Tribunal to disqualify the candidate
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner invaded the personal space of another campaigner	The factual evidence of both the complainant and the respondent was close, but the interpretation was hotly contested. Measures were put in place to avoid either campaigner campaigning in the same place as the other.
Election week	A campaigner voted using a voter's phone	The responsible party could not be identified
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer

week		sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner campaigned without a lanyard or ID	Assistant Returning Officer sent to do a sweep of team to warn them to wear IDs
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Unauthorised campaign material was published	Complaint upheld
Election week	A campaigner voted using a voter's phone	The responsible party could not be identified
Election week	A campaigner made misleading statements in person to a voter	The RO regarded the statement as borderline, but falling on the permissible side of the border
Election week	A campaigner campaigning without a lanyard or ID	Complaint deemed not a priority
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A campaigner voted using a voter's phone and falsely claimed voting was compulsory	The responsible party could not be identified
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Complaint not substantiated

Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	Unauthorised campaign material was published	Complaint upheld
Election week	A campaigner directed a student on how to vote in front of them	The responsible party could not be identified
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning inside a computer lab	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner verbally abused another campaigner, and a group of campaigners followed a campaigner around a building at night, including into a restricted area	Penalty imposed. The respondent strenuously denied the most damning elements of the complainant's account as well as the complainant's interpretation. Independent evidence provided support for the complainant's account
Election week	Campaigning took place without permission at a student accommodation event by three campaigners, two of whom were not resident there	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	Campaigners intimidated a student in a student residence at night	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner campaigning without a lanyard or ID	Complaint deemed not a priority
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Two campaigners pressuring students to vote	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner campaigning without a lanyard or ID	Complaint deemed not a priority

Election week	A campaigner campaigning without a lanyard or ID	Complaint deemed not a priority
Election week	Campaigning removing lanyard, then putting it on again when observed	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner called a student and pressured them to submit a vote while on the call	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner campaigned in a library without identifying themselves and voted using a student's device	Although very suspicious, the evidence submitted was not sufficiently persuasive to apply to disqualify the candidate

Election week	A campaigner campaigned in a library without identifying themselves and voted using a student's device	Although very suspicious, the evidence submitted was not sufficiently persuasive to apply to disqualify the candidate
Election week	A campaigner campaigned in a library without identifying themselves and voted using a student's device	Although very suspicious, the evidence submitted was not sufficiently persuasive to apply to disqualify the candidate
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A non-student engaged campaigners to waste their time, at the behest of a ticket	Complaint upheld in part, but the RO was not satisfied the ticket could be held responsible
Election week	A non-student engaged campaigners to waste their time, at the behest of a ticket	Complaint upheld in part, but the RO was not satisfied the ticket could be held responsible
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	Campaigners campaigned without permission and intimidated students in a student residence at night	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner directed a student on how to vote in front of them	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	Four campaigners entered student accommodation by tailgating and coerced voters	Penalty imposed
Election week	Campaign material was misleading	The ticket modified the material
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward

Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A non-student engaged campaigners to waste their time, at the behest of a ticket	Complaint upheld in part, but the RO was not satisfied the ticket could be held responsible
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A group of campaigners followed campaigners around a building at night	Although it could not be established that the conduct was a breach of the Regulations, the ticket concerned was warned and the RO is of the view that the conduct was unacceptable
Election week	A campaigner verbally abused students	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner verbally abused students and made racially discriminatory remarks	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner breached the University's no-smoking policy	Matter referred to University Security
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant had already made this complaint, but had made so many they must have lost track of them
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	The ticket agreed campaigners would wear lanyards going forward
Election week	A campaigner wore campaign material in a prohibited area	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner made racially abusive comments to a group of campaigners	Penalty imposed, although the RO felt an interpretation of the comments as merely offensive, rather than racist, was as probable

Election week	A campaigner made racially abusive comments to a campaigner	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner invaded the personal space of another campaigner and made an threatening comment to them	Independent evidence strongly suggested, although did not absolutely prove, the event did not occur
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant had already made this complaint, but had made so many they must have lost track of them
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning without displaying a student ID	Although it was contested whether campaigning was occurring at the time, the ticket agreed to improve their systems for ensuring lanyards were visible
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A non-student engaged campaigners to waste their time, at the behest of a ticket	Complaint upheld in part, but the RO was not satisfied the ticket could be held responsible
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated

Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner made a derogatory accusation about another campaigner that they were unable to substantiate	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner followed another campaigner around to intimidate them	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough independent evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A campaigner grabbed another campaigner to pull them aside and made a physical threat	The respondent credibly denied making the threat but conceded physical contact occurred, although denied it was rough. Penalty imposed on the basis of physical contact
Election week	A student was photographed and accused of being from RMIT	No breach of the electoral regulations was established
Election week	A campaigner pressured a student to disclose their vote	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough independent evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	Unauthorised campaign material was published	Complaint upheld
Election week	A campaigner directed a student on how to vote in front of them	The responsible party could not be identified

Election week	A campaigner directed voters to vote for self-identified positions, despite those voters being ineligible	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner called a student and pressured them to submit a vote while on the call	Penalty imposed
Election week	Two campaigners observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner made a social media post during the period of a ban	The campaigner separately admitted to the breach before it was put to them. Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner posted material that could not be registered	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner voted using a voter's phone; and represented themselves as an UMSU official	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough to impose a penalty
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant had already made this complaint
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant had already made this complaint
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A group of campaigners followed another campaigners around a building at night and made	A penalty would have been imposed except the

	sexually charged comments towards them	respondent's ticket had already been banned for the rest of the election. The only possible recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	Unregistered campaign material was published	The material had been registered
Election week	A campaigner voted using a voter's phone	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner made a misleading statement to a voter	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner made a misleading statement to a voter	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner admitted to regularly breaching the secrecy of the ballot	The RO did not have enough information to progress the complaint
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not

week		substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant had already made this complaint
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant had already made this complaint
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed

week		
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner made a misleading statement to a voter	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner directed a student on how to vote in front of them	The ticket was warned but, while the RO found the complaint credible, there was not enough evidence to impose a penalty
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner was campaigning while banned	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Election material had been left in an academic space	Complaint not substantiated
Election week	A photo was submitted but it was not clear what Regulation was alleged to have been breached	The RO did not have enough information to progress the complaint

Election week	A photo was submitted but it was not clear what Regulation was alleged to have been breached	The RO did not have enough information to progress the complaint
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner campaigned in a prohibited area	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	Campaigners intimidated campaigners on another ticket	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	Penalty imposed
Election week	Campaign material was posted by an account not controlled by a student	Although the RO regards it as likely the account would have been shown to be run by a student, it was not possible to place the complaint before the respondent, in any case whose ticket had already been banned for the rest of the election
Election week	Campaign material constituted an inducement to vote	It was not possible to place the complaint before the respondent, in any case whose ticket had been banned for the rest of the election
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The evidence submitted was suspicious but not enough to satisfy the RO
Election week	A campaigner observed a student who was voting	The complainant's ticket had already made this complaint

After election	A voter was offered a chocolate in return for a vote	Complaint too late to investigate
After election	A campaigner asked a student to vote while screen-sharing	The RO had already applied the maximum possible penalty to the ticket and accordingly the only recourse is to the Electoral Tribunal
After election	A campaigner made a rude and disrespectful approach to a voter	While further investigation would be necessary to determine if the Regulations had been breached, the election was already complete

## **Appendix E: Electoral Tribunal minutes**

Attached separately.