Dear Assembly,

There were numerous changes to 1.9.10.2 so deciding on the exact reason why the policy failed to pass was impossible. The straw-polls were helpful in determining the main factors, which were no booth questions, no rebuttals during pooled debate time, no electronic devices allowed during individualized question time, and candidates with an SRA must abstain from voting for the position they are running for.

We decided to allow rebuttals but still remove booth questions. Our reasoning was if you give rebuttals it is a true debate and booth questions have no place in a debate. Rather than break up the debate flow to usher candidates out, we will give them a chance to differentiate themselves from other candidates via rebuttal time. Rebuttals also generally take less time and will not be as potentially problematic as booth questions are. We decided to allow electronics during “day two” of voting because we agreed in the end it is best to keep communication avenues open for both SRA members and constituents with questions. This will allow SRA members to mass inform each other of right answers to questions should there be one and account for the lack of booth questions, in which a right answer is told to everyone.

We went over candidates with SRA seats abstaining from voting for their position again and came to the same conclusion as before. In positions where anyone could run it is unfair for some candidates to be able to vote for themselves while others cannot. In a room of 35 votes and an increasing number of candidates each year, the elections are close and one act of self-interest should not define the election results. If we talk about being equal opportunity, valuing experience from outside the MSU, or “bursting the bubble” we need policies to match. I look forward to discussing this again this weekend, please contact me via your preferred method if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Miranda Clayton
Operations Commissioner
McMaster Students Union
sraops@msu.mcmaster.ca