

# 2024 Probity Report



# Acknowledgements

This report was produced by the Probity Officers in accordance with the requirements listed under the Australian National University Students Association (ANUSA) Constitution (Election Regulations). The document summarises the financial disclosures from tickets, major issues and disputes during the election period and how they were resolved.

The **2024 Probity Officers** were:

*Audrey Kuan*

*Danielle Peck*

*Joshua Janto*

The **2024 Returning Officer** was:

*Richelle Hilton*

The **2024 ANUSA Executive member** responsible for liaising with Probity and the Returning Officer as well as setting up MSL for polling was:

*Phoenix O'Neill (President)*

The probity officers would like to thank all of the above-mentioned persons, Eleanor Boyle (ANUSA Operations Manager), the ANUSA Executive and staff, the candidates, and all members of the Association for their conduct and cooperation during the election period.

## Summary of Recommendations

1. That the ANUSA Constitution make it clearer as to what the consequences of a warning are to tickets and whether multiple complaints can lead to a more serious consequence.
2. That the ANUSA constitution makes it clearer as to what constitutes as removal of an electoral publication that includes covering electoral material up - an explicit statement that all precinct owners are able to remove posters at their discretion.
3. That a clean-up clause be implemented in the ANUSA constitution, obligates tickets to be responsible for taking down all their posters after the election period.
4. The ANUSA constitution regulates how posters can be put up, allowing for easy removal post-election or removal by others authorised to do so.
5. That ANUSA communicates with buildings beforehand, especially residential halls to allow them to opt out of having posters within 15m of their entrances and in the building itself.
6. That the ANUSA constitution regulates a second contact for tickets in case the convenor cannot be contacted.
7. That ANUSA spend more time promoting the role of Probity Officer so a larger team can deal with the volume of complaints.
8. That ANUSA create a more streamlined process that would enable Probity to better manage complaints. This would include:
  - a. A form for students to lodge their complaint
  - b. A customised database that enables the probity team to update the 'status' of the complaint and send automated emails, set templates to send emails or send customised emails from the database using the probity email address
9. A document that summarises electoral regulations should be made available to the student body. This will enable a fairer election as students will be able to have a voice in the goings on of the election
10. Probity recommends that ANUSA formalise the process for financial submissions to streamline the logistics behind it:
  - a. A form that is connected to the inbox for the statement of intentions.
  - b. A form that is connected to the inbox for the daily signed statements.

This will allow the probity team to easily keep track of daily signed statements, ensuring that electoral rules are followed and that the election is fair.

# Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Table of Contents.....</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Notable Disputes.....</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| Endorsement of a Ticket From External Greens MLA on Instagram.....                  | 5         |
| Action .....  | 5         |
| Recommendations .....   | 6         |
| Launch Party Held at Badger & Co .....  | 7         |
| Action .....  | 7         |
| Allegations of Voter Harassment.....  | 9         |
| Action .....  | 9         |
| Change and Serve! Misinformation Battle.....  | 10        |
| Change post connecting Brighter Together and Serve!.....                            | 10        |
| Action .....  | 10        |
| Change comment targeting Serve! about the Night Cafe and “Welfare Budget” .....     | 11        |
| Action .....  | 11        |
| Beginning of the Misinformation Battle.....   | 11        |
| Summary of Probity’s email to Change and Serve .....                                | 12        |
| Recommendations.....  | 13        |
| The Daley Bus Road Post .....   | 14        |
| The counter-complaint and response post to the Daley Bus Road Post.....             | 14        |
| Action .....  | 15        |
| Numerous Poster Complaints and Possible Breaches .....                              | 16        |
| Recommendations.....  | 16        |
| Posters In and Around Residential Halls.....  | 17        |
| Recommendations.....  | 17        |
| Environmental Officer Candidate Eligibility .....                                   | 18        |
| Action .....  | 18        |
| False Claims on Campaigning Material.....   | 19        |
| Action .....  | 19        |
| A Ticket Covering Other Tickets’ Electoral Posters with their Own .....             | 20        |
| Action .....  | 20        |
| Recommendations.....  | 20        |
| Late Signed Daily Statement .....   | 21        |
| Action .....  | 21        |
| Recommendations.....  | 21        |
| Minor Exclusion Zone Violations During Voting Period by Multiple Tickets .....      | 22        |
| Large Volume of Complaints and Students’ Lack of Knowledge of Electoral Rules ..... | 23        |
| Recommendations.....  | 23        |
| <b>Financial Report.....</b>  | <b>24</b> |
| Statement of Intention.....   | 24        |
| Daily Signed Statements .....   | 29        |

Recommendations ..... 32

# Notable Disputes

## Endorsement of a Ticket From External Greens MLA on Instagram

On Monday, September 16th, Probity received a complaint about a Member of Parliament endorsing Serve!. The Ticket was tagged in an ACT Minister's most recent post at that time, with the post presenting a policy announcement.

### **The breach in the Constitution as follows:**

3.1.6 It is an offence for an individual who is not currently a student of the university to campaign for a candidate in the election. For the purposes of this section, it is an offence for candidates and members of their campaign team to not carry their student cards while campaigning.

### **Action**

**Probity actioned a warning to 'Serve! For ANUSA' on the following basis that:**

1. Serve! had emailed Probity at 10:39 am notifying the team that they were unaware of the endorsement and in the process of asking the tag to be removed.
2. At 10:45am Probity received another email confirming the removal of the tag.
3. The complaint was received at 11:06 am.

### **The following interpretations were made:**

Noting the positive action and proactive response the ticket took, the Probity team's discretion was to offer a warning as this was unintentional and occurred without the ticket's knowledge.

Additionally, Probity was asked to clarify if the warning system was a strong reminder of the rules, or did it operate under a strike system. The explanation was provided by the Returning Officer (paraphrase):

- There is no strike system in place and warnings are a strong reminder of the rules.
- If a warning has been given and if an issue were to arise again, a lack of understanding or knowledge of the rule, cannot be relied on in a future situation.
- The existence of one/multiple warnings gives consideration for Probity/RO to the appropriate level of response allowing the team to take into consideration the

prior warnings and the specific circumstances of the new complaint/concern.

A strike system is not a good idea because:

- It may lead to the perception that it is somehow ok to break the rules a certain number of times before it becomes a problem, meaning rules would be broken with knowledge and intent.
- Limits Probity's flexibility to take into consideration the specific circumstances and merits of each concern/complaint/circumstance.

## **Recommendations**

That the ANUSA Constitution make it clearer as to what the consequences of a warning are to tickets and whether multiple complaints can lead to a more serious consequence.



## **Launch Party Held at Badger & Co**

On Wednesday 18th September, Probity received a complaint concerning Change For ANUSA's Launch Party held at Badgers (an exclusion zone). The party was approved by the Probity Team on the Friday 13th September that made the Ticket aware of s3.1.3A.

### **The breach in the Constitution is as follows:**

3.1.3A For the purposes of 3.1.3, 'actively canvassing votes' includes:

(a) engaging, communicating with or involving any other occupants of the space beyond the concerned ticket or candidate/s;

### **Based on Probity's investigation, the following interpretations were made:**

1. The Launch party was held in a separate section of Badger and Co, away from other occupants of the venue.
2. The Ticket was not in breach of Section 3.1.3A clauses (b) and (c).
3. It is not an electoral offence to sing Happy Birthday at a launch event.
4. The ban was imposed on the basis of having held the party in an exclusion zone and that the ticket knowingly invited what has been interpreted to be persons outside of the concerned ticket and/or candidate(s), despite being made aware of 3.1.3A of the election regulations when holding the party as per the previous email.
5. While Probity mistakenly used the word 'approve' for the party which caused a miscommunication between us and the ticket, ultimately, 'approval' was based on the ticket not breaching any electoral rules like they said they would not do.

## **Action**

A 48 hour campaign ban was actioned against Change your ANUSA. The ban included:

- No in-person campaigning was allowed. Flyers could not be handed out, posters could not be put up nor students affiliated with the ticket, were allowed to give speeches or talk to other students about the ticket.
- Prohibition from posting on all Social Media platforms including any web pages that may be affiliated (directly or indirectly) with the ticket. This also means that any social media accounts of anyone affiliated with the ticket, as defined above, is prohibited from posting anything that campaigns for or talks about the ticket. For the purpose of this condition, 'posts' include comments, photos, videos and blogs.

- Any social media content (posts/stories/reels etc.) from 12:00:00am Saturday 21 September 2024 onwards, must be taken down and not be put back before the end of the ban period. These must be taken down at least 15 minutes before the Ban period commences.
- All advertisements current and scheduled must be taken down for the duration of the ban period.
- Any content posted before 12:00:00am 2 days prior to the start of the campaigning ban period was allowed to remain on the ticket's social media and affiliated web pages/social media pages.

**Probity actioned a 48-hour campaign ban to Change on the following basis:**

- The Ticket had made a post regarding the Launch Party on all social media pages that stated, "Everybody [is] welcome, especially friends of the ticket."
- Probity interpreted this as an open invitation to those beyond the concerned ticket and/or candidate(s) on the balance of probabilities.
- As a result, section 2.11.7 of the electoral regulations states that 'For the purposes of 2.11.6, any person who campaigns for or on behalf of a candidate and/or registered ticket is considered to be a member of a campaign team.'
- Therefore Probity defined the 'ticket' to include any person who campaigns for or on behalf of a candidate and/or registered ticket.

## **Allegations of Voter Harassment**

During the voting period, Probity received several complaints regarding Left Action for voter harassment. This was concerning as the way Left Action was 'coercing' individuals to vote for their party included but was not limited to alleged verbal manipulation, accusations and physical intimidation.

**Based on Probity's investigation, the following interpretations were made:**

- The complaints were risen by students who stood nothing to gain from reporting Left Action and were therefore not malicious complaints to take them down.
- While the complaints lacked photographic evidence, on the balance of probabilities, due to the volume of allegations coming from students who were not involved in the elections it was found that Left Action had breached 3.1.3 and 3.1.7.
- These allegations are not only an electoral breach but are also against the ANU student code of conduct. Multiple complaints from several concerned individuals were accounted for and brought to the attention of Left Action.

## **Action**

Left Action was given a warning to rectify their mistakes to make known to all their campaigners to fix their behaviour. If more allegations arose after this warning, Left Action would receive a campaign ban for the rest of the voting period.

On 2 October, we received a complaint from an electoral candidate from an opposing ticket that a Left Action candidate had levelled false accusations against them publicly in front of voters that made them feel unsafe. After investigation, as Left Action had already received a warning, based on the balance of probabilities regarding the circumstances, language and approach of the accusations, the Left Action candidate received a campaign ban from 4:30 pm 2 October 2024 to 10 am 3 October 2024.

## Change and Serve! Misinformation Battle

Throughout the whole voting period, Change and Serve! were engaged in a misinformation battle.

### The rule relied on throughout the battle was:

3.1.2: It is an offence to publish any material that contains untrue statements or misrepresentations likely to mislead a voter in the casting of their vote.

At times, this rule was used sensibly, and at others, it was misused to the point where it became unproductive and **wasted everyone's time**. Probity would like to point out that submitting unserious misinformation claims seriously hinder our ability to action other real electoral issues promptly, adversely affecting the integrity of the election. We would strongly advise future tickets to refrain from doing so.

All decisions were made in light of balancing electoral rules and the free and fair debate of electoral topics.

### Change post connecting Brighter Together and Serve!

Change posted on their Instagram a meme with "Same ANUSA, Different Names" with the logos of tickets Brighter Together, Grassroots ANUSA, Power in Community, Together for ANUSA and Serve!. Serve! complained that none of the members of Serve! ran on Brighter Together, and therefore the post was misleading as they were not the "same".

As we considered the "incumbent" issue in student elections to be large enough to sway a voter in casting their vote, Change were asked to take down that post unless they could submit evidence contrary to Serve!. Note however, we did this reluctantly, as there is a belief that the "incumbents" of "grindies" (grassroots independent ticket) are all connected to one another with connected people running on each ticket, including Brighter Together and Serve!. This belief should not be censored by Probity as it is part of the free and fair debates in elections.

### Action

Change was given a warning and asked to take down the post or provide evidence contrary to Serve!'s complaint.

## **Change comment targeting Serve! about the Night Cafe and “Welfare Budget”**

Change commented on their Instagram directed at Serve including the statements “Where’s the night cafe?” and “Has [redacted] really done anything with Welfare besides use half the budget [on] magazines that were rejected by the majority of res halls?”

### **Probity’s findings after investigating and asking a response from Change found that:**

1. While members of Serve! were on tickets that supported the Night Cafe, there was no evidence that any of them were directly involved in policies to do with the night cafe, and therefore could not be held responsible for its failure.
2. Change did not provide evidence that the “welfare budget” (education welfare action group budget) and its use on “magazines” (counter course guides) were rejected by a majority of residential halls.
3. Thus, Change breached 3.1.2.

### **Action**

Because Change provided substantial evidence to their claims, they received a warning and were asked to take down their comment.

## **Beginning of the Misinformation Battle**

After these events, complaints of “misinformation” were brought up to Probity which was ridiculous.

### **These included:**

- Change bringing a complaint against Serve! because Serve! posted that they had the only Tasmanian candidate running in the election when Change had a candidate that lived in Tasmania for 5 years. The post was clearly satirical.
- Change complaining that Serve! stated that their foodbank policy “is only \*most\* of the length of [Change’s presidential candidate]’s entire president policy”, but in actuality Serve’s foodbank policy was 1121 words and the presidential policy was 3044 words, and thus was misinformation.
- Change complaining that Serve! should not be allowed to market themselves as independent. As evidence, they used a message from a chat approximately a year ago from a profile called “pookie” to prove this.

- While not happening after but during the Brighter Together incident, Serve! brought up a complaint against Change's post, with the post indicating that the grindies had failed to deliver the night cafe and Daley Road Bus. Serve! stated that they only promised to campaign for the issues, not deliver them, which they did do.

Probity had to respond to these misinformation claims while actual other serious complaints of voter harassment and canvassing votes in exclusion zones were brought up. This got to the point where Probity had to put their foot down to shut down this battle through a long email to both Change and Serve.

Summary of Probity's email to Change and Serve

1. **Both parties need to explain what the electoral rule being breached is and why, specifically, why it would likely "mislead a voter in the casting of their vote"**. One party satirically stating that they have the only Tasmanian in the election is very unlikely to mislead a voter in the casting of their vote. While, technically misinformation, this is irrelevant.
2. **Threshold of seriousness regarding complaints - complaints should be serious**. The foodbank policy word count and the Tasmanian incident were clearly not serious enough issues to complain about, and while technically misinformation, should not be brought to Probity.
3. **Burden of proof for misinformation - there must be substantial evidence to back your complaint**. Serve! relying on the semantic difference between the two words "campaign" for a policy and actually "delivering" a policy is not substantial evidence for misinformation. Change relying on someone named "pookie" from a chat approximately a year ago is not substantial enough.
4. **Balancing misinformation and free and fair debates in the election - there is a difference between the two**. Serve! will debate that they are independent, Change will debate they are not independent. These were issues to be debated about, not branded as misinformation.
5. **Communicate with each other before going to probity**. Both parties can debate with one another, and should communicate with one another if there is a post they do not like instead of going to Probity with it if it is not serious enough.

This seemed to work, and the unserious misinformation claims stopped.

## Recommendations

The ANUSA constitution allows Probity to use its discretion as to whether a complaint reaches a threshold of seriousness for investigation.

## **The Daley Bus Road Post**

Serve! posted on their Instagram that “The [Daley Road] Bus is coming back.” This was supported by information from the ANU website that a feasibility report would be prepared.

Change raised a complaint against this as they had received an email from the Minister of Transport stating that a feasibility report was not being prepared and that they were working with ANU to have this content removed from the website.

**Thus, they believed Serve! breached 3.1.2:** “It is an offence to publish any material that contains untrue statements or misrepresentations likely to mislead a voter in the casting of their vote.”

**Based on Probity’s investigation, the following interpretations were made:**

1. It is unproductive for students to question what ANU is publishing, and tickets shouldn’t have to double-check with government departments before they can refer to the policy in any way.
2. Serve!’s post therefore was not misinformation.

## **The counter-complaint and response post to the Daley Bus Road Post**

Change then raised a complaint that while the ANU information Serve! provided was not misinformation under our decision, the statement “The [Daley Road] Bus is coming back” was misleading because ANU has only promised a feasibility report, which was not a promise of the actual bus.

During Probity’s investigation of this matter, Change posted on their Instagram that “there is no tangible commitment to establish a Daley road bus”. Serve! complained against this post as it allegedly breached rule 2.11.6: “Candidates and/or members of their campaign team must cooperate with the Probity Officers in the exercise of their powers under 2.11.5.” where Change was going against the finding of Probity from the earlier decision.

**Based on Probity’s investigation, the following interpretations were made:**

1. As ANU had only promised a feasibility report and not a guarantee of the bus, Serve!’s post was misleading under rule 3.1.2.
2. Change’s statement “there is no tangible commitment to establish a Daley road bus” was misleading as a feasibility report is very much considered a “tangible commitment” to establish a bus, and was therefore misleading under rule 3.1.2.

## Action

Both Serve! and Change! needed to remove their posts. However, by the time this was actioned, Change had already removed their posts.



## Numerous Poster Complaints and Possible Breaches

Many complaints were raised against the campaigning posters around campus. These complaints included:

- Posters were put up with glue instead of tape, making them unremovable and leaving shreds on the wall that were difficult to clean up. This was an issue, particularly for people authorised to remove posters under rule 3.1.2A and who did not want posters at the entrances of their buildings.
- When ANU Facilities and Services staff were taking down campaigning posters as part of their contractual duties, students approached them to tell them not to remove the posters. However, it was not clear whether the people responsible for putting up the posters would also be responsible for taking them down.
- The substantial amount of posters made places in ANU look more haphazard and disorganised.

An email was sent out to all ticket convenors requesting the removal of posters after the elections. However, as of writing this report, there are still posters from tickets around the campus.

## Recommendations

1. The ANUSA constitution regulates a clean-up clause that holds tickets responsible for taking down all their posters after the election period.
2. The ANUSA constitution regulates how posters can be put up, allowing for easy removal post-election or removal by others authorised to do so.
3. That ANUSA communicates with buildings beforehand, especially residential halls to allow them to opt out of having posters within 15m of their entrances and in the building itself.

## **Posters In and Around Residential Halls**

A few complaints arose from residential halls regarding campaigning posters put up by tickets at the entrances of their halls and in the building itself. Residential halls are considered exclusion zones under Schedule B.

While rule 3.1.3 states that “It is an offence to actively canvass votes within the areas specified in Schedule B to these Regulations.”, under 3.1.3B, “putting up posters” is not considered actively canvassing. Under 3.1.2A, it is “an offence to remove from any place any Electoral Publication”, however 3.1.2A(b) states that no offence is committed by “a person who has the right to control the entrance to the place where the publication lies or that person's agent.”

A residential hall leader stated that their residential hall was apolitical to ensure a safe and enjoyable environment for all residents and that they would remove ticket campaign posters within 15m of their entrances. They requested that this be communicated to all tickets with posters around their hall. They also pointed out that in the 2024 ANUSA Election guide on page 9, it stated that campaigning material, including posters, should not be displayed in exclusion zones.

Other halls did have posters at the entrances and inside the building. This raises concerns for students who might feel overwhelmed that they cannot escape student politics even in their own residence.

## **Recommendations**

1. That ANUSA ensure that Election Guides and other official election related documentation are consistent with each other on the rules.
2. That ANUSA communicate with residential halls before elections about whether the hall accepts having campaigning materials within 15m of their entrances, and if they do not consent, that this be communicated to all tickets.
3. That ANUSA communicates generally with residential halls after elections to gain insight about the impact of posters in and around the halls and how it may affect students who feel like they cannot escape student politics even in their own home.

## **Environmental Officer Candidate Eligibility**

On Monday 23rd of September, Probity received a complaint concerning Progress' Environmental Officer Candidate, Shreyas Kumar and his eligibility.

### **The active member requirements as per 7.3.2 of the Election Regulations are:**

7.3.2 An active member of a Department means:

- (a) a member who has attended three meetings of that Department in that Academic year, with the exception of Disabilities where the requirement is two meetings; or
- (b) a member who, although they do not satisfy regulation 7.3.2(a), are recognised as an active member by a majority vote of the members of the Department concerned who are themselves active members as provided under regulation. (2022 Probity Report paraphrase)

### **The Probity Team began investigating, and the following evidence was provided.**

- Environment Collective Rolling Minutes confirmed that Shreyas had attended 2 meetings but not the mandatory 3.
- The confusion occurred because Shreyas and Progress thought the threshold for being an active member was met due to Shreya's attendance at 2 meetings and 1 additional event organised (banner painting).
- As a result, Shreyas attended an additional meeting, which met the threshold for an active department member.

### **Based on Probity's investigation, the following interpretations were made:**

Shreyas had attended a meeting, and he clearly intended to be an active member, so he was allowed to run for the Environmental Candidate position.

### **Action**

The candidate was eligible after attending a meeting, therefore fulfilling the 3 meetings required.

## **False Claims on Campaigning Material**

On Thursday 19th September, Probity received a complaint concerning Progress using the word “embezzlement” on their campaigning material. The specific statement was “Stop the embezzlement of Enviro Collective funds” on their posters, and further investigation by probity found the statement “Stop the embezzlement of the department’s funds by political groups” on an Instagram reel reposted by the Progress Instagram account.

### **The alleged breach in the constitution is as follows:**

3.1.2: It is an offence to publish any material that contains untrue statements or misrepresentations likely to mislead a voter in the casting of their vote.

The issue was whether the term “embezzlement” was a misrepresentation or was untrue, as this claim would likely mislead a voter in casting their vote.

### **Based on Probity’s investigation, the following interpretations were made:**

- Progress based their definition of “embezzlement” on the Oxford dictionary definition: “theft or misappropriation of funds placed in one's trust”.
- Progress provided substantial evidence that the actions of the Environment Collective fell under this definition.
- However, because there are many definitions of the word “embezzlement” (eg the term embezzlement has a different meaning under the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW)), and there is no single source of authority for the definitions of words in the constitution, the evidence Progress provided did not fall under a majority of the definitions of “embezzlement”.
- Thus, Progress had breached 3.1.2.

### **Action**

A warning was issued to Progress on the use and term of ‘embezzlement.’ This was in light of Progress providing substantial evidence for their claim, and they were highly receptive when we told them to stop using the word ‘embezzlement’ during our investigation.

Furthermore, Progress was instructed to remove posters and prevent any social media post using the term ‘embezzlement.’

## **A Ticket Covering Other Tickets' Electoral Posters with their Own**

A complaint was raised against Progress as their posters were placed on top of other tickets' posters, blocking them from view.

### **The breach in the constitution is as follows:**

3.1.2 A: It is an offence to remove from any place any Electoral Publication. (unless removal is covered under 3.1.2A (a),(b),(c) or (d)).

Even though Progress did not remove other tickets' posters, Progress placing their posters on top of them to the point where you could not tell the content of the other tickets' posters was equivalent to removing them.

### **Action**

Progress was given a warning and was given one business day to remove the offending posters.

### **Recommendations**

That the ANUSA constitution makes it clearer as to what constitutes as removal of an electoral publication that includes covering electoral material up.

## **Late Signed Daily Statement**

Daily Signed Statements by tickets were due at 9am every day of the voting period (Monday 30 September - Thursday 3 October 2024). Failure to submit daily signed statements by 9am would result in a campaign ban until the Daily Signed Statement was submitted to probity. This is covered under rule 2.10.2 of Disclosure Requirements in the constitution.

On Monday 30 September, due to a technical error where the form to submit the Daily Signed Statement was not working until later on, tickets were given until 12pm to submit their Daily Signed Statements. This was then extended to 4pm for all tickets who had not submitted it by 12pm as there were a large amount of tickets who still had not submitted them and to give them the benefit of the doubt.

Globalise the Resistance for Palestine failed to submit their Daily Signed Statement until 7:30pm that day. They had been imposed a campaign ban from 4pm, however, they were actively campaigning during this time on University Avenue. Multiple emails were sent including a call and a text during this time. When Globalise the Resistance for Palestine finally responded, the convenor stated that they had forgotten to press the submit button on the form, and due to their phone and laptop being out of charge, they had not received any communication from Probity about the campaign ban. When contacted in person about Probity trying to reach them, they did not realise the urgency in the matter until reading the online communication. We accepted this reasoning in good faith, however, we still needed to balance fair electoral processes.

## **Action**

- Globalise the Resistance for Palestine were given a campaign ban from 4pm-7:30pm on Tuesday 1 October, as this would have been the campaign ban they would have served on Monday 30 September for not submitting their Daily Signed Statement in time.
- The campaign ban included no in person campaigning and online campaigning, and any online posts posted from 12pm that day needed to be taken down during this time.

## **Recommendations**

That the ANUSA Constitution regulates a second contact for tickets in case the convenor cannot be contacted.

## **Minor Exclusion Zone Violations During Voting Period by Multiple Tickets**

Multiple tickets during the voting period were reported to have breached exclusion zones.

The most common one was the exclusion zone outlined in Schedule B of the constitution: “The Copland precinct, including the ramp and stairway to Kingsley Street”.

Many tickets actively canvassed votes on the ramp to Kingsley street. However, as these breaches were a matter of metres, violating tickets received a warning and after this they were not breached again. More serious breaches, or repeated offences have been outlined as separate issues in this report. Tickets should take care in the future to fully notify all campaigners of the exclusion zone areas and map.

## **Large Volume of Complaints and Students' Lack of Knowledge of Electoral Rules**

The Probity team had received a higher volume of complaints during the 2024 election period in comparison to the 2023 election period. This led to a significant backlog of complaints, resulting in a larger than usual volume of 'follow-up' emails that were sent to the Probity inbox. This was due to Probity only having a team of 3 people this year, and there was very limited promotion of the role.

Furthermore, many students did not know their electoral rights under the constitution as they do not know the rules even exist. This is detrimental for students who are unknowingly being taken advantage of by poor electoral behaviour.

### **Recommendations**

1. That ANUSA spend more time promoting the role of Probity Officer so a larger team can deal with the volume of complaints.
2. That ANUSA create a more streamlined process that would enable Probity to better manage complaints. This would include:
  - a. A form for students to lodge their complaint
  - b. A customised database that enables the probity team to update the 'status' of the complaint and send automated emails, set templates to send emails or send customised emails from the database using the probity email address
3. A document that summarises electoral regulations should be made available to the student body. This will enable a fairer election as students will be able to have a voice in the goings on of the election



# Financial Report

Below are the financial expenditures by ticket in alphabetical order. The probity team has also included the anticipated spending declared by each ticket/individual at the beginning of the campaigning period.

## Statement of Intention

| Ticket/Individual  | Anticipated sources of Financial contributions  | Estimated expenditure  | Anticipated non-financial contributions  |
|--------------------|---|--|--|
| Brenna Barker-Lamb | None  | None Declared  | Printing Services for approx. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 20x A4 Sheets of paper using ANU printers</li> </ul>  |
| Change your ANUSA  | Harry Danton Jack, Sam Gorrie, Sree Vaishnavi Gangarapu, Josh Polak, Lara Johnson, Lux Strugar, Ashlyn Horton, Will Burfoot, Brandon Lee, Milli McDonald, Samuel MacRae, Kiera Rosenberg, Hayden O'Brien, Dylan Adams, Charley Ellwood, Rosie Paton, Harrison Oates, Eloisa Belmar, Josh Shaw, Lucy Williams, Flynn Goerlitz. | <p><b>\$1,300.</b> We currently plan to run between 31-34 candidates, giving us a space of approximately <b>\$60-100</b> for extra spending that is necessary/unexpected during the campaign while remaining under the spending cap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ticket branded T-Shirts <b>\$175</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This includes \$110 for the physical shirts, \$40 for dye, and \$25 for screenprinting ink.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Website <b>\$60.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ With \$30 dollars for the purchase of the subscription and \$30 for the domain.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Fabric for banners <b>\$50</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The construction of</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Home printing of items,</li> <li>● The items used in and for screen printing of T-shirts, and</li> <li>● Already owned items of chalk, sticky tape, and paint.</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>banners from material come from the non-financial and time-based contributions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Printed Flyers <b>\$500</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This will be increased (with our space budget under the total \$1300 budget for spending) based on whether more are needed as the campaign week progresses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Facebook advertisements <b>\$250</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We also expect this may be increased based on the number of extra flyers we print, and the efficacy of the ads (if they cost more).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |
| Free Parking                           | <b>\$239</b> from 1 Candidate  | <b>\$239</b>   | None Declared  |
| Globalise the Resistance for Palestine | <p>Candidates of the Ticket:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Bea \$28</li> <li>● Finn \$28</li> <li>● Elise \$28</li> <li>● Remi \$28</li> <li>● Pippa \$28</li> <li>● Grace A \$28</li> <li>● Mickey \$28</li> </ul> | <p><b>\$190</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Printing \$100</li> <li>● Shirts \$90</li> </ul>  | <p>Candidates and supporters of the ticket</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A-frame (owned by Mickey) \$108</li> <li>● Table (owned by Mickey) \$40</li> <li>● Banner (spare calico owned by Finnian) \$15</li> <li>● Paint (owned by Mickey) \$10</li> <li>● Chalk pens (owned by Mickey) \$15</li> </ul> |

|                              |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                              |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tape (owned by Mickey) \$10</li> <li>• Clipboards (several, owned by Mickey, Finn, Bea, Elise) \$20</li> <li>• Pens (several, owned by ticket candidates) \$5</li> </ul>  |
| Jiacheng Zhang               | None Declared  | <b>\$0</b>                                       | Ethical Sources  |
| Left Action - Free Palestine | Aemonn Hassan, Aveline Cayir, Carter Chryse, Chris Morris, Connor Heins, Jamie Gray, Josh Kummerow, Nick Reich, Sarah Dillon, Yerin Park, Fundraising BBQ  | <b>\$999</b> Spending Cap                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screenprinting materials (existing ink, rig, screens) from Aveline Cayir</li> <li>• Stall materials (table, gazebo property of ticket members) from Nick Reich, Socialist Alternative ANU</li> <li>• A-frames (recycled form last year) from Nick Reich, Aveline Cayir</li> <li>• Printer, paper, ink (from ticket members) from Carter Chryse</li> </ul> |
| Progress for ANUSA           | ANU Liberal Club, William Roche, Max Tobin, Adryan Hermawan, Anton Vassallo, Claire Oberdorfer, James Donnelly, Jeremy Fox, Kunj Guglani, Peerson Lynch, Sreenath Didugu, Tom Wood, Shreyas Kumar, Luxue Wang, Ruibiao Zhu, Ryan Guo | <b>\$800</b> Budget                              | Edwina Royce, Keira Williams, Claire Oberdorfer, William Roche   |
| Res for NUS                  | Matilda Cooper Ayres, Harry Danton Jack, Sam Gorrie,   | <b>\$400</b> Budget<br><b>\$480</b> Spending Cap | Matilda Cooper Ayres, Sam Gorrie, Ashlyn Horton  |

|                  |  |  |   |
|------------------|--|--|---|
|                  | Ashlyn Horton  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Printing <b>\$350</b></li> <li>● Facebook Advertisements <b>\$50</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Time spent involved in the distribution of flyers in campaigning and to other volunteers who may sign-up to be involved in active campaigning.</li> <li>● Time spent printing and folding flyers ('How to votes') to be handed out.</li> </ul> |
| Serve! for ANUSA | <p><b>\$1100</b> from Candidates:<br/> Skye Predavec, Seungbin Kang, Alex Bako, Chiamaka Oba, Lee-Ann De Souza, Mitha Mallichetty, Harriet Ryder, Alicia Humphrey, Pankhuri Tiwary, Giorgia Marchiori, Chith Weliamuna, Eduardo Caceres, Mirielle Augustin, Holly Mellor, Isabelle Zhu Maguire, Ziyang Peng, Bhumika Khanna, Elaine Li, Lea Fallen, Sameer Ali, Saskia Hughes, Will Chen, Shane MacDonald, Aman Kumar, Ananya Malani, Jewel Joanna, Iz Coombs, Kuba Meikle, Blair Doran, Jessica Gunawan, Daniella Byishimo, Lucy Woolnough,</p> | <b>\$1100</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 4x Corflutes <b>\$10</b></li> <li>● 2x A-Frames <b>\$30</b></li> <li>● Printing facilities <b>\$200</b></li> <li>● Paint <b>\$15</b></li> <li>● Speakers <b>\$10</b></li> <li>● Trestle table <b>\$10</b></li> </ul>                           |

|                    |   |   |   |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
|                    | Sarah Strange, and Ainoujin Na.   |   |   |
| Sharif Mustajib    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Personal Funds</li> <li>● Donations</li> </ul>           | None Declared   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Printing and Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Flyers, Posters and Other Campaign Materials</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Advertising on Social Media Platforms</li> <li>● Support from friends and volunteers will include materials such as paper, glue, and T-shirts. Additionally, assistance with canvassing and organising events</li> </ul> |
| Solidarity for NUS | Milli McDonald, Samuel Macrae, Josh Polak, Charley Ellwood, Dylan Adams, Josh Shaw, Eloisa Belmar | <b>\$697</b> Spending Cap<br><b>\$300</b> Budget <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● \$150 on Meta advertising</li> <li>● \$150 on Printing of 'How to Vote' flyers</li> </ul> | Milli McDonald, Samuel Macrae   |

## Daily Signed Statements

| Ticket             | Actual sources of Financial contributions   | Total actual expenditure  | Total actual non-financial contributions   |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| Brenna Barker-Lamb | <b>\$0</b>  | <b>\$0</b>  | N/A  |
| Change your ANUSA  | <b>\$1000</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ashlyn Horton \$200</li> <li>● Milli McDonald \$200</li> <li>● Will Burfoot \$200</li> <li>● Sam MaCrae \$100</li> <li>● Sam Gorrie \$100</li> <li>● Brandon Lee \$50</li> <li>● Josh Polak \$50</li> <li>● Harry Danton Jack \$50</li> <li>● Lara Johnson \$50</li> </ul> | <b>\$862.30</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● T-Shirts - \$112.50</li> <li>● Dye (bought 5, used 3) - \$40.00</li> <li>● Banner fabric - \$50.00</li> <li>● HTV Printing - \$411.69</li> <li>● Stickers - \$36.68</li> <li>● Badges - \$35.48</li> <li>● Squarespace subscription \$22.00</li> <li>● Website domain - \$27.00</li> <li>● Advertising on meta - \$23.55</li> <li>● Advertising on meta - \$13.90</li> <li>● Advertising on meta - \$5.34</li> <li>● Green paper - \$24.39</li> <li>● A-Frames (bought 8, using 4) - \$30</li> <li>● Advertising on Meta - \$9.90</li> </ul> | <b>\$420</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Home Printing - Milli McDonald (50)</li> <li>● Screen Printing Ink - Ashlyn Horton (20)</li> <li>● Other shirts already owned by candidates - Kiana Levy, Madeline Hele, Lucy Williams, Ana Fernandes, Rosie Paton, Charley Ellwood, Leila Clarke, Milli McDonald, Lilly Bradbery (\$15 each, 135\$ total)</li> <li>● Sticky tape - Ashlyn Horton (10)</li> <li>● A frames - Sinead Winn (free)</li> <li>● Birthday Cake - Ashlyn Horton (85)</li> <li>● ANU printing credit - Samuel MaCRae, Penelope Robson, Will burfoot, Hayden O'Brien, Kiera Rosenberg, Darcy Oates, Ana Fernandez, Dylan Adams (Approx \$15 each, \$120 total)</li> </ul> |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corflutes to put on a frames - Samuel MaCrae, Milli McDonald (covered by posters) (free)</li> </ul>   |
| Free Parking                           | <b>\$0</b>  | <b>\$0</b>   | N/A  |
| Globalise the Resistance for Palestine | <b>\$0</b>  | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$118.76</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tape - Mickey (10)</li> <li>• Clipboards - Mickey, Finn, Bea, Elise (20)</li> <li>• Pens - Owned by ticket candidates (5)</li> <li>• Table - Mickey (40)</li> <li>• Banner - Finnian (15)</li> <li>• Scissors - Mickey (5)</li> <li>• Paper (ANU) - Student Printing Credit (120 sheets/ A4 = \$13.20, 24 sheets/A3 = \$10.56)</li> </ul> |
| Jiacheng Zhang                         | <b>\$0</b>  | <b>\$0</b>   | N/A  |
| Left Action - Free Palestine           | <b>\$443.70</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BBQ contributions - \$148</li> <li>• Contributions from all ticket members, equally split: \$443.70</li> </ul> | <b>\$591.02</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Website \$44.99</li> <li>• BBQ materials \$34.13</li> <li>• Pposter printing (ANU) \$68</li> <li>• Printing (Kwik Kopy) \$443.70</li> </ul> | <b>\$306.49</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing stall materials - Socialist Alternative ANU \$195</li> <li>• Screen printing rig - Aveline Cayir \$100.49</li> <li>• A-frames - Nick Reich, Aveline Cayir, Frames from the tip, velcro tape for \$5</li> </ul>   |

|                    |   |  |  |
|--------------------|---|--|--|
|                    |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Printer, paper, ink - Carter Chryse, Printer and paper free from facebook marketplace, paper \$6</li> </ul>   |
| Progress for ANUSA | <b>\$374.94</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ANU Liberal Club \$374.94</li> </ul>   | <b>\$374.97</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facebook Ads \$315.37</li> <li>Postering Supplies \$19.60</li> <li>Posters \$40</li> </ul>  | <b>\$30</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Graphic Design - Claire (\$30)</li> </ul>   |
| Res for NUS        |   | <b>\$171.52</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Printed HTV Flyers \$171.52</li> </ul>  | N/A  |
| Serve! for ANUSA   | <b>\$1345</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skye Predavec \$350</li> <li>Seungbin Kang \$225</li> <li>Lee-Ann De Souza \$100</li> <li>Mitha Mall \$95</li> <li>Harriet Ryder \$95</li> <li>Chiamaka Oba \$80</li> <li>Alex Bako \$0</li> <li>Alicia Humphrey \$40</li> <li>Giorgia Dalla Libera Marchiori \$40</li> <li>Pankhuri Tiwari \$40</li> <li>Edan Habel \$30</li> <li>Isabella Coombs \$40</li> <li>Blair Doran \$40</li> <li>Ananya Malani \$25</li> <li>Ziyang Peng \$25</li> <li>Shane Macdonald \$25</li> </ul> | <b>\$1091.94</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Website URL Cost \$20.79</li> <li>Squarespace \$34.65</li> <li>Tape \$22.62</li> <li>Printing (officeworks) \$30.00</li> <li>Sponges \$10.17</li> <li>Tape \$2.99</li> <li>Sub-Total \$66.74</li> <li>Facebook Ads: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FB to 22/09 \$99.09</li> <li>FB to 23/09 \$78.84</li> <li>FB to 24/09 \$98.57</li> <li>FB to 25/09 \$101.35</li> <li>FB to 26/09 \$14.02</li> <li>FB to 27/09 \$147.65</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <b>\$124.16</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speaker - Seungbin Kang (\$10)</li> <li>Trestle Table - Skye Predavec (\$2)</li> <li>Cardboard - Skye Predavec (\$1)</li> <li>2x Corflutes Skye Predavec (\$5)</li> <li>2x A-Frames Skye Predavec (\$30)</li> <li>Camera - Seungbin Kang (\$22.16)</li> <li>Wheatpaste flour Lea Fallen (\$14)</li> <li>Canva Pro - Alex Bako (\$40)</li> </ul> |



|                    |   |   |     |
|--------------------|---|---|-----|
|                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jewel Joanna Cabardo \$25</li> <li>• Kuba Meikle \$25</li> <li>• Isabelle Zhu Maguire \$25</li> <li>• Lea Fallen \$25</li> <li>• Jessica Gunawan \$20</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FB to 28/09 \$134.47</li> <li>• FB to 29/09 \$223.46</li> <li>• FB to 30/09 \$82.15</li> </ul> |     |
| Sharif Mustajib    | \$0   | \$0   | N/A |
| Solidarity for NUS | \$0   | \$0   | N/A |

## Recommendations

We recommend that ANUSA formalise the process for financial submissions to streamline the logistics behind it:

1. A form that is connected to the inbox for the statement of intentions.
2. A form that is connected to the inbox for the daily signed statements.

This will allow the probity team to easily keep track of daily signed statements, ensuring that electoral rules are followed and that the election is fair.