

GSOC Votes Committee Post Election Report
April 27, 2016

1. *On Generating This Report*

- 1.1. On April 18-22 this Votes Committee of GSOC-UAW Local 2110 administered an election and referendum vote. Now that this committee has completed our task, we have compiled the following report. This report will conclude the service of this Votes Committee. Further questions can be addressed to GSOC's Communications Committee at gsoc.comm@gmail.com.
- 1.2. Elections were completed and the results announced early on the morning (~6am) of April 22. Since this time our committee, which is made up of a majority of Jewish members, has been occupied with observing Passover. This report is being released at the earliest possible opportunity.
- 1.3. This report accounts for the actions of the Votes Committee and the decisions we made in preparation for and during the election and vote. We neither imply nor intend to account for the actions of individuals.
- 1.4. Overall, we ran this election with the intention of maximizing inclusivity, transparency and democratic integrity. At every stage we considered the needs and requests of GSOC members. For example, we were sensitive to the needs of observant Jews in the run up to Passover and insisted on online votes and extended voting so as to allow all of our membership to participate in the vote.

2. *Makeup of Votes Committee*

- 2.1. As we wrote in our interim report released April 19, our committee was constituted by a varying subset of a total of 7 people between February and April. The committee was formed on February 10, 2016. It was composed of Jacob Denz, Michael Gould Wartofsky, Darach Miller, Tess Rankin, and Shelly Ronen. Jessica Feldman joined the Votes Committee shortly thereafter on March 9, and Parth Singh joined on April 3.
- 2.2. Denz formally resigned from the Votes Committee on April 18. Till April 18 Denz had been cc'd on committee communications, though did not reply to emails between February 25 and April 18. Denz attended no committee meetings. We were unaware of Denz's intention to run for election, nor did we have knowledge of his acceptance of nomination prior to the Local's Notice announcing results by acclamation.

3. *Membership Definitions and Election Eligibility*

- 3.1. We devote some space here to what we consider to be necessary background for understanding the complicated lead up to the election.
- 3.2. Who is a member, who is a member in good standing, and who may vote in the elections of GSOC-UAW Local 2110 are questions that have been the subject of ongoing disagreement and debate. GSOC and the Local differ in their opinions as to what rights ought to be granted to graduate students who are not currently

employed as TA's, RA's, GA's or some other job separate from their stipended work.

- 3.3. In part this disagreement arises from Management's (NYU's) attempts to prevent unionization. In 2009, Management restructured its graduate student funding in a reform colloquially referred to as "FAR 4." FAR4 provided "four to five years of fellowship... eliminating teaching as a condition of receiving financial aid, and providing compensation above and beyond fellowship when students teach"¹ -- that is, when they work. By disaggregating our compensation derived as fellowships from compensation specifically given for "work," management attempted to claim that our ongoing research is not work. We believe this to be an attempt to weaken our ability to form a union. This did not work, though Management's undermining actions appear to be casting long shadows over our union's ongoing operations. We consider it imperative to resist Management's attempts to undermine our power as a union.
- 3.4. It is our understanding that the position of the Local prior to Management's voluntary recognition in 2013 and prior to the struggle to negotiate a contract which concluded in spring 2015, was that any graduate student who signed a union card was a member. Any graduate student who signed a card was permitted to vote in the vote to unionize on December 11, 2013. Any graduate student who signed a card was permitted to vote to ratify the contract on April 8, 2015.
- 3.5. Since spring 2015 the position of the Local is now that members must, in addition to having signed a card, be currently working and thus paying dues. The Local now maintains that only these "members in good standing" may run for elected office and perhaps (at times) that only they may vote.
- 3.6. It is our understanding that the position of GSOC's membership differs from the Local. Our Unit Bylaws, which were ratified by a member vote on October 10, 2015, state in Article 4. A that, "Full membership rights in this unit will be given to everyone eligible to work in a union position who signs a union membership card." This means that anyone eligible to work in the union who signs a card is eligible to nominate themselves for elected office and vote.
- 3.7. It is our opinion that much if not all of the controversy of these elections stems from this debate. As a Votes Committee, we did not concern ourselves with this debate, but rather faithfully executed our task under the most directly pertinent rules: those of GSOC bylaws. We strongly recommend that GSOC and Local 2110 come to some formal agreement on the matter.
- 3.8. The election committee met for the first time on February 29. During this meeting, Executive board member Patrick Gallagher informed us that we could administer the stewards election and referendum using our Unit criteria for eligibility. We took him at his word and proceeded accordingly.

¹ New York University, McCracken Fellowship Guidelines. Accessible at: econ.as.nyu.edu/object/gsas.pdfs.far4guidelines, p 2.

- 3.9. Gallagher said that the Local had its own criteria for nominees to Joint Council (JC). The Local, he said, would insist on administering the JC vote. Gallagher also said that the Local may be willing to be flexible on these eligibility criteria for JC nominees because our Unit is not composed of members who work continuously. Gallagher advised us that he would confer with others at the Local and confirm. We did not hear of any result.
 - 3.10. On April 5 the Local sent us a revised draft notice of elections which specified that "all members in good standing" could run for Shop Steward and that "members in good standing for six months" could run for Joint Council seats. This was in conflict with prior practice, in-person communications of February 29, and our own bylaws.
 - 3.11. Gallagher attended our Assembly of Stewards meeting on April 9 and said nothing about this matter. He was unequivocal on the Local's position that steward and JC elections be conducted only in person, a request we complied with.
 - 3.12. To seek understanding and agreement with the Local about how best to proceed in accordance with unit and Local bylaws as well as the IUAW constitution, we contacted Gallagher and Rosenstein by email and then phone requesting clarification on this issue. In response to an email from GSOC member Nate Preus asking about JC eligibility on April 11, Rosenstein replied, "I'm not sure what your question about eligibility is." Preus followed up the same day with no response. Vote Committee member Ronen called Rosenstein. Ronen's phone call, voicemail and text message on April 12 went unreturned. Later on April 12, Rosenstein responded to Preus writing, "we sent out a draft notice to the Votes Committee that included the eligibility requirements." This did not provide us with clarifying information, nor did it help with the contradictions between the several communications and documents. Preus sent further requests for clarification in several emails on April 13, 14 and 15. Rosenstein replied on April 15, shortly after the deadline for nomination submissions had closed writing - at which time the question was of course moot - writing, "We will post a notice shortly with the names of eligible candidates."
4. *Online Vote Administration*
 - 4.1. During the Votes Committee meeting on February 29, Miller, Rankin, and Ronen attended and met with Gallagher. During this meeting the Committee informed Gallagher of our intent to administer elections using online, as had been done for the ratification of the Bylaws in the spring of 2015.
 - 4.2. During the meeting of February 29, Gallagher stated that the Local would oppose online voting for all but the BDS referendum. He expressed concern about the security and integrity of online balloting. We took these concerns seriously and as such redoubled our commitment to use Helios, a secure online balloting service.
 - 4.3. Helios operates with a two-step identity verification for maximum security. The system sends a ballot to a voter's email address and then after they have

followed the link and voted, it sends them a second email to verify their identity. The content of the vote is cryptographically anonymous, and administrators can only see if a voter has cast a ballot by submitting their cryptographically signed hash. To administer this, we required a list of eligible voters and their email addresses from the Local, which does not make these data available to us on a general basis.

- 4.4. Our first request for this list was communicated verbally to Gallagher on February 29 and several times subsequently by Stewards Unit Rep Ella Wind on March 10. A further email was sent by Unit Rep Ella Wind to Gallagher and Rosenstein (as well as the GSOC stewards listserv) on March 14th once again requesting an update to the card signers list, with no response. Following another email on March 28th about this issue from Wind, Gallagher responded, "We will produce lists of card signers for use at the polling place if a vote is triggered between now and the end of the semester." Wind responded on the same day that this arrangement would hinder the ability of votes committee to carry out an online vote. Gallagher wrote that lists would only be turned over to Votes Committee "if there is a contested election." Another email was sent by Wind to Gallagher and Rosenstein before the April 5 Assembly of Stewards meeting again requesting their attendance to discuss why list access had still not been granted after several weeks of requests. After further back and forth emailing on April 6 between Ronen and Rosenstein on April 6, two phone calls between Rosenstein and Ronen on April 11, and Communications Committee Chris Nickell and Local 2110 staff member Shep Clyman, a list was sent from Clyman to Nickell on April 11.
 - 4.5. An updated list was requested by Nickell on April 18 and supplied by the Local on the same day. This list was requested because the Committee was informed that several organizers from caucuses highly invested in the referendum had collected a significant number of cards from new members who wished to receive electronic ballots, and they had been entered into the list in the interim between April 11 and April 18.
5. *Call for Nominations*
 - 5.1. A call for nominations was drafted by the Local and sent by Gallagher to Rankin and Ronen of the Votes Committee on March 10. In the emailed draft, the deadline for submitted nomination acceptance was 3pm at April 15, with voting to take place on April 20 and 21. The call for nominations was set out to membership by the Communications Committee on April 6.
 - 5.2. In the interim between this draft and the final call being sent out by GSOC's Communications Committee, the Votes Committee had determined that a longer vote period was preferable, in order to maximize involvement. On April 5 and April 6 members of the GSOC for Open Dialogue caucus and the GSOC for BDS caucus requested online voting so as to be as inclusive a process as possible. Since the referendum regarding BDS was very important to many Jewish

members, the week of voting was set to be immediately prior to the beginning of Passover. This was communicated to Gallagher in person at the Assembly of Stewards meeting on April 5th and Gallagher offered no objections. We thus decided to extend voting. The call for nominations was edited accordingly before being sent out on April 6.

- 5.3. On March 10, the Local was aware of only two current stewards who were stepping down (Michelle O'Brien and Ella Wind). On April 10, Sean Larson sent an email to Gallagher and Ronen informing us of his intention to resign bringing the total number of vacant seats in the district of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences Humanities and Social Sciences to three.
 - 5.4. We regret that our committee did not edit the Local's draft to include a request that nominees also send their paperwork to our Committee's email address since this would have kept our committee informed and, critically, served as an additional check against oversights. One such oversight was the exclusion of Ziad Dallal who was eligible even by the Local's own criteria. Dallal was subsequently accepted by the Local and announced as elected by acclamation in the Revised Notice of Election of April 18 (see below in 6.3 and 6.4).
6. *Unilateral Election Results*
- 6.1. On April 15, shortly after the deadline for the nominations submissions, the Votes Committee expected to receive communications from the Local with confirmation of the final candidates. Instead, we all received, along with the entire membership on the Local's email list, a Notice of Election with results by acclamation. We were thoroughly confused by this communication and its effect to undermine our stated task of administering fair and democratic elections.
 - 6.2. The statement that was drafted immediately following this notice, "GSOC Election Interference" asked members to disregard this prior notice. Based on our information at the time, it appeared that nominees had been excluded using inconsistent criteria. We were not aware that the exclusion of Dallal was a mistake. In this call we also requested that any nominees who had been excluded reach out to us directly so that we could review the matter. The Communications Committee reiterated this request in the communication of April 18, "Critical Member Update" in which we asked for omitted candidates to bring themselves to the Votes Committee's attention by Tuesday, April 19 by noon.
 - 6.3. As we mention above in 5.4, the Local's notice of April 18, "Revised Notice & Response on Election" corrected the erroneous omission of Dallal from their results of election by acclamation. This clarified for our committee that the Local had consistently applied criteria, albeit narrower eligibility criteria than we had expected. This was in direct contradiction to what we had been told by Gallagher on February 29, and the criteria we considered appropriate by virtue of its adherence to our unit Bylaws.
 - 6.4. While Dallal was inappropriately *excluded*, another candidate was inappropriately *included*. At the time of the Notice of Elections by acclamation on April 15, Jacob

Denz was simultaneously serving on the Votes Committee. The Committee was not aware that Denz was also a nominee. His simultaneous service and candidacy were highly improper. It was in violation of well known rules that Maida Rosenstein herself enforced when she insisted in an email exchange of April 15 that Chris Nickell, who was a known candidate, be removed from communications possibly pertaining to Votes Committee business. When Ronen pointed out the inappropriacy of Denz's candidacy and service on the Votes Committee in an email of April 18, he immediately resigned.

- 6.5. The Committee was very concerned about this issue, but decided to permit Denz's candidacy on ballots in order to honor our commitment to inclusivity and a democratic process. We were subsequently disappointed that on April 21 Denz published excerpts of communications sent only to the Votes Committee. These communications were not shared with any other nominees, and should not have been shared widely by Denz, who had clearly recognized the inappropriateness of his both serving on our Committee and running for JC representative.

7. *Delay of Vote*

- 7.1. Following the Local's unilateral announcement of election results, our committee drafted an open letter in which we decided to delay the vote in the hopes that we could meet with the Local and come to some agreement. We sent our open letter to the Executive Board at 10.26am on April 18 and received no response. Rosenstein sent some members of the Votes Committee (among others) an email at 6.03pm that day so we can assume that she saw the open letter but chose not to respond to it.
- 7.2. In the absence of any communications from the Local in response to our request for an amicable resolution, the Votes Committee drafted and sent a second open letter on April 19 along with an interim election report to Local 2110 explaining our decision to go ahead with voting for stewards and JC seats. In this call we urged the Local to lend its support to the elections.

8. *Request to Withdraw Names from Ballot*

- 8.1. On Tuesday, April 19 at 9.29pm the Votes Committee received an email from Samuel Zerin and apparently (but not verified) signed by Zerin, Ilana Ben-Ezra, Lauren Bernstein, Mijal Bitton, Aryeh Genet, Michael Heller, and Yechezkel Eis requesting their names be removed from the ballot. We responded asking those individuals to reconsider and offered to meet with them the morning before the election began at 12pm. We made ourselves available and waited for the invited candidates to meet with us at 8.30am on April 20.
- 8.2. At 9.57am on April 20 we replied to Sam Zerin and cc'd every signatory, stating that we could not remove them from the ballot with so little notice and without having confirmed the identities and wishes of those signed on to the email. We suggested they distribute a notification of their wish to withdraw in an area near the voting sites where this is allowed: more that 20 feet from the ballot box. Their

names were thus included on the ballots, except that of Aryeh Genet who had not previously informed us of his nomination as stipulated in communications of April 15 and April 18.

- 8.3. Though these candidates did not meet with our Committee, Zerlin replied to our invitation at 10.13am on April 20 expressing an openness to meet and a hope that GSOC and the Local could come to an agreement about membership definitions and nomination eligibility.

9. *On the Simultaneity of Referendum Vote and Elections*

- 9.1. On April 6, Singh verified that the BDS petition garnered 2/3 of Assembly of Stewards signatures after it was submitted, which triggered the referendum process as per GSOC Bylaws.
- 9.2. Administering the JC, steward, and referendum votes at the same time was challenging. Our committee worked hard to ensure the referendum would not endanger the integrity of the elections, or vice versa. We maintain that it is desirable for referenda to be voted on at the same time as elections, since the turnout for voting is likely increased.
- 9.3. The Votes Committee did not and does not take a position on the BDS referendum, and our concern with the exclusion of a wide range of candidates was based solely on the application of eligibility requirements in direct contradiction of GSOC Bylaws and a conversation with Gallagher in the Committee's first meeting of February 29. Our communications to membership and nominees have reflected this.
- 9.4. Some have made accusations that the Local systematically excluded members based on their political positions on BDS. We do not wish to lend credence to this divisive rhetoric by engaging with it.
- 9.5. The Committee has heard reports of at least one candidate circulating rumors of a "Zionist conspiracy claim." We recognize the seriousness of such claims. For this reason, we condemn the spread of rumors about them and the use and abuse of such allegations for purposes of politicking. GSOC members have engaged in respectful dialogue about BDS for months, including at two town halls and one general meeting. Now that the votes have been counted, we strongly urge all members to reject the politics of division and to allow respectful dialogue to continue.

10. *Election Procedures*

- 10.1. Though historically the Local has collaborated with our members in administering elections, and provided at least half of the workforce required, we were working with little to no support during this election.
- 10.2. Our Committee is proud to have competently taken the lead on administering the election and holding the count, and its completion was only possible because of the uncompensated labor of no fewer than thirty GSOC members.

10.3. We went ahead with the election and worked to the best of our abilities to follow election guidelines from UAW 2322, as well as referring to GSOC Bylaws, Local 2110 Bylaws, and Department of Labor resources.

11. *Purchasing Materials*

11.1. The Local provided two ballot boxes and some envelopes. Gallagher replenished our stacks of envelopes once on Tuesday April 19, but no other materials were provided. The Votes Committee requested Gallagher provide procedures on receiving compensation for costs incurred for printing and election materials. Gallagher said he would get back to us. We had not heard anything since, until today April 26, Rosenstein wrote that if we submitted receipts and stipulated what they were for, the Local would review them. At time of writing we have complied with the Local's request for documentation.

12. *Ballot Box Security*

12.1. Two people remained with open ballot boxes at all times. Ballot boxes were sealed and signed over the seal at the end of every day's voting period. They were stored securely in a locker whose keys were placed in an envelope and sealed, with three signatures over the seal. The key envelope remained with one member of the Votes Committee overnight for each of the three nights before counting. Seals were photographed by Votes committee members after sealing and before opening each day.

13. *Counting Procedures*

13.1. In addition to these members of the Votes Committee: Parth Singh, Shelly Ronen, Tess Rankin, Darach Miller, and Jessica Feldman, our counting procedures were attended by Murhaf Abdalqader, Cayetana Adrianzén Ponce, A.J. Bauer, Elizabeth Benninger, Alex Campolo, Claudia Carrera, Ned Crowley, Ziad Dallal, Hannah Schott Deuchar, Jeannette Estruth, Benjamin Fogel, Jeff Fuller, Faris Giacaman, Shafeka Hashash, Hazem Jamjoum, David Klassen, Sean Larson, Chris P. Nickell, Nathan Pensler, Colette Perold, Jehad Saleem, Abhinav Swaminathan, Irina Troconis, Nantina Vgontzas, Maya Wind, Daniel Brinkerhoff Young. Patrick Gallagher, member of Executive Board of Local 2110 was also present throughout the entire process, which lasted the entire night. We applaud his commitment to a fair process.

13.2. No candidate handled, read out ballots or marked tallies for races in which they were involved.

13.3. Ronen was assigned the role of the arbiter but in practice decisions were made by consensus among the Votes Committee in all decisions except two, wherein a vote was taken and a 4-1 vote determined the decision.

14. *Checking Lists*

- 14.1. Since we had three polling sites (Washington Square, Tandon School of Engineering and online), two readers read and checked all the names of the people who voted at each of these polling sites against an unmarked, master list. These two readers sat opposite one another at a table with two observers standing behind each of them, reviewing their actions. This was done to identify voters who might have cast ballots both in-person and online. Three such cases were found, and the paper ballots were destroyed.
- 14.2. Consistent with previous election practices, union card signups were available at the ballot box. Members of the Communications Committee had also operated in the same spirit of inclusion for the online vote, sending ballots directly to those members who had recently signed cards. As a result, eleven electronically cast votes did not match up with voters on the member list provided to us by the Local. Where possible, in the case of ten of eleven votes, we manually verified the cards sent directly to Nickell of the Communications Committee against online votes. Three members of the votes committee reviewed their cards and documentation and approved them. One voter who had submitted an electronic vote had not submitted their card to Nickell. This vote remained contested.

15. *Opening Boxes and Alphabetization*

- 15.1. The first step involved opening the ballot boxes and alphabetizing the envelopes, which were marked with voter names. (Inside these identified envelopes were blank envelopes so as to protect voter anonymity). Once envelopes had been alphabetized, observers checked the envelopes for duplicates. This was done to prevent double votes.
- 15.2. Once ballots had been alphabetized and checked for duplications in the online voters, the external, identifying envelopes were opened under observation so anonymously sealed ballots could be extracted and then shuffled in absence of identifying information.
- 15.3. Once opened, ballots were sorted into stacks of 20 and then numbered for reading and tallying (see below in 18).

16. *Contested Ballots*

- 16.1. During the process of opening external (and then internal) envelopes, some number of envelopes were separated and treated as temporarily contested. These included envelopes with illegible names, incomplete information, entirely unmarked envelopes and open envelopes. For those with illegible or incomplete information, we used our lists of voters to verify and clarify.
- 16.2. At least two members of the Votes Committee reviewed each contested ballot in turn and evaluated if the vote could be included in the count. Our central principle was to honor the intention of the voter while protecting against fraudulent votes or tampering with legitimate ballots.
- 16.3. For stewards and JC elections, four ballots were marked as contested. Three had no information and one was completely unsealed. Thus we could not verify that

these votes were not fraudulent. These irregularities made it improper for us to count these votes.

- 16.4. For the referendum vote, seventeen ballots were contested and not opened. Two of these ballots were entirely unsealed, seven were partially unsealed and six had external envelopes that were entirely devoid of information and so could not be verified as legitimately coming from a voter on our list. One additional ballot was marked with identifying information indicating the voter was ineligible for coverage by our contract. One additional ballot was marked as contested by a poll worker due to confusion about eligibility. These irregularities compelled us to set the seventeen ballots aside until the end. And at the end, the margin of votes was not narrow enough to warrant that we open these and count them.

17. *Spoiled and Identified Ballots*

- 17.1. There were two irregularly marked ballots and we tried, to the best of our abilities, to honor the intention of the voter. One ballot in the referendum vote was determined to be spoiled by a 4-1 vote of our committee. One member (Miller) dissented. This was decided by the committee after the ballot was displayed for all observers. A second ballot was an unmarked referendum ballot that the voter had indicated on the back their selections for the steward race. We felt this was inappropriate to count and determined it spoiled. Another ballot was found to be ripped up into at least eight pieces inside of the blank, internal envelope. We determined this ballot was spoiled.
- 17.2. Spoiled ballots were thus treated as if blank and as such, no votes were recorded.
- 17.3. Five referendum ballots had been signed by their voters. We reviewed this carefully as a committee and determined by a 4-1 vote that the ballots should still be counted despite these voters having relinquished their anonymity. One member of the committee (Singh) dissented.

18. *Tallying by the Calling Method*

- 18.1. We opted to use the calling method for reading ballots. We assigned one reader and four recorders, each with two observers watching over their shoulders. Observers oversaw the tallying and also, at the end, checked the recorders' final total counts.
- 18.2. Initially we assigned three recorders, including one blind recorder who recorded on a computer rather than on paper. One of this recorder's observers expressed concern about the observer's ability to look over the recorder's shoulder and verify the count and so we determined that to be safe, we erred on the side of caution and added an additional set of recorder and observers. Regardless, the blind recorder was able to correctly tally the results on par with the other recorders, and we hope this motivates future votes committees to better consider including accessible user interfaces to this process, both for casting and counting ballots.

- 18.3. The recorders unanimously reported the final tally counts for the steward election in the district of professional schools and for the referendum vote.
- 18.4. The recorders differed slightly for the steward election in the district of humanities and social science. All four recorders agreed on the final counts for four of five candidates. For one candidate, three of four agreed and one recorder differed by one vote. The majority total was taken as the final total.
- 18.5. The recorders differed in their reported final tallies for the JC race. One candidate was recorded by two recorders as having one total, and the other two recorders showed him have one more vote. We decided to flip a coin in order to determine his total count. The coin toss meant that the candidate was given the extra (uncertain) vote, changing a 201 to a 202. This did not affect the outcome of the election.

19. *Final Results*

- 19.1. This election and referendum vote provoked a large turnout, with approximately 650 members voting. This is roughly 38% of our current membership. We are pleased with this turnout, given that voter turnout in the US for midterm elections is on average 40%.
- 19.2. During the election and one week prior, approximately 218 members signed cards. This makes up roughly 15% of our current membership. We are pleased with the efficacy of the democratic process in driving member engagement and broadening the ranks of our membership.
- 19.3. We include below the raw numbers of the counts.

In Solidarity,

Votes Committee

Jessica Feldman, Michael Gould Wartofksy, Darach Miller, Tess Rankin, Shelly Ronen, Parth Singh

	Candidate Name	Vote Count
Joint Council	Claudia Carrera	205
	Ziad Dallal	202
	Benjamin Fogel	185
	Sean Larson	178
	Sam Dinger	172
	Nicholas Duron	171
	Christopher P. Nickell	168
	Daniel Brinkerhoff Young	166
	Kyle S. Shybunko	40
	Jacob Denz	32

	Candidate Name	Vote Count
Stewards - Steinhardt and Professional Schools District	Colette Perold	36
	Tim Neff	35
	Rachel Kuo	35
	Alex Campolo	33
	Joshua Krug	10
	Mijal Bitton	9
	Lauren C. Bernstein	8
	Victoria (Tori) Dahl	6
	Steven McCutcheon	4
	Yescheskel J. Eis	3
	Michael J. Heller	3

	Candidate Name	Vote Count
Stewards - Humanities and Social Sciences District	Maya Wind	123
	Nate Preus	121
	Benjamin Fogel	115
	Ilana Ben-Ezra	16
	Samuel Zerín	7

Question - BDS Referendum	Paper Ballot Count	Online Count	Total
Q1. Join the BDS Movement - Yes	250	179	429
Q1. Join the BDS Movement - No	39	177	216
Q2. Pledge to Boycott - Yes	209	157	366
Q2. Pledge to Boycott - No	74	195	269