

April 17, 2009

To: Faculty Senate
Fr: Joan McMahon
Re: Faculty Senate Elections via SurveyMonkey

This year, for the first time, Faculty Senate and University Standing Committee elections were conducted online, using the SurveyMonkey program. The purpose of this memo is to outline advantages and concerns regarding this year's elections, and to offer recommendations for next year's elections.

Advantages:

- It is asynchronous, which allows voters to participate at their convenience.
- It is paper-free, which is good for the environment.
- Votes are tallied by machine, which reduces the chance of human error.

Concerns:

- The initial set-up in SurveyMonkey was time-consuming. However, this was due to the fact that it was the first time the tool was used for elections. Future set-ups should be much less time-consuming.
- Monitoring the elections from start to finish was time-consuming. Every run-off:
 - Required the creation of a new survey.
 - Required notification of faculty by the Faculty Senate President or Secretary.
 - Called for additional faculty participation in terms of voting.
- Meeting the quorum (51%) rule outlined in the Handbook for traditional (not online) elections.
- Possibility of faculty fatigue/disengagement when asked to vote multiple times.
- The time lag from the day elections started (3/31) to the day elections were concluded (4/13). (The Handbook states that "vacancies shall be filled within ten class days", p. 155. This year's election took 11 class days.)

Recommendations:

- Rules outlined in the University Handbook regarding Faculty Senate elections be reviewed and revised as needed. For example:
 - Voting for one position at a time. This year the College of Social Sciences had four vacant seats. The next page of this memo outlines the election process, which required 7 run-offs.
 - Requiring a majority (more than half of the votes cast) rather than plurality.
 - Suggestion: Perhaps one slate could be offered for multiple seats. If "x" number of seats are vacant, allow voters to cast "x" number of votes (each for a different candidate). Candidates receiving the most votes are elected.
- Consider accepting nominations for Faculty Senate and Standing Committees via SurveyMonkey. (This year nominations were emailed to Senators and compiled by the Secretary.)
- Faculty Senate subscribe to SurveyMonkey (or another online survey tool). SurveyMonkey subscription is \$200/year.
- Train Faculty Senate Secretary to use SurveyMonkey as a polling tool.

College of Social Sciences Faculty Senate Election

Four open seats. One seat held by tenured faculty member from Department 4

Initial Elections – Polls Closed 3/31 – 45 Votes Cast – No Single Candidate Received at Least 51%

Candidate	Department	Tenure	% of Votes Cast
A	1	U	27.3
B	2	T	20.5
C	3	T	18.2
D	4	T	15.9
E	5	U	11.4
F	6	T	3.8

Run-Off #1 – Polls Closed 4/2 – 39 Votes Cast – Candidate B Wins 1st Seat

A	1	U	48.6
B	2	T	51.4

Run-Off #2 – Polls Closed 4/6 – 42 Votes Cast – No Single Candidate Received at Least 51%

A	1	U	35.7
C	3	T	14.3
D	4	T	19.0
E	5	U	4.8
F	6	T	19.0
G (Write-In)	4	T	7.1

Run-Off #3 – Polls Closed 4/7 – 41 Votes Cast – No Single Candidate Received at Least 51%

A	1	U	39.0
D	4	T	34.1
F	6	T	26.8

Run-Off #4 – Polls Closed 4/8 – 39 Votes Cast – Candidate A Wins 2nd Seat

A	1	U	64.1
D	4	T	35.9

Run-Off #5 – Polls Closed 4/9 – 34 Votes Cast – No Single Candidate Received at Least 51% (since one seat is now filled by an untenured faculty member, Candidate E should have been eliminated from this vote).

C	3	T	11.8
D	4	T	35.3
E	5	U	5.9
F	6	T	35.3
G	4	T	11.8

Run-Off #6 – Polls Closed 4/10 – 34 Votes Cast – Candidate D Wins 3rd Seat

D	4	T	55.9
F	6	T	44.1

Run-Off #7 - Polls Closed 4/13 - 40 Votes Cast - Candidate F Wins 4th Seat (since Candidate D is from Department 4, which is already represented by current Senator, Candidate G, who is also from Department 4 was eliminated – as was Candidate E, who should have been eliminated earlier).

C	3	T	45.0
F	6	T	55.0