



# Board of Delegates Election Policy

## Center Seat and At-Large Selection Process

### Section 1. Purpose

**1.1** The purpose of this policy is to establish a standardized, equitable, and efficient process for the review, deliberation, and election of applicants to the Michigan Board of Delegates.

**1.2** This process is intended to:

- ensure meaningful student-led deliberation,
- promote fairness and consistency in evaluation,
- protect geographic representation and board continuity, and
- preserve the authority of the Board of Delegates and Directors in all electoral decisions.

---

### Section 2. Applicant Review Committees (ARCs)

**2.1** Applicant Review Committees (ARCs) shall be established for the purpose of reviewing assigned pools of applicants and presenting candidates to the Board of Delegates.

**2.2** Each ARC shall consist of three (3) to four (4) members appointed in accordance with procedures determined by the Executive Board of Delegates.

**2.3** ARC members shall review only those applications assigned to their committee.

**2.4** ARC members shall unavoidably be aware of assigned applicant identities.

**2.5** All ARC members shall independently review each assigned application in its entirety. No application or portion thereof may be divided among members.

**2.6** All applications shall be evaluated using the approved Board of Delegates rubric(s).

---



## Section 3. Center Seat Election Process

### 3.1 Advancement of Center Candidates

**3.1.1** Following the completion of application scoring using the approved evaluation rubrics, applicants shall be grouped according to their respective Center.

**3.1.2** For each Center, the three (3) highest-scoring applicants shall advance to full consideration by the Board of Delegates.

**3.1.3** If a Center has fewer than three (3) applicants, all applicants from that Center shall advance to consideration.

**3.1.4** Advancement to this stage does not constitute election to the Board of Delegates, but qualifies the applicant for presentation, deliberation, and vote by the Board.

---

### 3.2 Election of Center Representatives

**3.2.1** Each Center shall elect up to two (2) representatives to the Board of Delegates.

**3.2.2** Each advancing candidate shall be presented to the Board of Delegates by the assigned Applicant Review Committee.

**3.2.3** ARC presentations shall include a balanced summary of the candidate's strengths, areas for growth, and alignment with the expectations of the Board of Delegates.

**3.2.4** Following each presentation, the Board shall engage in a brief period of deliberation.

**3.2.5** Elections for Center seats shall be determined through blind ballot following the presentation and deliberation of advancing candidates.

**3.2.6** Subject to the continuity provisions outlined in Section 3.3, the candidates receiving the highest vote totals shall be elected to the available Center seats.

**3.2.7** If the two highest vote recipients do not include a qualified sophomore candidate, the Board shall consider the highest-ranking qualified sophomore candidate for election in accordance with the continuity priority outlined in Section 3.3.



The Office of the Executive

# MICHIGAN BOARD OF DELEGATES

<https://mascmahs.org/bod/> +517-327-5315

Michigan Association of Student  
Councils & Honor Societies

1001 Centennial Way Suite 100,  
Lansing, MI 48917  
[info@mascmahs.org](mailto:info@mascmahs.org)

**3.2.8** In the event of a tie affecting the final available Center seat, the Board of Delegates shall conduct an additional ballot between the tied candidates following a brief period of deliberation.

---

## 3.3 Sophomore Continuity Priority

**3.3.1** To support continuity and long-term effectiveness, the selection process prioritizes having at least one sophomore Center representative when qualified candidates are available.

**3.3.2** This multi-year approach supports mentorship, leadership development, and sustainable organizational knowledge across election cycles.

**3.3.3** While geographic representation is foundational, selected candidates must demonstrate readiness to actively contribute to the work and responsibilities of the Board.

**3.3.4** Qualified applicants are those who meet the expectations outlined in the evaluation rubric and demonstrate the ability to meaningfully contribute to the leadership and service responsibilities of the Board of Delegates.

**3.3.5** If no sophomore candidate from a Center meets these qualifications, the Board may elect two candidates from other grade levels.

---

## Section 4. At-Large Election Process

### 4.1 Creation of the At-Large Pool

**4.1.1** Following the allocation of Center seats, all remaining unelected applicants shall constitute the At-Large applicant pool.

**4.1.2** From the At-Large applicant pool, the top twenty percent (20%) of applicants by evaluation score shall advance to full consideration and vote by the Board of Delegates.

**4.1.3** Advancement to this stage does not constitute election, but qualifies the applicant for presentation, deliberation, preliminary scoring, and final vote.

---



## 4.2 ARC Presentations and Board Deliberation

**4.2.1** Each advancing At-Large candidate shall be presented to the Board of Delegates by the assigned Applicant Review Committee.

**4.2.2** ARC presentations shall be limited to three (3) minutes per candidate.

**4.2.3** Presentations shall include key strengths, areas for growth, and overall alignment with the expectations of the Board of Delegates.

**4.2.4** During presentation and deliberation, candidates shall be identified solely as “Applicant #.”

**4.2.5** Following each presentation, the Board shall engage in up to two (2) minutes of deliberation.

**4.2.6** Comments made during deliberation shall reference application evidence, interview performance, or rubric criteria.

**4.2.7** A designated timekeeper shall monitor pitch and deliberation time.

**4.2.8** A designated discussion moderator, appointed by the Executive Board of Delegates, may close discussion early if comments become repetitive or non-substantive.

---

## 4.3 Preliminary Candidate Scoring

**4.3.1** Immediately following each candidate’s deliberation period, Board members shall record a preliminary evaluation score for that candidate.

**4.3.2** Preliminary scoring is intended to capture individual evaluation while information is fresh and does not constitute a vote for election.

**4.3.3** Preliminary scores shall be recorded using the following scale:

- **5** – Strongly support election
- **4** – Likely support
- **3** – Neutral / possible candidate
- **2** – Unlikely selection
- **1** – Do not support

**4.3.4** Preliminary scores shall be collected anonymously and averaged after all candidates have been presented.



The Office of the Executive

# MICHIGAN BOARD OF DELEGATES

<https://mascmahs.org/bod/>

+517-327-5315

Michigan Association of Student  
Councils & Honor Societies

1001 Centennial Way Suite 100,  
Lansing, MI 48917  
[info@mascmahs.org](mailto:info@mascmahs.org)

---

## 4.4 Candidate Pool Cut

**4.4.1** After all At-Large candidates have been presented and preliminarily scored, the average scores shall be used to narrow the candidate field.

**4.4.2** To create a manageable finalist group, approximately one and one-half (1.5) times the number of available At-Large seats shall advance to the final ballot.

**4.4.3** By way of example, if ten (10) At-Large seats are available, the top fifteen (15) candidates by average score shall advance to final voting.

**4.4.4** Candidates outside this range shall be removed from consideration.

---

## 4.5 Final At-Large Election

**4.5.1** The remaining candidates shall constitute the final At-Large election pool.

**4.5.2** Final At-Large voting shall be conducted by blind ballot.

**4.5.3** Each eligible Board member may vote for up to the number of available At-Large seats.

**4.5.4** The candidates receiving the highest vote totals shall fill the remaining At-Large seats.

**4.5.5** In the event of a tie affecting the final available At-Large seat, the Board of Delegates shall conduct an additional ballot between the tied candidates following a brief period of deliberation.

---

## Section 5. Conflict of Interest and Presentation Restrictions

**5.1** Any ARC member, Executive Board of Delegates member, or Board member with a conflict of interest regarding an applicant shall, in their discretion, abstain from voting on that applicant.

**5.2** If more than one ARC member is personally familiar with an applicant, the ARC may proceed without restriction.



**5.3** If only one ARC member is personally familiar with an applicant, that member shall be prohibited from presenting or pitching said applicant.

---

## Section 6. Role of Directors

**6.1** Directors may express their opinions regarding applicants before final determination.

**6.2** Final approval of an applicant shall require:

- a successful vote of the Board of Delegates in accordance with the procedures above, and
- concurrence from at least one-half (1/2) of the Directors.

**6.3** If no Directors concur with the Board of Delegates' decision, the Directors shall provide a statement of reasoning to the Board.

**6.4** Upon receipt of such reasoning, the Board of Delegates may engage in additional deliberation and conduct a subsequent vote on the applicant.

---

## Section 7. General Election Standards

**7.1** All applications shall be reviewed using the approved Board of Delegates evaluation rubric(s).

**7.2** The Board of Delegates shall remain committed to fairness, consistency, and rubric-based evaluation throughout the election process.

**7.3** The purpose of all presentations, deliberations, and voting is to identify applicants who are prepared to contribute meaningfully to the leadership, service, and operational responsibilities of the Board of Delegates.

---

## Section 8. Implementation

**8.1** This policy shall take effect upon adoption and shall govern all future Board of Delegates application review and election cycles unless amended by the appropriate authority.

---