Elections & Rules Committee  
April 29, 2015

Begin: 6:58pm  
Adjourn: 2:09am

Present: Steven Wendeborn (Chair), Alexander Miller (CLI), Rahul Bhide, Max Freedman, Bella Rowe, Joshua Savitt.

Public portion of meeting
Opening statement
- Election postponed: better that the election is postponed than having to do the whole thing again
- Difficult for the candidates, but we have determined to push the election to Thursday April 30th. This is in order to not disenfranchise any voters
- Only one specific slate was named in the Maroon as receiving a complaint, so E&R may have an obligation to clarify that multiple slates were implicated.
  - E&R encourages anyone who is spreading information about the campaign to check to make sure that their information is correct

Issue #1: Moose Party complaint
- If they were out of line, they would have been removed at the debate itself
- Collusion with TK: discussion of evidence whether there was collusion
- There was a lot of satire, but they (Moose) do not intend to break election rules
  - Behavior at E&R debates – “failure to comply may result in removal from event and further penalties”
     - There was no removal, so how can you move straight to “further penalties”?
  - Endorsement by TK Appreciation Slate: this happened after they dropped out of the election, and it was also not solicited by Moose Party. No collusion apparent

Issue #2: College Council Petition
- Brought to us – we are unsure if we wish to make a complaint of this issue
  - If we decide it needs to become a complaint we will give respective parties the appropriate time to respond
    - Petition takes issue with how the current cabinet was formed as well as how cabinet planned to form itself for next year
    - States that one slate is operating in a manner ‘contrary to fair and open election’ and petition solicited signatures from candidates/current college council individuals
      - Issue 1: implications of this petition - perception that they’re actually on college council vs. just candidates for CC
      - Issue 2: people of multiple slates or teams signing – is this collusion?
Defining ‘campaign team member’ = an individual actively or publicly working in support of a slate or campaign

- Some individuals claim they were approached by a CC member to sign petition.
  - Claim you can’t expect their position as a CC candidate, and as a slate candidate, to differ
  - These opinions can be the same – but the issue arises when individuals make this apparent in a public document

Issue #3: Complaint filed against Emma Smith
- Emma made a post in a ‘public’ Facebook group
- We are deliberating on a specific excerpt from this Facebook post
  - Notably – “cabinet members are paid hundreds of dollars. My slate is promising to abolish this policy”
    - Complaint states that this is misinformation and slander
  - Emma’s defence
    1. Intentions: it was a genuine mistake
      - She looked to the Maroon to find out information about Student Government. When you search ‘stipend’ in the Maroon, the most recently published article talks about “SG rejects petition to roll back cabinet stipends.” So her understanding was that the stipends had been put into place
      - No malicious intent, she apologizes
    2: Intent in context of the forum
      - It was one sentence of many. Not in a public Facebook group but a relatively closed one, of ~120 people
    3: Exactly what happened, follow-up, and implications
      - Apologized to her sorority and addressed her mistakes - leans on Maroon as evidence, makes clear it was an ‘honest mistake.’ Defends herself by saying that the comment about stipends was not the main message of what she was saying about her slate
- However, new proposal about stipends was available on the SG website a fairly long time ago
  - Is ignorance a defence?
  - This is not a question of ignorance - when you search the Maroon with good intentions, you may leave with understanding that the stipends were being provided to SG members
    - Good to understand there were more ways the stipend issue was publicized
    - Searching the Maroon is not a good defence when you’re part of a campaign team which should have in-depth knowledge about such relevant issues
After lengthy public deliberation, more information was needed to proceed to the consideration of one matter on our docket. As a result, in consultation with our advisor at the CLI, the public portion of the meeting was concluded and we proceeded to deliberation of the other three matters.

-- Deliberations --

Motions

1. Promotional stickers issue
   - Open Minds overspent on their budget. They have turned over excess product to us that constitutes this overspend
   - They paid for these goods (stickers) themselves
   - They will receive the promotional stickers back at the end of the election period
   - We thank them for being forward and open with their admittance that they overspent
     - Motion: we determine this situation is acceptable
     - Unanimous agreement

2. Moose Party issue
   - Determined as committee that there was no wrongdoing
     - Motion: issue no penalties to Moose Party
     - Unanimous agreement

3. Emma Smith
   - Conclusion to issue a warning to the campaign team in the spirit of the election
     - Emma tried her best to inform herself of the situation regarding stipends, but at the same time her entire cabinet provided a huge resource base, and understanding the reality was not out of reach
     - Motion: Issue warning to the slate in the spirit of the election

4. Joint College Council Candidate Letter in the Maroon
   - We await a formal complaint

5. Alleged Recording Incident
   - The complaint regarding alleged recordings has been currently and willingly withdrawn with the full support of the Elections and Rules Committee. For more information please consult the forthcoming statement from the concerned parties.

Addendum (10:53 pm on Thursday, April 30)

- The complainant in the Recording Incident intends to reinstate the complaint at 1:00 pm on Friday, May 1. The committee awaits whatever new material the complainant intends to provide.

Minutes submitted by Bella Rowe