Chair:
- This is a complaint hearing; we will be assessing the factual basis for the complaint in order to determine whether a violation of Article II § 3 of the Election Code has occurred.
- We also have to discuss some voting issues that arose this morning.
  - SSA and Humanities Division ballot access was restricted for some students due to a technological malfunction. CLI worked with the vendor to rectify the issue.
    - Status: Access restored at 11:18 am.
  - Some students saw ballots for their own division as well as for SSA and IME when they tried to vote. This was also the result of a software error, which CLI worked with the vendor to fix.
    - Status: Fixed by 11:46 am. Students who voted on these three-part ballots will still only have one vote registered.
  - Some members of the UChicago community are upset that they are unable to vote.
    - Registrar’s office does not classify those on extended status as students for the purpose of the database they provide for the purpose of the election.
      - Those on extended status have, per CLI, not been able to vote in the past.
      - The Constitution says in Article I:
        - 1) All students of the University of Chicago shall be members of the Student Association
        - 2) A student shall be any person, registered in any Division or School or with advanced standing, considered a student in residence by the University of Chicago.
      - Since the University has taken the position that they are not students by virtue of not being enrolled, that is where things stand.
      - Administrators have indicated it will not be possible to include them in this election even if the Committee were to try to do so.
Inclusion in future years will likely need a Constitutional Amendment.

- Notes that gavel is cheap; jokes about getting a new gavel.

Issue #1: Alleged Overspending

- Chair:
  - Initial complaint: a geofilter on Snapchat @sitver exceeded the campaign spending limits. Complainant alleges that Sitver spent $1820.70 on a geofilter for entire campus based on Google search, and pricing estimate for that coverage area.
  - Response received (respondent present): Receipts were attached for geofilters.
    - Area of coverage not as large as complaint alleges
      - Confined to 2/3 of the Reg, ½ of Mansueto, and a strange pterodactyl shaped area combining the Cathey Dining Commons and Granville-Grossman.
      - Receipt for Reg and Mansueto area shows expenditure of $22.79
      - Receipt for Cathey and Granville-Grossman shows expenditure of $34.19
      - Total cost of geofilter targeting is $56.98
  - Josh Savitt:
    - The initial complaint was forwarded to the respondent at 3:43pm on 5/1/16
    - Respondent responded by 3:57 on the same day.
      - Not enough time to fabricate results.
  - Michael Sitver:
    - The reason for targeting so specifically was to save money.
      - People tend to sit to one side of Mansueto.
  - Josh Savitt:
    - Have you otherwise exceeded the spending limit?
  - Michael Sitver:
    - I have other expenditures, but I have not exceeded the limit.
  - Chair: Asks if Committee has further questions
    - Committee does not

7:23 pm—Committee enters deliberative session

Motion: The Committee finds that the respondent’s snapchat geofilter expenditures did not constitute overspending.

The complaint alleged that the respondent spent $1820.70 on a custom snapchat geofilter for his campaign. After reviewing the receipts of the respondent, the Committee finds that the
respondent only spent $56.98 on the geofilter. The Committee also finds that $56.98 is less than the $100 spending limit. Therefore, the Committee establishes that the respondent, Mr. Sitver, has not exceeded the spending limit by purchasing this geofilter.

In favor: 4

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: Chair