

Elections Committee Meeting Minutes of March 27, 2020

I CALL TO ORDER at **12:08 PM**

II ROLL CALL

Present: Abhay Bilapatte, Antonio Orejel, James Carroll, Kenneth Lefin, Sia Saquee.

III ACTION ITEM – **Approval of the agenda**

Motion to approve the agenda of March 27, 2020 by **A. Bilapatte**, second by **K. Lefin**, motion **CARRIED**.

IV ACTION ITEM – **Approval of minutes March 20, 2020**

Motion to approve the minutes of March 20, 2020 by **K. Lefin**, second by **A. Bilapatte**, motion **CARRIED**.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT – **Public Comment is intended as a time for any member of the Public to address the committee on any issue’s affection ASI and/or the California State University, East Bay.**

Mahdi states thank you for taking time out of your day to attend this meeting. **A. Orejel** states that currently, the previous audio for last week’s minutes are not uploaded yet and will be uploaded soon.

4:00

VI. UNFINISHED ITEMS

A. DISCUSSION ITEM – **Marketing** (Kenneth) – **Voter’s guide** adjustments

a. Facebook/Instagram boosted views

K. Lefin states that because of COVID 19, all of our events got cancelled. We are doing the best we can with our social media marketing through Instagram. If **S. Saquee** can go over the amount that was spent on videos for the candidates. **S. Saquee** states that she thought it was a great idea to boost post on Instagram in order to get more reactions from students. However, we had some issues when trying to promote each candidate and at times post were flagged. Eventually, all the promoting for the candidates were taken down, which later I created and promoted a general post. The cost was \$42.71, and it reached about 16,113 people and we targeted people who didn’t follow our page or were connected through someone who follows us. 98% saw the promotion and 99% of people were not following our page, it is easier to reach our students through social media rather



than in person. Thank you, James, for letting us use your card, I know we were not able to get a p-card in time. This was be a good idea for the future due to being effective and low cost. **M. Hinrichs** states good job working with the social media outreach and expand it to other CSUEB accounts. **K. Lefin** states that the voter's guide came out really good, despite having a couple errors. **S. Saquee** states it was nicely done and easy enough for people to see the content. **A. Orejel** states that there were a couple errors that we caught. Next time, we have to be mindful to catch even the tiniest error, for example, we almost forgot a letter on someone's name. Though great job on the voter's guide. **S. Saquee** states that she wants to thank everyone that worked on this together.

12:05

VII. NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

A. DISCUSSION ITEM – Election Results

J. Carroll states that only CSUEB student can vote with their net ID. We also, have to check that there is no duplication of votes and votes from former students. The voting is closed now, and we are going to have the votes by today or if not by Monday. We just need to double check with the registration office to check if all students are enrolled for this semester. We might also have run off elections due to the top runner not receiving 50% of the votes plus one more vote for some positions. **A. Orejel** states that some voters didn't see some of the candidates that they wanted to vote for based on their major. **E. Pinlac** states that they can only vote for their specific college senator that's based on their major. **A. Orejel** stated that due to those students not seeing the candidate that they wanted to pick, they selected that they were part of a different major. Would we need to cross reference students' majors? **E. Pinlac** states that it's part of the challenge, which we won't be able to verify. With the new system we are able to identify that the student is inputting their correct information as opposed to how Bay sync works. **J. Carroll** states that if we know someone who inputted the wrong information, you could send me their information so I could double check. However, I don't feel comfortable with all the vagueness due to it not being accurate. **A. Orejel** states if alumni are able to vote or just current students. **E. Pinlac** states that staff and alumni can vote in the system, however, those votes will not count. **J. Carroll** states that once we have the tentative results, we will share it with the committee and then the candidates will receive that information.

19:07

B. DISCUSSION ITEM – Campaigning (Abhay)

a. Grievance Evaluation

- i. Five grievances – Posting/stapling flyer on science building walls. Both slates.



A. Bilapatte states that we had eleven grievances and most of them have been addressed already. **J. Carroll** states that he copied the grievance into a google document. For example, we have grievance number seven it was submitted by K. Dhillon on March 20th. It states that during the ASI Concord committee meeting on March 10th at 3:30 PM, audio timing at 3:45. Arianna Miralles, who is running for Director of Concord used public comment to discuss on getting help from the Concord committee for ASI elections. Later on, in the meeting, audio time 34:54, Arianna Miralles commented to use the UU referendum townhouse meeting as a campaign event. A. Milano agreed with Arianna Miralles and allowed for this discussion to continue. The Concord Committee Meeting is not an appropriated place to discuss ASI Elections, feel free to listen to the audio. There are two things we would need to address with this issue. First, with public comment anyone can speak and the second, was this done to try to campaign in any other ASI event. The UU Raw Referendum Townhall was going to be used but due to the shelter in place order, we need to make sure that none of these events happened. The attempt itself might not be a violation, it would only be if the event occurred. Does anyone have any questions? **A. Bilapatte** states that if the comment actually happened in the meeting due to not listening to the audio. **S. Saquee** states that she listened to the audio and heard the candidate state that the UU Raw Townhouse meeting would be a good campaigning opportunity. I haven't verified if the townhouse meeting occurred, but the campus was closed, and we need to follow up. **A. Bilapatte** states that we need to verify the townhouse meeting happened, but if not, it would not be a violation. **S. Saquee** states that we don't have to decide at the moment. **A. Orejel** states that we need to figure out whether the comment is a violation, despite it not happening. I would say that the comment was okay to say at the time. **S. Saquee** states it might look like she was using her ASI position to campaign and while it might have not occurred, it most likely did not get her extra points. **A. Orejel** states that they were talking about future dates in April for the townhouse meeting. **A. Bilapatte** states that grievance eight was sent in anonymously and was submitted March 20th. **J. Carroll** states that the person who sent it wanted to remain anonymously and followed up stating that if we move forward with the grievance the person might not be able to remain anonymously. The grievance states, as a concerned voting student it has come to my attention weeks after the first incident that was done by Arianna Miralles. I have to speak up about these things because no one else will in fear of retaliation of E. Sanchez-Martinez. In this meeting, E. Sanchez-Martinez was trying to turn her sorority sisters against K. Kaholoaa, by making up rumors and lies about her. One of the rumors consisted of K. Kaholoaa stating she was better than other



sisters due to being on a higher slate than them. Referencing E. Pamela-Sanchez, A. De Leon, and Z. Perez. The main reason K. Kaholoaa did not want to take the picture is because she didn't want to get involved with another slate. Yet, E. Pamela-Sanchez would not let this go and insisted that K. Kaholoaa to take the picture with them to promote herself to the campaign. Currently, E. Sanchez-Martinez is interfering with other people's campaigns like the Director of Concord. As well as, reaching out to other people who are not on her slate that are running for the same position. E. Sanchez-Martinez insisted that A. Miralles to take pictures with her in order to promote E. Sanchez-Martinez slate. I just wanted to express this concern with the elections committee due to people being in fear of E. Sanchez-Martinez. It is said that E. Sanchez-Martinez has the advisors on her side and her sorority sisters don't say anything. I would like to stay anonymous due to not wanting to get involved, I think she is unethically trying to win the campaign. Thank you for your time and concern, I hope you take action against the matter. Feel free to reach out if you have any questions. **J. Carroll** states that he reached out to gain clarity about the situation, like any false statements or anything to hold someone else liable. I also asked some clarity of the idea of forcing someone to take a photo and asking someone to be in pictures with them or forcing the person to vote for them. Some clarity can provide whether or not it interferes with other people's campaign and could be a physical violation. The answers I received back did not provide any additional clarity, in which a person might have felt threaten or harassed. It sounded more that there's a discomfort with the certain people involved. The person also stated that if they can't remain anonymous then they would want their grievance removed. **A. Bilapatte** states that we need to verify with the person that felt uncomfortable in this situation in order to get a better understanding of what occurred. I think asking another person to work with you is acceptable, however the person asking must not go overboard. **A. Orejel** states that we need to ask who else was present when this incident occurred to get their perspective about the situation. This will help to determine whether the situation is true. **K. Lefin** states that if candidates had issues about this, they should have sent the grievance rather than this anonymous person. What's throwing me off more is that the person would rather remove the grievance if they aren't able to remain anonymous. Like A. Orejel stated if this was an issue between candidates, we should ask them. **J. Carroll** states that part of the investigation would involve the people that were named in the incident like A. Miralles and K. Kaholoaa. If they don't come forward, then we would not be able to continue with this grievance. **S. Saquee** states that it seems like a sorority situation, in which we need to engage with their organization about this issue. **M. Hinrichs** states that being anonymous



becomes problematic when they want to withdraw if they can't remain anonymous. We have seen in the past with sororities and fraternities with homecoming some of the same activities. **A. Bilapatte** states that another grievance was sent on March 25th by someone anonymous. **J. Carroll** states that the person wanted to remain anonymous because they don't want to get into any drama. On Monday night, E. Sanchez-Martinez discussed in the group chat that sisters should vote for her, while using her position in her sorority to give sisters points if they vote for her. Lastly, she wanted sisters to send her proof that they voted on Bay sync to get points. This shows her true intentions on trying to get points to win the presidential campaign. **J. Carroll** states that the person attached the group chat, in which shows the anonymous being true. I asked the person clarifying questions, however, they stated that if they cannot be anonymous, they would like to reserve the grievance. This is similar to the previous grievance; we could reach out to the president of the sorority to clarify this item. **K. Lefin** states that she wasn't asking to show people proof that they voted for her only that they voted in general. **A. Bilapatte** states that yes that's what J. Carroll stated. **J. Carroll** states that the highlighted portion of the screenshot states to send proof of your final submission and you'll receive a point. **A. Bilapatte** states that she just asked her sisters to vote but not for one person in specific. **J. Carroll** states that this is a grey area due to the organization having their own system of having points. However, I would like to reach out to their president to clarify on this. **K. Lefin** states if we can continue if they don't response. **J. Carroll** states that it can be a yes or no, but we need to gain clarity and reach out to the organization. When it comes to a hearing anyone being accused has the right to know where it come from, despite having proof, it does not violate anything. **A. Bilapatte** states we have two more grievances to get through. **J. Carroll** states that it came from Amy Perez on March 26th stating that they receive a message from the slate to vote for them. My phone number was given out without my permission and I feel as if my privacy was violated. **J. Carroll** states that they sent out clarifying questions, in which Amy provided screenshots of the conversation. It came from Elevate East Bay, which stated who to vote for. She needs to clarify if anyone has her phone number or did, she give out her phone number. At the moment, we don't have enough information to move forward with this until Amy responds back to my email. **A. Bilapatte** states that we need to wait for Amy's response to see if we can identify what member from the slate has her number.

Motion to extend the meeting for twenty more minutes by **A. Bilapatte**, second by **J. Carroll**, motion **CARRIED**.



A. Orejel states that he wonders where the slate got the number from. **A. Bilapatte** states that the last grievance was submitted by Jessica on March 26th. **J. Carroll** states that Jessica stated that on March 26th, A. Miralles posted a picture of herself and six members of the Elevate slate. My knowledge is that she did not file with the elections committee to be part of that slate. This violates the elections code, not only with the picture but with a collaborating video as well. Attached it include the pictures that Jessica stated. **A. Bilapatte** states if J. Carroll can share the picture with the rest of the group. **J. Carroll** states yes. **K. Lefin** states it's similar to an earlier grievance. **A. Bilapatte** states that A. Miralles did not start with a particular campaign and is seen collaborating with this group. Due to having proof, we need to reach out to the slate members and ask them what happened. **S. Saquee** states that we do not have a clear policy as to including someone who does not have a slate. I'm not sure if E. Pinlac would like to comment on that. However, it does not seem as there's a violation but rather just a campaign. **A. Bilapatte** states that it should be okay, but it is not in the rules. **J. Carroll** states that it is not in the rules and I don't see it as violation. The only way I would see it as a violation is a person not reporting that they are part of a slate and being on full campaign mode of being part of that slate. **A. Orejel** states that he did see the video and it didn't seem as a violation. **E. Pinlac** states that in Article 4, section I, number 2 it might affect this, but it is left open for interpretation. **S. Saquee** states that moving forward this is something we can clear up for future elections. **J. Carroll** states that this is all the grievances and I like the idea to clear up the election codes. **M. Hinrichs** states that this is the first time it appears that someone hijacked someone else's slate and continued with them. **S. Saquee** states that it seems more as a collaboration, due to the slate posting this individual on their Instagram. **A. Orejel** states that it shouldn't affect students in the future when it comes to collaborating with one another.

1:05:40

C. DISCUSSION ITEM – **Potential Run-Off**

J. Carroll states that we will have this information once we have all the vote. Next week we have spring break, when we return, we will hear all grievances and the week after that we will have the run-offs. When we submit the list for preliminary results, we will mark the positions that will continue with the run-off. As well as, the groups discussing how they want to market the run-off elections. **S. Saquee** states that we will continue with Instagram marketing and with M. Hinrichs in student life. **K. Lefin** states that when the final results are done, where will the post be posted. **J. Carroll** states that it would be sent to the elections committee to then post on social media.



1:08:29

D. DISCUSSION ITEM – **Calendar Updates – Certifying elections and posting info**

A. Orejel states that we are making sure that all dates go as follows or if anything needs to be changed. **A. Bilapatte** states that this is the best way to get things done and communicate.

1:09:38

VIII. ROUNDTABLE REMARKS

A. Orejel states that he would like a meeting with all the updated grievances. Thank you to everyone for communicating effectively and I hope everyone is doing good physically and mentally. Students will be listening to the audio or reading the minutes, and we have remained good at being neutral.

A. Bilapatte states that despite our current situation, we have progressed in the number of votes.

M. Hinrichs states that you all are doing a great job facilitating this committee meeting online.

S. Saquee states thank you for everyone working together and answering the various questions I have.

A. Orejel states that thank you Mahdi for being our first zoom participant.

Mahdi states that if J. Carroll or E. Pinlac can state if the votes will be released today or Monday?

J. Carroll states that it might happen Friday or Monday.

S. Saquee states that is it fair to post the results during the weekend.

J. Carroll states that as soon as the results are in, the committee and slates will receive an email and would become public information to share.

1:15:25

IX. ADJOURNMENT at **1:24 PM**

Minutes Reviewed By:

Committee Chair

Name: Antonio Orejel

Minutes Approved On:

Date

