



## ELECTIONS BOARD AGENDA

Associated Students

3/5/21, 2:00 PM

Zoom

---

**CALL TO ORDER by Andrew Yan at 2:00 PM**

### **A. ROLL CALL**

---

<b>Name</b>	<b>Note:</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Note:</b>
Andrew Yan <i>Chair</i>	<b>Present</b>	Ruth Garcia Guevara <i>Advisor</i>	<b>Present</b>
Wessal Esber <i>Vice Chair</i>	<b>Present</b>	Diana Collins Puente <i>Advisor</i>	
Emma Xing	<b>Absent (Excused)</b>	Dylan Martinez <i>Senate Liaison</i>	<b>Absent (Excused)</b>
Shannon Hollingsworth	<b>Absent (Excused)</b>		
Austin Foreman	<b>Present</b>		
Lauren Sullivan	<b>Present</b>		
Daniel Ong	<b>Present</b>		

#### **Icebreaker:**

<https://pbs.twimg.com/media/Eu6jHPUVIAspdq?format=jpg&name=small>

### **B. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

---

#### **B.1. DoC Meeting**

Andrew: First item of discussion is the two people who did not attend the mandatory DoC meeting. Someone emailed us after the meeting saying they did not attend because they were taking an exam.

Wessal: I don't want to be so hard on this but I also don't want people to think that it's ok not to come. My recommendation is to issue an infraction since it's better than not being able to run at all.

Austin: They didn't send proof that they actually had an exam. I think there needs to be some kind of proof. We did also let them know that they need a proxy. I think if we have the proof letting them have an infraction and letting them still run. My other question is, if we allow them to not go to the meeting, where are they going to get the information during DoC.

Ruth: That's a good point, the reason to come to DoC is for the information.

Andrew: I sent an email to all candidates. That email specifically said that the meeting is required, and the email also said that it's ok if you can't make it, but in that case you need a proxy. So that was made very clear to everyone involved. It was also on the FAQ page and the agreement that everyone signed. I believe any non-attendees are not eligible to run.

Lauren: I think I would also recommend disqualification because they emailed us after the meeting and they didn't send a proxy.

Wessal: Yes, I wanted to highlight that the email we received was after the meeting, not before.

Daniel: If for some reason they actually did have a test I don't think it should bar them from candidacy.

Austin: To Ruth's point that there are limited candidates, but the position they're running for is L&S, there are 6 people including them, so if they did drop it there would be 5 people. All 4 seats would be filled.

Andrew: Regardless of how many people are running, they didn't meet a requirement to run.

Austin: I think it would be nice to give them the chance to prove that they had an exam. If they were studying for this exam they could very well have their mind elsewhere. I do understand being remote, it is harder to manage your time, your mental space as a whole. I think if they can prove then it would be nice to give a chance, due to remote circumstance, we understand the difficulties. However we absolutely need hard proof that you had an exam, and even if they had proof, they should have sent a proxy so they still need at least an infraction on that.

Andrew: I am concerned about the precedent we're setting if we allow people to skip the meeting, even with an infraction. Everyone else went to this meeting because they thought it was mandatory, which it is. It isn't fair to all the other candidates.

Ruth: For the most part, it is mandatory. It depends on the board each year. They had been given a warning, and that would just set them off on the wrong foot. Before, folks used to have a lot more chances. Now it's just three chances, so this counts as a lot. My only concern is given the amount of candidates. I think the precedent you could be setting is that the mistakes that are made are also warnings, it could be that you're actually being tougher instead of lenient since it's actually your first warning.

Wessal: And you only get three, so it's a third of the allotted mistakes before you get disqualified. So that's 33% disqualified, if it were under the old setup, it would not even make the difference, here we're going to be understanding because we're not going to penalize you for asking a test but we definitely need proof.

Austin: I think that's way too lenient if there's no proof. We need to set their precedent that there needs to be hard proof. We made infractions that are more strict now. We're not going to overlook not attending the meeting.

Andrew: Also, the other candidate who did not attend the meeting chose Campus United as their party, which is not a registered party this year. I emailed that candidate right after they declared to ask about that (because they literally can't run with Campus United) and I did not get a response. Given that and because that person did not attend the meeting I'm not sure if they have any intention in running.

Andrew: While we are on this topic, I just checked and there is one person who did not sign the promissory agreement. It's the same person who didn't go to the meeting. That agreement was due yesterday at 4pm.

Austin: The deadline has passed, and it literally also says when you declare candidacy, and it even says right here that you need to go for DoC. All candidates already agreed to that. It's all there, to me

not completing the promissory agreement is almost worse than not attending the meeting because you literally just have to click the checkbox. You should really read everything that's in there. I've changed my mind. We can now disqualify the candidates, they clearly did not have any intention in running other than to sign up.

Lauren: If everyone else agrees.

Wessal: I agree.

**Motion to disqualify Elena Chao for not attending Spring 2021 DoC**

*First/Second: Foreman/Ong*

Vote: 4-0 to APPROVE, no abstentions

**Motion to disqualify Arthur Varela for not attending the Spring 2021 DoC and for not filling out the promissory agreement**

*First/Second: Foreman/Ong*

Vote: 4-0 to APPROVE, no abstentions

Austin: What about the other person who we thought was absent and he did not introduce himself until the very end? It seemed like he might have been in a different meeting.

Andrew: I didn't even mind if people were in two Zoom meetings simultaneously, you might as well take advantage of the situation we're in. However, we had to use everyone's time during the meeting to ask for his declaration three times. [Approximate times were 4:30, 4:50, 5:05]. He only appeared the third time.

Austin: It would have been nice if he paid more attention. It really seemed like he had our meeting on mute and was in some other meeting. But at the end of the day he was present on Zoom and he did speak up at the end.

Ruth: I was actually thinking about that. That person put it on mute and wasn't participating. Since I think that person was with a party, I would almost say that we should reach out to the liaison and say that this person wasn't present. Not necessarily giving them an infraction. But we should say we noticed that he wasn't paying attention, so it is up to the liaison for them to make sure that they know the information.

Austin: That sounds good.

Wessal: No infraction right, just email?

Lauren: I agree just email.

Andrew: Who wants to send that email?

Austin: I was going to do that right now.

Andrew: So I am going through emails right now. I think we are missing some info from both parties. Isla Vista Party did not submit the budget and Storke Party did not submit the party slate.

Wessal: I personally would give an infraction but that's up to you.

Lauren: I would say infraction.

Austin: I agree with Wessal and Lauren. What happens if these deadlines have been missed in the past, have they received infractions?

Ruth: They have received warnings or FYIs. If we see it's a constant missing of deadlines, sometimes the board will take a pause and send a FYI. We say: we're noticed that people are not following the deadlines. Going forwards, deadlines that are missed moving forward will end in infractions.

Ruth: If you do a FYI you need to tell them you need by X date and they need a very short turnaround time.

Austin: I think we should do that. We should send an email to the liaisons.

Andrew: Ok, then it would be motion to issue an FYI.

Austin: How about by Monday?

Ruth: I think you're being generous because the deadlines have already passed. I wouldn't give them all of Monday, I would give them up to Monday,

Austin: Also, there are also independent candidates who have not submitted the budget, right?

Andrew: Yes.

**Motion to send an FYI to party liaisons and independent candidates on the deadlines for the Spring 2021 general election. They have until Monday 3/8/2021 at 10 AM to send in any past due information. Any missed deadlines hereafter will result in an infraction against the party or individual in the case of independents.**

*First/Second: Foreman/Ong*

Vote: 4-0 to APPROVE, no abstentions

Andrew: I'll send the email.

## **B.2. Fees**

Ruth: I'll be back in a minute.

Andrew: So I'll start, Ruth had some questions for us about fee campaigning. The first question is if a department is open or partially open can they pass out flyers, swag, or have a sign sheet to promote their reaffirmation.

Ruth: I'm back. I just had a meeting with departments and they asked that question and I couldn't answer.

Wessal: No it's online only. That's my opinion.

Austin: Yeah, we voted for an all online spring 2021 virtual election. It's virtual.

Austin: They can't pass it out in-person but they can have a sign up to receive the merch. If they're willing to pay for the merchandise they can do all of that virtually.

Andrew: Point of information, they still can't pass it out. You can't buy physical merch at all. The t-shirts are kind of an exception. They are technically allowed to buy their own t-shirts, but they can't wear them in public. The reason is because a group of 30 could meet up at IV Starbucks wearing their t-shirts and that's basically physical campaigning. Not sure if anyone would still want to buy t-shirts if you can't wear them out, but the option is there.

Austin: I didn't think of that, but yes, that seems like it's almost going to subliminally condition people by seeing their party shirt a bunch. Then when voting happens they might not even remember where they saw the party from, but subliminally, they would have seen the shirt 8 or 9 times.

Ruth: Just to be clear, departments can buy t-shirts and wear during Zoom meetings.

Andrew: Yes. Same for candidates.

Andrew: Just to be clear, that was our rule from last year. We are allowed to change them if anyone disagrees, but if we are changing the rules we need to change it over the next week and then let people know by the break. The candidates plan out campaigning during the break. That's kind of rude if we were to change it during spring quarter.

Ruth: This is specific to departments.

Andrew: Yes, but it applies to candidates as well. I think we should keep the rules consistent between candidates and departments. It's easier on everyone.

Ruth: The next question was geo fencing, being able to pay for ads that pop up in a certain area.

Andrew: I've done that before for elections. I don't see why that wouldn't be allowed.

Austin: Targeting areas is all about virtual advertising. That's the center of it, you're always trying to get the right audience. That's ok.

Ruth: They also asked if the parties have space for video. Sort of how we give candidates questions to answer, maybe we can give parties questions as well.

Austin: The only thing is, with the candidates, we are covering the candidates, and all of them are required to do it, so all sides are being promoted. In terms of fees, there's two sides, there's a yes side and a no side, so unless we can support both of those sides somehow, I don't think we should participate in facilitating the videos. They're welcome to post whatever support they want, but I don't think us facilitating videos is good because there's no clear person to contact for the other side.

Andrew: Yes, I don't want to promote the fees.

Austin: The party liaison responded to my email already and they said they will talk to the candidate who muted the meeting.

Andrew: This is the final meeting of the quarter. We'll regroup in Spring.

Ruth: I wanted everyone to on their break to go on the Elections Code and read what it says on the requirement of the 20%. If we do not reach the 20% what does it mean when it comes to fees. I want people to read the code and tell me what we all think when we come back.

**MEETING ADJOURNED by Andrew Yan at 3:06 PM**