



PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION MEETING

Associated Students

July 15th, 2016

AS Nati conference room

Minutes taken by: Karen Kyi

Name	Note: absent (excused/not excused) arrived late (time) departed early (time) proxy (full name)	Name	Note: absent (excused/not excused) arrived late (time) departed early (time) proxy (full name)
Marisela Marquez	Present		
Jimmy Villarreal	Present		
			t

Villarreal: Communication from the election committee based on the allegations, the page before that is the letter from the president of the interfraternity council as his response

Marquez-: in terms of timelines, this came out first.

Villarreal: this one went to the student body but it was also given to the senate no?

Marquez: the day that you were voting the complaint came in alerting the elections board that this was occurring perhaps the day before. Then this came in unsolicited to the elections board and they met about it, read it and essentially what the complaint had said was confirmed by this. Typically the elections board will do more investigation itself, but this letter confirmed what was said. This and the confirmation from the IFC is what prompted them to send this out and the senate meeting happened the day after. All that occurs, this isn't dated but it comes out after the release of the first investigation

Villarreal: the last page, not talking about that.

Marquez: I know, just letting them know that that's the order it happened. Brendan's letter precedes this.

Villarreal: but they made a recommendation, maybe not writing it out like this, but they made a recommendation to revote before that. Cause how did Brendan know about this before?

Marquez: no, they reached out to campaign manager for some of the members for some of the members running for office. I don't know how the connection went from the campaign managers to Brendan. But the next thing happened is not a message from the candidates or the manager but the first thing they receive is this letter from Brendan.

Villarreal: I will read the letter from Brendan.

(Villarreal reads letter)

Villarreal: so that's from the election because the preliminary finding found that there was no bribery as far as the legal term

Marquez: we should read that, you can find it on the website

Villarreal: I'm going to email you both minutes later today or tomorrow so that we can look back at those and make some decisions. And if you could read this last one please.

Marquez: Can you send me what you send them.

(Villarreal Reads Document)

Villarreal: So I think it's important to look at what is in the last paragraph. Marisela mentioned that the investigation was split into different questions. The first question that was addressed in the preliminary findings was about the use of the term "bribery" whether or not bribery occurred. The election committee mentioned the other questions addressed. Second question continued to look at whether the IFC grant program resulted in serious voting irregularity as a result of undue student influence. Other question if it violated any current Associated Students election codes, Campus elections commission guidelines or campus regulations. So those were the three questions. Those were the three areas of the scope that the investigation looked at. Anything that seemed to possibly change the results of the election. Just keep those in mind. And we will have the report for you at the official meeting. We went over the summation. Now we just have issues to discuss issues. Few things we can talk about. Bylaws of the commission (we want to get something down on paper), what constitutes Coram for the commission (if we don't have enough people, can we make any votes?), who it is that is in the leadership position of the elections commission (so like Marisela mentioned we have a vice chair, secretary for the treasury), recruitment of members (we need more members), nomination procedures (how it is you go about finding somebody else and how to go to that process), compensation for services (we have set aside for 5000 overall for any kind of expense this commission will incur, so we want to talk about how much each commission should get honoraria wise). Bylaws go, we wanted to talk about Coram and majority. What is Coram? How many people does it take to actually pass a vote? What else bylaws wise?

Marquez: How often are you going to meet? That's part of a bylaw change. What's your charge, what's your scope? Those are each bylaw changes and creations. How often do you get to create a whole new entity? Whether or not you want to have a public meeting or a closed off meeting and how you would go about that. So it's basically who,

what, when, where and why. Those are basically what bylaws are. And you have articulated or the senate has taken it down a certain path as far as what the boundaries are and what your expectations are. But now you are in power to add or edit them. During compensation, you will see in the legal code that all the members in the association have a certain honoraria, you get a set amount based on certain duties. So you should have a bylaw with the duty of the commissioners how much do you want to allow for your own honoraria. And there are some recommendations I could give to you or the chair could give. I will be staffing this myself and my backup would be my other managers in the department in case I cannot be here. Somebody else will be here. We will also have a student employee here. You may ask me for a report weekly, however I do not know how often you will meet so whenever you meet you can ask for a regular update from me or any of the regular staff. So generally that is bylaws. You might want to think about them, but at this point you might want to make nominations about other people to be at the table.