

ELECTIONS MEETING MINUTES:

Date: 04/03/2023

1. Call to order:
2. Members
 1. Present: Grace Neumann (chair), Jorge Garcia (vice chair), Ally Fritsch, Devin Kircher, Jack Barrell, Kaitlyn Spencer, Grace Sjaastad, Morgan Wright, Dane Dinnsen
3. Absent: Grace Neumann, Grace Sjaastad,
4. Agenda:
 1. (4:10) Ritter-Trout Violation
 1. Defamation and campaign supporters
 2. (4:35) Correa-Laffey Violation
 1. Campaign posters in Lodgepole
 3. (5:00) Ritter Violation
 1. Campaigning in the Native American Cultural Center
 4. (5:30) DeSalvo Violation
 1. Unapproved poster in Clark
5. Topic/hearing: Ritter-Trout Violation
 1. Discussion:
 1. Ritter plead not guilty and
 2. the offense (DeSalvo), used his time to make it clear that the defamation at hand is the responsibility of the plaintiffs, and that these problems will cause the future of the ASCSU to diminish because of these supposed lies
 3. Rithik used his time to make the committee aware that the individual posting defamation is actually been very present and allowed to participate with the defendant
 4. Mia Ritter the defense used her time to make it clear that although Ro is an avid supporter, and took pictures for the campaign but was subsequently paid, "This violation is petty", and students have the ability to "say what they wish" with no actual ties back to the defendant. In addition, Mia said outright that she did see the words used to describe the DeSalvo and Silverheart campaign before she chose to repost still.
 5. OUR DISCUSSION:
 1. One of the offenses, (Rob Long) asked if the partnering up together would assist for the single hearing fact. With a total number of 6 Complaints at category two.
 2. Morgan: she was aware of the words used to describe her candidates and still chose to repost the tagged product from this account despite being aware of this individual's words used against other campaigns
 3. Is 'Ro' apart of this campaign or not, does Mia actually hold the accountability in order to prevent violation of the codes - Section 10 subsection twenty-two,
 4. We do not have the manpower or the ability to challenge ones right to speech, hurtful speech still is present even If it is free, and how does our committee choose to see and handle this situation when we have an office of general council that handles these issues on a day-to-day basis.

5. They were paid for the pictures of the campaign, they know each other better than what was made clear to us, in addition the ritter-trout campaign did violate SOMETHING, even if not the outlined portion of the code.
6. In the past this committee has chosen not to hold any defamation trails. And therefore, when it comes to defamation we can't vote or rule on this issue.
7. Splitting the ticket into two tickets, defer the whole situation to another council/court, (another code condition that needs to be worked on is more specific in the terms of this case)
8. When you hear defamation, this is a big deal, if we decide to defer it must be a university sanctioned general council. Could the legal counsel change the outcome of the election, ASCSU as a whole has not fought defamation because of the legality of the universities position and their best interest.
9. We have a code of ethics that we have adopted, and we can combine like violations, we are presented an up or down vote, based on the rules that we have and how they have been applied.
10. Two violations will be heard, one is defamation 10.6 and violation of 10.22.
11. This supporter (Ro) has posted things in the past slandering Nick, and this will not make a difference in the hearing
12. Devin claims that if we set prevent as a type negligence, then we can then rule on 10.22, and that will set a precedent against this.
13. Motion is made to separate the Voting on 10.22 and 10.6.
14. Those in favor of considering two separate violations
 1. (Yay: 6, Nay:0) (unanimous)
15. Voting on 10.6 first – (has a violation occurred or not occurred)
 1. Not guilty (5:1:0)
16. Voting on 10.22 (has violation occurred yes or no)
 1. Yes guilty (4:2:0)
 2. Discussion upon the category violated has started now
 3. Motion for the violation to be a level of category two, and vote passes as a category 2,
 - 4.

2. Vote:

- Those in favor of considering two separate violations
 - unanimous **yes** (Yay: 6, Nay:0)
- Voting on 10.6 first – (has a violation occurred or not occurred)
 - **Not guilty** (5:1:0)
- Voting on 10.22 (has violation occurred yes or no)
 - **Yes guilty** (4:2:0)
 - Discussion upon the category violated has started now
 - Motion for the violation to be a level of category two, and vote **passes as a category 2 violation**,

6. Topic/hearing: Correa-Laffey Violation (Campaign posters in Lodgepole)

1. Discussion:

1. This violation hearing was submitted by Alex Silverheart, and this was filed for the campaign of Rithik and Jessica Laffey, with which plead as guilty or not guilty, sections 10 subsection 10 is violated along with section 10 subsection 22.

2. The offense chose to use the time to point out that this is relatively cut and dry, and thus this violation has been withdrawn.
2. Vote: **not heard**
7. Topic/hearing: Ritter Violation (Campaigning in the Native American Cultural Center)
 1. Discussion:
 1. Submitted by Rob Long violator (defendant) Mia Ritter plead not guilty for violation of Section 10 subsection 10
 2. Plaintiff speaks first, and the violation report details with pictures and timestamps of the violation being committed,
 3. Private meeting was meeting every single Thursday, was allowed by liaison to attend in hopes for an endorsement was allowed to as a private meeting was prearranged, and elections materials were not left behind.
 4. Ally does verify that she gave permission and that the words that were said were exactly the words she used but no written proof of this being a prearranged meeting is present.
 5. Discussion begins, and this is "Cut and Dry"
 6. Unanimous discussion not guilty
 2. Vote:
 1. Unanimous decision **not guilty** of violating section 10 subsection 10.
8. Topic/hearing: DeSalvo Violation (Unapproved poster in Clark)
 1. Discussion:
 1. Posters in Clark not permitted, violation of section 10 subsection 12
 2. If approval is not allowed if it is against policy and thus violated this portion of the elections code. Unless the campaign can provide proof for the poster in that specific location it is seen as a violation of
 1. If we don't rule on this, then we are setting a precedent that this doesn't matter if no one is caught.
 3. Defendant doesn't know who put that in that location, there is no proof that it was posted from their campaign or another campaign.
 1. Proper preventative measures were put into place within the campaign to ensure that something like this would not happen.
 4. In the future we need to ensure that it is relayed that we remove things to be found in violation at the earliest possible moment.
 5. Voting begins for violation of section 10 subsection 12
 1. Results are not guilty
 2. Vote: unanimous **not guilty** vote from committee.
9. Adjourn:
 1. Notice was made to all participants of all results, and meeting ended at 6:15pm