



**ASSOCIATED
STUDENTS INC.**

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE ASI ELECTION COUNCIL OF ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF CSU CHANNEL ISLANDS, INC.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, to the general public and to all of the Board of Directors of Associated Students of CSU Channel Islands, Inc., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation, that: A meeting of the ASI Elections Council will be held on Thursday, April 13, 2017 at 7:30 – 9:00 a.m. pursuant to Education Code Section 89921 et seq., at California State University Channel Islands, in Bell Tower Rm. 1188, located at One University Drive, Camarillo, CA 93012, to consider and act upon the following matters:

1) Call to Order: 7:37 a.m.

2) Roll Call:

- i. Members present: Jeremy Booker, Michelle Noyes, Sean Kramer
- ii. Members of the Public: Mia Fernandez, Raul Perez, Carla Mena, Noelle Ewing Mariana Hernandez, Rebeca Marquez, Erica Landa, Angela Christopher, Nathan Altman, Roland McClean, Stephen Hemedes, Alexis Mumford, Marshall Goldman, Karina Hinojosa, Isiah Ball, Kristina Hamilton, Helen Alatorre, Cindy Derrico, Ensie Barcelon, Julian Ramirez, Jennifer, Viola Bow, Amelia Flores.

3) Formal Election Council Hearing:

- a. J. Booker made a statement on how the hearing would proceed:
 - i. Full agenda with three cases
 - ii. Case will be heard in the order they were received in full from the complainant
 - iii. When called you will have 5 minutes to make your case
 - iv. After the council will be allowed to question the complainant
 - v. The council will call for witnesses that can lend additional information relevant to the complaint
 - vi. Witnesses will have a sum total of 10-minutes to present their testimony
 - vii. If present the respondent will be called forth and will have up to five-minutes to respond to the charges presented against them
 - viii. The council will call for witnesses that can lend additional information relevant to the complaint
 - ix. Witness will have a total of 10-minutes to present their testimony
 - x. After the council will be allowed to question the respondent
 - xi. At any time the council reserves the right to ask any follow up questions of any complainant, respondent, or witness at any time
- b. Case 1: Alleged violations of the Hemedes and McClean campaign team. Complaint submitted by the Altman and Mumford campaign team.
 1. Complaint 1: The complaint claims that the Hemedes and McClean team campaigned prior to the allowed start date of active campaigning (March 27, 2017). The complainants were informed of this Saturday March 25, 2017, by an anonymous student. The witnesses are Nathan Altman, and Jack Holden. The marketing and advertising had their official logo and small statements.
 - a. Nathan Altman and Alexis Mumford Statement

- i. A. Mumford: Saturday, March 25th, before the election campaigning began, the Hemedes and McClean campaign started their election campaign Instagram page.
 - ii. N. Altman: The account was private and there were no posts on it, but the description for the campaign page was already campaigning for them before the actual start date for the elections.
 - iii. A. Mumford: This allowed people to still request to follow the account, which would be up to the decision of the Hemedes and McClean campaign to accept them or not. This was brought to our attention by a student who wishes to remain anonymous.
 - iv. A. Mumford: Additionally the use of the CI logo was used, which the election code states you are not allowed to use when campaigning. One of their endorsement from the CI Lacrosse team has a picture with the CI logo in the background.
- 2. Complaint 2: The complaint claims that Hemedes, in a social media video, criticized the outreach methods of other candidates. The complainant has alleged this behavior to be slanderous. Witnesses: Nathan Altman
 - a. Nathan Altman and Alexis Mumford Statement
 - i. A. Mumford: Quoted the election code were it speaks about profanity, respect, slander and the like and that if such is used a candidate may be disqualified. In a Snapchat video, Stephen Hemedes in his own personal account said something along the line that his opponent do not campaign toward the right type of people. A witness was offered to the council.
 - 1. Witness: Carla Mena
 - a. It stated that “my opponents don’t know how to target the appropriate audience”. I forwarded that to Alexis Mumford, Nathan Altman, and Jack Holden.
 - ii. A. Mumford: What does this mean? That we don’t know how to campaign? As for as I am concerned, Nathan and I, and sometimes we don’t leave the school until 11’o’clock at night campaigning to the students and some of the students that we have been campaigning to are here today. There isn’t a right person to campaign to on this campus, because each student on this campus matters. Everybody has a voice here and everybody is the right person.
 - iii. N. Altman: They each pay the fees and each are a student here, whether you are full time or part-time you are still a student here.
- 3. Complaint 3: The complaint claims that Hemedes and McClean addressed the campaign in a public venue which disrupted a Student Government event. Witnesses: AlexisMumford.
 - a. Nathan Altman and Alexis Mumford Statement
 - i. A. Mumford: Quoted the election code about keeping the dignity and integrity of the campus community. On April 5th, at the Student Government event, Standing with Survivors, after the event concluded Roland McClean came up to some of the candidates and asked to talk about something serious. It was a serious matter, but the way Roland conducted himself, was not in a professional manner. Some of the candidates that were address were interrupted by this and weren’t able to check in with the candidates or the audience after such an intense event, and a scene was caused. The

correct thing to do was to submit a complaint to the election council about the rumors that were received. Many of the people that were approach by Roland did not appreciate the way you approached them as two of them were panelists and the way Roland approached them took away from the empowering moment that they just had sharing such a person story about themselves. I have a witness who can testify how they were spoken too.

1. J. Booker clarified that while making your claim, please address the council and not the individuals in the room also, the council is going to have the witnesses wait until after your five minutes are up.
 2. C. Derrico: This particular charge, as sent back to you in the response has been referred to the Title IX and Inclusion office. It is not the purview of this committee, it must first be reviewed by Brittany Grice. Meaning we have received it and will wait to hear more until we hear back with an update from that office.
 3. J. Booker: In responding, you do not have to respond to that point, because it is already referred over.
4. Complaint 4: The complaint claims that Hemedes and McClean, on social media, discredited the efforts of Student Government. Witnesses: Karina Hinojosa
- a. Nathan Altman and Alexis Mumford Statement
 - i. A. Mumford: Friday, April 7th, their Instagram statement did not paint the Student Government very well. I quote “we are still in a campaigning process and we have already delivered on a promise to connect you and I and CSUCI. We received more engagement and participation from active students than the official CI sanctioned Student Government page this shows our dedication to action. We are not campaigning to win an election, we are campaigning to show a CI how change is made. You are all amazing examples of the CI family and what it means to come together and be a part of something great. We love you all and will not let you down.
 - ii. N. Altman: Seeing as how he was in Student Government beforehand, last year. He knows who controls the social media. He knows that is the director of operations. Not anyone else. Usually the director of operations and maybe even the president at times.
 - iii. A. Mumford: This is a nice sentiment to his followers, but not to Student Government.
 - ii. S. Kramer: Asked if there are any witnesses to the claims that were made and please feel free to come forward.
 1. Karina Hinojosa, Witness for complaint #4
 - a. This student knows that being in charge of the Student Government social media is part of my position, as I have told him and discussed it in front of him. I did feel that this was a personal attack against me. I did discuss this with the current student government members about it, as I was very emotional about it. This was one of many personal attacks I feel I have received from the Hemedes and McClean team.
 2. Jack Holden, Witness for complaint #1
 - a. I did see the Instagram account up on March 25th with the description before the campaign date.
 3. Marshall Goldman, Witness for complaint #4?
 - a. I read it as well and I did feel when I read it that it was trying to demote other campaign teams, on how they are campaigning, as well

as CI as a whole is trying to connect with student and I don't think that is fair to anyone.

- iii. J. Booker clarified that you do not have to be listed as a witness to speak as a witness. As there are no other witnesses, the election council will move to allow Hemedes and McClean to respond to the alleged complaints, you will have a total of five minutes to respond.
 1. R. McClean: To begin with complaint #1, that the campaigning began prior to the start date. The complainants failed to bring any evidence. It is strictly that they just saw, I don't recall that we ever created the account until March 27th, which was the start of the campaign election. We never started the account before then and they don't have any evidence of it, other than what they said so.
 2. R. McClean: To address complaint #2, the complaint claims that Hemedes in a social media video that criticized the outreach of other candidates. The complaint has alleged this behavior to be slanderous. To begin, they don't have any source, they don't have the video, so we can't judge what was said or wasn't said. Lastly, criticism isn't slanderous and so if they can't take criticism allegedly then I don't know.
 3. R. McClean: Going on to complaint #4, claims that Hemedes/McClean on social media, discredited the efforts of Student Government. What was said was, "we receive more engagement and participation from active students than the official CI sanctioned Student Government page". That's a fact.
 - a. S. Hemedes shared the business analytics which showed statistics of the impressions and Instagram reach in the Ventura County area.
 - b. R. McClean: From that information, I was stating from a factual point of evidence. At the moment for that picture, if we go back, the date is April 7th.
 - c. S. Hemedes: On April 7th I made that post and if you were to look at the most recent Student Government post, you're not seeing the same engagement. I was not intentionally trying to slander Student Government. I didn't now refer to Student Government, and referred in the post to "our". The point of this was to show how hard we are working. I stay up till 4 or 5 every night and wake-up at 7 or 8.
 - d. R. McClean: We didn't discredit the efforts and that's a fact.
- iv. Complaint 5: The complaint claims that the Hemedes and McClean team has used the University logo in campaigning efforts on social media. Witnesses: Alexis Mumford, Nathan Altman, Jack Holden.
 1. R. McClean: Lastly, complaint #5, the complaint claims that Hemedes/McClean, used the university logo in efforts in social media. When we received the endorsement from the Lacrosse team, we asked them what picture they would like to use for their endorsement, they sent us that picture. That is their official team picture. In the picture there is a mural, of an artistic depiction of the CI logo. If anyone was to ask someone in marketing if that is the official CI spirit logo they would say no. There are noticeable differences. It also includes the "we are CI". Thus not making it an official CI logo.
 - a. S. Hemedes: Also in the CI election code, logos are mentioned two times. Where this is loosely defined in the election code and the email that was provided on this topic. For a logo to be a logo, it has to have multiple iterations. This is one mural inside the CI gym.
 - b. R. McClean: It has been around since 2009 and is a part of our school's history.
- v. Hemedes and McClean went on, but council member Sean Kramer shared that they were at time.
- vi. J. Booker ask if Hemedes and McClean had any witnesses they would like to bring forth to support their claims. Hemedes and McClean said no.
- vii. J. Booker opened it up to questions from the council.

1. J. Booker asked if Hemedes or McClean had any support to back up what was said about if you asked someone in communication and marketing about the logo that they would say it wasn't an official university logo.
 - a. S. Hemedes: If you go to the university website it lists the official CI logos. There are two versions shown there. When comparing these on the official university website, there are noticeable differences with the mural and the official logos.
 - b. McClean and Hemedes then brought up the website to show the council the differences.
 - viii. S. Kramer asked if there are any other witnesses for the other claims.
 1. S. Hemedes said he could provide a witness with regards to what he was doing on the 25th of March, he stated that he was actually in Oxnard, CA celebrating with his friends an early birthday. Hemedes also shared that he would know when the campaign actually would start because the 27th is his birthday and went skydiving that day. Therefore it would be difficult for him to forget when they were allowed to start campaigning. It was also stated that they did not promote anything before the 27th of March.
 2. R. McClean said there is no evidence to this, other than what the opposition has said.
 - ix. J. Booker announced that the council will now move on to the second case.
- c. Case 2: Alleged violations of the Hinojosa and Goldman campaign team. Complaint submitted by the Hemedes and McClean campaign team.
- i. Complaint 1: The complaint presented by the Hemedes-McClean ticket claims that the Hinojosa and Goldman team has used the University logo in campaigning efforts on social media. Witnesses: Stephen Hemedes and Roland McClean.
 - a. Stephen Hemedes and Roland McClean Statement
 - i. S. Hemedes: There were uses of the official CI and ASI logos on their Instagram page.
 1. Examples were brought up on the screen:
 - a. "Don't be late to the debate" post where a large logo was exhibited.
 - b. "Stand with Survivors" post where they were wearing CI and Student Government logos
(More clear images where emailed with the complaint to the council)
 - b. J. Booker asked if there were any additional witnesses and Hemedes/McClean stated that there were no additional witnesses.
 - c. J. Booker let the respondents know that they have up to five-minutes to respond.
 - i. K. Hinojosa stated that they received the debate ones from Kristina Hamilton directly and were directed that they could share it through their campaign if they like. To further clarify K. Hinojosa shared that the election code does not talk about the Student Government logo. Additionally stated that this post was not campaign material as it was a Student Government event and a Student Government marketing materials. If the logo had not been used, the post would have been misleading and would have been seen as my event, when in actuality it was a Student Government event. In regards to the name tag, the name tag was flipped backwards, covered by hair, and unreadable in every picture. Additionally the name tag was worn so people could know

who I was, as I am a mandated reporter. This was not on any campaign or flyer. K Hinojosa also shared that she is a survivor of sexual violence and that Marshall Goldman is close to a survivor and it was important to both of them to assist in promoting such an important event. Also stated was that it was upsetting for Roland McClean to approach them in such a threatening manner at the end of such an intense event.

- ii. K. Hinojosa went on to state information that was posted in a video after the event and J. Booker explained that the council could not address this as it has been referred out.
 - iii. K. Hinojosa finally stated that all posts were cleared by all parties involved to properly promote the event.
- d. J. Booker asked for any witnesses.
- i. Alexis Mumford: Saw the posts and knows that the election code states the CI logo or the ASI logo, and it does not say anything about the Student Government logo. As a candidate in this race I had a right to report this as well, but I did not feel it needed to be reported.
 - ii. Stephen Hemedes: ASI is an umbrella and has entities underneath it such as the CI View, Student Programming Board, and the Nautical. All of those logos belong to ASI. Therefore making it an ASI logo. Following that, in the enhanced images in the email, you can tell they are an ASI and a CI logo. If we believed that it was appropriate to post, then we would have not commented on it, but since it was posted on the tickets campaign page inherently it has benefits to her campaign. If she had wanted to, she could have posted it on the Student Government page.
 - 1. K. Hinojosa clarified that it was posted to the Student Government live story.
 - a. S. Hemedes requested that evidence be provided for that.
 - b. J. Booker let the council know that they may raise that questions.
 - c. S. Kramer asked Karina Hinojosa if there is evidence to support that.
 - i. Mia Fernandez stated that she was a witness to this live video as she was in the live video.
 - ii. Katherine Hawkins also stated that she was a witness, as she was a panelist at the event.
 - iii. Alexis Mumford also stated that she was a witness to this live post.
- ii. J. Booker announced that the council will now move on to the third case.
- d. Case 3: Alleged violations of the Altman and Mumford campaign team. Complaint submitted by the Hemedes and McClean campaign team.
- i. Complaint 1: The complaint claims that Nathan Altman, Alexis Mumford and members of their campaign team have participated in slander tactics during campaigning. This claim is supported by the following:
 - 1. Flyer distribution at the Presidential Debate. Witnesses: Stephen Hemedes, Roland McClean, Brooke Oscarson, Jasmin Barajas, and Stephanie Sanchez

2. The creation of the social media page: Hemedes.McCclean ShadeRoom.
Witnesses: Stephen Hemedes, and Roland McClean
- ii. Complaint 2: The complaint claims that Jack Holden, a member of the Altman and Mumford campaign team has participated in negative social media comments which has influenced voter attitudes. Witnesses: Stephen Hemedes, and Roland McClean
 1. Roland McClean and Stephen Hemedes Statement:
 - a. R. McClean: As a campaign it has been felt that there has been personal targeting by the Mumford and Altman campaign team. Alexis Mumford's boyfriend, Jack Holden negatively commented on our page. As well as an Instagram page created call the Hemedes McClean ShadeRoom, saying things that were not nice about both of us.
 - b. S. Hemedes: There were hashtags on the photo posted saying "don't vote for Hemedes.McCclean", "is this Trump election part 2?". For a while Hemedes and McClean didn't think there was any involvement from another campaign team, but when looking into the Facebook page of Nathan Altman, it was found that a post on there said "is it ok for me to hate someone that voted for Trump, because they hate America". Hemedes clarified that of course everyone has a right to their own political opinions. It is a widely known fact that Roland McClean is a proponent of some of the legislation that is passed by President Trump. It is felt that because of his political view, our campaign team and Roland McClean specifically were being targeted by the Altman and Mumford team. Additionally, Alexis Mumford replied to Nathan Altman's post with "Yes it is possible".
 - c. R. McClean added that there have been many other inappropriate allegations that have attached me and our supporters. It is not professional. There were also pictures of me distributed at the debate that I did not give permission to be handed out. The group that passed these out is a group that openly support the Altman and Mumford team. Additionally there are no witnesses, but I have heard from many people that this specific group and this campaign is going out of their way to say false narratives about Hemedes and myself.
 - d. S. Hemedes: I have two witnesses who can attest to the Instagram page. They are available via phone call. There was also an Instagram message that I was sent by a colleague where that person was questioning Alexis Mumford's involvement with the hate page as well. This evidence has been provided to the council.
 - e. J. Booker informed everyone that the council will not reach out to the witnesses via phone as it was stated that if you could not be here you had to provide written documentation it would have had to been sent to Jeremy Booker prior to this hearing.
 - f. S. Kramer asked if there are any pictures here to see currently.
 - i. S. Hemedes clarified that the evidence was given to ASI.
 - ii. Kristina Hamilton clarified as a witness that the flyer was given to Genesis DeLong at the event.
 - iii. (A copy of the flyer was provided to the council in the meeting that was heavily damaged)
 - g. M. Noyes stated that Hemedes/McCclean team brought the complaint against the Hemedes.McCclean Shaderoom Instagram page, against the Altman/Mumford ticket. What evidence to you have to that claim.
 - i. S. Hemedes answered that he connected to the Facebook post between Altman and Mumford. The post was very target and specific. The omission of a name, was the foresight to try not to violate the election code. That is how we connect it.
 1. S. Kramer clarified that the connection is hypothetical.

2. S. Hemedes explained that they felt constantly from different students, and were continued targeted by supports for the Altman/Mumford ticket by these statements.
2. J. Booker called the Altman/Mumford team to the floor to respond.
 - a. Nathan Altman and Alexis Mumford Statement:
 - i. A. Mumford: First addressed the Facebook page. In the screenshot is says March 22nd, meaning this was probably taken premeditated to be used against us. This was taken way before campaigning even started.
 - ii. N. Altman explained that he went to a comedy show the night before the post. The comedians were from all different political parties. Brett Erikson had a funny quote "I voted for Trump because I hate America". I thought this was hilarious, so the next day, I quoted that on Facebook. Furthermore there were three written documentations that was sent.
 - iii. A. Mumford: Anyone who knows the Student Government culture, are all very relaxed and we challenge people in the hypothetical. We all have a sense of humor where we challenge each other to that. There are multiple Student Government members who would be willing to testify on that type of culture.
 - iv. A. Mumford: In regards to the social media page, that page was made April 8th, which is my birthday and I would have no reason to make a page such as a ShadeRoom on my birthday. I was supposed to campaign that day, but I decided to give myself the day off. Also that day I texted Stephen Hemedes, which I provided to the council. It says: Hey, my campaign team just found out about the Instagram page. I just want to let you know I swear it's not us. And we did not encourage it or anyone to do it. I am sorry this is happening and they are using your own photos. This is just not ok". That was sent at 4:45 p.m. At 10:21 p.m., Stephen Hemedes responded: "Thank you for the reassurance. Yes, it's pretty messed up. We are dealing with it right now. It just scares us that there are hate group organizing and we don't quiet feel safe making public appearances right now. We just want to figure out how we want to move forward." And since it was later on and I was celebrating my birthday, I chose not to respond.
 - v. N. Altman: Furthermore I reported the ShadeRoom also I did text Stephen Hemedes on that day as well. Wondering how he was feeling as it was brought to my attention by a friend.
 - b. J. Booker asked if there were any witnesses.
 - i. Brandon Burns witness to the comedy show that Nathan Altman attended. I was invited by Nathan Altman, and he did share that joke in person before he posted it. Also a witness to the flyers that were passed out at the debate did not involve Nathan Altman as I was outside with him fixing his tie and then he went to the restroom and by the time he got back the flyers were already being passed out. There were many people from multiple campaigns sitting at nearby tables at the debate, and we were handed the flyers by other students.
 1. S. Kramer asked if Brandon Burns directly saw who was passing them out. Brandon Burns said he did not as he was not directly passed a flyer.

- ii. Jack Holden was a witness to the fact that he was with Alexis Mumford the entire day on her birthday. I can also attest to the fact that Alexis Mumford had no involvement with the Instagram page as I was with her when she found out about it. Secondly, a complaint was made against me that I made a negative comment on the Hemedes/McClean Instagram page. It wasn't addressed, but it was a simple criticism. The comment was "I guess having more Instagram followers makes you more qualified". This was something that was open for them to respond to. Instead they deleted it within ten-minutes. I don't feel that a simple criticism is slander.
- iii. Rebecca Marquez: A member of MECHA here on campus. We would like to take responsibility of passing out the flyers. We did not do it in support of a specific campaign. We as an organization cannot outwardly support any candidates, so we are not supporters of any of the tickets. We passed out those papers to let information be known. We didn't do it in a slanderous way. It is public information.
- iv. Erica Landa: A member of MECHA. I would like to respond to what was said about feeling attacked when the students did approach one of the candidates. We have a video which demonstrates where I personally asked the candidate if he is feeling attacked and uncomfortable and shared that we could leave him alone. He said no it is fine, just one at a time. We can send the video if the council would like to see it.
- v. Viola Bow: I personally handed out the flyers. The purpose was to just get information out to the audience. There is no connection to any candidates.
- vi. Noelle Ewing: Received a flyer the night of the debate. The picture was not from the debate, but from a peace rally. Severally students have spoken to me about this. N. Ewing went on to say that Roland McClean accused her of handing out the flyers. Additionally at the "Standing with Survivors" event I felt attacked there as well. Candidates include all those running and I felt offended by the social media post because I am extremely involved.
- vii. Alexis Mumford: Was also at the debate in the crowd and when the flyers were being handed out she was outside taking pictures and when she came back in the flyers were on the tables. Also stated that students have every right to do what they did and voice their opinions and concerns.
- viii. Amelia Flores: To address that Roland McClean felt intimidated when approached. We felt the same way at the peace rally when you were holding the Trump sign up at us. We have witnessed, him say that he was at the rally to "start shit", and we have a witness to this, Rebecca Marquez, because he said that to her.
- ix. Jennie Luna (MECHA's advisor): I am aware of some of the activities that go on. They were acting on their own and were not acting on the behalf of any of the candidates.
- x. Mia Fernandez: Received a flyer at the debate, and saw Nathan Altman come out of the restroom and she let him know about the flyers.

A member of the public spoke out of turn and J. Booker told everyone not to respond to it and it was the responsibility of the council to ask questions.

- xi. Julian Ramirez stated that he did not see any of the candidates passing out the flyers.
- xii. Angela Christopher stated that she did receive a flyer from Viola.
- c. Alexis Mumford stated that the testimony states that we handed out the flyers, but that is false information.
 - i. Brandon Burns stated as a witness as well to Nathan Altman exiting the restroom after the flyers were distributed. Alexis Mumford was also sitting at a table, so she could not have distributed them.

4) Questions

- a. J. Booker opened it up to questions from the council.
 - a. M. Noyes asked that when complaints were submitted on this case, there is screen shots from an Instagram, and my name came up, and why were those screen shots given to the council.
 - i. S. Hemedes answered that the screen shots were used to show general Student Government involvement in other campaigns.
 - ii. S. Hemedes branched out to speak to Jack Holden's above comments.
 - iii. M. Noyes interrupted to clarify what she was asking. It says followers and it shows requested with my username, and other Student Government members.
 - iv. S. Kramer added to the question that picture of people who are friends on Facebook were also shared with the council. The council would like to know what those are for and what they support evidence wise.
 - v. S. Hemedes: Sent to show the people who were connected to the campaign team. If not valid then please omit it.
 - vi. M. Noyes: Looking at it, it shows who your account is following, so it's your account showing you following different students.
 - vii. S. Hemedes: Was trying to show followers of different campaign teams. This was from a different case that was actually omitted and dropped.
 - b. M. Noyes: In reference to the Instagram post, during your first testimony, I don't know why I would say Student Government in this post.
 - i. S. Hemedes: I meant to say, I don't know why I would slander Student Government, as I am trying to become a part of Student Government. The statement was to just show how much work is being put in.
 - c. J. Booker asked a question in reference to Case #2 (Hinojosa/Goldman). The question is for Karina Hinojosa, can you verify which account you posted these pictures too?
 - i. K. Hinojosa: The ones with Marshall and I, and Mo and I, were on our election campaign. The video was posted on my personal, the election, and Student Government. The purpose was to get these confidential resources in the video out to as many students as possible.

5) Deliberations:

- a. J. Booker stated that the council would move on to deliberations. This portion is closed for comment, unless you are specifically addressed by members of the council. If you want to remain here, please do so quietly and thank everyone for coming and that they could leave or stay, but if there are interjections, you will be asked to leave.
- b. J. Booker, as this point we will go in order, and are operating under the charge of do we feel that complainant efficiently made the case for a violation of the election code. If the council believes a case has been made, the council can do four different remedies: 1) the council can dismiss the complaint and can refer it to the proper campus office, 3) can issue a written up warning, 4) can remove candidacy, 5) or can call for a new election.
- c. The council took time to schedule their next meeting to be able to continue the deliberations then.
 - i. The next hearing will be 12-1:30 p.m. on Monday, April 17th
 - ii. This will be posted appropriately for the public to be able to attend
- d. Case 1:
 - i. Complaint 1:
 1. M. Noyes stated that it did violate the election code, as it popped up as a recommended account for her to follow prior to the campaigning start date.
 2. S. Kramer did not see a date on the screen shot that was emailed to the council.
 3. C. Derrico reminded the council that is not the obligation of the council to produce the evidence but on the complainant.
 4. M. Noyes pulled up the evidence of the screen shot and the date is Sunday, March 26th.
 5. J. Booker for clarification, you say that this statement here that reads "Our mission is to bring students to the forefront of CSUCI's decision making processes #Clvoice Connecting you and I in CSUCI, copyright 2017" is campaigning?
 - a. M. Noyes stated yes.
 - b. S. Kramer stated that just the last part, because the rest of it would just sound like a normal hey let's get everyone to come together
 - c. M. Noyes having their last names attached to their statement and that it was popping up on peoples accounts
 - d. S. Kramer at this time it was considered a private account with only three followers, which could be just them.
 - e. J. Booker: Do you need to take any action in order to have Instagram target people who you may be affiliated with?
 - i. S. Kramer: No, it just goes through similar circles. It can target anyone.
 6. J. Booker asked if we can vote on this point, if there is a violation of this code?
 - a. S. Kramer and M. Noyes both stated yes.
 - b. J. Booker votes no.
 - c. J. Booker seeing as the majority has it, what is the suggested remedy for this?
 - i. M. Noyes stated that this most likely helped their campaign before anyone else started campaigning.
 - ii. J. Booker stated that it is his thought that it could be considered unintentional marketing. Obviously, we don't know the reach or how that impacted followership.
 - iii. M. Noyes notes that in Hemedes and McClean's statement today, they said they did not start campaigning before the 27th or March. But this has been decided is campaigning.
 - iv. J. Booker clarified that this could be a difference of opinion as they could have seen campaigning as making the account not private anymore to be campaigning or could have been a member of the their campaign team. If we revert back to

- times without social media, you could compare this to making signs in ones garage to prepare.
 - v. J. Booker called for the rest of the council's recommendation to move forward.
 - vi. M. Noyes stated that she sees this as starting campaigning two days early and that is an advantage. Meaning that they broke the election code and would put this under a dismissal.
 - vii. J. Booker and S. Kramer vote for a written warning.
7. Complaint 1 will receive a written warning.
- ii. Complaint 2:
 - 1. M. Noyes vote is to dismiss.
 - 2. S. Kramer votes to dismiss since the council can't see it.
 - 3. J. Booker votes to dismiss as well.
 - 4. Complaint 2 is dismissed.
 - iii. Complaint 3:
 - 1. As previously explained above, those complaint cannot be heard by the Election Council.
 - iv. Complaint 4:
 - 1. M. Noyes stated that it seems to be targeted toward Student Government
 - 2. J. Booker disagrees and can see how it can be taken offensively, but was written as a basis of fact, and to show the impact and foot print being contributed. I don't see where in our election code this would be a violation.
 - 3. S. Kramer stated that is not towards a candidate but Student Government.
 - 4. The council all voted to dismiss.
 - 5. Complaint 4 is dismissed.
 - v. Complaint 5:
 - 1. M. Noyes stated that this one is hard because the CI logo is everywhere. For example, you could take a picture by a bulletin board and have logos in it. I don't see a major problem, especially because it was not on a flyer they handed out.
 - 2. J. Booker asked if we need additional clarification on this?
 - 3. S. Kramer shared that they did put up the gym picture with the mural in the back on their social media page.
 - 4. J. Booker reminded the council that the evidence presented today said that it was not a sanctioned university logo.
 - 5. J. Booker would like clarification with marketing on this point.
 - 6. Complaint 5 will be pinned until additional feedback from communication and marketing is supplied to the council.

6) Adjournment: 8:56 a.m. and will be reconvened Monday, April 17 at noon, and the location will be announced once a room is secured.

Any interested person may submit documents in support of, opposition to, or otherwise related to complaints to the Election Council Chair prior to the hearing. Documents submitted should bear the title and name of the submitter and a brief statement of the submitter's connection with or interest in the complaint. These documents will be distributed to the individual with the alleged accusation. Submissions may be directed to jeremy.booker@csuci.edu and must be received prior to the public hearing.

Next Election Council public hearing is scheduled for Monday, April 17, 2017 at 12:00 p.m. in the Student Union Conference Room. Minutes transcribed based on hearing recordings, please note some pieces may be inaudible. Respectfully submitted by Annie Block-Weiss, ASI Administrative Support Coordinator.