Elections Board Meeting Minutes  
Date: 02/05/2024

I. Call to Order  
a. 6:38 PM

II. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Present/Absent</th>
<th>Required Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Montes</td>
<td>Elections Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree Dawson</td>
<td>Deputy Elections Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazmin Laughlin</td>
<td>Elections Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Sancruzado</td>
<td>Elections Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Unfinished Business  
a. n/a

IV. New Business  
a. Campaign Violation 1: Santana Way
   i. Opening statements: Santana Way: Candidate Kailey LaChapelle used resources to seek campaign and fundraising assistance. This violated several election codes. LaChapelle also did not notify the Elections Commissioner of any fundraising. Emails were sent proving LaChapelle's code infractions.
   ii. Kailey LaChapelle: Kailey LaChappelle did not deny sending the email. They drafted the email at the SGA office. The email was in LaChappelle's drafts folder and was not intended to be sent. Their PSU director contacted them to let them know the email had been sent. Proof of this accident: the email was excessively long, and no other SGA members were copied. No one responded to the email, and no money was received by the candidate or their party. They are arguing a Tier 3 violation
iii. Hua Hui Samuel Vogel: A character witness states that this is out of character for Kailey LaChapelle and that it was a mistake. Fundraising is not explicitly defined in the election codes Arguing for a Tier 3 violation

b. Questions Period
   i. Desiree Dawson: Asked Santana Way how he found out about this email and the violations.
   ii. Santana Way: He was informed by someone who asked if funding was permitted, and they presented him the email.
   iii. Similar question for Santana Way asked by Grace Sancruzado: followed by what he did once he saw this email
   iv. Santana Way: Said he didn’t do anything until he reviewed the elections code. Then he emailed the board.
   v. Questions from Jazmin Laughlin to Kailey LaChapelle: Asking how the emails left his drafts and why he failed to contact the elections board.
   vi. Kailey LaChapelle: they have a history with email issues and he planned to contact the board but decided not to after talking to his team.
   vii. Grace Sancruzado: Asking LaChapelle that since they understand that there is negligence in their actions why are they asking for a Tier 3.
   viii. Desiree Dawson asking Kailey LaChapelle if he was aware before the writ was submitted or opposing candidates knowledge, if he heard that other candidates knew about the email. LaChapelle denies he knew a writ was going to be placed.
   ix. Desiree Dawson Asked LaChapelle if his team/director agreed that contact with elections board should not be done. LaChapelle and his team did not think he should out himself.

c. Closing Statements:
   i. Santana Way believes that this should be a Tier 1 violation. Because even if LaChapelle did not intend to send the email, they breached the code. Regardless of whether Erica sent the message, the email was nonetheless delivered. They failed to contact the election commission or the contributors. Even if money was received, there was an acceptance of purpose.
   ii. Kailey LaChapelle: Denies that they were waiting for a response and that if they had received one, they would have notified the board. They are a stickler for standards, extremely busy, and should not be characterized by a single error. Tier 1 means that the board agrees that this was intent.

d. Deliberation
i. Melanie Montes: Review/read the difference between all the Tier Violations and which codes the candidate was accused of violating.

ii. Melanie Montes: pulls up email evidence submitted by Santana Way and specifically the time stamps on the emails.

iii. Move into deliberation after revealing evidence.

iv. Jazmin L: Understands how the mistakes happen but there is no proof of whether LaChapelle sent it or not. believes that actions did not represent that this was a mistake.

v. Melanie M: Agrees with Jazmin there isn't clear evidence of this being a mistake and didn't take accountability for these actions.

vi. Desiree Dawson: States that Kailey didn't seem apologetic and didn't do anything to fix the situation. Continues to state in the call that they understand that a violation was conducted but are more concerned that they were caught more than there sorry for their violations.

vii. Grace S: Agrees with Desiree stating that having documents from their advisor does count for something, but this is clear negligence.

viii. Jazmin L: Asked if other writs or violations had been conducted prior to this.

ix. Both Desiree D and Melanie M states that he has had a history of violations and writ hearings. Melanie continues to state that when candidates apply they sign a clear statement of the codes and violations.

x. Desiree Dawson: Mentions that Kailey's email was sent before their candidacy was approved by the board, which makes it seem less of negligence.

xi. Jazmin L: Agrees this seems slightly premeditated because of how early in applications the email was sent.

xii. Grace S: Is confused of why the donor list and who these emails were sent to wasn't presented by the candidate.

xiii. Melenie: Reviews the email sent to the board to look for premeditation.

xiv. Jazmin L: Ask about past writs against Kailey LaChapelle.

xv. Desiree Dawson: Ask if code violations would affect the candidates current roles in SGA.

***

**Voting Period**

i. Melanie Montes mentions to move into voting period based on Santana Way's writ against Kailey LaChapelle violation on Tier 1.

ii. Desiree D: Seconded

iii. Melanie: Yes

iv. Desiree: Yes

v. Jazmin: Yes

vi. Grace: Yes

vii. Based on unanimous decision

viii. Based on code 6007.8

**Elections Board Members**
g. Advisor Report

V. Announcement
   a. N/A

VI. Meeting Adjournment
   a. The meeting adjourned at 7:46 pm