



**Student Government
Association**

Elections Board Meeting Minutes

Date: 03/05/2024

- I. Call to Order
a. 5:36PM

II. Roll Call

Name	Position	Present/Absent	Required Attendance
Melanie Montes	Elections Commissioner	Present	Yes
Desiree Dawson	Deputy Elections Commissioner	Present	Yes
Jazmin Laughlin	Elections Board Member	Present	Yes
Grace Sancruzado	Elections Board Member	Present	Yes
Johnny Merino	Elections Board Member	Present	Yes

III. Unfinished Business

- a. n/a

IV. New Business

- i. Campaign Violation 1: Harlan Rifkind (Speaking on behalf of the accuser who could not make it)
 1. They are breaching several election codes. First, they put many posters on bulletin boards when there should only be one per candidate. It should also be noted that the accuser indicates that each candidate had existing posters and campaign material on their social media accounts, as well as YDSA campaign material, despite receiving a Tier 1 violation for their previous writ, which prohibited them from campaigning for 72 hours.
- ii. Kassandra Toussaint
 1. Asserts that they are not breaching the code; in the most recent violation hearing, they were specifically advised that they were permitted to keep up past and old campaigns. It should also be mentioned that the posters were removed after the candidates learned of the infraction.
- iii. Daniel Salup-Cip
 1. Indicates that the first violation should be thrown out because the board already struck an agreement on these campaign matters on the last call. Also claims that after they learned of the breach, they immediately



**Student Government
Association**

removed the posters from the board. They did not purposefully violate any rules, and once they were aware, they acted immediately.

- iv. Joncarlo Ospina
 1. Understands that the late meeting minutes may be perplexing, but ensures that a consensus and understanding has been achieved with the board on the previous meeting. Thinks this writ was a political attack and disagrees with how the board handled the situation.
 - v. James Hernandez (witness)
 1. States that when they learned of the violation, they helped to remove the posters
- b. Questions Period
- i. Jazmin L. asked the accuser Harlan if he took the photos himself. He answers that he is just a stand-in.
 - ii. It is asked of all three candidates how long the posters/flyers were up by Jazmin L. Cassandra shows evidence that the candidates did take down the flyers. They have time stamps to prove this they were put up on the 20th and taken down on the 22nd. JC claims that the accuser went on Instagram to gain their evidence. Daniel states that he and the other candidates have continued communicating with the elections board and following the rules.
 - iii. Grace S asked if the people associated with the party were aware of the poster posting in correlation with their campaigning. Cassandra answered that she called her associates and they took them down. Daniel answers that their candidacy is not overly centralized and because of this, the operation of where their flying is not super centralized it's a similar situation to when their posters were unknowingly put up in Sipa.
 - iv. Cassandra claims that she lives distant from university and understands the codes, but when YDSA, an organization she supports, offers assistance to independent candidates like herself. She accepts it since, as a commuter student who works, extra assistance is needed. But sometimes things happen, and she does her best to maintain control and ensure that regulations are followed. JC reiterates this testament. When a candidate discovers a violation, they do their best to fix the matter. And this writ feels personal.
 - v. Johnny Merino asks Daniel if they are members of YDSA and, if so, if they use the YDSA logo/name on their posters for endorsement. Daniel responds that all of the candidates are members of YDSA and operate in tandem with the organization. JC maintains that not everyone who works for them is under YDSA. Not everyone engaged in their campaign is authorized to work for them or YDSA. He confirms that they are endorsed by YDSA.
 - vi. Cassandra slightly disagrees with the statement that there are no random persons. That everyone who helps them knows at least one person in the organization, and they care about the candidacy and it's values. Daniel adds that while they are members of YDSA they are not leaders, they don't "use" the YDSA.



**Student Government
Association**

- vii. Johnny also requests James' point of view, in which they state that they have been supported/endorsed by YDSA but are not a YDSA member.
- c. Closing Statements:
 - i. Harlan Rifkind
 - 1. According to the code, candidates are liable for any constituents or party members who are posting. They should be aware of any posting policies. All three candidates acknowledge being negligent about the problem. One of the applicants is an incumbent and is aware of the regulations. Tier 1 violation recognizes this negligence. The ydsa post on the 20th reveals the posters, which were placed on the same day, so why didn't the candidates know about the postings?
 - ii. Kassandra Touissaint
 - 1. Understand that the posters are on Instagram, but it was the third slide in, and they followed the guidelines as best they could. As soon as they were aware of any postings, they made every effort to have them removed.
 - iii. Daniel Salup-Cid
 - 1. They do not analyze every post that YDSA makes; if they had caught any posters, they would have dealt with them. They are working, full-time students, and doing their best. They do not exhibit continuous negligence because this infraction was reported before their original violation hearing.
 - iv. JonCarlo "JC" Ospina
 - 1. They work hard and have had a lot of action. They feel bullied, and this writing is ridiculous. They do not deserve a Tier 3 because it states that even after being informed of a violation, they do nothing. Which is not the case. If they see something wrong, they work hard to fix it.
 - v. Harlan soon explains that what he meant by continuous neglect was that the posts were still up and they hadn't been adhering to the code closely. JC explains that some posts were not removed because they did not want to delete anything that could be used as proof for the elections board.
 - vi. James Hernandez
 - 1. Supports the allegation that any offending posters were removed as soon as any candidates were made aware of the infringement. And they think it's absurd that they should be forced to delete any proof.
- d. Deliberation
 - i. Jazmin agreed with Harlan on the posting on the building policy being broken. Desiree asked for clarification and it was noted by Mel, Jazmin and Grace that there was a level of negligence as they kept on these posters for 48 hours even though it broke the code.
 - ii. Johnny asks for clarity on the posting and endorsement policies. Mel clarifies what they are expected to post.
 - iii. Mel advises that each candidate must be aware of the codes and ensure that others working with them understand the posting policy. Both Jazmin and Mel



**Student Government
Association**

say this is an obvious example of negligence, and they should have approved what was going on.

- iv. Desiree claims that the first breach cannot be upheld because candidates were clearly advised that they may keep past campaign materials up. Desiree also believes that a Tier 3 penalty should be issued, which would prevent them from actively campaigning for the remainder of the voting session for violating the posting regulation. The rest of the board agrees.
- e. Voting Period
 - i. Melanie Montes moves into the voting period based on violations 6006.1 and 6006.3 against Daniel Salup-Cid, JonCarlo Ospina, and Kassandra Toussaint on a Tier 1 violation. This is seconded by Jazmin L.
 1. All Board members present
 - a. Melanie No
 - b. Desiree No
 - c. Jazmin No
 - d. Grace No
 - e. Johnny No
 - ii. Melanie Montes moves into the voting period based on violations 6006.1 and 6006.3 against Daniel Salup-Cid, JonCarlo Ospina, and Kassandra Toussaint on a Tier 3 violation. This is seconded by Jazmin L.
 1. All Board members present
 2. Melanie Yes
 3. Desiree Yes
 4. Jazmin Yes
 5. Grace Yes
 6. Johnny Yes
 - f. Melanie Montes clarified that they have been given a Tier 3 Violation. Daniel asked for clarification, which notes that this period will end Wednesday @6:51. New material cannot be posted, but existing posters/flyers can stay up if they follow the code. Daniel continues to ask what happens if outsiders repost their material, they say that's okay but try not to have YDSA post their material because it could look like they are campaigning through YDSA.
 - g. Kassandra asked about the posting policy and about others reposting their campaign material. Melanie restates that if someone else posts their content and it's out of the candidate's hands and the board understands this. But just make sure the individual candidates aren't posting and affiliated orgs such as YDSA aren't posting either so people don't get it confused for endorsement/campaigning.
 - h. Harlan asks for clarification on why they can't campaign for 24hrs when the elections code states that Tier 3 must be a min of 48hrs. Mel states that since elections are over tomorrow and so is campaigning this is the max timing.
 - i. JC asks further questions about what a Tier 3 violation means. And that he would be going to appeal this case, and that when they went to appeal their case last time for their writ decision there was no response. JC stands that the board should go back on their



**Student Government
Association**

decision, JC disagrees with their stance on the negligence. Melanie clarifies that the negligence is for the posting policy and the bulletin board.

- j. JC asks if they are allowed to at least table for just an hour because there is only a day left. Mel denies this request because the board has already made their decision. All appeals have to go to the judicial and Mel reviews the statutes. But it's asserted that the candidates need to reach out to the judicial board.
 - k. Kassandra asked about class groupchats posting flyers and if the campaign policy extends to msg apps. And if a post can be made to stop people from campaigning on their behalf. Mel says that she can post to ask about no campaigning, but they understand how group chats work. Try to limit it the best they can.
 - l. Harlan asks if the posting applies to other orgs. and Mel confirms it does but it mainly means YDSA because they are highly correlated with these candidates.
 - m. JC asked if there is a standard about the violation on a tier 3. Mel says she understands his confusion about what negligence they committed but even if the candidates rectified the violations they are still responsible for the initial violation. If they have further questions they can email the board.
- V. Meeting Adjournment
- a. The meeting adjourned at 7:13 pm