General Body Meeting

April 22, 2009

1) Roll Call

2) Community Time

3) President's Report
   a) Will approve appointments committee by committee. Then will go through elections results. Then will go into executive session to discuss three elections appeals (within set time limits)
   b) There is an unofficial meeting next week for UCS

4) Vice President's Report
   a) Brian and Mike will meet with President Simmons. Anything to discuss:
      a. Diane Mokoro: Text message notifications about snow days and delays
      b. Jerry Cedrone: Is there a way to have a system to support nationwide and worldwide community service efforts? Now, Brown focuses and recognizes community service that affects Brown’s campus and community. New category in UCS Student Activities, perhaps?

5) Appointments Approval
   a) AAA:
      CCC Appointments—Arthur Matuszewski ('10), Jasmina Stritof ('10), Shelia Krishnan ('11), and Alex Wilpon ('11). Patrick Martin Tuite as alternate ('11) —Approved
      Update: gathering responses from prereq interviews and will pass those on to next year’s committee chairs. Also, syllabi should be online
   b) ASS
      LAB: Amanda Kozar, Talia Kegan—Approved
      PSOC: Evan Holownia—Approved
      CAB: Ang Zheng—Approved
      Update: Alyssa and Debra are compiling list of student activities. Send her information if you haven’t already
   c) CL
      CL Advisory Board Appointments-Doug Jacobs—Approved
      Res Council-Ben Lowell, Eoin Chung, Jane Zhang, Chaz Kelsh, Greg Anderson, Gerard Cedrone, Jillian Robbis—Approved
      Update: vegan nutritional information for Campus Market is online. Ben Farber is trying to finalize changes in dining hall hours (VDub should have breakfast offered for another half hour)
Communications
ACCRIP—Helen Chen ’10, Alternate is Raisa Aziz ’11—Approved
Update: Need end of year updates from other committees. Maybe box-slip day 1 of next year?

e) SA:
BUCC appointments: Chaney Harrison, Brittaney Check, Ama Quao—Approved
DAB appointment: Brittaney Check—Approved
UDC appointment: Jee Hyun Choi, Chaz Firestone, Paul Shamirian, Lauren Pischel, Jason Bertoldi—Approved

Student Group Categorization:
- International Humanitarian Foundation as Category 2—Approved
- Pencil Project as Category 1—Approved
- FIMRC (foundation for international medical relief for children) as Category 1—Approved
- Brown Hispanic Business Association as Category 1—Approved
- Human Defense Initiative as Category 1—Approved

If you are going to be on Eboard next year, please meet with your predecessor to ensure continuity!

6) Election Results Approval, Complaints, and Announcements
Non-appealed, non-run-off races:
1) AAA Chair: Robert Taj Moore (52.66%); Jasmina Stritoff (30.65%). Taj Moore approved as AAA Chair
2) ASS Chair: Andrew Bergmanson ran unopposed (received at least 5%). Andrew Bergmanson approved as ASS Chair
3) CL Chair: Ben Farber ran unopposed (received at least 5%). Ben Farber approved as CL Chair
4) SA Chair: Brady Wyrtzen ran unopposed (received at least 5%). Brady Wyrtzen approved as SA Chair

Three appeals. Each candidate will have 5 minutes followed by 2 minutes from Council followed by 5 minutes from Elections Board and 2 minutes from Council

1) Anish. His name was left off the ballot for the first hour or two of the election. Two hundred votes already cast, more than 10% of votes. From that figure alone, thinks he has a valid appeal. He was not notified—found out himself that his name was not on the ballot. Was put on the ballot, but those individuals who had already voted were not allowed to revote. There was no email sent to the electorate—people deserve to know if there’s a problem with the ballot. Also, he was not given information throughout this process. His picture and candidate information was also missing. He was confused and does not think the situation was handled properly.
   a. Elections Board: Most of interaction was with Zack Langaway. Between 12 and 1:15, Anish found out name was not on ballot. At 1:15, Zack put Anish’s name and information on ballot. Zack and Anish agreed to discount the votes cast between 12 and 1:15. Bottom line: even after those votes between 12 and 1:15 were cast, Anish still lost and the top six people were the same. Anish had 557 votes, person in 6th place had 623 (far less than the 286 votes discounted)
   b. Anish denies that he agreed to this. All Zack said was “we are discounted all votes that are cast and we will put you back on the ballot.” He did not know how many votes were cast. The last 4 or 5 slots could be different.
   c. Questions:
      i. Jerry Cedrone: in first two hours, would a vote for Anish have taken away votes from other candidates? If people whose votes
were cast were allowed to revote, could results have been
different? Yes.
ii. Kening Tan: votes are anonymous? Yes.
iii. Max Lubin: what did elections board consider? Were unaware that
Anish did not agree. Thought revote would disenfranchise more
voters.
iv. No transcript—conversations were by phone.

2) Salsa-UFB Chair. On Tuesday of election, Jose Vasconez put up posters comparing
their accomplishments. Have of what Jose was false. Said Salsa never fundraised---
but she’s part of Class Board, Relay for Life. She emailed Elections Board on
Wednesday (15th) to ask for procedure, but did not receive email from Elections
Board while polls were open or while polls were closed. Thought Elections Board
would address complaints. Appeal: thought process was unfair and thinks that
procedure was violated. Elections Board is to ensure fairness of elections board and
make sure that process is smooth. Doesn’t think that opponent’s material should be
false. US Law, like UCS law, does not tolerate slander or liable. Also, her
complaints were not addressed. Her complaints were raised and not addressed—
responsibility of Board is to student body and candidates

a. Elections Board: elections board monitors content of posters. Zack stamped
Jose’s material and deemed it appropriate. Due to issues, they were
(apologetically) unable to do anything. Complaint came hours before polls
closed. Only penalty is to penalize points—polls had closed so they could
either disqualify him or allow results to stand.

b. UCS Questions:
   i. Alyssa Blood: what was vote? Salsa 845, Jose 924
   ii. Brittaney Check: is there anything written about campaign material
and slander? Checks and balances?
      1. Brian Becker: next UCS president will revise elections
         board. Any complaint filed must be addressed by
         elections board, as stated by code.
      2. Nothing in the Code speaks about campaign material.
         Want an honest campaign
      3. Harris Li: in elections packet, there is information about
         campaign material. Not in relation to elections board

iii. Clay Wertheimer: timeframe?
   1. Sent email Wednesday after 10:30. Polls closed at 12 on
      Thursday.

iv. Phileda Tennant: information
   1. “A couple dozen hours” v. “hundreds of hours” for UFB
doesn’t make sense mathematically. Fundraising also
blatantly false.

v. Max Lubin: When did you first know about false information?
   1. Salsa: heard about it on Tuesday. Busy Tuesday night.
      Unsure about appeals process, so waited.

vi. Diane Mokoro: Did Zack know that posters were dishonest?

vii. Jerry Cedrone: who replied to Salsa?
   1. Unable to make a decision on Wednesday, wanted to wait
      until Thursday to see poll results.

viii. Jasmina Stritof: when did posters go up?
   1. Posters went up on Tuesday. Salsa never (not even now)
      received a reply.

3) Neil Parikh-UFB Vice Chair. On Tuesday, removed a set of illegally posted signs.
Realized it was immature. Witnessed. Went to meeting with Zack and Lilly—
suggested that his points for printing be removed and he apologize. Got a call from
Zack urging him to withdraw from election, otherwise he might be disqualified. If he withdrew, there would be a gag rule put in place. No possible reparations or full elections board appeal mentioned. Emailed BDH telling them that he would withdraw. Ricky Gresh told him about other options—talked to Lilly about fair hearing. Zack strongly encouraged him not to appeal and he decided to withdraw. Elections Board violated the agreement of silence on two occasions when they were quoted in the BDH. Appeal: did not receive fair hearing or fair option. Did not have fair, impartial board because two members of Board made decisions.

a. Elections Board: Initial meeting with Zack, Neil, and Lilly was NOT formal. Merely investigating and suggested he resign for personal reasons. Elections Board did not speak to BDH during the time when the polls were open. Discussions took place in the open—someone could have overheard. Acted as timely as possible. Had called full board thinking that Neil didn’t want to resign, but then Neil decided to resign so they canceled this meeting.

b. UCS Questions
   i. Ben Farber: Lilly confirmed facts on Thursday with BDH. Violation of agreement?
      1. Lilly: agreement was to keep elections as fair as possible and not talk during voting
      2. Neil: thought agreement was never to talk to BDH
   ii. Ben Farber: Was appeal necessary for disqualification, or could Elections Board chair act independently? When Zack threatened disqualification, was Neil aware that appeals process was necessary?
      1. Neil: did not know that formal complaint had not been filed. Thought that disqualification was guaranteed.
   iii. Diane Mokoro: final results?
      1. Juan 999 and Neil had 667
   iv. Clay Wertheimer: when were names changed?
      1. Early morning on Wednesday
   v. Max Lubin: do you, Neil, honestly feel that personal contact with Juan caused Zack Langway to act as he did (as stated in appeal)
      1. Neil: to some degree, yes.
   vi. Elections Board: why didn’t you go through with formal hearing?
      1. Neil: in his perception, he thought that Zack and Lilly had already made up their mind and didn’t expect less involved members to present his case.
   vii. Phileda Tennant: is there history for these unofficial meeting?
      1. Lilly: there’s no formal process for Elections Board. They make up their own rules each year—probably not the best way. Zack and Lilly did what they thought was fair. Thinks it is unfair to say that Lilly and Zack say they were biased. Lilly had even urged Neil to run.
   viii. Brittaney Cheek: what can UCS do?
      1. UCS can only approve or disapprove of election results. Typically process if for there to be another election as soon as possible if elections disapproved.
   ix. Ben Farber: what were offers that were discussed?
      1. Lilly: disqualification and exchange of points. Note—Elections board did not interpret the poster’s removal as “the removal of an illegal poster.” At the time, presented as a malicious action.
4). Move to executive session.
   a. Motion to approve results for UFB at-large representatives NOT APPROVED
   b. Motion to approve results for UFB Chair APPROVED
   c. UFB Vice Chair Elections are APPROVED Executive Session ends

   c) Brian and Mike will probably write campus-wide email, host meeting with UFB at-large candidates. Fall timeline might be affected by one to two weeks.

d) Presidential Results: Clay Wertheimer (64%), Ryan Lester (34%)--approved
e) Vice Presidential Results: Diane Mokoro (66%), Harris Li (33%)--approved