CMU Student Senate

Minutes of Special Meeting April 12, 2004

9:05 pm Roll Call

> **Senators Present:** Hussein Al Baya (SIA), James Auwaerter (CIT), Julie
> Beckenstein (HSS), Michelle Birchak (CIT), Tim Bowen (HSS), Matt
> Brooks (HSS), Maureen Burns (CFA), Hanish Dayal (CIT), Vito Fiore
> (HSS), Megan Flocken (HSS), Sooran Kim (CFA, came late), Steven
> Kling (CIT), Nicolette Louissaint (CIT), Ben Loving (MCS), Jonathan
> Mendelson (SCS), Erik Michaels-Ober (HSS), Rebecca Nathan (CIT),
> Daniel Papasian (CIT), Nasheena Porter (HSS), Jay Pujara (SCS,
> came late), Matt Rado (HSS), Meg Richards (SCS, came late),
> Edward Ryan (MCS), Thomas Sabram (CIT), Nicholas Scocozzo
> (CIT), Wei Tang (SHS), Tom Terraccino (SIA), Kristina Wiltsee
> (MCS), Yanna Weisberg (SHS), Yew Choe Wong (CIT), Jack Wu
> (SCS), Eleanor Zimmermann (MCS)

> **Senators Absent:** Daniel Jentzen (CFA, 1 absence), Alex Sussman
> (SIA, 1 absence)

> **Members at Large Present:** Joe Arasin (SCS), Andres Bermudez (HSS)

> **Members at Large Absent:** Ananya Bubna (SIA, 1 absence), Waylon Lu
> (SIA, 1 absence), Sarah Sareen (HSS, 1 absence), Aaron Walker
> (CIT, 1 absence), Lisette Yoon (HSS, 1 absence)

9:07 pm Call to Order

9:07 pm Special Business

9:07 pm **Question of the ratification of election results and any other election
issues**

9:07 pm Appoint Nick Scocozzo for Chair pro tem for this special meeting due to Vito's
conflict of interest

9:08 pm Motion for the validation of the election results (Nick Scocozzo)

9:08 pm Discussion

> The Internal Development committee met on Saturday and recommended to the
> Senate Chair and Election Board to postpone Senate elections that were to be
> held today. Current Senate Chair (Nick) has abstained from any discussion or
> opinion at that meeting. Tim Bowen was not present at the ID meeting. ID

committee has deemed that the elections rules were violated for 3 reasons: Elections server was not running for a full 48 hours, estimated to be running at best 36 hours, official communication was not sent out to entire community to notify them once server was up and running, and the Elections Board postponed elections, which violating the Election rules. There were no dissenting reports written during this meeting.

9:11 pm Straw Poll (Megan Flocken)

9:12 pm Motion to allow for Audience Participation (Steven Kling)

9:12 pm Audience Participation

Rob Reeder (President of GSA) is concerned that there are irregularities of the election but GSA cannot take any opinion regarding the ratification election.

9:15 pm Discussion

ID felt the election rules were violated

Problem with legitimacy; need another election so that all students may fairly vote. The issue should be seen as being related to the server and the violation of election rules, not of the "closeness" of votes.

The long-standing precedent of the CMU community that final election results are available for students before they are validated by Student Senate

9:23 pm Call the Question (Matt Books)

9:23 pm Objection (Tim Bowen)

9:23 pm Discussion

All candidates have operated under the same disadvantages/advantages so there is no need to invalidate these results.

Future elections this year will go smoothly because the elections board will run tests to prevent technical difficulties and also speak to computing services

9:25 pm Move the Question (Edward Ryan)

Fails, hand vote (2-13-9)

9:26 pm Discussion

There were a number of graduate students whose votes were not able to be counted.

There is no way a student could have voted twice – if a student already voted and tried to vote again, after selecting the candidates and attempting to "cast vote," an error message would have popped up and not allowed the student to continue voting.

There was not an official communications email sent to the entire campus to alert students that the server was back up and running. Therefore, some students would not have known they were able to vote, making the elections results to be inaccurate

The question that you should consider is that constituents' voices were heard or not. Please discuss whether voices were heard, not the violation of rules.

Fear that there will be less people voting if elections are reopened.

9:35 pm Audience Participation

This was the largest voter turnout in recent history. People might get more fed up if there is a new election going on. Just as many votes will be lost.

9:37 pm Discussion

1 Double enveloped vote and 5 paper ballot votes during this election.

If 1 person states that he/she was not able to vote, then that is a concern because that is 1 voice that was not heard.

Fear that people will not vote if we have another election a concern, but it is only speculation. Take into account that everyone's voice was heard. Did people have a fair chance to adequately vote for these elections?

Given that the vote was so close and there are large numbers of people who were disenfranchised, there is a question of the legitimacy of these elections. There is no way of showing that one candidate had favor over the other. There is also a debate of double voting – however there are people claiming to double vote, even though CTO adamantly denies this could have happened. The elections server also keeps a list of Andrew IDs that voted and to verify double voting all you need to do is match the number of Andrew IDs to the number of votes

- o The number of people who voted (2138) is the same number of votes that have been casted (this has been confirmed by examining the elections server)

An option is to have an additional day of voting where people who did not vote can cast their vote and people who have already voted cannot cast another vote. That way this can give a fair chance to all students. But is this technologically possible?

People who really cared and wanted to vote would have found a way to vote.

Double enveloping is a method of checking whether a person is eligible to vote or not.

A statistical prospective – results will skew the vote if re-election was done.

Voters that have not been heard, while that is unfortunate, it does not really matter because this is a simple random sample of the campus community.

The issue of running an election where we would append new votes to the existing votes is that you are running an election with 2 different populations.

Also, there is a statistical anomaly here because server was down for 30 hours and the only way people knew the server was up was by email (if they lived on campus or belonged to an organization) or by going to the site, therefore this cannot be a representative sample of the population because there were certain people excluded from the second population.

9:55 pm Move the Question (Tom Terracino)

Moved, hand vote (18-5-6)

9:57 pm Vote on issue of validating the election results for SBP, SBVP

Fails, roll call (5-19-7), see Appendix I

10:01 pm Motion to suspend the Election Rules (section VI on the issue of setting the election date, C and E) (Michelle Birchak)

10:02 pm Discussion

10:03 pm Call the Question (Matt Brooks)

10:03 pm Vote

Passes, voice vote

10:04 pm Motion to set the election date to April 20 and April 21 for Senate and Presidential elections (Vito Fiore)

10:05 pm Discussion

10:05 pm Call the Question (James Auwaerter)

10:06 pm Objection (Jonathan Mendelson)

10:06 pm Discussion

Communications committee would be able to launch a full new campaign.

Issue of election dates being so close to Carnival.

Elections results must be validated by April 27th

Possibility of advertising new elections before carnival events.

Can possibly use the Tartan to advertise the elections.

10:11 pm Move to Question (Rebecca Nathan)

Moved, hand vote (23-0-6)

10:12 pm Vote on setting the Election date

Passes, hand vote (22-0-8)

10:18 pm Discussion of new election

Issue of server being compromised/hacked

10:20 pm Motion to recommend to the elections board not release election results until after Student Senate validates the results (Jay Pujara)

10:20 pm Discussion of motion

Not fair to candidates to postpone results. It is really important that the campus community to see the data that the elections has elected.

10:24 pm Call the Question (Erik Michaels-Ober)

10:24 pm Vote

Fails, voice vote

10:24 pm Motion to Adjourn (Matt Rado)

10:25 pm Announcements

Tim Bowen has withdrawn from the race and pledges his support to Kris and Hussein

Commended the Elections board for their hard work

10:26 pm Adjourn

April 12, 2004 – Appendix I

Hussein Al Baya	SIA	not present
James Auwaerter	CIT	opposed
Julie Beckenstein	HSS	abstain
Michelle Birchak	CIT	opposed
Tim Bowen	HSS	abstain
Matt Brooks	HSS	affirmative
Maureen Burns	CFA	opposed
Hanish Dayal	CIT	opposed
Vito Fiore	HSS	opposed
Megan Flocken	HSS	opposed
Daniel Jentzen	CFA	not present
Sooran Kim	CFA	opposed
Steven Kling	CIT	abstain
Nicolette Louissaint	CIT	affirmative
Ben Loving	MCS	opposed
Jonathan Mendelson	SCS	opposed
Erik Michaels-Ober	HSS	abstain
Rebecca Nathan	CIT	affirmative
Daniel Papasian	CIT	abstain
Nasheena Porter	HSS	affirmative
Jay Pujara	SCS	opposed
Matt Rado	HSS	opposed
Meg Richards	SCS	opposed
Edward Ryan	MCS	opposed
Thomas Sabram	CIT	affirmative
Nicholas Scocozzo	CIT	abstain
Alex Sussman	SIA	opposed
Wei Tang	SHS	opposed
Tom Terraccino	SIA	opposed
Kristina Wiltsee	MCS	affirmative
Yanna Weisberg	SHS	opposed
Yew Choe Wong	CIT	opposed
Jack Wu	SCS	not present
Eleanor Zimmermann	MCS	opposed