Emergency Meeting

Call to Order

- Erica: Here to vote on annulling the presidential election. We need 2/3 for this vote to pass (15) because Meghana will be abstaining.
- Erica: Read statement sent out by the elections committee.
- Griff: Read dissenting statement.
- Emily: Made statement.
  - I'm so sorry. I should not have texted Teddy and Meghana.
  - Selfish act that I regret.
  - Throughout the election, I had no real time results about the election.
  - I know that I did harm. My intention does not justify my actions.
  - I hope this does not overshadow my love for Williams and my devotion to make it past and present a better place.
- Meghana: Made statement
  - I would like to apologize for my actions on Saturday.
  - I should not have sent the actions on Saturday.
  - I understand how they can be seen as unfair.
  - Despite believing that we won fairly, I understand and respect the recommendation to annul the election.

Discussion

- Quinn: There are a lot of people and we want everyone to be able to talk.
  - Motion to Limit Speaking Time to 1 min per person: Quinn
    - Second:
    - Result: 23 – 0 – 0
- Gideon: I'm in favor of annulling the election. Agree with the committee that a violation occurred. Despite it only being a couple of texts, those texts had a large impact. I think it is reasonable to do the election over again, that is not unfair. It's not just about the technicalities, its about the perceived legitimacy of this institution. It's clear that a lot of people outside of this body think that we messed up this process so need to do it again and do it right.
- Jochebed: Personally agree that an annulment is in order.
  - Have a number of statements to read from people who could not attend the meeting.
    - I don't think that Meghana's actions were grievous. They were wrong but not grievous. People had every opportunity to vote for whoever they wanted to. They felt the pressure of being in a close race, asking them to ignore those texts is hard.
    - Personally I think what they did is fine. This happens in all kind of elections. They did not even say vote for us. That being said, individual people aren't always right. It is ultimately up to CC. I do not think that people should annul based on what CC or Yik Yak says.
    - My opinion is that while they technically violated the bylaw, there actions don't seem to be in contrast to the bylaws intent. I still think that the elections were fair.
    - Against annulment.
- Funmi:
  - Statement from constituent
    - Worried that people are not able to detach Teddy's actions from the actual instance. I hope that people will ask the Co-Presidents to defend themselves.
    - I think that actions were grievous
Victoria:
- Think that Emily's actions were all about encouraging votes. Meghana and Teddy's actions were all about manipulating that information to suggest they were loosing. In favor of annulment, and thank we need to turn the conversation to Meghana and Teddy.
- Ellen: Don't think we should ignore Emily's actions. That's why we chose annulment, it suggests there was something wrong with the process.
- Lucas: I do not think that it is fair to pen that misinformation all on Teddy and Meghana.
- Maddie: I got a message from Meghana that said she didn't know the election. But I also have heard that it is more than 2 texts.
- Michelle: I think that as a result of the whole election process, it is clear that it didn't seem fair to people. Obviously, there wouldn't be so many people at this meeting if we didn't believe that it was fair. But what makes this difficult is that I think most people would have acted in a manner similar to Teddy and Meghana. Meghana's misinformation is warranting people believing this election was not fair.
- Jesus: Feel that no matter what happens in the real world, this here at Williams is unacceptable. They were actively going out and talking to people. I feel there is also a problem with the way the electoral committee is structured.
- Jochebed: Want to reiterate that this room wouldn't be packed if people didn't think that this process was unfair and didn't feel misled by this election process. As College Council, if we didn't annul we would be acting in bad faith to the community for the remainder of the year.
- Ellen: Want to clarify two points. Emily's text message did not send misinformation. Secondly, Ted and Meg's last campaign push was not the problem, it was explicitly stating “I'm not supposed to know this but I'm down in the polls.”
- Kate: This has illuminated there are other problems with the way we run elections. Perhaps this is something we should looking at by annulling this and then relooking at the way we run elections.
- Jesper: I'm concerned that we're using this event to mend what is a broken relationship between CC and the student body. But the question at hand is in the spirit of this Bylaw, did they act egregiously? I think the point was to get voters out, not slander Grant, which is the spirit of why the Bylaw was written, so it would be more appropriate to reduce the vote count.
- Jochebed: This election has brought to light a lot of the issues the community at large has with CC.
  - **Straw Poll (() is votes of campus):**
    - Annul: 17 (a large amount)
    - Not Annul: 5 (very few)
- Michelle: There have been a lot of issues raised with how the committee is structured. But those are not the reasons that we should be voting to annul if we choose to annul.
- Alyssa: We need to think about the bylaws and from the bylaws I do not think that these actions were grievous. Trying to get people to vote is not a marker of bad intent.
- Funmi: I don't think it matters that they were afraid. What matters is that they did mislead people.
- **Motion to Accept Election Committees Recommendation to Annul: Victoria**
  - **Second:**
  - **Vote to Vote: Lucas**
    - **Second: Michelle**
    - **Result: 11 – 11 – 1** (Motion to Vote Fails, Discussion Continues)
- Jochebed: So excited that you come. If you all had come to our other meetings, we could
more readily hear your grievances and work to operate in a way that is better for our community.

- Lucas: I think if we are going to do a recall, there needs to be some action against Emily, because it seems unfair to only punish the people on the ballot. It is a failure of the system and needs to be looked at holistically.
- Funmi: The problem at hand is less than Emily has done something that is against the spirit of the bylaws, than that it worked to skew the process. That is what the elections committee met for 6 hours to deliberate and figure out.
- Alphayo: Emphasize that this is not a personal indictment of Meghana and Teddy.
- Allison: Would like to make a recommendation that anyone who would run in the election for president make a motion to recuse themselves from the annulment vote.
- Teddy: There is no doubt that the text that Meghana said did skew things to a certain extent. But I do think the text was not sent to that many people. I think there should be a punishment that fits the crime. Thinking this would be unprecedented. There have been other election scandals in the past in which penalties have been addressed that were not forfeiture. Think that saying the entire election is void because of this and would be unjustified.
- Henry: I have a few points. If we are talking about grievous violations, what about what Grant did? College Council is about serving the community and making it better. If we have another election, then we are not leaving our College Council anytime to get things done. What we are doing is essentially writing off the semester for what could be a good pair of presidents. The fact is you voted for these people because you put your trust in them. So think that we as a community are shooting ourselves in the foot. What we need to discuss is obvious bylaw reform. Set up a commission with College Council and an outside sources to discuss the bylaws and reform them.
- Emily F: I think something needs to done, but a good substitute could be correcting the numbers of the election and then very seriously correcting the procedures we have.
- Funmi: Does the election committee know what would have happened if we do take away the votes?
  - Erica: They still would have won.
    - Before text were sent: 843 (M+T) – 410(J)
    - Final vote: 925(M+T) - 461(J)
- Victoria: It is great that we found out this information. But at the end of the day, this entire campus is uncomfortable with the election.

- **Motion to Follow the Recommendation of Elections Committee and Divide the Council:** Victoria
  - **Second:** Gideon
  - **Motion to Vote to Vote:** Matt
    - **Second:** Lucas
    - **Result:** 3 – 19 – 1 (Motion to Vote Fails, Discussion Continues)
- Emma: What counts as a conflict of interest?
  - Lucas: It is based on anyone who would stand to benefit from the annulment of this election.
- Ben: Could there be annulment based on the process?
  - Quinn: Emily had no opinion in the decision that we reached – all others operated unbiasedly.
- Claire: Urge annulment based on a lot of students being uncomfortable. As someone who did vote for Meg and Teddy, we should be allowed to reconsider our votes.
Johnny: Don't agree with the idea that just because it's inconvenient we should not annul.

Clyde: If someone who is a member of CC was to run, how would their position be filled? So if you want to run for another position, you would have to resign your position and then run?
  - Griff: Can't hold two positions, so would have to resign and then run.

Clyde: If I plan to run for College Council president, would I have to abstain?
  - Erica: Yes, but in good faith because we can't protect the future.

Laura: Think there is the initial conflict of interest and additional conflict of interest based on, have you considered putting the matter of annulment to a campus wider referendum?
  - Erica: There are two ways referendum can occur. The first is by petition of 10% of members of the student body. The second is that council can pass it with 2/3 vote of the Council.
    - At least 1/3 of the students voted for in the College for it to be valid. The Council must advertise referendum for 2 weeks.
  - Laura: If tomorrow, I wanted to propose a referendum, what would I do?
    - Erica: Find 200 people, then we would advertise.
  - Erica: The decision of this committee can also be overturned by referendum.

Ellen: Procedurally we should let Council vote first, and if they vote the way you want, then there is no need for referendum.

Funmi: Speaking to inherent conflict of interest of elections committee, I would like to push back heavily. People who are in student group have inherent bias towards who they vote into office. To say that our conflicts of interest are inappropriate or unique is misguided.

Motion to Limit Speaking Time to 5 Minutes, at the end of which we vote: Gideon
  - Second: Lucas
  - Result: 23 – 0 – 0

Alyssa: A lot of this comes back to election processes. I wish this had come up before the elections happened. But since they didn't we should let these elections be considered valid.

Jochebed: Recuse myself.

Zach: Have opportunity to vote again.

Motion to Accept Committees Proposal to Annul and Divide the Council w/ Idea that Anyone who would run for president should recuse themselves by Roll Call: Emily
  - Second: Funmi
  - Result: 19 – 1 – 3

Vote by Roll Call:
  - Victoria: Yes
  - Ellen: Yes
  - Matt: Yes
  - Griffith: Yes
  - Alphayo: Yes
  - Quinn: Yes
  - Alyssa: Yes
  - Michelle: Yes
  - Funmi: Yes
  - Lucas: Yes
  - Lia: Conflict of Interest
  - Stephanie: Yes
  - Zach: Yes
- Web: Yes
- Allegra: Yes
- Jesper: No
- Emily F: Yes
- Maggie: Yes
- Emalie: Yes
- Gideon: Yes
- Jochebed: Conflict of Interest
- Meghana: Conflict of Interest
- Maddie: Yes

○ The elections are annuled.