

## Board of Directors Meeting Minutes of May 27, 2020

- I. CALL TO ORDER at **4:39 PM**
- II. ROLL CALL  
**Present:** Bronte Kuehnis, Daisy Maxon, Kabir Dhillon, Melissa Baron, Siddharth Valecha, Riley Miller, Euridice Sanchez-Martinez (excused), Yajaira Ortega-Huerta, Lynn Vu, Omer Shakoor, Antoinette Milano, Brittney Golez, Tyler Engquist, Daisy Padilla, Erik Pinlac, Mark Almeida, Darrell Bailey, Marguerite Hinrichs, Michael Lee.  
  
**Late:** Erik Pinlac, Mark Almeida, Steve Spencer, Marguerite Hinrichs, Michael Lee, Andrew Yunker.  
  
**Absent:** Patricia Regalado, Martin Castillo.
- III. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Agenda**  
**Motion** to approve the agenda of May 27, 2020 by **K. Dhillon**, second by **M. Baron**, motion **CARRIED**.
- IV. ACTION ITEM - **Approval of the Minutes of May 20, 2020**  
**Motion** to approve the minutes of May 20, 2020 by **Y. Ortega-Huerta**, second by **S. Valecha**, motion **CARRIED**.
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT – **Public Comment is intended as a time for any member of the public to address the board on any issues affecting ASI and/or the California State University, East Bay.**  
**Tameem Tukakhil** states that he has been following this case since post elections and it has gone too far. I have sat through two elections committee meetings, one meeting was not fully prepared to hold a meeting until the following week. If we are going to follow rules, we should abide by those rules given the fact that run offs do not exist in the election code or bylaws. People have started to say that run offs are traditional, while trying to find this information that I cannot seem to find. The election runoffs seem like a joke to me given the fact that it was not reversed to the first election results. I hope the board of directors comes to an accurate decision.

**E. Sanchez-Martinez** states she will be speaking about both items today. Good afternoon board of directors, today I want to speak about democracy, ethics, and student

board and the elections committee. The majority voted against Mahdi and I believe that it provided more clarity. In the future, we need to write these things on paper in order for them to not be misunderstood.

**Mahdi Fugfugosh** states if he can ask a question to the chair?

**B. Kuehnis** states yes.

**Mahdi Fugfugosh** states I was wondering what would happen if the board of directors upholds both or none of these appeals? What would be the scenarios?

**B. Kuehnis** states that the board of directors has two choices. They can either appeal the decision or uphold it. If they uphold the decision it would mean that they will agree with the decision made by the elections committee by that appeal. If they overturn it, that will mean they disagree with the process or decision made by the elections committee on that appeal. In which, another investigation will be done to start the process all over again.

**Mahdi Fugfugosh** states if he can ask a follow up question for more clarification.

**B. Kuehnis** states yes.

**Mahdi Fugfugosh** states what would happen if the board of directors wants to overturn the appeal? The board of directors' term ends this month, would the incoming board of directors make the decision?

**B. Kuehnis** states that if it is appealed, then another investigation will start. Considering that the board of directors' term will end, it will go towards the next board of directors who have been elected. If they are unable to meet quorum, then it will go towards the executive committee, who will sit in the board of director meetings until the positions have been filled.

**Mahdi Fugfugosh** states that he would like to thank Bronte for the clarifications. I would like to ask the board of directors to form a conclusion, in order to end this situation soon and not prolong it. First and foremost, in my appeal, I am stating that multiple election code rules or policies were not followed, ignored, or broken. The runoffs were not supposed to happen and were stated incorrect, due to only occurring if there was a tie. Past practice and traditions should only take effect when something is unclear or not stated. In this case the runoffs were untrue since the runoffs state that it only happens when it is a tie. On top of runoffs happening, both elections votes were moved. I, as well as, majority candidates were not aware of this process. When the votes were removed, it was not followed with the policy listed in the elections code. The election committee did not sit and oversee this process nor did the President of the university. The 50% plus 1 will should not have happened if the votes were not removed. However, we cannot foresee the future, but the election committee advisors could go back to see if any candidate reached 50%. This will allow for more clarification to see if rules were followed. All I am stating in my appeal is

that multiple violations like posting on social media, counting votes, and the process was not being followed. Meanwhile, enlisting a rule that should have not been considered. Now with the appeal against me, I am here to talk with the board of directors to give any information that is needed. What has been said about me, has not been done by me, or asked by me. What hurts me the most is that a person that had nothing to do with this, got effect financially. This person did not get affect by the elections committee decision, but by a person who publicly stated this. I am not sure if the board of directors can do anything about this since what is done is done. All I am asking from the board of directors is to look at the rules and see if the rules are followed. If the board of directors' view that rules have not been followed, I am asking you to uphold these rules. At the end of the day, this process is for students and to serve students. In the last meeting, we stated why is everything being done in close session when it involves multiple students and positions? I understand that privacy must be prote m3/.47h7.3360.0000092 0 612 7d,8.02 4hos. et,8.026W\*n(ple-47(di27TF1 1202 40

