

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY
STUDENT SENATE
THIRTY-FIRST SESSION
APRIL 18, 2019
HAVASUPAI ROOM A & B, UNIVERSITY UNION, 4:00 PM

Date: April 23, 2019
Date of Senate Meeting: April 18, 2019

Number on council: 12
Number present: 12

Prepared by Alyssa Cox

Senator McClintock, Vice Chair of the Senate, called the Senate meeting of the 2018-2019 Associated Students of Northern Arizona University Senate to order at 4:00 PM in the Havasupai Room A and B, University Union.

Roll Call

Senators:

Senator Ambrosio
Senator Hernandez
Senator Burke
Senator Gibson
Senator Martinez
Senator McClintock – not included in voting
Senator Schonbrun
Senator Freitas – not included in meeting
Senator Nardi
Senator Alba – Late
Senator Ward
Senator Majkrazk

Approval of Minutes

Senator McClintock, Vice Chair of the Senate: If there are no corrections, the minutes are approved.

Call to the Audience

Item A: Supreme Court Statement

The Supreme Court Statement is attached at the end of the minutes. The following is the discussion that took place within the senate after the reading of the Supreme Court statement.

Senator Schonbrun: You said that you reached out to the election commissioners about why they said that the signatures were okay the first time around. What did they say in response?

Supreme Court: Through the statements we found out that they just approved it so we didn't want to reach out again but we also interpreted what happened because that's the job of the supreme court. Even though the election commission didn't find a violation we thought it should have been a violation. Kristine also told us that the election commission didn't find the signatures invalid even though that in the students complaint he said that the signatures were invalid because they're being written not by the endorsing student.

Senator Hernandez: Can you point out to me where in the ASNAU Constitution it says that endorsing another student is illegal?

Supreme Court: On page 3 in our statement it quotes the Election Code and Constitution.

Senator Hernandez: All it says is that they can't use their office of ASNAU, right? It says their office, not their personal lives.

Supreme Court: It says "using an official ASNAU position to endorse another candidate for office." If you're in a position, regardless of where you are, you should not endorse.

Senator Hernandez: I disagree because it only says office. I think they have the right to endorse as a person, not as an office. That's how I interpret this.

Supreme Court: To be honest that wasn't really a huge part of the complaint. We mainly focused on the President-Elect and cleared everyone else. There wasn't too big of a violation so we just wanted to make sure we set that tone for future endorsements and elections.

Senator Nardi: First, I want to mention one of your points saying that in elected officers personal lives that they can endorse, to me it blurs the line between your position and personal life. It's too difficult to distinguish. It's too hard when you hear this person endorses someone. I also have a question for the supreme court which is, under Ronni Marks signatures, you said that 128 were verified. Does that mean that the remainder didn't have a correct student ID number was for a false student?

Supreme Court: That wasn't even verified. There's no process to check that. If you submit it, it counts.

Senator Nardi: So how did 128 get verified?

Supreme Court: What we mean by that is that they're in different handwriting. We got her packet and we made a copy and we found that the ones in the yellow was one handwriting, the ones in the green were a different handwriting, then we counted the non-highlighted signatures and those were the verified ones. 128 were written in a student's handwriting. We did not have access to verify student ID numbers. That's something that we found very problematic. There's no process of verifying the signatures. They could be fake and no one checked but that's something different that should be looked into.

Vice Chair McClintock: Did Kristine say that there was no way to check IDs?

Kristine Heflin: No students have access to check names against student ID numbers so I'm not sure why we do that. If we used student email IDs students would be able to check those. But there is no way to check all of them. The election commission asked me to spot check a few so I did check 10-15 but I don't have time to do all of them.

VPGA Quintero: When we were asked to submit a student we didn't have a definition of what endorsing meant and in that case I will need to rescind me saying that I endorsed someone because all I did was forward a resume that was sent to me to Dylan who then put them into office.

President Graham: I would also like to rescind me saying I endorsed someone because I was referring to when I make appointments. I have not endorsed an election candidate and that is something I was very specific about during elections. I didn't sign anyone's election petitions because I wanted to remain a bit more neutral in my position.

Senator Burke: I understand that a majority of these complaints were targeted towards Ronni but the actual election commissioners were found to have made a mistake passing her packet along and approving it. So I'm wondering why there is no reprimand against those officers.

Supreme Court: At the time there was also confusion about who the election commissioner was because from what I understand there was a new appointed person halfway through so we just decided to focus on the fact that the election had already happened. If you want to have us look into that we can.

Kristine Heflin: I don't think it's fair to say that the election commission made a mistake; they made a decision and the supreme court disagrees with that decision.

Senator Hernandez: Going off of your decisions for Ronni, I think they are very extreme and not appropriate at all. The election happened. She ran unopposed and got a very high percentage of votes. I'm not okay with removing Ronni from her position and I urge every other senator here to agree with me. Maybe the solution is some sort of probationary period or asking her to collect the signatures by the end of the year. If we have an election next year we will have a lot of next year without a president which we need. I believe that Ronni is a good candidate. I don't think it's fair to remove her from the position.

Senator Schonbrun: I have a question about your decision. You state that Ronni's statement holds a lot of negative weight, but later you say that you recommend that she doesn't get sworn in as the official ASNAU President until the process is rectified and more ethical and problematic parts from her statements have been heard by the Senate fully. That doesn't seem like it has a lot to do with the actual election. Can you explain why?

Supreme Court: As we were getting all the information to make these decisions we also requested the statement from Ronni and as we were reading it a lot of parts stood out as problematic in terms of the reactions towards someone making a complaint against her should have been. As we kept reading it got more problematic. The language felt very attacking towards the character of the complainant and so we got really concerned with not only the signatures which was the main part but with her language and how that would play if she were to be elected so we wanted to make a whole section on how you should potentially react to complaints made.

Supreme Court: For us it also tied into that ethical behavior as the Student Body President. Like we said in our statement there's going to be a lot of times where people will disagree with you or challenge what you're doing and the way that you respond to that is important. When we asked everyone to send us statements, that's a lot of what we're basing this decision off of. We have complaints, we have suggestions, and so when we get these statements that's what tells us if this is verified. When we received the statement from President-Elect Ronni we felt that it had very attacking language and we felt that it was necessary to bring up because if you're running to be the Student Body President and this wasn't handled in an ethical and responsible manner so that's why we wanted to bring it up to this group.

Senator Schonbrun: So you're saying that this statement weighed into your decision as a court? It didn't have anything to do with what you felt about the actual election process?

Supreme Court: The actual election process was that. We looked at the signatures and we thought that was completely wrong. At first we were like yes, let's just have her get the rest of the signatures by the end of the year but then we kept reading the statement and we thought maybe that we should bring her statement up and see if [the senate is] okay with it.

Supreme Court: In that statement it also opened the door to what happens through social media, what a

past conversation with the previous ASNAU President was a year ago, which was not verified because she is no longer a student so we don't even know if it's true or not. This also tied into these numbers because by Ronni's interpretation of what in person was, her statement, and the social media aspect of thing, whose to say that these didn't come from social media?

Supreme Court: In her statement she said that she got these from social media so that was very concerning to us because that's not what in person is.

Chief of Staff O'Reilly: I wanted to go off of what Senator Hernandez said. ASNAU can run without a president. That's why we have a Vice President of Academic Affairs to step up in case there isn't a president and even though someone is running unopposed I think they should still take it upon themselves to put themselves out there, have a platform, talk to the students, and not just collect signatures off of social media.

President Graham: I would like to note that Senator Hernandez has actually used his position to endorse a candidate and so that is actually in violation of our constitution. As far as thinking about Ronni and the position of ASNAU I would like the encourage you to separate Ronni from the position. Yes, ASNAU can run without a president. It will be difficult but if we start out a presidency unethical that's really setting up ASNAU so I would like you to consider that you cannot endorse any position within ASNAU whether they have been elected already or not. Please keep that in mind when you're speaking about the person in question. Additionally, the senate chair needs to call on you to speak unless you are the supreme court so please keep that in mind. Please cut the side chatter because that is very distracting.

Senator Nardi: I don't know if ASNAU keeps backlogs of past election packets but in order to assess the validity of Ronni's claims, if possible we could go back and check the past presidents packet to see if that also has the same handwriting. If they don't match then I think that's an ethical violation and I would not be comfortable with Ronni running again but if Lauren also did that then I think it's appropriate. My second statement pertains to voting. In order to keep this process fair and objective I think in terms of Ronni's interpretation of what in person means, it was still a violation so just keep that in mind.

Senator Burke: I wanted to note that in terms of the statements that you pointed out, that it was problematic, a lot of them were valid as someone who was there during the time that this happened. He did use his authority as an election commissioner to set an agenda for ASNAU and I think the only thing in there that was problematic was that she called him disgruntled. I don't think all these sections should be called problematic.

Supreme Court: Everything she said could be valid and is valid because that's how she felt but that's not what we focused on. We didn't say that it wasn't true, we didn't say that what she said isn't valid, it's the nature of how she phrased a lot of the wording and it just seemed really attacking. Bring it back to professionalism, the manners in which a president should act, how would she react if this happened during her term next year, that's what's problematic. Her reactions and the way in which she carried herself.

Senator Burke: I have to disagree with that.

Senator Hernandez: I retract my endorsement of Ronni. Second of all I think I have a solution that might work. I have a three point plan. One, Ronni has until the end of the semester to collect the 250 signatures. Two, there is an election at the end where people reaffirm her, and three periodically next year she has to attend impartiality trainings. She won by a very high percentage of the votes.

Supreme Court: I want to hear what everyone else has to say but a side note, she got that high percentage

because she was unopposed and that leads back to the Greek life thing and social media thing.

Supreme Court: Also the reason why we are recommending that it's the beginning of the fall semester of next year is because no matter of what happened in this election process, there was a violation and so by having a new election would make a clean slate for her to start over. Like President Graham and Chief of Staff O'Reilly said, ASNAU can function without a president and it would be hard. I discourage you swaying a vote because it's going to be harder than something that's unethical. It will be harder work but that shouldn't sway your vote.

VP Quintero: I just want to comment about having a high percentage of votes because she ran unopposed. Last year when I ran unopposed I only got like 60%. People will vote against you even if you are running unopposed. It's not a guarantee.

VPAA Marks: You made a statement about me being in Greek life. If we represent all students why would I not be considered legit if I'm apart of Greek life? That singles out a whole community on campus.

Supreme Court: You are considered legit but posting on the sorority Facebook page and getting girls to give you their ID numbers, that was just concerning.

VPAA Marks: I also put in my statement, which wasn't acknowledged, that no one had to do it. I said you are more than welcome to say no. I didn't say you had to. I didn't force anyone to do anything.

VPSA Riggins: I wanted to remind you guys what they're requesting. I think it's just to recollect her signatures to be voted again. Lets take a time back to when you guys ran. You guys walked around this campus and asked people to sign it, and you had to get it done in a certain time. You didn't have until the end of the semester, you only had about a week or two. In my situation I only had a day. I went to a lot of different things to get 250 signatures. I would get if it were two or three signatures, but that is a lot of signatures. They're not asking for the elected person to not be president, they're asking for them to be the president the correct way

Senator Gibson: I find an issue in the system and having to collect more signatures because I almost feel like we're holding everyone accountable for a faulty system. I don't understand why we ask for student ID numbers if there's no way for them to be verified and if we're just gonna make her get more signatures there's no way to verify that. That whole system is faulty.

Senator Nardi: Is it possible for us to cross reference Lauren before we vote on this?

Vice Chair McClintock: I don't know if we would be able to today. I know that she is our student regent for NAU so we do have a way of contacting her.

Kristine Heflin: My whole thing was that Lauren is no longer a student and any complaints about her packet should have been dealt with at the time. I don't know if it's appropriate for us to involve her in this investigation.

Senator Hernandez: Going off of what VPSA Riggins said, she had a day but we all got 2-weeks which is about the same amount of time that is left in the school year. Maybe we can give Ronni the same amount of time that everyone else got. The election commission made a decision which kind of validates them in a way. Maybe not in the supreme courts eyes but at least in the election commissioners eyes. I think the most fair way to do this would to be to go through my three point plan.

Senator Schonbrun: I have a question because in Article IV, Section I, Clause A, there's a section that says "For the purposes of section 1.1, pending extenuating circumstances, the, "in person signature requirement," may be overturned by a majority vote of the election commission." By letting the signatures go through wouldn't that be equivalent to a majority vote by pushing it through?

Supreme Court: That was brought up in Ronni's statement as well but I would like to focus back on what the supreme court interpreted. Just because the election commissioners did it that way we did not find that our interpretation of in person didn't match what she provided.

Supreme Court: And this whole thing was so tricky to go through because Ronni was going through some illness and injury at the time and we just wanted to be as impartial as possible and with the student complaint, the job of the supreme court is to go through everything and make a recommendation and interpret the constitution. Even with that clause we decided that what she provided still wasn't in person.

Awareness and Campaign Coordinator Susan Resendiz: Is there more to her statement than we're seeing?

Supreme Court: Yes. We only put what we thought to be problematic up there.

Awareness and Campaign Coordinator Susan Resendiz: Is there a way to see all of it?

VPAA Marks: The statement that I sent to the supreme court is the exact statement that I sent to the election commission because with my injury I can't stare at a computer screen or think so when I got asked to submit a statement within 24-hours I couldn't do that so I submitted what I had previously sent in.

Motion to adjourn meeting: Senator Hernandez

Second: yes

Pass/Fail: Motion fails, 9-1.

Motion to vote on three point plan: Senator Hernandez

Second: no

Supreme Court: I would ask you to all maintain professionalism and respect the amount of work that this has been for all the parties involved.

Kristine Heflin: I believe that his plan violated the ASNAU Constitution about a vote to uphold it. We have specific timelines for an election. That's what the fall thing is about. It's four or five weeks to have an election.

Motion to vote on the proposed suggestions of the supreme court on whether or not we should have a reelection for the Student Body President for the 2019-2020 school year: Senator Nardi

Second: yes

Discussion:

Motion to have a roll call vote: Senator Hernandez

Second: yes

Discussion:

Senate Clerk: Having a roll call vote can create peer pressure. If we call everyone's names the people after might vote the same way as the person before them, or they might vote a certain way based on how many votes there already are for each option. If there's already a certain amount of votes they might think

that their vote doesn't matter.

Pass/Fail: Motion fails, 8-2.

Motion to have a paper ballot: Senator Majkrazk

Second: yes

Discussion: none

Opposed: Senator Hernandez

Pass/Fail: Motion passes, 9-1.

In Favor: Senator Ambrosio, Senator Martinez, Senator Alba, Senator Majkrazk, Senator Nardi

Opposed: Senator Burke, Senator Ward, Senator Gibson, Senator Schonbrun, Senator Hernandez

Pass/Fail: Motion fails, 5-5.

Unfinished Business

New Business

Voting Period

Executive Reports

A. President: Dylan Graham

I attended the Springboard Advisory Committee Planning Session with the Athletics Advisory Committee and we discussed goals and standards. I attended a meeting with the Center for International Education to discuss the international population and their likeliness to use campus mental health resources. I attended Cindy's Retirement Event. I attended the Presidential Leadership Fellows Closing Banquet. I spoke at the Gold Axe and Distinguished Senior Award Ceremony and received the Gold Axe and President's Prize. I was a tasting judge at the SHRM Kitchen event. I attended the ASNAU GO Fall Scholarship Review Session and weighed in on the recipients. I attended the President's Forum before attending Senate.

B. Vice President of Academic Affairs: Ronni Marks

No report.

C. Vice President of Student Affairs: Samariah Riggins

Sex in the Media Training: April 19, 2019 at 3:30pm in IMQ. Remember all staff trainings are paid! I have been working on High Pine, ALL WEEK LONG! 28 clubs will be receiving an award at High Pines! High Pine Awards will be Tuesday, April 23 @ 6:00pm in the Dub Bois ballroom! Please come! Expecting 100 students. I have also reached out to all the recipients for the test prep scholarship! I will be training the incoming VPSA. ASNAU Swag came in!!! If you would like something please come to my office and you can grab something!

D. Vice President of Government Affairs: Analisa Quintero

This week I planned the upcoming civic engagement forum! Thursday from 6:30-7:30pm in Havasupai AB.

E. Chief of Staff: Tori O'Reilly

Spent the week preparing for the concert and now working on the ASNAU Banquet.

Staff Reports

A. Student State Affairs:

Shanlie Blair: ABOR report is attached at the end of this document.

B. Public Relations:

Graphic Designer – Amanda Jacob, Pip Franke: No report.

Social Media – Madison Abernethy:

Videographer – Abbi Jackson:

C. Special Events:

Lindsey Kevorkian: Inaugural Banquet Friday the 26th at 5:30pm in the international pavilion. Please send Tori your RSVP if you have not done so already.

D. Information Technologist:

Dylan Schreiner: No report.

E. NSG:

Jewel Fernandez: NSG will not be meeting this week.

F. Diversity Coordinator:

Taheera Shabazz: This week I picked up my order of Pride shirts from FlagT. In addition, all of the Pride accessories that I have also chosen to give out along with the shirts has been ordered and will be delivered next week. I have also scheduled my tabling, and I will be handing everything out on the Union Pedway from 10am-12pm on Wednesday. Lastly, I am currently working to spend the rest of my budget to help the Women's and Gender Studies department put on a menstrual health/awareness campaign.

G. Front Desk:

Christian Catano, Yakira Flanagan, Tyler Millidge, Alyssa Cox: We have been working on making sure that all the payment request forms from the year are on the shared drive and filling in all the blank spots on the senate allocations tab in the budget.

H. Executive Assistant:

Kiana Saleapaga: No report.

I. Sustainability Coordinator:

Kristen Morale: No report.

J. Volunteer Coordinator:

Katie Martinez:

K. Awareness and Campaign Coordinator:

Susan Resendiz: No report.

L. Club Manager:

Jo Williams: I have been hard at work making sure everything is perfect for the High Pine Awards.

Committee Reports

A. Legislative Committee: Senator Freitas

Senator Freitas: No report.

B. Appropriations Committee: Senator McClintock

Senator McClintock: This next week is the last week of appropriations, please make sure to tell your clubs that if they do not come they will be denied reimbursement for this academic year.

Senator Reports

College of Arts and Letters:

A. Senator Ambrosio:

B. Senator Hernandez: All of the details for our dinner with the dean have been worked out! We are excited to announce that we have the dinner on Wednesday April, 24th at 4PM in room Havasupai A/B. We hope that everyone attends. Also I attended the Spanish club fiesta on Tuesday and I danced Merengue.

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences:

C. Senator Burke: This week I reviewed a handful of bills and attended the appropriations committee meeting. I look forward to attending the Death Cab For Cutie concert tonight!

D. Senator Gibson: No report.

College of Health and Human Services:

A. Senator Martinez: No report.

College of Education:

A. Senator McClintock: Our items and catering for the NAU PD Public Safety Fair have been ordered! Don't forget to sign up to get hours during reading week! I have a map and all the event information if you are interested in seeing those!

B. Senator Schonbrun: This week I wrote my end of the year report, told my clubs of the due date for reimbursement packets, and I am working with Senator Hernandez to put on an event connecting Secondary Ed Students to resources.

College of Business:

A. Senator Freitas: No report.

B. Senator Nardi:

College of Environment, Forestry and Natural Sciences:

A. Senator Alba: I wrote 3 bills this past week.

B. Senator Ward: No report.

College of Engineering, Informatics, and Applied Sciences:

A. Senator Majkrazk:

Advisor Reports

A. Erin Grisham:

B. Kristine Heflin:

Open Forum

Announcements

Adjournment

First: Senator Hernandez

Second: yes

Discussion: none

Opposed: none

Pass/Fail: Unanimous. Motion passes.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:07 PM on Thursday March 7, 2019.

Magenta - Quoted ASNAU Constitution/Bylaws, Election Code, NAU Website

Green - Supreme Court findings of the complaints

Red - Supreme Court suggestions to complaints and ASNAU Senate

Introduction

We would like to first acknowledge the student who brought about the complaints and we would also like to acknowledge that his interactions with all Senate members could have been more in-depth and responsive. Additionally, we would like to remind a students and Senators present that each student is a member of ASNAU according to our constitution.

- **Constitution Article III. Membership**
 - “Any person enrolled as a student, paying tuition and registration fees at Northern Arizona University Flagstaff campus shall be a member of ASNAU.”

To start and to be able to validate his feelings and thoughts, we would like to read some of the bases of the complaint submitted:

Complaints from Student:

1. “ASNAU President Graham and the Executive Council overstepped the separation of powers and authority of the legislative body.”
2. “Political influence and elections violations are rampant in this electoral proceeding.”
3. “ASNAU has no current way of verifying signatures and student information.”
4. “There was political pressures to not reschedule the student body election.”
5. “The election began to proceed without an Election Commission.”
6. “I felt forced to resign my position as chairperson of the Election Commission because of rules and violations and political retaliation of part of ASNAU.”
7. “I was told that Senators and ASNAU staff were explicitly informed to not work with me as a student or my student organization, the Community Service Coalition.”
8. “Emails and meetings were ignored numerous times.”
9. “The Senate Parliamentarian is in dereliction of duties...”
10. “The Volunteer Coordinator is in dereliction of duties...”
11. “There is a monopoly on student voice by ASNAU and a minority of student representation from within the body.”

Remedies Suggested from the Student:

1. “I am asking for the impeachment and termination of any ASNAU official who played part in violating the impartiality and objectivity of the electoral process and targeted me and my organization for political and personal reasons including the failure and dereliction of duty including: ASNAU President Graham, ASNAU Vice President Quintero, ASNAU Senator Freitas, Senate Parliamentarian Estrella and Volunteer Coordinator Martinez.”

2. "Additional guidelines should be inserted into the 'Integrity and Objectivity' section of the election code."
3. "The ASNAU Constitution add language concerning ethics and integrity."
4. "[ASNAU officials] need to reopen the election process, void all candidates petitions, and postpone the ASNAU general election."
5. "The following candidates need to be issued new petitions created and given by the Election Commission and collect new petition signatures: Sergio Alba & Christian Catano."
6. "The following candidate needs to be disqualified and referred to NAU Student Life due to forged student signatures and ID numbers: Ronni Marks."
7. "The following candidate [be] ineligible to run due to a lack of credit accumulation: Kai Simson."
8. "I will rescind my resignation and return to my role as Chairperson of the Election Commission."

Supreme Court Findings and Suggestions:

The Supreme Court Verdict

After reading all statements from everyone involved and mentioned in the original complaint, The Supreme Court has found the following issues:

Student Complaints and Verdicts:

1. "ASNAU President Graham and the Executive Council overstepped the separation of powers and authority of the legislative body."
 - a. No verification, but we recognize lack of professionalism and inadequate measures taken to properly address the students wants, needs, and concerns.
2. "Political influence and elections violations are rampant in this electoral proceeding."
 - a. President Graham & Vice President Quintero have admitted to endorsing candidates which is illegal under ASNAU
 - i. Election Code Article VII. ASNAU Complex
 - ii. Section 2. Integrity and Objectivity:
 - a. To ensure the integrity and objectivity of ASNAU, all ASNAU officials and staff shall be prohibited from the following: 1) using an official ASNAU position to formally endorse any candidate for office; 2) using any ASNAU capital equipment, facilities, and/or office supplies for the express purpose of advancing individual candidates for office; 3) displaying or disbursing any campaign materials on behalf on an individual candidate(s) for office within the physical ASNAU office.
3. "ASNAU has no current way of verifying signatures and student information."
 - a. Confirmed, no current way of verifying signatures and student information.
 - b. The Supreme Court suggests that be changed.
4. "There was political pressures to not reschedule the election."
 - a. No verification available for the Supreme court to decide upon this.
5. "The election began to proceed without an Election Commission."
 - a. Election commissioners were confirmed in accordance to ASNAU Constitution, Bylaws and Election Code. No violation.
6. "I felt forced to resign my position as chairperson of the Election Commission because of rules and violations and political retaliation of part of ASNAU."
 - a. No violation.

7. "I was told that Senators and ASNAU staff were explicitly informed to not work with me as a student or my student organization, the Community Service Coalition."
 - a. No violation. Points of contact were Senator Nardi, VPGA Quintero and Kristine Heflin so students involved did not need to reply to any emails.
8. "Emails and meetings were ignored."
 - a. Complainant was given one point of contact multiple times: Senator Nardi, VPGA Quintero and Kristine Heflin
 - b. We believe he felt confused and attacked because of this, so the Supreme Court recommends that in the future students can reply and state that the point of contact was changed in order to upkeep transparency.
9. "The Senate Parliamentarian is in dereliction of duties..."
 - a. Senate Parliamentarian Estrella and VPGA Quintero were not found in dereliction of duties.
10. "The Volunteer Coordinator is in dereliction of duties..."
 - a. Volunteer Coordinator Martinez was not found to be in dereliction of duties.
11. "There is a monopoly on student voice by ASNAU and a minority of student representation from within the body."
 - a. The Supreme Court has found that endorsements of candidates and ASNAU culture and morality concerns are substantial and have created a negative reputation.

Supreme Court Suggested Remedies:

1. "I am asking for the impeachment and termination of any ASNAU official who played part in violating the impartiality and objectivity of the electoral process and targeted me and my organization for political and personal reasons including the failure and dereliction of duty including: ASNAU President Graham, ASNAU Vice President Quintero, ASNAU Senator Freitas, Senate Parliamentarian Estrella and Volunteer Coordinator Martinez."
 - a. No impeachment of any ASNAU members is suggested by the Supreme Court.
2. "Additional guidelines should be inserted into the 'Integrity and Objectivity' section of the election code."
 - a. The Supreme Court suggests that ASNAU look into updating this section of the election code for the next elections.
3. "The ASNAU Constitution add language concerning ethics and integrity."
 - a. Currently, there is no mention of ethics in either the ASNAU Constitution or Election Codes. The Supreme Court suggest that ASNAU look into adding a section concerning ethics. This could be molded from what the University provides, as we stated above, and shaped for ASNAU purposes.
 - b. The NAU website addresses ethics as a way to help maintain a safe and trusting environment for everyone associated with Northern Arizona University. All members of the university community, while acting in the course and scope of their employment, are responsible for maintaining the highest ethical standards of conduct. With regard to conduct, members of the university community are expected to practice:
 - Integrity** by maintaining honesty and responsibility in all of their dealings, and by avoiding conflicts of interest;
 - Trustworthiness** by acting in a reliable and dependable manner;
 - Respect** by treating others with fairness, civility, and decency;
 - Stewardship** by protecting and safeguarding university property and resources;
 - Compliance** by following local, state and federal laws and regulations and Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and university policies and procedures;
 - Confidentiality** by protecting the security, and privacy of university information such as student records, employee files, patient records, and contract negotiation documents; and
 - Responsibility** by being accountable and fulfilling all obligations to the university.

The purpose of these guidelines is to reinforce current Northern Arizona University policies regarding the conduct of those acting on behalf of the university, including administrators, faculty, staff, and student employees, as well as authorized volunteers and representatives acting as agents of the university such as ASNAU Senators and ASNAU members in general.

4. “[ASNAU officials] need to reopen the election process, void all candidates petitions, and postpone the ASNAU general election.”
 - a. **The Supreme Court does not recommend this.**
5. “The following candidates need to be issued new petitions created and given by the Election Commission and collect new petition signatures: Sergio Alba & Christian Catano.”
 - a. **The Supreme Court does not find Sergio Alba and Christian Catano in any violation of their petitions. No new petitions are needed.**
6. “The following candidate needs to be disqualified and referred to NAU Student Life due to forged student signatures and ID numbers: Ronni Marks.”
 - a. **The Supreme Court does not recommend the the disqualification of Ronnie as President-elect yet, but suggest the following instead:**
 - b. **The Supreme Court suggests disqualifying all signatures written in recurring handwriting due to our stated definition and constitution interpretation of what “in person” signatures mean. She should be allowed to run again if she wishes in a special election to be held next semester with a brand new 250 signatures due to that process of the election being of high concern.**
 - c. **This is not an impeachment process and will not open up the door for such process.**
 - d. **181 signatures were written in the same handwriting. Printed the signatures and highlighted all recurring handwriting.**
 - i. **158 in one handwriting (highlighted green)**
 - ii. **23 in another handwriting (highlighted yellow)**
 - iii. **128 verified signatures**
 - iv. **122 needed signatures to meet 250 quota**
 - e. **We would like Ronni to have a brand new 250 signatures turned in to the ASNAU Vice President and all ASNAU officials next semester if she chooses to run again in a brand new Fall 2019 election. The current VP-elect can serve as the interim President until the new election is held and a new President-elect is chosen.**
7. “The following candidate [be] ineligible to run due to a lack of credit accumulation: Kai Simson.”
 - a. **Credit accumulation was found to be validated and in accordance to policies and Constitution.**
8. “I will rescind my resignation and return to my role as Chairperson of the Election Commission.”
 - a. **Supreme Court recommends that the resignation is final.**

Final Thoughts on Ethics, Endorsements, and President-elect Ronnie Marks

At this time, we have listed the remedies and suggestions from the Supreme Court. We would now like to discuss behavior and actions that do not align with the ASNAU Mission and Constitution that we feel is vital to address to all of ASNAU:

1. *Endorsements and the impact that it has on this organization and its morality and reputation*
2. *Ethics*
3. *Conclusion*

Endorsements

Verbal Endorsements

Endorsing someone for an elected position is prohibited according to the ANSNAU Constitution. This can be interpreted as endorsements made in person, over social media, or in a public setting. With that being said and with ethics and professionalism being a recurrent issue in this particular situation, we would like to bring attention how endorsing has shown negative repercussions.

1. Endorsing can discourage candidates from running. Intentionally or unintentionally, ANSAU holds a heavy name with amazing and powerful individuals. When a certain person endorses a candidate publicly over another, it can feel discouraging and politically swayed. Students in the past have expressed that ASNAU elections are very swayed to Greek life and the members already in ASNAU.
 - a. Posting on secret social media *sorority/fraternity* facebook has been admitted and recognized as being a good way to vote for a certain person over another. With meeting in large numbers, it has been brought to our attention that mass voting has occurred in previous elections by endorsed candidates. Block voting is not recognized as ethically or fair in the eyes of the Supreme Court. **We will circle back to this when we talk about endorsement signatures.**
2. Election Code Article VII. ASNAU Complex
 - a. Section 2. Integrity and Objectivity:
 - 2.1 To ensure the integrity and objectivity of ASNAU, all ASNAU officials and staff shall be prohibited from the following: **1) using an official ASNAU position to formally endorse any candidate for office; 2) using any ASNAU capital equipment, facilities, and/or office supplies for the express purpose of advancing individual candidates for office; 3) displaying or disbursing any candidate(s) for office within the physical ASNAU office (ASNAU Election Code)**
 - i. Although it seems harmless, it is in policy for a reason. Out of the six statements that we got, one-third admitted to formally endorsing a person

running for ASNAU office or Election Commission using their ASNAU position prior to the election either verbally or in meetings or on social media.

Signature Endorsements

The Supreme Court found a concerning number of signatures that Ronni Marks had handwritten in her petition for ASNAU Student Body President. We were confused why this was approved by the Election Commissioners when reviewing packets, and we would like to provide our interpretation. When asking the question of why it was approved, Kristine Heflin responded, “You should also be aware that the Election Commission conducted a review of a complaint regarding Ronni’s petition and did not find her in violation of the Election Code. This is not to say that the Supreme Court complaint does not have merit but only to suggest that you may also wish to contact the Chief Election Commissioner (ASNAUElections@nau.edu or I can provide his student email) for information about their review/decision to aid in your own.”

Election Code ARTICLE IV. Petitions and Nominations:

- Section 1, point b.
 - A student who has received the endorsement of no less than two-hundred fifty (250) campus wide student signatures upon a nominating petition meets requirements set by Article I; Section 4 of this Election Code, and upon approval of the ASNAU Elections Commission shall be considered an official candidate for the position of ASNAU President, Vice President of Student Affairs, Vice President of Academic Affairs, or Vice President of Government Affairs. **All petitions must be signed in person by the endorser.**
1. Stated above is directly out of the Election Code in regards to signatures required by a candidate running for the position of ASNAU President, Vice President of Student Affairs, Vice President of Academic Affairs, or Vice President of Government Affairs. Additionally, it was a complaint provided by the student, and one that the Supreme Court felt was essential to look into for the reason that this is a large part of the process of elections.
 - a. When asking Ronni Marks to elaborate on this issue, she admitted to handwriting the names and ID numbers of students because “they gave her permission”. This was her way of interpreting “in person”, and stated that this was how previous Student Body President, Lauren L'ecuyer went about obtaining signatures, and felt that it was a precedent. She also stated, “She posted on my sorority’s facebook page asking for ladies’ full names and ID numbers. When I checked out my packet, I was timid and worried that each signature needed to be personally signed, and she reassured me that so long as I got personal approval to write their names for them, it would be okay. For the past two years, I have gathered signatures by getting their permission. Having two previous packets verified with these versions of signatures, I believed the precedent had been set that it was allowed so long as they gave their consent”.

- i. The supreme court's purpose is to interpret the ASNAU Constitution, and in this case the Election Code, and **we found this way of receiving signatures to NOT be an interpretation of "in person" signatures.**
- ii. Ronni Marks felt this was ethically and morally correct due to an alleged and not proven conversation with the last president about a year ago. The **Supreme Court found this incredibly concerning** because as running Student Body President, **one should be fluent in the constitution/election code, and not relay on an alleged conversation a year ago.** This statement also allowed us to circle back to private Facebook pages obtained by greek life students and how block voting can be encouraged and further discourage other students from even running for positions due to fear of not receiving as many votes as greek life members or members who have been endorsed. By Ronni's interpretation of "in-person", one could theoretically ask for full names and ID number over the internet, and with that permission, can write those credentials onto a candidate petition. This is not interpreted by the Supreme Court as "in-person".

Ethics

Currently there is no mention of ethics in either the ASNAU Constitution, Bylaws, or Election Code.

The NAU website addresses ethics as a way to help maintain a safe and trusting environment for everyone associated with Northern Arizona University. All members of the university community, while acting in the course and scope of their employment, are responsible for maintaining the highest ethical standards of conduct. With regard to conduct, members of the university community are expected to practice:

Integrity by maintaining honesty and responsibility in all of their dealings, and by avoiding conflicts of interest;

Trustworthiness by acting in a reliable and dependable manner;

Respect by treating others with fairness, civility, and decency;

Stewardship by protecting and safeguarding university property and resources;

Compliance by following local, state and federal laws and regulations and Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) and university policies and procedures;

Confidentiality by protecting the security, and privacy of university information such as student records, employee files, patient records, and contract negotiation documents; and

Responsibility by being accountable and fulfilling all obligations to the university.

The purpose of these guidelines is to reinforce current Northern Arizona University policies regarding the conduct of those acting on behalf of the university, including administrators, faculty, staff, and student employees, as well as authorized volunteers and representatives acting as agents of the university such as ASNAU Senators and ASNAU members in general. Although ethics is not a tangible object, we feel that it has significantly corrupted ASNAU this past election period, and failed to give the complaining student due process under the ASNAU Constitution and Bylaws.

Recommandation to Senate on President-elect Ronnie Marks

With the above being observed, the Supreme Court would like to bring to attention that it has found that numerous members of ASNAU have not practiced ethical behavior in this election process. In one of the statements that the Supreme Court received, President-elect Ronnie Marks stated the following:

From Ronni Mark's statement:

- "... stopped the group of current ASNAU members to use his authority as Election Commissioner to discuss his agendas for ASNAU- an apparent conflict of interest. After hearing him hassle one of the current Senators ...
- How is it justified to ignore the signatures of 300 plus students because of the allegations of one student?
- The voices of 300 student signatures should not be disregarded because of one disgruntled student
- "...filing this complaint is a conflict of interest, and his complaint should not be validated.
- "...he condescendingly told my fellow candidates and me that his previous school didn't allow the endorsements of other candidates because of the disagreements it would create
- "...he has already caused chaos"
- "Why would Jeremy resign right after I politely asked him not to pursue his agenda until the election were over?"

Lastly, Ronni stated in her statement that : "The ASNAU Mission Statement says, "**The primary purpose of ASNAU is to serve NAU as the representative student voice.**" The final words of the ASNAU Purpose say, "Because of the Student We exist." I want to draw attention to these quotes because they focus on ***ASNAU's number one duty- to represent the students. I want the President position because I know I will represent the students the way that they want; I will voice their concerns and their passions.***"

After acknowledging everything above, it can be confirmed by the Supreme Court that Ronni does not in fact follow through with those commitments and statements due to how she reacted to her complaint and the complainant with the attacks on his character.

The Supreme Court found the language in Ronni's statement to be unprofessional and concerning. We would like to recognize that she was going through a personal injury and illness, however we are weary about attacks of character, her interpretation of the election process, and words she used to defend the situation in general. As Student Body President-Elect, there will be many times when people disagree with your choices and stances. Responding in a professional and collected manner will get you much farther than perhaps attacking the other person that you are supposed to represent. We would also like to acknowledge that there was no conflict of interest from the complainant like Ronni mentioned in her statement, because any student that is concerned about ASNAU procedures or unethical behavior is allowed to submit a complaint to the Supreme Court. Furthermore, we would like to formally disagree with Ronni on the basis that this student's complaint should not be validated, because every student's complaint is valid to be heard and every student is also a member of ASNAU according to the ASNAU constitution. We understand that when a person is being accused of something, it is easy to become defensive, and we fully recognize that. However, as a Supreme Court dissecting this case with many moving parts, the language of requested statements hold much negative weight.

The Supreme Court wants to disqualify all signatures written in recurring handwriting due to our Supreme Court stated definition and constitution interpretation of what "in person" means. The Supreme court has highlighted all recurring handwritten signatures, and suggests that Ronni Marks gathers a brand new 250 signatures in the handwriting of the endorsing student for a new election that will be held next semester Fall 2019 if she chooses to run again. As of right now, we recommend that the Vice President step in as interim President until the Fall 2019 special election. Ronnie should be allowed to run again with other signatures if she wishes because that was our only concern in the electoral proceedings. This is not an impeachment process and will not open up the door for such process, but we recommend that Ronnie Marks not be sworn in as the official ASNAU President until this process is rectified and more ethical and problematic parts from her statements have been heard by the Senate fully.

Negative stigma about ASNAU elections - The Supreme Court wants to address once again that it is fully illegal under the constitution to endorse anyone running for positions according to:

Election Code Article VII. ASNAU Complex

ii. Section 2. Integrity and Objectivity:

a. To ensure the integrity and objectivity of ASNAU, all ASNAU officials and staff shall be prohibited from the following: 1) using an official ASNAU position to formally endorse any candidate for office; 2) using any ASNAU capital equipment, facilities, and/or office supplies for the express purpose of advancing individual candidates for office; 3) displaying or disbursing any campaign materials on behalf on an individual candidate(s) for office within the physical ASNAU office.

If the Senate feels that Ronnie Marks should **be allowed to run again and then be sworn in AFTER verification of a new 250 signatures written in the handwriting of the student endorsing her in the packet in a new special election in Fall 2019, where other students may run for the position as well**, you may choose to swear her in officially as the Student Body President of ASNAU if she gathers the largest amounts of votes out of everyone running.

After hearing our recommendations and large concerns, if you are not comfortable with her representing the student body and you as Senators, then you may also stop her from running again and choose to open up the position for other students without her being eligible to run in the Fall 2019 semester.

During this semester's last ABOR meeting, NAU got approval for:

- The HLC \$25 per semester fee increase for mental health
- The Green Fee \$10 per year increase for sustainability initiatives
- The tuition fee increase of 2.5% for incoming undergraduates and a 2.4% for incoming graduates
 - These are the lowest proposed tuition fee increases from the university
 - These tuition fee increases do not affect current students due to NAU's Tuition Pledge= 98% of students will not be affected by this tuition fee increase
 - To compare, our sister universities saw to a \$1,000-3,000 tuition fee increase
- The approval of three regent professors:
 - Julie Baldwin
 - Peter Fulee
 - Andrew Richardson
- Learned of Arizona's current population demographics:
 - Fertility rates for all appropriate age ranges are dropping with the death rates increasing = no replenishing workforce (this trend has been in place for the last 6 years)
 - Arizona is experiencing a large migration of 10,000+ per year = further depleting our workforce, competent and participating citizens i.e. "brain drain"
 - Interesting note made by Pres. Crow: there are more students attending community colleges in Oregon than there are of attending students for all three universities of AZ
- Brainstormed ideas for the new SSA Director (and any other position that wants to collaborate):
 - Placing feminine hygiene products in all university bathrooms or all Union bathrooms that are checked and replaced weekly
 - Looking at the process of opting out of fees, who applies, the process, and how to make it easier and more accessible to students
 - A dedicated blurb in the President's weekly email to the student body updating students on ABOR (dates, meeting info., what it is, etc.), local and state gov. policies and events, tax resources, federal government shutdown resources/info updates
 - Updating the Blue Lights system to go mobile on an app
 - Campus map available for most well-lit places/paths
 - Self-defense training/seminar as an event(s)
 - Making all syllabi available for view before enrollment