

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/6/2017 0:34:42		Cindy Liu		Columbia College	I believe executive board, on a ticket (not sure her exact position)	Not attending the mandatory April 5 rules meeting	When I was waiting to sign in, I noticed that someone was taking an abnormally long time (I later found out his name - Richard Nederlander). I noticed he looked at his laptop, and then wrote down Cindy Liu's name and uni. I suspect that, since Cindy wasn't there, he needed to message Cindy asking about her uni so he could write her name because they are in the same party together.  I snapped a very quick picture, because the situation was fast it's not the best picture. But, while you cannot read the exact names written, you can discern the lines of text. If you were to count down the number of lines in the picture, I'm certain Cindy Liu's name would show up there. My name is the one right after. I believe Richard probably wrote his name earlier on the same page. It can't have been after since he left immediately after I saw him write Cindy's name. That would be pretty good evidence that he wrote in Cindy's name. In the picture, he is not in the act of writing. However he is clearly right about to write or just wrote something given his body positioning. He couldn't have possibly been finishing up writing his name, if his name is earlier (I suspect not directly earlier - he probably tried to space the names out a little). This is a picture of him just having written Cindy's name, and the existing evidence validates that.			Not a violation, candidate that was signed in was in attendance
3/29/2017 10:40:28		Karlee Roberts/Rodriguez		General Studies	VP Communications	Using position to solicit votes. This is utilizing the email for the Communications team, for her personal campaign and is not allowed, creates massive bias, and is highly manipulative. [Article 7: Endorsements, Section 2: Council Endorsements, "A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part"]	When creating bio/platform I would guess. I noticed it at 10:30am this morning.			Yes, violation: using the official gssc communications email for personal campaigning is not allowed. Type 2 violation, 1 vote for every 5 people effected. 70 people saw the blog link based on Facebook estimates, so 70/5 = 14 votes.
4/2/2017 22:14:42		Raisa Flor and Dennis Zhao		General Studies	Vice President of Policy and President	Article 2, Section 3, subsection 1 ; Article 7 Section subsection 1	Current GSSC Julian LaRosa has been actively campaigning for Raisa and Dennis for their respective positions in violation of council members endorsing candidates (Article 7 Section subsection 1). He also has sent unsolicited social media messages to members of the GS community, which is also in violation of the CEB rules (Article 2, Section 3, subsection 1)			Yes, violation: Type 2 violation of 10% given that the violator is the current
4/3/2017 23:59:49		Julian LaRosa		General Studies	On behalf of President Dennis Zhao and VP of Policy Raisa Flor	Article 2 Section 1 subsection 5; Article 2 Section 3 subsection 1; Article 7 Section 2 subsection 1	Here's the deal: President Julian LaRosa has been actively campaigning for Dennis Zhao and Raisa Flor. Julian acts on behalf of the candidates when campaigning for them as per Article 2 Section 1 subsection 5. He asked for support for these candidates through unsolicited support, which violates Article 2 Section 3 subsection 1; He also endorsed these candidates, while being the President of the student body (Article 7 Section 2 subsection 1). There is no way to know of the true effects of Julian's efforts on the race. Did he swing 10 votes, 30 votes, or 50 votes? The reality is that Julian's voice is strong. People respect him because he is the student body president. I do not know where this new "immunity" comes into play offered by CEB, but I ask that CEB holds up the integrity of these elections. I ask for immediate disqualification of the above candidates as it is impossible to know how much this has negatively affected Sam and Yona. Regardless of whether Julian continues to campaign for these candidates or not, the GS students know where Julian stands on this election. This will sway votes even if Julian stops campaigning for them.			Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves or others and may not attack other candidates's views, experience, or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. Offering alternative ideas, solutions or evidence of preparedness does not constitute an attack.
3/30/2017 20:53:17		Onur Calikusu		SEAS	ESC President	Campaigning-section 3	Onur messaged me unsolicited--made me uncomfortable, shockingly unwanted (3/29 at 1PM)			No violation: under further investigation, this violation was not filed by the actual individual who received the text - they later reached out to correct the accusation.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/2/2017 18:05:14		Zoha Qamar		SEAS	VP of Policy	Criticism	I have a concern regarding the current ESC members, including Zoha, who is running against my team. I received a screenshot from a member of ESC and saw their comments during the debate. I don't think that these comments are respectful and they definitely don't show good sportsmanship. They are the people representing us and I don't feel comfortable approaching them now or in the future due to the nature of their rude and condescending comments. I don't see how this is allowed at all. I am feeling really uneasy because of these comments. Additionally, Sid, current VP Policy was laughing with Zoha at our team while he asked Zoha and Aaron a question. I understand that there is bias because they currently serve in ESC, but I find it unacceptable for them to talk this way. After all, they're supposed to be the ones representing us and our concerns. Thanks.			No violation: while the comments were of a rude and unnecessary nature, because they occurred in a private conversation it is beyond CEB's jurisdiction and thus cannot be acted upon. ESC President was reach out to about the matter, and more moderation of the private group chat was requested by CEB.
4/2/2017 18:13:31		Richa		SEAS	Class 2019 President	Criticism	Richa took part in condescending comments in the ESC Group chat as she was watching the debate. She's running for class president and I don't think her comments are professional, nice, or respectful. I feel very uncomfortable having her as my class president knowing that this is the way she speaks about fellow members of her class behind closed doors. This is really offensive and disrespectful. Thanks.			No violation: while the comments were of a rude and unnecessary nature, because they occurred in a private conversation it is beyond CEB's jurisdiction and thus cannot be acted upon. ESC President was reach out to about the matter, and more moderation of the private group chat was requested by CEB.
4/3/2017 9:57:56		Aida Lu		SEAS	ESC President	A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate while acting in his/her capacity as a member of Student Council. CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office.	On Back to the Future's Facebook page, an elected ESC official was seen endorsing the party, and as such violated the rules. In no way, shape, or form did they make any effort to nullify their advantage. Given the fact that this took place THREE times, there must be additional adjudication.			Violation: Article 6, Section 2, part I: CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office. Back to the Future solicited and posted these endorsements. 11 votes are deducted from each individual pictured.
4/3/2017 9:59:33		Zoha Qamar		SEAS	VP Policy	A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate while acting in his/her capacity as a member of Student Council. CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office.				1. The type 2 violation for number of people (90) reached will be divided by five to get, 18 votes that will be penalized. 2. There are three instances of the type 2 violation so the total is multiplied by three to bring the total to 54 votes. 3. The violation was towards and entire party and not directly against an individual the total violation penalty is divided by the number of candidates; 54/5= 10.8 4. The penalty will be rounded to 11 votes that will be deducted per candidate of the party who's endorsement was in violation of the election guidelines.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/3/2017 10:00:27		Ben Barton		SEAS	VP Student Life	A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate while acting in his/her capacity as a member of Student Council. CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office.	On Back to the FUTURE's Facebook page, an elected ESC official was seen endorsing the party, and as such violated the rules. In no way, shape, or form did they make any effort to nullify their advantage. Given the fact that this took place THREE times, there must be additional adjudication. These pictures have been posted on the team's Facebook page since Wednesday and the page has a reach of 227+ students.		Violation: Article 6, Section 2, part I: CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office. Back to the FUTURE solicited and posted these endorsements. 11 votes are deducted from each individual pictured.	
4/3/2017 10:02:15		Cesar Trujillo		SEAS	ESC VP Finance	A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate while acting in his/her capacity as a member of Student Council. CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office.	On Back to the FUTURE's Facebook page, an elected ESC official was seen endorsing the party, and as such violated the rules. In no way, shape, or form did they make any effort to nullify their advantage. Given the fact that this took place THREE times, there must be additional adjudication. These pictures have been posted on the team's Facebook page since Wednesday and the page has a reach of 227+ students.		Violation: Article 6, Section 2, part I: CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office. Back to the FUTURE solicited and posted these endorsements. 11 votes are deducted from each individual pictured.	
4/3/2017 10:03:10		Julia Joern		SEAS	ESC VP Communications	A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate while acting in his/her capacity as a member of Student Council. CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office.	On Back to the FUTURE's Facebook page, an elected ESC official was seen endorsing the party, and as such violated the rules. In no way, shape, or form did they make any effort to nullify their advantage. Given the fact that this took place THREE times, there must be additional adjudication. These pictures have been posted on the team's Facebook page since Wednesday and the page has a reach of 227+ students.		Violation: Article 6, Section 2, part I: CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office. Back to the FUTURE solicited and posted these endorsements. 11 votes are deducted from each individual pictured.	
4/3/2017 22:08:59		Zoha Qamar/Walker Magrath		SEAS	VP Policy	Candidates may not endorse other candidates.	On his Facebook, Walker Magrath (a candidate himself) posted a status endorsing Back to the FUTURE, namely Zoha Qamar. In this post, he got 28 likes, not to mention reaching countless other students. I demand this be treated as the Type II offense that it is.			Violation: Article 6, Section 2, part I: CCSC, ESC, and GSSC members may not endorse any candidates on social media while holding office. Back to the FUTURE solicited and posted these endorsements. 1 vote for every 5 people affected, 28 people liked the photo/post, 28/5 = 5.6 votes deducted in total from the party. 5.6/5 = 1 vote per candidate.
4/3/2017 23:23:29		Onur Calikusu		SEAS	ESC President	Misrepresentation and damage referencing the ESC Rules Presentation stating explicitly "Do not attack character of other candidates in any way" and page 9 of the ESC Rules Meeting document.	The comment was blatant aggression and an accusation against the integrity of myself, Aida, and Larson Holt. I posted my support for my friends on my personal Facebook page in no sort of ESC capacity and felt personally targeted by one of the ESC presidential candidates. It was entirely unprofessional and should be brought to justice.			No violation: when investigating, the post was taken down before CEB could follow up, so CEB could not adjudicate the matter.
4/4/2017 10:00:26		Aida Lu		SEAS	President	"Campaign free zones are: Mudd 4th floor, within 100 feet of the Mudd entrance, and any outside walls and dining halls. Residential hall lobbies are limited to posters only. Candidates may not campaign in person in these areas."	They have campaigned in front Ferris dining hall.			Not a violation, the photo shows the candidates outside the dining hall, which is Lerner Space.
4/4/2017 10:01:49		Back to the FUTURE		SEAS	All of Exec Board	Type 2 Violation	Ben Barton campaigned for his entire team on the Columbia Class of 2019 page. This page has an incredible reach and the rules say that you are not allowed to campaign for yourself and your team in predetermined pages. I believe this is a Type 2 violation.			Not a violation, campaigning on class facebook pages is allowed
4/4/2017 10:01:51		Ben Barton		SEAS	VP Student Life	Campaign free zones are: Mudd 4th floor, within 100 feet of the Mudd entrance, and any outside walls and dining halls. Residential hall lobbies are limited to posters only. Candidates may not campaign in person in these areas.	They have campaigned outside of Ferris dining hall.			Not a violation, the photo shows the candidates outside the dining hall, which is Lerner Space.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/4/2017 10:02:55		Julia Joern		SEAS	VP Communications	Campaign free zones are: Mudd 4th floor, within 100 feet of the Mudd entrance, and any outside walls and dining halls. Residential hall lobbies are limited to posters only. Candidates may not campaign in person in these areas.	They have campaigned in front of Ferris dining hall.			Not a violation, the photo shows the candidates outside the dining hall, which is Lerner Space.
4/4/2017 10:04:08		Cesar Turjillo		SEAS	VP Finance	Campaign free zones are: Mudd 4th floor, within 100 feet of the Mudd entrance, and any outside walls and dining halls. Residential hall lobbies are limited to posters only. Candidates may not campaign in person in these areas.	They have campaigned in front of Ferris dining hall.			Not a violation, the photo shows the candidates outside the dining hall, which is Lerner Space.
4/4/2017 10:05:18		Zoha Qamar		SEAS	VP Policy	Campaign free zones are: Mudd 4th floor, within 100 feet of the Mudd entrance, and any outside walls and dining halls. Residential hall lobbies are limited to posters only. Candidates may not campaign in person in these areas.	They have campaigned in front of Ferris dining hall.			Not a violation, the photo shows the candidates outside the dining hall, which is Lerner Space.
4/12/2017 23:34:43		Nikola Danev		Columbia College	Student Services Representative	Section 2, Part I (Council Endorsements)	Today at 3:42pm, current University Senator Sean Ryan updated his Facebook profile picture to the campaign photo of Nikola Danev, who is running for Student Services Representative. Ryan's active campaigning for Danev, as a current member of CCSC, violates Section 2, Part I on Council Endorsements. Although Ryan later took down the photo—perhaps tacit acknowledgement that the endorsement was against the rules—Ryan's support of Danev on Facebook violates part iii) of this clause, as Ryan is a known current council member and he is actively supporting a candidate. I'm attaching a screenshot of Ryan's support for Danev on Facebook today.			Yes, Type 2 Violation. Sean Ryan is a current CCSC Senator and well-known for his position on SAV/the University Senate through both personal posts and news interviews. Ruling stated below.
4/13/2017 3:08:27		Cesar Zamudio		Columbia College	Class of 2020 President	Article 3, Section 2, part I	They have on their personal Facebook page, as well as the Facebook page for their ticket made reference to an article written in the Columbia Spectator entitled "The Incumbent." The article in itself is one of a relatively large amount of bias against anyone who is running again for re-election as it implies they are in some way not necessarily worthy of having the right to serve. The statuses which accompany the post make clear reference to the LionHeart party, their only competition, with the status on their Facebook page in particular being one intended to undermine the validity of the LionHeart platform describing it as "lofty promises" in an attempt to remove the ticket's credibility.			Not a violation. 1. the facebook posts never mention LionHeart explicitly in them 2. once reading the article, the authors wrote that "This isn't, in any way, an indictment of Lion Heart or any of the other candidates". The article explicitly states that it is not a critique
4/13/2017 13:32:56		Our 20/20 Vision		Columbia College	Class of 2020 President and Vice-President	Article 4, Section 2, Point V	A poster of the LionHeart tickets and a poster of Vice-President candidate James Ritchie were torn down overnight just as posters for other campaigners appeared on the noticeboard. The posters targeted were clearly LionHeart's as the posters for Low Beach Party were left intact.			Not a violation, no concrete proof that 20/20 vision took down the posters.
4/13/2017 17:47:43		A New Roar		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Council	4.2.V. Candidates may not damage, destroy, obscure, move or otherwise limit access to campaign materials produced by others.  3.1.V. All candidates are responsible for the conduct of themselves and all others who support or represent them, regardless of whether or not the act/support was requested or solicited. A supporter is defined as anyone working on behalf of or promoting a campaign. Candidates are responsible for notifying such persons of all CEB guidelines and Election by-laws. Rule violations by supporters will be considered as being committed by the candidate(s). The Elections Board will evaluate the validity of the connection between a supporter and a party by the evidence presented by the filed rules violation.	A resident of the 8th floor of McBain Hall, (name omitted), observed a vandalized Blue Ivy poster on the floor bulletin board at 2:29PM today. The poster clearly depicts a phallus near the mouth of VP candidate Yerv Melkonyan and an aggressive unibrow (creating a malicious facial expression) over the forehead of President candidate Sophie Broadbent. There are no other marks on any of the other party members. Please see linked image.  Apart from the obvious vandalism of the poster, we would like to contend that this is a politically motivated action. The only two people who were marked were Yerv and Sophie- who are running together on the Presidential ticket. There is absolutely no other reason anyone would choose BOTH Yerv AND Sophie AND exclude the rest of the party, other than to specifically target the Presidential ticket. A friend of either Sophie or Yerv, if they were joking, would have only targeted their friend. Since the person drew over both Yerv AND Sophie, they are clearly making a statement about the "ticket." This is why we think this is politically motivated, and not a mere joke.  Of course, we do not believe that a member of A New Roar itself drew on our poster. That accusation (1) would not make sense, (2) would not be representative of their character, and (3) would be a huge risk for them to take. However, we believe it is likely that a supporter drew on the poster without realizing that "rule violations by supporters will be considered as being committed by the candidate(s)." We believe it is a supporter, because as stated above, drawing on Yerv and Sophie is a political statement being made.			Not a violation, no concrete proof that A New Roar or one of their supports drew that on the posters.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/13/2017 18:49:35		Elise Fuller/Omar Khan/Lewit Beeddada		Columbia College	Inclusivity & Equity rep	Current candidates/current student council members endorsing a candidate	Omar Khan, Alfred Dominguez, and Lewit Beeddada each commented on Elise's photo, praising her candidacy/saying she'd make a great representative. Omar and Alfred are running for USenate, and Lewit is the current inclusivity & equity rep.			Type II Violation Article 2 Section 5, 4 reacts on Omar's comment. Therefore, 4/5 = .8 rounded up to 1, 1 vote deducted from both Elise and Omar
4/14/2017 15:15:56		Alliance (Sreya, Alex, Hellowise, Nathan, Nicole)		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board	Article 5, Section 2, Clause V: Posters must not be affixed to brick, glass, or stone.	They posted a flyer on the brick wall outside the RA room on Carman 5			Not a violation, once CEB went to investigate this poster an hour later it was not there.
4/14/2017 15:18:54		Alliance (Nathan, Nicole, Alex, Hellowise, Sreya)		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board, all positions	Article 4, Section 2, Clause V: Candidates may not damage, destroy, ***obscure***, move or otherwise limit access to campaign materials produced by others	Alliance covered the platform points of our VP finance with their poster. I included three images of it with the following IMGUR link.			Not a violation, campaign poster does not obstruct the other posters in an unreasonable manner.
4/14/2017 17:26:59		Low Beach Party		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board	Article 7, Section 1, Part IV, Letter H: "Should a candidate/party or endorsing organization announce the endorsement before the endorsement is announced by the Elections Board, the endorsed party/candidate loses right to all endorsements and the party/candidate will be penalized as a Type 1 Violation (10% of poster quota, based on original allotment)."	Low Beach Party posted on their Facebook Page yesterday at 2:10 PM, "Thank you Columbia Financial Investment Group - CFG for endorsing us! #FallBacchanal" At that point in time (and up until the present moment right now) there has been no announcement by the Elections Board about this endorsement neither on the Facebook page nor the CEB website nor any other public communication. The Rule clearly states that Elections Board must announce the endorsement before the party can announce the endorsement, but this has not been the case.			Not a violation due to miscommunication by a CEB member regarding the endorsement process.
4/15/2017 22:01:09		David Kaminsky		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Vice President	Under "Campaign Materials," the rules packet states: "Sending unsolicited mass emails to students not known by the candidate is prohibited."	At 7:25pm on Saturday, April 15th, CCSC 2019 VP candidate David Kaminsky posted in a Columbia private Facebook group called "Kosher Food Hunt KFH." In the Facebook post, Kaminsky says "I encourage you to vote for me and my team, A New Roar" - he then attaches the link to his party's Facebook page and website. This is, without a doubt, a violation of the CCSC Elections Rules, which state that "sending unsolicited mass emails to students not known by the candidate is prohibited." Kaminsky's post in a Facebook group of 530 Columbia students equates to sending an "unsolicited mass email to students not known by the candidate."  We, Blue Ivy, request that Mina Mahmood and David Kaminsky, if not the entire A New Roar party, are penalized 10% to 20% of their votes for this illegal Facebook post. We think that a penalty of this size is appropriate considering the very large number (530) of Columbia students that are members of the Facebook group. Kaminsky's post reached such a large base of students that we, Blue Ivy, would be put at an unfair disadvantage if A New Roar is not penalized for it.			Not a violation. Facebook posts on groups/pages are allowed by candidates
4/15/2017 23:29:14		A New Roar		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Council	Sending unsolicited AND/OR list-serve emails and social-media messages to students is prohibited, regardless of whether the candidate is known to the student or they are already friends on facebook. A message is unsolicited if the recipient did not explicitly give his/her email address to the candidate and consent to email communication, or if the recipient did not explicitly ask for more information from the candidates.	At 7:25pm on Saturday, April 15th, CCSC 2019 Presidential candidate Mina Mahmood posted in a private GroupMe called "Yung Black Thoughtties," a group of 88 (primarily) black students from the Class of 2019. In the GroupMe message, Mahmood says, "Hey! I'm running for president of student council and we made a pretty lit debate video. Would love love love if y'all could like comment share etc. pls watch, you won't be disappointed. hope you're having a good night!! <a href="https://www.facebook.com/ANewRoar/videos/187711405080324/">https://www.facebook.com/ANewRoar/videos/187711405080324/</a> ." Mahmood's message in a GroupMe of 88 Columbia students equates to sending an "unsolicited mass email."  We, Blue Ivy, request that Mina Mahmood and David Kaminsky, if not the entire A New Roar party, are penalized severely for this action. This is an egregious perpetuation of a video that is accusatory in tone, aggressive in nature, and completely mean-spirited. To continue publicizing this video, which is defamatory and a severe attack on character and integrity (as expounded upon in another rules violation), ought to be worthy of penalization, considering the very large number (88) of Columbia students that are members of the GroupMe. To summarize, there are two penalty-worthy components of this action: (1) that the message was sent in a mass-GroupMe and is clearly considered a violation, and (2) that the message amplifies an aggressive and defamatory video about Blue Ivy.			Type II Violation, groupme is composed of 88 members but 68 expressed consent (screenshots were provided), and 5 are not in CC. Therefore, (88-68-5 = 18)/5 = 3, thus 3 votes deducted from Mina Mahmood

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/16/2017 0:12:50		A NEW ROAR - Mina Mahmood, David Kaminsky, Sofia Petros, George Jiang, and Tarek Deida		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 (Class President, Class VP, and 3 Class Representatives)	<p>Section 2: Criticism and Obscenity</p> <p>I. Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves or others and may not attack other candidates' views, experience, or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. Offering alternative ideas, solutions or evidence of preparedness does not constitute an attack.</p> <p>II. Discriminatory, obscene, sexually suggestive, drug and alcohol related or generally offensive or inappropriate content is prohibited. Inappropriate or defaming language and images are prohibited, subject to the discretion of CEB. If a candidate has any question regarding the appropriateness of any campaign materials, he/she is responsible for checking with CEB.</p> <p>3.1.VII Any candidate/party expressing ideas for campaigning not contained within this document should submit to the Elections Board a written statement of intent. Any action taken by candidates/parties not sanctioned by these rules can result in disciplinary action and as such the Board requests clear, concise communication from candidates if they have any alternate ideas for campaigning that they are interested in pursuing.</p>				Outside of CEB Jurisdiction, referred to Josh Lucas
4/16/2017 2:54:18		David Kaminsky		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Vice President	"Sending unsolicited mass emails to students not known by the candidate is prohibited."	<p>At 7:25pm on Saturday, April 15th, CCSC 2019 VP candidate David Kaminsky posted in ANOTHER Columbia private Facebook group called "Columbia/Barnard Queer Memes." In the Facebook post, Kaminsky says "I encourage you to vote for me and my team, A New Roar" - he then attaches the link to his party's Facebook page and website. This is, without a doubt, a violation of the CCSC Elections Rules, which state that "sending unsolicited mass emails to students not known by the candidate is prohibited." Kaminsky's post in a Facebook group of 93 Columbia students equates to sending an "unsolicited mass email."</p> <p>I'd like to point out that this is the THIRD TIME that we have caught A New Roar posting in a large Facebook group/GroupMe. They have probably posted in multiple more Facebook groups and GroupMes - we only have evidence of them posting in three because we are members of those groups.</p> <p>We request that you heavily penalize A New Roar for their consistent breaking of the rules.</p>			Not a violation, Facebook posts on groups and pages are allowed by candidates
4/16/2017 19:38:31		A New Roar		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Council	6.2.I Candidates may only purchase copies for posters and palm cards, website domain/construction services, and food/non-alcoholic beverages. No other materials may be purchased.	<p>I am reporting A New Roar for spending additional funds to boost their Facebook post, as seen in the attached screenshot. In the screenshot you can clearly see "sponsored" below the name of the page, "Vote A New Roar for CCSC 2019." The word "sponsored" on top of a post is an indication that a FB page has decided to boost its audience for a certain number of people by paying an additional fee. Here is information on how this works: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/business/a/boost-a-post">https://www.facebook.com/business/a/boost-a-post</a></p> <p>As the rules packet states, corroborated by a personal phone call with Charlie Kang, spending is not allowed for anything but posters. This is done to ensure a fair election that all candidates have access to. In addition to boosting/sponsoring a post, A New Roar sponsored the post of the extremely controversial and defamatory video that was published a day ago. This is perpetuating an aggressive and misrepresentative image of Blue Ivy that we believe is extremely detrimental to our campaign. They have been able to reach an innumerable amount of new individuals through this advertising- we implore you to penalize A New Roar for this unfair and unjust action.</p>			Not a violation, as Facebook allows free trials. The accused party was told to stop using the sponsored post as Facebook does not give every page the opportunity to have the free trial.
4/16/2017 22:01:03		A New Roar		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Council	<p>Section 9.3.X.:</p> <p>Penalties will be implemented in one of three ways:</p> <p>A. Type 1: 10% reduction in poster allocation or funding limit (when applicable)</p> <p>B. Type 2: 1 vote deduction for each 5 people affected by the violation OR a 10% vote deduction</p> <p>C. Type 3: 50% vote deduction OR immediate disqualification</p>	<p><b>Omitted due to extenuating circumstances</b></p>			addressed above

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/17/2017 0:00:08		Nathan Rosin		Columbia College	CCSC President	Article 8, Section 1, Part III, Sub-section F : Aggressive actions towards any voters that make them feel pressured or uncomfortable, and obligated to vote for the candidate or party for fear of physical or emotional retribution	Nathan messaged Henrietta Steventon and told her that "u changed ur cover photo against me" when she made Low Beach Party's picture her cover photo (because she is Kristen's best friend). He is clearly intimidating this voter into not campaigning for us. He used "aggressive actions" to make her feel "pressured and uncomfortable" and obligated to support him "for fear of [her]... emotional retribution".			Will not count as violation due to the secondhand nature of the statement, but a warning email stating more reports of such behavior will incur a Type II violation.
4/17/2017 14:43:08		A New Roar		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Council	Supplementing previous violation.	We would like to add on to a previous violation concerning Facebook advertising. On their video post, A New Roar publicly claims, "Facebook offers a free 'post boost' 12-hour trial for every new public page. We can assure you that there is no paid Facebook advertising here." We have three points in response to this that the CEB ought consider: 1) A New Roar must submit proof of this trial existing and usage of this trial to publicize their post to the CEB to even validate their claim. The burden of proof ought to be extremely high because, in 99% of cases when a post is marked "sponsored," this indicates paid advertising, not free advertising. We can find no evidence from our internet research that a 12-hour trial offer is offered; we contest the accuracy of their statement. 2) Providing evidence "only" proves that their statement was correct, "not" that their action was fair or just in an electoral context. We were not presented with this option whatsoever. We are willing to even temporarily make one of you admins of our page/meet with one of you to grant access so you can verify for yourself that we were not offered this opportunity. Because we were not granted this option to publicize ourselves, their actions are unfairly skewing the election in their favor. 3) Boosting a post is equivalent to soliciting voters. Sending a mass email = sending a mass GroupMe message = posting in a Facebook group = boosting your post to force yourself onto people's timelines. Normal FB campaigning is fair because your friends see your comments, likes, and actions on Facebook. However, boosting a post forces the video onto the timelines of people who did not like the page "Vote A New Roar CCSC 2019" or who are not friends with the candidates. This is unequivocally analogous to solicitation without consent.			addressed above
4/17/2017 18:27:39		David Shan		Columbia College	Sandwich Ambassador	I couldn't find the specific rules documents mentioned above. However, this activity violates slide 2 of the "CCSC Rules Meeting" presentation, which states that, "Only tape provided by Columbia Elections Board may be used." Therefore, the candidate's use of pushpins is a clear violation of this rule.	I noticed this violation on Monday, April 17th at around 1am when I was walking through Wallach Hall. On the poster board in the Residence Hall, I noticed that candidate David Shan's poster was fastened to the wall with an authorized fastening material (pushpins). I took photos of both the poster board and the specific poster in question and have attached them to this form.			No longer a rules violation because a document signed by a Notary (legally binding) was submitted to confirm that neither David nor his campaign manager used push pins. [Previous ruling: Article 6, Section 2, Subsection 3, Part D: "Only tape distributed by the CCSC Elections Board can be used for flyers/posters. Failure to comply with this rule will result in 10 votes for each separate instance reported." As specified in this section 10 votes will be deducted.]
4/17/2017 20:19:01		Toqa Badran		Columbia College	Student Services Representative	Section 2 Article V	The candidate placed 2 of her posters in Carman hall over 4 other posters, slightly obstructing the view of mine and another candidate's. Her other poster (not pictured) is obstructing the views of a Senate Candidate's and a Pre-Professional Representative Candidate's posters. The location is Carman Hall lobby, next to the elevators.			Not a violation, campaign poster does not obstruct the other posters in an unreasonable manner.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/17/2017 20:25:45		Sophie Broadbent		Columbia College	President of CCSC 2019	Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves, attack another candidate's views, experience or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. Offering alternative ideas, solutions or evidence of preparedness does not constitute an attack.	In Blue Ivy's video released today, which can be found here <a href="https://www.facebook.com/voteblueivy2019/videos/653964874795814/?pnref=story">https://www.facebook.com/voteblueivy2019/videos/653964874795814/?pnref=story</a> They attack our character in their caption "when they go low, we go high." The rules summary states " Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way." Not only does this slander us, but they compare us to Donald Trump. This is a direct quote from Michelle Obama in reference to poor character of Donald Trump. As of now this has been shared publicly on Facebook by both Sophie Broadbent and Yerv Melkonyan roughly 2 hours ago.			Not a violation, explicit wording by itself and without context does not warrant a violation.
4/17/2017 20:30:04		Yerv Melkonyan		Columbia College	Vice President of CCSC 2019	Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves, attack another candidate's views, experience or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. Offering alternative ideas, solutions or evidence of preparedness does not constitute an attack.	In Blue Ivy's video released today, which can be found here <a href="https://www.facebook.com/voteblueivy2019/videos/653964874795814/?pnref=story">https://www.facebook.com/voteblueivy2019/videos/653964874795814/?pnref=story</a> They attack our character in their caption "when they go low, we go high." The rules summary states " Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way." Not only does this slander us, but they compare us to Donald Trump. This is a direct quote from Michelle Obama in reference to poor character of Donald Trump. As of now this has been shared publicly on Facebook by both Sophie and Yerv roughly 2 hours ago.			Not a violation, explicit wording by itself and without context does not warrant a violation.
4/17/2017 20:35:21		Ecem Senyuva / Blue Ivy		Columbia College	President/VP/Rep	Section 2 (II) Discriminatory, obscene, sexually suggestive, drug and alcohol related or generally offensive or inappropriate content is prohibited. Inappropriate or defaming language and images are prohibited, subject to the discretion of CEB if a candidate has any question regarding the appropriateness of any campaign materials, he/she is responsible for checking with CEB.	Ecem refers to Sophie's sorority sister (me) as a cyber bully. This is an extreme defamation of character and directly attacks me. It also paints our video as an example of cyber bullying, so it not only impacts how I'm represented but also how my team is presented. It makes us look like aggressors.			No deductions, but told the party to have the post taken down immediately.



Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/18/2017 0:08:35		Rafael Ortiz		Columbia College	Pre-Professional Representative	Early Campaigning & Paid Campaign Materials	<p>The first issue pertains to Rafael Ortiz's Early Campaigning violation. Per CEB rules, "violation of this rule will result in a 1 vote penalty every 15 minutes from the start of the early campaigning until the campaign period officially begins." Additionally, CEB defines 'public announcements' as a form of campaigning. I've attached both the finalized CEB rules and a screenshot depicting the violation in question. The reason I'm following up is that I wanted to clarify that this violation took place on April 3rd, 9-10 days before the start of campaigning on April 12th. The screenshot entitled 'EarlyCampaigning' depicts the date of Rafael's CCSC candidacy announcement on April 3rd. The calculus for this violation should somewhat resemble:</p> <p>(9 days)(24 hours)(60 minutes) / (15 minutes / 1 vote penalty) = 864 vote penalty</p> <p>On a Columbia-specific platform that has nearly 26,000 members, many of whom who look to comment threads for forms of amusement, Rafael's comments represent a 'public announcement' that puts everyone at a distinct disadvantage, especially given his influence on the Buy Sell Memes page.</p> <p>The second issue I'd like to emphasize is the (1) fact that Rafael's site (rafaelortiz.us) incorporates both a purchased custom url and a premium subscription to the website building platform Weebly and (2) that it has been up for the entire duration of his campaign, despite an earlier submission of this violation at the beginning of the campaign.</p> <p>On Google Domains, a platform that searches the cheapest prices for online domains, a similarly named site such as 'rafaelortiz.co' requires a yearly subscription of \$30/yr. Moreover, a premium website (as opposed to a free template, which includes 'ad banners' to the website builder company) offers many advantages to customers such as premium templates and access to SEO/Google Analytics to optimize a site's impressions. A premium subscription at Weebly requires an annual subscription, which has a minimum annual subscription plan for (\$8/month) (12 months) = \$96. I've included a link to the Google Domains search and a screenshot of 'Weebly's offerings to verify these prices. I've also included a screenshot revealing the source code of 'rafaelortiz.us', which confirms that his site uses Weebly.com as a website provider and has not been coded manually.</p> <p>Google Domains: <a href="https://domains.google.com/registrar?s=rafaelortiz.com&amp;hl=en&amp;_ga=1.220523288.1446352031.1491990038&amp;pf=1">https://domains.google.com/registrar?s=rafaelortiz.com&amp;hl=en&amp;_ga=1.220523288.1446352031.1491990038&amp;pf=1</a></p> <p>CEB Election Packet: <a href="http://blogs.cuit.columbia.edu/ceb/files/2016/09/Fall2016ElectionsPacketClassCouncilFINALIZED-1.pdf">http://blogs.cuit.columbia.edu/ceb/files/2016/09/Fall2016ElectionsPacketClassCouncilFINALIZED-1.pdf</a></p>			The first issue is not a violation, because the comment was made on April 3rd, 2 days before the Rules meeting so the candidate could not have known about this rule previously. The second issue was resolved because the website was created for personal use before the election. Rafael was told to immediately remove any campaign material on his site, and the candidate complied.
4/18/2017 17:11:52		Alex Cedar and Alliance		Columbia College	VP Campus Life and Executive Board	Article 3, Section 2, Part I - criticism	<p>A student in McBain sent an email to the Blue and White with the following quote overheard from Alex Cedar discussing Low Beach Party while knocking on doors in the building: "They're more what people want to hear, not what will actually happen." This is a clear attack on Low Beach Party's platform and character, in violation of the Article 3, Section 2, Part I of the election rules. While we know the identity of the student who submitted this account to the Blue and White, we wish to protect that person's identity, as this form will be made public in the future. However, we are willing to provide the name of the sender confidentially to CEB at their request.</p>			Cannot rule on the violation as there is no tangible proof other than the one witness. Further evidence (recording, multiple witnesses, etc) is necessary to make a ruling.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/18/2017 17:35:34		Huhe Yan (Supporter of A New Roar)		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Council	<p>Section 3.2.I: Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves or others and may not attack other candidates' views, experience, or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way.</p> <p>Section 3.1.V: All candidates are responsible for the conduct of themselves and all others who support or represent them, regardless of whether or not the act/support was requested or solicited. A supporter is defined as anyone working on behalf of or promoting a campaign. Candidates are responsible for notifying such persons of all CEB guidelines and Election by-laws. Rule violations by supporters will be considered as being committed by the candidate(s). The Elections Board will evaluate the validity of the connection between a supporter and a party by the evidence presented by the filed rules violation.</p>	<p>A New Roar supporter Huhe Yan posted the attached comment on a video. Since I referenced two passages in the rules packet:</p> <p>(1) Proving Yan is an active supporter of A New Roar Huhe Yan, as evidenced by his cover photo, is an avid supporter of A New Roar. He is VP Candidate David Kaminsky's roommate, the videographer of the CCSC 2019 debate video, and the producer of the controversial "CCSC 2019 Fact Check" video.</p> <p>(2) Showing that Yan's comments are needlessly aggressive and violate the rules. Yan writes, "Having witnessed CCSC's "utter incompetent leadership," it's time for fresh voices and real changes, not more stickers." (Emphasis added.) It is worth noting that this was commented on one of OUR supporter's Facebook posts; Hai Ge, a Blue Ivy supporter, shared our campaign video. Yan proceeded to comment on this post. We would like to draw attention to the phrase "utter incompetent leadership." This is a dismissive, aggressive, and baseless attack on Sophie Broadbent's and Grant Der Manouel's (the only two incumbents on our team) ability to lead. By calling them "utter[ly] incompetent," Yan is not contributing to a productive campaign dialogue. Furthermore, given his previous involvement with the creation of the debate video, his behavior in the past corroborates a general narrative that both he and A New Roar have been perpetuating – a personal, negative, aggressive, and dismissive attitude towards our party and it's experience. To explicitly reference the rules packet, they are attacking "other candidates' views, "experience," or platform. Candidates may not attack the "character of another candidate" in any way." We believe that Yan's comment both fulfills this description in the rules packet and perpetuates the negative and aggressive campaigning that has been exhibited by A New Roar thus far.</p>			<p>not a rules violation due to no candidate being explicitly mentioned and "CCSC" is too large an umbrella term. A warning email has been sent to a New Roar Party asking them to tell their supporters to be more civil in expressing their support.</p>
4/18/2017 18:36:13		Alliance (nathan, nicole, alex, sreya, hellouise)		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board	<p>Article 8, Section 2, Subsection I, Part C: "All sections of Article 3 and 4 apply to submitted profiles and photos." AND "Article 4, Section 2, Part II: "The only forms of permitted campaign materials are posters and palm cards, which must be approved by CEB during Poster Approval, as explained in Article 5 (Poster Specifications)."</p>	<p>All campaign materials must have been submitted to CEB during the online submission portion. Alliance has publicized campaign materials and images that were not approved by CEB. They have done this on three separate occasions and thus counts three times. Please see the three images below.</p>			<p>No longer a violation, CEB accepts Alliance party's rebuttal that the images in question are not necessarily posters but social media. [Prior ruling: Type II violation, Number of affected people: 8 (number of likes on the first photo) + 15 (the number of attendees of the event) = 23  23 / 5 = 4.6, rounded up to 5 votes deducted. Because the images are on the party Facebook page, CEB will divide the votes among the party members. Thus each party member will be deducted one vote.]</p>
4/18/2017 19:02:43		Nikola Danev & Toqa Badran		Columbia College	Student Services Representative	<p>Taking Down Election Materials</p>	<p>Two posters supporting Pre-Professional Representative Candidate Ethan Kestenberg were taken down, and their spots are currently occupied by posters supporting Student Services Representatives Toqa Badran and Nikola Danev.</p>			<p>Cannot rule on this violation as the picture does not explicitly show the other candidates taking down the posters to put up their own.</p>

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/18/2017 21:11:26		A New Roar		Columbia College	CCSC 2019	1. "Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. All candidates are responsible for the conduct of themselves and all others who support or represent them, regardless of whether or not the act/support was requested or solicited. A supporter is defined as anyone working on behalf of or promoting a campaign." 2. "Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way."	1. Considering that I was requested to ask [omitted for anonymity] a to take down a Facebook post that said "sorority sisters don't cyberbully sorority sisters," I request that the following also be taken down - my suitemate from last year shared my campaign video on her personal Facebook timeline. She is from China. Huhe Yan, who filmed A New Roar's Facebook video and is very good friends with all members of the party, wrote a rude comment about "Asian representation" and referred to my class council as having "utter incompetent leadership" - I ask that this is removed. 2. Secondly, I am reporting a video that A New Roar Class Representative posted on her personal Facebook timeline - in the video, she says "far too often there are issues of power and communication that come into play with students and individuals that have students more privileged identities over others." This is, without a doubt, an attack on character - political parties are only allowed to respectfully criticize one another's platforms. They are not allowed to attack a candidate for being "privileged" - that is incredibly rude. The video is public and can be viewed here. The comment is made at around 50 seconds into the video. <a href="https://www.facebook.com/1587743398/videos/10211531065424079/">https://www.facebook.com/1587743398/videos/10211531065424079/</a>			not a violation because the video does not explicitly address a candidate. The issue regarding New Roar's support has been addressed in an earlier violation report.
4/18/2017 23:15:44		Nikola Danev		Columbia College	Student Services Representative	A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate while acting in his/her capacity as a member of Student Council.	Sean Ryan changed his profile picture in support of Nikola Danev, which is a rules violation.			Type II Violation, Article 7, Section 2, Subsection 1: "A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate" 14 likes on the picture, 14/5 = 2.8 rounded up 3 votes deducted from Nikola Danev
4/19/2017 1:15:28		Vikramaditya Kapur / Low Beach Party		Columbia College	VP Campus Life	Endorsements	Multiple violations? He says student organizations endorsed him when they are only allowed to endorse parties for executive board. Furthermore, I doubt the validity of endorsements from his celebrity friends. Students may not know this is a joke or will associate AlunaGeorge with an endorsement from Bacchanal given their platform for fall Bacchanal. Attached is a post of Facebook made at 12:21am 04/19/2017			Not a violation because the candidate in question is running for an executive board position.
4/19/2017 3:49:29		Elise Fuller		Columbia College	Inclusion and Equity Representative	Section 2 Article V	The candidate placed her poster completely over my name and part of my picture on one poster and over my platform on the one adjacent to it. She also covered another candidate's poster. This is not the first instance I've had to move my posters because she has covered them. The picture attached is from Carman Hall lobby.			Not a violation because there is no explicit mention of poster obstruction in the rules document. However, the candidate was told during rules meeting that poster obstruction is not allowed. The candidate was informed of the poster and told to immediately move it to a different location.
4/19/2017 10:01:20		Sam Saffari		Columbia College	Academic Affairs Representative, CCSC	"Candidates must have their posters stamped for approval by the board before they can be hung." Article 5: Poster Specification, Section 2, point VI	Unstamped poster next to the ground floor elevator in Schapiro.			Went to check poster, had the OK stamp on back so not a violation

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/19/2017 12:10:55		A New Roar, 20/20 Vision, Nicole Allicock, Dafne Murillo, Toqa Badran, Elise Fuller, Rafael Ortiz, Maria Fernanda, Cindy Liu		Columbia College	Class of 2019&2020 reps, E-Board president, Academic affairs, student services rep, inclusion and equity rep, pre-professional rep, alumni affairs, VP campus life	Direct messaging of who to vote for	A member of a group text I'm in (not running for any position) sent a screenshot to our group of a google doc that contained a list of people to vote for			Not a violation from the evidence presented, a student expressing his views within a private chat. Context is not provided, and there is no explicit campaigning for any one candidate.
4/19/2017 13:49:49		Blue Ivy		Columbia College	President/VP/Representatives	Article 7, Section I. "Parties for Executive Board and Senate may seek endorsements from recognized student groups and publicize approved endorsements." CCSC cannot be endorsed by student groups and publicize endorsements.	Yesterday, Blue Ivy went door-to-door canvassing with a member of Undocu: Pablo Calderon. When canvassing, Pablo was vocal about his involvement with Undocu and endorsed/validated the party to the voters whose doors they knocked on. This is not only a violation on this front, but also Blue Ivy is stealing our platform wherein we discuss how we plan on supporting undocumented students. Their platform has no mention of this. This is in opposition to Article 2, Section 6: " No candidate may switch parties; each candidate must remain affiliated with the party declared on his/her candidate registration form."			Not a violation, one party does not have exclusive rights to a platform item
4/19/2017 14:04:12		amelia kaitlyn, campaigning on behalf of nicole allicock		Columbia College	CCSC President/VP Policy	article 3, section 2, part i (Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves or others and may not attack other candidates' views, experience, or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. Offering alternative ideas, solutions or evidence of preparedness does not constitute an attack.)	this person, campaigning on behalf of my opponent, posted on facebook "if you're voting for ccsc stuff and don't want to accidentally elect a trump supporter ("cough" dave mendelson "cough") directly attacked me as a person and my character for publicly defaming me by calling me a trump supporter and by misrepresenting factual information because I am not a trump supporter. This is a huge character assassination that people on this campus take very seriously.			Not a violation since the person is not a candidate, but will email Nicole Allicock to tell the person to take down or edit the facebook post
4/19/2017 14:12:07		ari mao, campaigning on behalf of nathan rosin		Columbia College	president of ccsc	article 7, section 2	ari mao, a member of CCSC Campus life committee, is campaigning for nathan rosin. Sang B. Ra made this clear to me week ago that this is a violation. since we cannot determine how many people see a facebook post, this violation warrants a 10% vote deduction.			Type II Violation, <a href="https://scontent-lga3-1.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t35.0-12/18049673_10212463052075201_719067494_o.png?oh=c7e98c2b659aa9a09366be2bfb4b209&amp;oe=58FA6FE7">https://scontent-lga3-1.xx.fbcdn.net/v/t35.0-12/18049673_10212463052075201_719067494_o.png?oh=c7e98c2b659aa9a09366be2bfb4b209&amp;oe=58FA6FE7</a> shows 14 people have liked the post. 14/5 = 2.8 rounded up to 3. Because three candidates are mentioned in the post, the votes will be distributed among the 3 candidates, thus deducting 1 vote from each candidate.
4/19/2017 14:14:18		nathan rosin		Columbia College	ccsc president	article 2 section 7 part i	the following image shows nathan rosin publically supporting Rally for CCSC 2018. it is a violation to use your candidacy and position to further the election of another student.			At this time not a violation but a warning email was sent telling Nathan Rosin to immediately remove the post. Should the matter persist, a type II violation will be applied.
4/19/2017 15:44:25		Sophie Broadbent		Columbia College	President of CCSC 2019	Additionally, no other physical campaign materials are permitted other than what is listed or provided for by Columbia Elections Board. Prohibited materials/methods include, but are not limited to: chalking, use of whiteboards and chalkboards, creative uses of tape, custom t-shirts, buttons, stickers, hats, other apparel, Facebook Ads. No food or drinks may be served in connection with a candidate's campaign. Alcohol may not be served in any instance.	Monday April 10th, after CCSC 2019 hosted "Get Baked by Melissa," Sophie Broadbent distributed the leftover event cupcakes to a group of people on Mcbain 8 in attempt to persuade voters for her campaign. If necessary, I have people who will testify to receiving these cupcakes from her.			Not enough evidence presented, when followed up the submitted evidence was not enough to determine any campaigning.
4/19/2017 18:02:14		Sam Ravani		Columbia College	Sandwich Ambassador	Article 8.1.III.E	Sam Ravani messaged one of my friends, [omitted for anonymity], this afternoon unsolicited, specifying himself as a party along with the link to CCSC voting. According to Camille, Sam was her OL leader (which is how they know each other), but 1. Was removed as an OL, and 2. Has not spoken to Camille since. The screenshot attached in the link below also reveals that there is no prior conversation before this instance, further indicating how this was a clear violation of the rule stated above.			Type II Violation, 1 vote deducted with warning that more of such behavior is reported then the 10% deduction will be applied.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/19/2017 18:56:56		Rafael Ortiz		Columbia College	Pre-Professional Representative		Tearing down opponent's campaign flyers and replacing with your own.	Most of Ethan Kestenberg's flyers have been torn down. Specifically, eight flyers have been torn down in the John Jay/Wallach/Hartley complex, Rafael Ortiz's area of residence. While the facts above are merely circumstantial, the photographs below substantiate two clear areas of campaign violation by Rafael Ortiz. In two different areas, Ethan Kestenberg's campaign flyers have been torn down and replaced by Rafael Ortiz posters. In exhibit A, Rafael's campaign flyer directly replaced Ethan Kestenberg's. In exhibit B, Rafael and Toqa's campaign flyers remain, while Ethan Kestenberg's has been taken down. This builds on an earlier violation by Toqa where Ethan's campaign flyer above the sign over JJ's was replaced with her poster.		Cannot make a ruling on circumstantial evidence. Evidence must be a picture, video, or confession.
4/20/2017 0:01:38		Dante Mazza on behalf of Low Beach Party for CCSC E-Board		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board	This violates the CCSC elections rule and regulation Article 7, Section 2, Subsection I: "A candidate may not use his/her position on Student Council to further his or her candidacy, nor the candidacy of any other student. No member of Student Council may use his or her position to campaign for any candidate. Actions considered inappropriate include, but are not limited to the following: (i) use of Student Council email privileges to promote a candidate or part, (ii) campaigning or allowing a candidate to campaign at a Student Council event, and (iii) expressing one's support for a candidate"	As per our discussion via email, I am submitting this as a case of an appointed council member posting on behalf of a candidate and/or party. At 11:41 AM Dante Mazza, an appointed rep for Class of 2019 and a senate staffer posted the attached endorsement for Low Beach Party for CCSC E-Board.			Type II Rules Violation, 5 reacts on the post therefore 5/5 = 1 vote deduction. Usually when vote deductions are applied to parties, the deduction is split amongst its candidates. However because there is only one vote to be deducted, it will come from the President-Vice President ticket. Please also have Dante remove his post immediately.
4/20/2017 0:21:14		Sam Safari		Columbia College	Academic Affairs Rep	Article 3 Section1 Part IV: Candidates must comply with all university rules, including those set forth by Residential Programs, Housing and Dining.  According to the Housing Policies: "Posting flyers and advertisements are prohibited on walls, doors, door vision panels, elevators, or anywhere other than designated bulletin boards." Available at: <a href="http://housing.columbia.edu/policies/posting-policy">http://housing.columbia.edu/policies/posting-policy</a>	The candidate posted his flyer on Broadway Hall's main elevators, disregarding Housing Policy, which prohibits this, and unfairly gaining a visual advantage over other candidates who abided by the university rules. Pictures, taken on Thursday April 19th at 11pm, are included			Type II violation, Because two instances were reported so far, CEB will deduct 2 vote.
4/20/2017 10:34:08		Ethan Kestenberg		Columbia College	Pre-Professional Representative	I would like to indicate that a rules violation was committed by individuals running for At-Large positions who, against guidelines established in the rule booklet, met with student news organizations. This was done in order to secure endorsement or publicize their information with these organizations.	Violations occurred through out the week, but was unaware of them until yesterday (for the lion) and the day before (for Spectator).			Not a violation because interviews by media are not endorsements, and because the Election rules only specify when candidates receive the endorsements it becomes a violation, candidates cannot be penalized for signing up for an interview. The Columbia Spectator has already been contacted and removed their endorsements of all non-Executive Board endorsements.
4/20/2017 11:09:47		Sam Safari		Columbia College	CCSC Academic Affairs Representative	Article 3 Section 1 part IV of the Spring 2017 CCSC Elections packet states that: "Candidates must comply with all University rules, including those set forth by Residential Programs, Housing and Dining, CUIT and this document. All Residential Programs, Housing and Dining and CUIT rules are adopted into the Candidate Rules and Regulations."  This poster violates Columbia University's Housing guidelines in two ways: 1. «general wall decorations should be limited to the approved bulletin board locations and individual residents' doors.» (This poster is on the wall near the elevator, not an approved location as listed above) 2. The deadlines specify the tan tape used to affix this poster is also a violation as the only thing that may be used to affix things to walls is blue painters tape «With the exception of blue painter's tape, the use of adhesives and other hanging hardware is not permitted.» See original guidelines: <a href="http://housing.columbia.edu/policies/decorations-and-posting-guidelines">http://housing.columbia.edu/policies/decorations-and-posting-guidelines</a>	I discovered this violation on April 19th at 6:15am, when I took the following picture. This picture was taken near the elevator in the hallway area on the first floor of Schapiro. I can personally testify that the poster was no longer there at 11:24am, and I was told at 11:25 by someone in Columbia Elections Board that they found this poster in the recycling bin of Schapiro			Addressed above in previous violation

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/20/2017 11:40:24		Low Beach Party for CCSC E-Board		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board	Article 3, Section 2, Subsection I "Candidates may critique but may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves or others and may not attack other candidates' views, experience, or platform. Candidates may not attack the character of another candidate in any way. Offering alternative ideas, solutions or evidence of preparedness does not constitute an attack."	Just after midnight on Tuesday evening/Wednesday morning, Low Beach Party posted the following on their Facebook page which is still loaded: "Congratulations to Vikramaditya Kapur for earning the Columbia Daily Spectator endorsement for Low Beach Party for his work on TEDx Columbia and Fall Bacchanal!"  This post constitutes a violation of the rule that states "Candidates... may not knowingly misrepresent any factual information about themselves" in two different ways.  First, it states that Vikramaditya Kapur earned "The Columbia Daily Spectator endorsement for Low Beach Party" when in reality he earned the endorsement for himself, and Spectator never endorsed Low Beach Party - there is no mention in their article of endorsing Vikramaditya as a member of Low Beach Party, they just endorsed him as a candidate for VP Campus Life, and expressly did not endorse anyone else from that party.  Second, the post states that Spectator endorsed Vikramaditya "for his work on TEDx Columbia and Fall Bacchanal!" However, upon reading the spectator article, Spectator actually endorsed him only for his work on "TEDx Columbia initiative and his varied, specific ideas on how to widen community events" but SPECIFICALLY NOT for his or the party's work on Fall Bacchanal, stating that they do not support the platform point of Fall Bacchanal: "their focus on reinstating a fall Bacchanal seemed ill-founded considering the more pressing, serious issues the student body faces... One of their deflections—an acknowledgment that many of their expensive initiatives, such as creating a 24-hour rape crisis center and expanding CPS and Health Services' hours to 24 hours, very well may not come to fruition—led us to believe that much of their platform was founded on gaining votes without necessarily implementing change."			The First issue is not a violation because the phrasing can be interpreted as Vik having earned an endorsement for himself that contributes to his party's efforts. The second issue is a Type II Violation, 5/5 = 1 vote deduction. Usually when vote deductions are applied to parties, the deduction is split amongst its candidates. However because there is only one vote to be deducted, it will come from the President-Vice President ticket. Also asked that the post remove the "Fall Bacchanal" part.
4/20/2017 11:53:32		Wesley Hu		Columbia College	CCSC EXEC VP Communications	Harassing/guiling a voter/unsolicited FB message with someone not really friends with	FB message			Not a violation because the candidate asked for permission, and the voter responded by engaging him in conversation
4/20/2017 12:44:12		alex cedar (and alliance party)		Columbia College	vice president campus life	article 7, section 2, part ii (getting endorsed by RHLO.) and for claiming that the whole party was endorsed by the columbia daily spectator when they didn't (not sure what rule violation that is)	he posted on the class of 2019 facebook page . it currently has over 17 reacts. not sure how many it will have by the time you see it			The First issue is not a violation because the phrasing can be interpreted as Vik having earned an endorsement for himself that contributes to his party's efforts. RHLO endorsements are allowed so not a rules violation.
4/20/2017 16:09:18		Vikramaditya Kapur and Low Beach Party		Columbia College	VP Campus Life and CCSC E-Board	Article 3, Section 2, Subsection II: "Discriminatory, obscene, sexually suggestive, drug and alcohol related or generally offensive or inappropriate content is prohibited. Inappropriate or defaming language and images are prohibited, subject to the discretion of CEB If a candidate has any question regarding the appropriateness of any campaign materials, he/she is responsible for checking with CEB."	Today at 12:14 PM Vikramaditya Kapur posted a message in the Columbia Class of 2018 Facebook group that included the following phrase: "VOTE FOR LOW BEACH PARTY for CCSC E-BOARD (Especially me) to make Campus like cannons [champagne bottle emoji] [champagne bottle emoji] [champagne bottle emoji]" In this post he specifically says he wants to "make Campus like cannons" which is a former Bar nearby campus, essentially saying he wants to make campus like a bar. He then put three champagne bottle emojis next to it. Both the sentence and the emojis are clearly "alcohol related content" which is forbidden by the rules packet in Article 3, Section 2, Subsection II.			Not a violation but emailed the candidate to edit the post.

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/20/2017 19:12:42		Rafael Ortiz		Columbia College	Pre-Professional Representative	(Sustained) Paid Campaign Materials & Posting in Large Group about CCSC	Despite Rafael Ortiz being told that he is not allowed to use paid-for campaigning materials, parts of his campaign program are still paid-for. After a week since the first violation was submitted, Rafael finally changed his url from 'rafaelortiz.us' to 'rafael-ortiz.weebly.com'. But that was the only thing Rafael changed. Rafael has neglected to remove the other premium features he has paid for on Weebly. After contacting Weebly Support and asking if the site in question (rafael-ortiz.weebly.com), I was promptly informed that the site is still using a 'Starter Subscription'. The 'starter subscription' includes access to many features that are not available on the free version of Weebly, placing Rafael unfairly above his competition. Moreover, the fact that Rafael acknowledged his site was premium by changing his url, but not removing the site entirely and changing to one that is completely free like all other candidates represents a clear breach of campaign etiquette. Refer to Exhibits A and B for email proof verifying that Rafael's site still utilizes premium subscription features. The second violation involves Rafael discussing the CCSC election in the Columbia Buy Sell Memes Page. Although Rafael does not explicitly campaign for himself, there is a very clear political slant to this post as he attempts to humanize himself and establish humility with over 24,000 Columbia students. For a candidate running for a CCSC position, it's impossible to separate his role as a candidate and his role as a regular person posting memes. However, this does appear to cross the boundary, posing an ethical concern for many candidates running. Refer to Exhibit C.			The first issue is addressed above, he previously already held the site for personal use and had uploaded his campaign material on the page (therefore did not explicitly use funds during the election cycle). He has since removed it to a free version of the website at CEB's request. The second issue is beyond the scope of election rules.
4/21/2017 11:38:38		alex cedar and alliance party (cedar, nathan, nicole, sreya, hellouise)		Columbia College	VP Campus life	article 3, section 2, part 1: candidates may not attack another candidates platform	in Alex's interview with The Lion, he directly attacked our platform by calling it "impossible". This breaks Article 3, Section Two, part I very clearly. He said "Alliance will also hold a Fall Bacchanal-esque concert at the Baker Athletics Complex after the Homecoming Game. While a Fall Bacchanal on Low Steps remains (to quote an administrator with whom I met) impossible, a concert at Baker is much more financially viable, and the university is much more likely to allow it to happen, given the security, infrastructure and logistical services already in place for the football game."			Not a violation, Alex Cedar was quoting an administrator's opinion on the matter, which is not necessarily an attack but a restatement of an opinion relevant to the topic, given not by the candidate in question.
4/21/2017 11:39:58		Dave Mendelsohn/ Low Beach Party		Columbia College	President	Physically providing voting platform and being present during non-candidate voting.	Between the hours 12am and 1am Dave was observed campaigning in Shapiro Hall. When students agreed to vote for him he would provide them with his phone to do so. This is clear violation of the rule against physically providing the voting platform (his phone) and being present for non-candidate voting.			Requested written testimonies from the witnesses. Received one from [omitted for anonymity], did not receive one from [omitted for anonymity] (personal ties with Dave Mendelsohn). Type II Violation, Article 8, Section 1, Subsection 3 Part A: "Giving a voter a tablet, laptop, phone, or Internet-accessible device on which to vote." 10% deduction.
4/21/2017 12:02:00		ALLIANCE (cedar, nathan, nicole, sreya, hellouise)		Columbia College	CCSC Executive Board	article 7, section 2, part 1: people on student council campaigning for candidates	Zach Mcneal and James Houk, two appointed council members, campaigned for Alliance. This totals 45 reactions + comments on the two combined posts.			Type II Violation, 43/5 = 8.6, rounded up to 9 votes. The votes will be split amongst the party, with the highest position (President-VP Policy) incurring the most deductions. The distribution is as follows: 3 from President/VP Policy, 2 from VP Communication, 2 from VP Finance, and 2 from VP Campus Life

Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
							<p>The Low Beach Party's central Platform point this election season is focused on Fall Bacchanal. In promising Fall Bacchanal to the student body, they have made quite a few assertions, some of which are contradictory, and some of which are factual misrepresentations.</p> <p>4/20, 12:35 PM "We'd love to tell you more about our plans for TEDx Columbia, #fallbacchanal (which, contrary to our opponents criticism, is a feasible plan that has been crafted with the help of the undergraduate student life office and members of the bacchanal committee)" (Class of 2019 FB Group)</p> <p>4/20 1:29 PM "Fall Bacchanal is a project we have been working with administrators on since November and have collaborated with Bacchanal Committee to figure out exactly how to plan it" (Dave's Facebook Page)</p> <p>Low Beach Party claimed on Facebook that its candidates met with members of the Bacchanal committee to discuss the possibility of a Fall Bacchanal Concert. Candidates from Alliance previously met with Tyler Allen and Jesse Van Marten (Co-Chairs of the Bacchanal committee) because we, too, had included collaboration with Bacchanal committee in our platform, who said that (as of 4/13/17) they had not been contacted by any other party apart from Alliance.</p> <p>4/12 10:00 AM "Through over a dozen meetings, discussions, and presentation of financial models to administrators, we have crafted this event perfectly for the student body." (Low Beach Party Website)</p> <p>4/12 10:00 AM "Fall Bacchanal... Designed to be perfectly feasible by having over a dozen meetings, discussions, and presentation of financial models to administrators" (CEB Website)</p> <p>Low Beach party also claimed that their Fall Bacchanal event is "perfectly feasible" because it has been "crafted... perfectly" with the administration. Candidates from Alliance met with Josh Lucas, Director of Student Engagement in the Office of Undergraduate Student Life, and Aaron Gomes, advisor to Bacchanal committee, a little while ago to discuss the possibility of a Bacchanal concert taking place on campus in the fall. We did so because we were considering putting a similar event on our platform, but wanted to check feasibility first. They informed us that the possibility of fall Bacchanal concert taking place in any form is zero (for both financial and behavioral reasons), and as such, we formed our platform point to be a collaboration with his office, Bacchanal committee, etc. to create a smaller tailgate music event at Baker after homecoming as a potential alternative. The administrators also indicated they had not yet discussed this exact type of event with other parties.</p> <p>Low beach party has claimed (1) that their fall bacchanal event has been crafted perfectly and is perfectly feasible, and (2) that they have crafted it with both the Undergraduate Student Life Office and the Bacchanal Committee. However, (1) the event is not perfectly feasible by any means, and (2) it seems like they have not perfectly crafted it with the Office of Undergraduate Student Life or Bacchanal committee. When Alliance brought up in the debates that we had also spoken to the Undergraduate Student Life Office and Bacchanal committees and what their responses were, Presidential candidate Dave Mendelson responded:</p> <p>"I don't know exactly how you phrased it to them but financially the model makes sense through selling tickets so the issue here is behavior, and this has been my biggest area of contention with the Undergraduate Student Life Office. They want to see slow change so that we start out with something like a DJ on the lawns, something like that on campus, to see that students are behaving themselves so that they can set the possibility of having a fall concert, and then they move up to a fall Bacchanal. Just like all major social movements on our campus what this requires is a lot of student pressure, and then we compromise, and then we have something, like, something on the lawns. And then we move up to the fall bacchanal. Right now they're only doing things</p>			



Timestamp	Your UNI	Name of Rule Violator	Your Name	School of the alleged Rule Violator	Position for which alleged Rule Violator is campaigning	Which rules in the student council's elections bylaws were violated?	Describe the violation. Include how and when it occurred.	For review of evidence, contact CEB (some materials would violate anonymity so not listed here)	Email Address	CEB Decision:
4/21/2017 12:04:21		alex cedar, campaigning on behalf of alliance party (nathan, nicole, sreya, hellouise also)		Columbia College	CCSC Executive board	article 2 section 3 part I- misrepresenting factual information	in the following images, Alex claims that they were endorsed by Spectator (to gain credibility). Only one of the four positions on his ticket was. This is a total misrepresentation and attempt to look more credible based on lies.			Not a violation because the phrasing can be interpreted as Nicole/Nathan having earned an endorsement for themselves that contributes to their party's efforts.
4/21/2017 13:33:52		Nathan Rosin/Nicole Allicock		Columbia College	CCSC President and VP Policy	Mass email	Mass email sent to the list server			Type II Violation, 80/5 = 16, 16 votes will be subtracted from Alliance's President-VP Policy ticket, Article 3.3. I: "Sending unsolicited AND/OR list-serve emails and social-media messages to students is prohibited, regardless of whether the candidate is known to the student or they are already friends on facebook. A message is unsolicited if the recipient did not explicitly give his/her email address to the candidate and consent to email communication, or if the recipient did not explicitly ask for more information from the candidates."
4/21/2017 13:40:55		Alfredo Dominguez/A New Roar Party		Columbia College	University Senator + Class Council	Candidates supporting other candidates	Dominguez campaigned for A New Roar despite having his own campaign; this was uploaded onto Facebook.			Type II Violation, 3 reactions on the post, 3/5 = .6 rounded up to 1 vote deduction from Alfredo Dominguez
4/21/2017 14:12:06		Sofia Petros		Columbia College	CCSC 2019 Class Representative	Section 3. Email and Social Media Communication I. Sending unsolicited AND/OR list-serve emails and social-media messages to students is prohibited, regardless of whether the candidate is known to the student or they are already friends on facebook. A message is unsolicited if the recipient did not explicitly give his/her email address to the candidate and consent to email communication, or if the recipient did not explicitly ask for more information from the candidates.	Sofia Petros posted in the COOP GroupMe, which has 124 members in it. According to the rule listed above, this is not allowed. In addition to penalizing A New Roar for breaking this rule, CEB should take into consideration that A New Roar was very recently notified that posting GroupMe messages is not allowed - A New Roar already lost votes for posting in a GroupMe earlier this week, and yet, they decided to break this same rule again anyway. This demonstrates a lack of respect for the CCSC Election rules.			Not a violation because the message only asks for people to vote in general, not for any one particular candidate or party.
4/21/2017 14:47:10		Alfredo Dominguez		Columbia College	University Senate	Article 2 Section 5 "No party or candidate may be affiliated with or campaign on the behalf of another party or candidate except for candidates in the same party	Alfredo Dominguez a current candidate for University Senate, can be seen on an advertisement endorsing the sophomore class party "A New Roar." The picture of the candidate endorsing "A New Roar" is attached.			Violation addressed previously.
4/21/2017 15:27:09		Shreya and Alliance		Columbia College	VP Comms and Eboard	Article 3 section 2 part 1	A girl on my floor posted on behalf of Alliance in our floor GroupMe chat without my consent to provide that material and said she would send the link to vote to the group chat also without my consent, or the consent of other's in the chat. She also stated, "They [Alliance] were endorsed by Spec" when in fact only two of their members were endorsed by Spec, and in once instance, a candidate from an opposing party was endorsed by Spec. This constitutes a misrepresentation of factual information. Additionally, this girl referred to an opposing party's [Low Beach Party's platform point as "fakewnews" and told people in our group chat not to let ourselves be played, a clear violation of the rule prohibiting critiques of a platform or party and on the last point, an attack on character. I've attached a photo of the chat in this report.			There are three parts to be addressed in this violation submission: 1. The message in the group me is unsolicited and thus will result in a Type II Violation. (1 vote deduction unless more information is provided regarding how many people were affected) 2. The endorsement issue like before is not necessarily a factual misrepresentation, as members of Alliance were endorsed by the Columbia Spectator. 3. While describing the Fall Bacchanal plan as "fakewnews" is rude and uncalled for, it is an expression of the voter's personal opinion and not subject to Election rules.
4/21/2017 16:46:19		alex cedar (and nathan, nicole, sreya, hellouise, alliance pa		Columbia College	ccsc executive board	article 8, section 1, part iii, e : sending message with voti	sent unsolicited message along with link			Not a violation, voter in m
4/21/2017 17:01:30		Alex Cedar		Columbia College	VP Campus Life	False Advertisement of Endorsements	Spec didn't endorse Alliance as a party in its entirety.			Endorsement issue addre