

Mady Womack	)	April 10, 2017
OneKU Presidential Candidate	)	
	)	
Jonathan L. Ehrlich	)	
OneKU School of Law Candidate	)	
	)	
Chance Maginness	)	
Onward Presidential Candidate	)	Case Number: 2017-xxxx
	)	
Tomas Green	)	
KUnited Presidential Candidate	)	
	)	
Petitioners	)	
	)	
VERSUS	)	
	)	
Harrison Baker	)	
Elections Commission Compliance Chair	)	
Garrett Farlow	)	
Elections Commission Chair (Main Respondent)	)	
	)	
Respondents	)	

Respondents' Brief of Arguments

**Standard of Review:**

We do not argue with this standard. De novo standards require that the lower “court” is reviewed fully, including their finding of fact. This is the implicit stance of the Court of Appeals as written. Seeing the de novo standards are usually applied in appellate settings it makes sense to continue that trend, but not for the reasons stated. We are a not a federal system, judicial or otherwise. We, and I use that term to encompass all things related to Student Senate, are a student governance system and nothing more. To clarify fully, we do not need to hold hearings for those that were dismissed. We hold the power, explicitly, to determine whether or not students are classified as eligible or not completely separate from our powers as an arbiter.

The statement from the Petitioners that this “review was a ‘radically inconsistent

interpretation of the Student Senate rules” and the Commission did not follow historical precedent is false. In Appendix A there is a letter from a former member of the Elections Commission that details how in the general election of Spring 2014 a random sampling was taken from each candidate form and if there were issues then deeper investigation would be warranted. While the letter also states that it was “highly unlikely that any individual candidate would not have enough valid signatures to be eligible for the election” it was also stated that, “Most of the signature sheets that we received had plenty of extra signatures”. In Appendix B there are candidacy declarations in which all signatures were checked for validity. In the context of the election this cycle (Spring 2017) the average number of signatures that were written on the sheet was, 28. Three above the absolute baseline of eligibility. Furthermore, the letter also states how Mr. Pacey was Acting Commission Chair for the Freshman Elections and when he checked those forms found that many contained the bare minimum for eligibility, he ran them all personally, and found that enough people were ineligible to where only the seats available remained. The important thing to note here is that this decision was appealed to the Court of Appeals and the decision of Mr. Pacey to perform such an action was upheld.

To clarify, and it will be reiterated throughout this brief, all students that were found to be ineligible had the opportunity to speak with, or meet Dr. Tuttle who had the private student information.

### **Arguments:**

#### Unreasonable Decision:

First to clarify the difference between Michelle Kokes and the remainder of the candidates I would like to say that this situation was categorically different than the other individuals in question. All of the documents were turned in and I looked them over to make sure they met the basic requirements. I made sure that they had a Dean’s Stamp, filled out the form correctly, and that they

had at least 25 written signatures, assuming at the moment that they were all valid. At this time I then took the IDs from the sheet and put them into an Excel spreadsheet which was sent to Dr. Tuttle to be examined by the Registrar's Office. Dr. Tuttle then spent her time, outside of work, running and checking, then rechecking all of the signatures that were found. She then sorted them by coalition and whether or not they had enough signatures to be considered valid.

I think it is also important to note that prior to the deadline listed on the website, we had received many forms that were missing signatures, declaration of candidacy forms, or the Dean's Stamp. Harrison took the time to contact those individuals and tell them that at that moment in time that they were missing these documents and that they needed to turn them in by the appropriate deadline. This shows that the Commission is dedicated to making sure that people are eligible to run, as long as they follow the regulations outlined and submit the correct documents by the time it is due.

In response to the claim the Petitioners make that if we had notified all invalidated candidates in a timely manner then they would be able to file as independents: Even if we were simply spot checking the ID numbers we still would not have had the time to turn around all of the documents that we had. No member of the Commission has access to the system that can check enrollment data. The normal individual who runs the spot check was not able to serve in that same position this year and so we had to search elsewhere. It was at this point we floated the idea to Dr. Tuttle, our adviser and she agreed that it would be a good idea. If the numbers were spot-checked it would still require pulling each person up and checking the qualifications of each signature that was spot-checked. This would have to be worked into Dr. Tuttle's schedule which is understandably busy considering her position in Student Affairs.

Candidates should operate under the assumption that all the documents will be checked

thoroughly. This is why the form specifically says that the bottom that it is suggested that more than the required number of signatures be found, just in case some are found to be invalid.

The Petitioners seem to make a suggestion that because a few individuals were found to be valid after originally being told that they were invalid that the Commission is incompetent is a stretch of reality as well as barely veiled attack on the competency of the individuals the Senate trusted to make decisions revolving around Elections. Furthermore, the fact that a few candidates have been revalidated does not suggest the Commission is incompetent at their jobs, and frankly it is offensive to suggest otherwise. We have done the work needed and we apologize that in the middle of sorting over 2500 signatures that occasionally an individual gets sorted into the wrong pile or something is read incorrectly.

Due Process:

To reiterate, for the record, that the Commission found these students to be ineligible to be candidates. They were not disqualified or removed from the ballot. They were never on the ballot until the Court of Appeals granted their injunction. The Petitioners never give any proof that shows that the Commission is wrong. Instead they make an attempt to equate a law student that falsified an application to get into law school to candidates in a student senate election. Considering that these two are hardly equitable and that the remedies that the Petitioners are suggesting makes it clear to remove the individual that falsified their document it is unclear as to why they made the statement that they did. I would also argue that students that wish to be candidates do not have a “claim of entitlement” to their status. There are regulations that govern their status and if they do not follow them they lose said status.

Students that wish to be candidates do not have significant property interests in their continued candidacies. In *Board of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth* (408 U.S. 564 (more) 92 S. Ct.

2701; 33 L. Ed. 2d 548; 1972 U.S. LEXIS 131; 1 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 23) it was found that Roth did not have a property rights because the contract that was signed specifically for that position was for the time of one year. Because this was the expectation there was not rights that were explicit in the continuation of said job. In regards to the matter at hand, the idea that if you wish to become an eligible candidate in the general election you have to gather 25 signatures counts as a unwritten contract between the governing body (The Commission) and the individual in question (potential candidate). This was a clearly defined expectation of the Commission that all individuals interested in running must follow the rules. Through this argument the idea that students have due process rights because of a significant property interest is null.

The Commission also gave notice to potential candidates through contact with the Election Commission Liaisons. The information of those who were considered valid candidates was given to the Election Commission Liaisons of each coalition, with the exception of the coalition with no Senatorial Slate. It was expected that the information would be disseminated by those individuals, who serve as an intermediary between the Commission and the coalitions. Everyone was made aware of the fact that any and all decisions of the EC can be appealed by the Court of Appeals through the information sessions, and through any email/in person interaction in which a decision was reached. If the students asked for the reasoning we gave it to them. Within the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities Due Process is not outlined at all. We operate just as past Commissions have in the sense that when we make a decision we do not contact every single person to explain the whole process to them. Only in circumstances where there was a violation is the evidence explained and the opportunity to present their arguments given. Since the Commission has the ability to determine individuals ineligible without a hearing we do not have to follow that same process. In *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 425 U.S. 319, 96 S.Ct. 893, 47 L.Ed.2d 18 (1976) a three-pronged test was

created in which to determine whether or not due process has indeed been violated. The prongs of this test are as follows:

- 1) The importance of the issue at stake
- 2) The risk of an erroneous deprivation of the interest because of the procedures used, and the probable value of additional procedural safeguards;
- 3) The government's interest.

1) To determine the importance of the issue at stake is incredibly subjective. The original decision of the court rested on SS benefits and the courts found that to be a substantial private interest, however, later courts have said that it is up to the Courts to decide on the relative merits at stake. I would urge the Court to think holistically about the candidates that were found to ineligible and whether or not they had a powerful, vested interest in becoming Student Senate members. Seeing that no evidence was submitted with the Brief of Arguments that is written testimony from the ineligible candidates that becoming a member of student senate was a goal or aspiration of theirs it should be suggested that while they may be upset about the fact they cannot get involved it was not a traumatic event that would trigger this prong.

2) While the Petitioners are correct in stating that there have been errors made in the process overwhelmingly there have been few issues in the process. Of the original 47 individuals only 4 individuals have been placed back on the ballot due to an issue. One such individual was because the extra signature that was submitted was on a scrap of paper approximately 2 inches by 2 inches and got caught on a paperclip on the back of a stack of papers. So in reality only 3 individuals have been added back onto the ballot which is an error rate of 6% which for the second time in recent history that such a process has been applied by the Commission is excellent. Within this system there was also the ability for all students to ask for clarification on their documents. The Commission retained

possession of the paper documents with the signatures and a spreadsheet that listed all the numbers of gathered signatures, how many were considered invalid, and then the number of eligible signatures they had. If the student requested more information than that they had the opportunity to contact Dr. Tuttle and either schedule a meeting or have an email correspondence. We actually reduced the risk of “erroneous deprivation” by ensuring that this process was fair and equal for all individuals. The issue with spot-checking is that perhaps not all individuals will receive the same number of spot checks, especially if the Commission knows the individual and perhaps wishes to make it easier for that individual to become a Senator. The system that we used was an impersonal program that simply ran the numbers and spat back the information on the student. Dr. Tuttle served as a further check on bias by serving as the intermediary between this information and the Elections Commission. This shows that the students had several methods in which to address their grievances, and many did.

3) The final prong of this test is the interest of the government. In the Matthews ruling it was found that the courts gave, “substantial weight to the good-faith judgments” of those in charge of the administration of actions. All of the judgments the Commission made in regards to the signatures and the process in which they were checked were done in good faith. It is not the position of the Commission to simply eliminate individuals with no reason, it is the job of the Commission to enforce the rules.

**Remedies:**

The Commission does not fully support any of the remedies offered by the Petitioners and instead suggest:

- 1) The appeal be dismissed in its entirety and the decision of the Elections Commission be upheld, as it has been in the past.

However, in the interest of showing a good-faith effort to the work of the Petitioners the Commission will say that should the Court side with them that options 2 or 3 would be seen as the most acceptable. Option 1 would unfairly disadvantage the fourth coalition that will not have the opportunity to place members of its slate back on the ballot. Also, the number of slated individuals is not equal between the three remaining coalitions and the coalition that receive the least number of slated spots back proportionally could claim distortion in the results of the election and suggest that they have been unfairly treated. Option 2 would be the least concern to the results as it would be all individuals simply running as independents and no one coalition would gain any unfair advantage over the other by suddenly having far more people to help table or to reach out to others. Option 3 is similar to the action that attempted in Student Senate, and if you were to follow the text of the bill that ultimately failed it would only allow for those students that had 5 or less missing signatures to be placed back on the ballot. It would not allow for student that were missing forms, had failed the quiz, or completed actions unbecoming of a future senator i.e. Forgery.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

---

Harrison Baker  
Compliance Chair

Garrett Farlow  
Chair



**Terumo Cardiovascular Group**  
6200 Jackson Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103  
Main: 734.663.4145  
Toll-free: 800.262.3304  
[www.terumo-cvgroup.com](http://www.terumo-cvgroup.com)

April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Student Senate Court of Appeals  
University of Kansas  
1301 Jayhawk Blvd., Room 410  
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dear Court of Appeals,

After hearing about the current situation facing the Elections Commission and Court of Appeals today I felt that my unique and extensive experience in University of Kansas Student Senate Elections might be of value to these proceedings. I was involved in the elections process for several years, starting with the spring election of 2004 through the spring election of 2015 I was involved in every general election and several of the freshman and special elections. I have served in campaigns as an un-slated volunteer, senator candidate, campaign organizer, and campaign consultant. Most relevant to your decision today, however, was the time I spent as an Elections Commission Member for the spring 2014 general election and as the Acting Elections Commission Chair for the fall 2014 freshman and special elections.

In my time as a volunteer, candidate, and organizer it was common practice among the coalitions to encourage each of their members to collect far more signatures than were required. If I recall correctly we were required at the time to collect a minimum of 50 signatures. The campaign managers always encouraged us to collect at least 75 signatures on the assumption that they were all checked. The only issue that I can recall from that time was caught in a signature inspection where it was found that a potential candidate had copied their signatures from another candidate's signature sheet. I believe that student was barred from running in that, and the next Senate election.

As an Elections Commission Member for the spring 2014 election we determined as a commission to inspect a random sampling of each signature sheet, with the understanding that if any signatures among the sample were found to be invalid that a further investigation into the signature sheets would be necessary. Most of the signature sheets that we received had plenty of extra signatures, so, after our investigation found no invalid signatures, it was determined that it was highly unlikely that any individual candidate would not have enough valid signatures to be eligible for the election.

For the 2014 Freshman Election I was acting as the Elections Commission Chair. After receiving the signature sheets from all of the prospective candidates I found that many of them contained the bare minimum of signatures. It was decided by the commission that checking every signature would be necessary to ensure that each candidate had a sufficient number of signatures. I personally checked every signature for that election and found several invalid signatures. Between signature issues and missing dean stamps several candidates were

determined to be ineligible to run. In the end there were only enough eligible candidates to just fill the available seats. At the time the commission's decision was appealed to the Student Senate Court of Appeals, where the Elections Commission had their determination upheld.

Inspecting every signature is by no means unprecedented, in fact I applaud this Elections Commission for being so thorough. With four coalitions running this year I'm sure it would have been easy to not inspect every signature. I'm sure that inspecting each signature was by no means an easy task and the commission should be applauded for taking the time to ensure that the rules of the election were fairly enforced. Student Senate, like the Court of Appeals, thrives when the rules are followed and enforced. Taking the time to follow the rules is what ensures that every action of the body is well considered and that every voice has the potential to be heard. Obtaining signatures might seem unimportant, but the ability to follow process and receive the support of your constituents is essential to a proper Student Senate. I believe that the Elections Commission not only operated within their power in this instance, but that they had the precedence as well as an obligation to check every signature if they had any suspicion that any candidate might not have gotten enough valid signatures to qualify them to run.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Pacey PhD.  
Former Acting Elections Commission Chair

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Katie Werner  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – not in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Sarah Fees	Freshman ✓
2. Alaina Hatting	Freshman ✓
3. Jenika Burkert <span style="color: red;">Soph</span>	Freshman
4. Morgan Hyden	Freshman ✓
5. Bronwyn Troxel	Freshman ✓
6. Dambi Kim <span style="background-color: yellow;">Not act.?</span>	Freshman
7. Casey McDonald	Freshman ✓
8. Amber Johnson	Freshman ✓
9. Katlyn Lee	Freshman ✓
10. Emma Davis	Freshman ✓
11. Megan Yates	Freshman ✓
12. Courtney Crain	Freshman ✓
13. Amanda Reban	Freshman ✓
14. Chive Cross <span style="color: blue;">Class</span> <span style="background-color: yellow;">?</span>	Freshman
15. Sydney Crawford	Freshman ✓
16. Abby Samburg	Freshman ✓
17. Erin Brown	Freshman ✓
18. Abby Erickson <span style="color: red;">Not active</span>	Freshman
19. Elizabeth Moylan	Freshman ✓
20. Madeleine Petersen	Freshman ✓
21. Abby Carver	Freshman ✓
22. Aubrey Myer	Freshman ✓
23. Sophia Kahlman	Freshman ✓
24. Grace Hinsworth	Freshman ✓
25. <u>Carlye Spikes</u>	Freshman ✓

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room 1000, Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and get a minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

McKenzie Ortiz Freshman  
Name Division in which candid

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – in the division/school that this candidate seeks to repre**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Samuel Adams	Freshman ✓
2. Megan Fox	Freshman ✓
3. Grace Cairns	Freshman ✓
4. Casey McDonald	Freshman ✓
5. Nora McHenry	Freshman ✓
6. Kertelyn Johnson	Freshman ✓
7. Aubrie Wauhob	Freshman ✓
8. Kyle Cook	Freshman ✓
9. Maddie York	Freshman ✓
10. Justin York	Freshman ✓
11. [Signature]	Freshman ✓
12. [Signature]	Freshman ✓
13. Paige Kenney	Freshman ✓
14. Anh Nguyen	Freshman ✓ <i>Soph</i>
15. Brooklyn Klosow	Freshman ✓
16. Ryan Oliver	Freshman ✓
17. Stephanie Messing	Freshman ✓
18. [Signature]	Freshman ✓ <i>half time</i>
19. Judith Ikerionwu	Freshman ✓
20. Nathan Lucas	Freshman ✓
21. [Signature]	Freshman
22. Paul Moran	Freshman ✓
23. Gabrielle Maida	Freshman ✓
24. Emily Glover	Freshman ✓
25. Ian Stone	Freshman ✓

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room 1000  
 Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and get  
 minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Mckenzie Orth Freshman  
Name Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – n  
 in the division/school that this candidate seeks to repres**

	Name (please print)	Division/School
1.	Jordan Bertholf	Freshman ✓
2.	Chris Schreiber	Freshman ✓
3.		Freshman
4.		Freshman
5.		Freshman
6.		Freshman
7.		Freshman
8.		Freshman
9.		Freshman
10.		Freshman
11.		Freshman
12.		Freshman
13.		Freshman
14.		Freshman
15.		Freshman
16.		Freshman
17.		Freshman
18.		Freshman
19.		Freshman
20.		Freshman
21.		Freshman
22.		Freshman
23.		Freshman
24.		Freshman
25.		Freshman

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room # Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Jordan Watkins  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – r  
 in the division/school that this candidate seeks to repre:**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. <u>Omynique Williams</u> <i>1/2 time</i>	Freshman ✓
2. <u>Christian Falt</u> <i>(William)</i>	Freshman ✓
3. <u>Allie Waldorf</u>	Freshman ✓
4. <u>Omni Sauer</u>	Freshman ✓
5. <u>Xu Zecheng</u>	Freshman ✓
6. <u>Yehan Li</u>	Freshman ✓
7. <u>Ziyi Zhou</u>	Freshman ✓
8. <u>Madisen Pool</u>	Freshman ✓
9. <u>Carly GARDEN</u>	Freshman ✓
10. <u>Chancellor Adams</u>	Freshman ✓
11. <u>Ric'haela BOWIE</u>	Freshman ✓
12. <u>Bryce Curtis</u>	Freshman ✓
13. <u>Dainera Carlos-Hart</u>	Freshman ✓
14. <u>Mariah Coomes</u>	Freshman ✓
15. <u>Stephen Sagl</u>	Freshman ✓
16. <u>Alpana Rahman</u>	Freshman ✓
17. <u>Minahel Baig</u>	Freshman ✓
18. <u>Derek Annetan</u>	Freshman ✓
19. <u>Raid Myrick-Cox</u>	Freshman ✓
20. <u>Daryan Herrick</u>	Freshman ✓
21. <u>Natalie Hunt</u>	Freshman ✓
22. <u>Danny Murga</u>	Freshman ✓
23. <u>Dee Keller</u>	Freshman ✓
24. <u>Angela Reid-Brydon</u>	Freshman ✓
25. <u>[Signature]</u>	Freshman ✓

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and get minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Taylor Zabel  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – r  
 in the division/school that this candidate seeks to repre:**

	Name (please print)		Division/School
1.	Ryan Stuart	sophomore ok	Freshman
2.	Yarden Turner	soph X	Freshman
3.	Michael Zhou	soph X	Freshman
4.	Justin Connolly		Freshman ✓
5.	Timothy Kaba		Freshman ✓
6.	Grant Parker		Freshman ✓
7.	Sebastian Blitt		Freshman ✓
8.	Taylor Bushm		Freshman ✓
9.	Alex Ogan		Freshman ✓
10.	Vann Hasselt	Junior X	Freshman
11.	MALAINA PIYASSAPHAN		Freshman ✓
12.	Ian Hiert	soph ok	Freshman
13.	Alex Griffin		Freshman ✓
14.	marilee Haug		Freshman ✓
15.	Vanessa Notaris		Freshman ✓
16.	Vivek Panethanaram		Freshman ✓
17.	Brooks Dandhy	soph ok	Freshman
18.	Colson Myers		Freshman ✓
19.	Micah Stiel		Freshman ✓
20.	Trent Allen		Freshman ✓
21.	Chance Maginness		Freshman ✓
22.	Madeline Field		Freshman ✓
23.	Shivani Patel		Freshman ✓
24.	Tejas Patel	soph ok	Freshman
25.	JAY SHALI		Freshman ✓

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
Student Senate Elections Commission

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Joseph B. Haug  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – not in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent.

	Name (please print)	Division/School
1.	Charlie Robson	Freshman ✓
2.	Gabe Bernier	Freshman ✓
3.	Aaron Roy	Freshman ✓
4.	John Ruzzin	Freshman ✓
5.	Nathan Lane <i>soph</i>	Freshman
6.	Mitchell Mott	Freshman ✓
7.	Christian Boudreaux	Freshman ✓
8.	Mason Schell	Freshman ✓
9.	Reed Schulte <i>soph</i>	Freshman
10.	Jacob Alexander	Freshman ✓
11.	Jennifer Gross	Freshman ✓
12.	April W. ... ?	Freshman
13.	CHAWAUKIT M	Freshman ✓
14.	Tyler Ahke	Freshman ✓
15.	Loren Jammie	Freshman ✓
16.	Rebecca Comaham <i>?</i>	Freshman ✓
17.	Kristine Binkley	Freshman ✓
18.	<del>Adm Alexander</del>	Freshman ✓
19.	<del>dominick@pen47@yahoo.com</del>	Freshman ✓
20.	<del>...</del>	Freshman
21.	Gabby Al-Ebrahim <i>soph</i>	Freshman ✓
22.	Kennedy Raby	Freshman ✓
23.	Nick Hodges	Freshman ✓
24.	Eric Snyder	Freshman ✓
25.	Roman Garza	Freshman ✓

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room # Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather a minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

**Brandon True**  
Name  
 2787682

Freshman  
Division in which candidate is

Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – not in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Patrick B Lacy	Freshman ✓
2. Matthew Frates	Freshman ✓
3. Jazil Ahmed	Freshman ✓
4. Nathan Mize	Freshman ✓
5. Owen Brunswick	Freshman ✓
6. Philip Aaby	Freshman ✓
7. Will Shouse	Freshman ✓
8. <del>Brian Ditzgen</del> Carter Rosenkranz	Freshman ✓
9. <del>Samuel Beck</del> Jaron Beck	Freshman ✓
10. London Smutz	Freshman ✓
11. DAVE STEWART	Freshman ✓
12. John Meyer	Freshman ✓
13. Matt Gredys	Freshman ✓
14. Ben Muller	Freshman ✓
15. Kalen Hilst	Freshman ✓
16. Alwe Scott	Freshman <sup>Soph</sup>
17. Thomas Wardruff	Freshman <sup>Soph</sup>
18. Stephen Sage	Freshman ✓
19. Ashton Aldridge	Freshman ✓
20. Nick Warner	Freshman ✓
21. Alec Berryman	Freshman ✓
22. SAHIL KARAN	Freshman <sup>Not Set</sup>
23. Nick Latimer	Freshman ✓
24. Puya Sheth	Freshman ✓
25. Shivani Patel	Freshman ✓
26. Anna Eader	Freshman <sup>soph</sup>

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room # Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather minimum 25 signatures.

27. Sarah Scheller <sup>sheet 2 Freshman</sup>

(Additional 5 signatures on reverse)

Applica  
 Septer  
 accepte  
 (form cc

I  
 is  
 De

<sup>on official</sup>  
<sup>sheet 2</sup>

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Brandon True  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – r  
 in the division/school that this candidate seeks to repre:**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Anna Baeler <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
2. Sarah Schuler	Freshman ✓
3. Serod Castro <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
4. Zac Green <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
5. Aquib Jamil <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
6. Justin Albrecht	Freshman ✓
7. Jacker Flores	Freshman
8.	Freshman ✓
9.	Freshman
10.	Freshman
11.	Freshman
12.	Freshman
13.	Freshman
14.	Freshman
15.	Freshman
16.	Freshman
17.	Freshman
18.	Freshman
19.	Freshman
20.	Freshman
21.	Freshman
22.	Freshman
23.	Freshman
24.	Freshman
25.	Freshman

I  
 is  
 De  
 Applic  
 Septe  
 accept  
 (form c

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather a minimum 25 signatures.

# Student Senate Elections Commission

## Candidacy Petition for Student Senator 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Michael Zhou  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent.

	Name (please print)	Division/School
1.	Justin Connolly	Freshman ✓
2.	Grant Parker	Freshman ✓
3.	Yarden Tzur Soph	Freshman
4.	Bryan Hunt Soph	Freshman
5.	Taylor Zabel	Freshman ✓
6.	<del>Yarden Tzur</del> Tyler Soph	Freshman
7.	Bert Webb	Freshman ✓
8.	Robert Yavel Soph	Freshman
9.	William Zitz Soph	Freshman
10.	Will Bolen	Freshman ✓
11.	Steven [unclear] Soph	Freshman
12.	Elizabeth Peterson	Freshman ✓
13.	Adam Steinilber Soph	Freshman
14.	Breta Phillips	Freshman ✓
15.	Virangika Dimalasena	Freshman ✓
16.	Emmaline Lorenzo Soph	Freshman
17.	Michael Wang Soph	Freshman
18.	Surya Shankar	Freshman ✓
19.	Evan Barnes	Freshman ✓
20.	John Hey	Freshman ✓
21.	Vivek Panchananam	Freshman ✓
22.	Matt Herndon Soph	Freshman
23.	Tejas Patel Soph	Freshman
24.	Hanna Ritland	Freshman ✓
25.	Daniela Calderon Cordoba Soph	Freshman

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room 7 Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

Michael Zhou  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – not  
 in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent.**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Madylan Womack <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
2. MYKELL MA	Freshman ✓
3. Sebastian Blitz	Freshman ✓
4. Taylor Bahm	Freshman ✓
5. <i>[Signature]</i>	Freshman ✓
6. Anj Naravaty <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
7. Tristan Brandt	Freshman ✓
8. Matthew Signing	Freshman ✓
9. Zac Green <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
10. Nathan Lane <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
11. Gosiye Igba seimo kumar	Freshman ✓
12. <i>[Signature]</i>	Freshman ✓
13. Saqib Javed	Freshman ✓
14. Benjamin	Freshman ✓
15. Kyle Bampetsreiter	Freshman ✓
16. Ellen Nasser	Freshman ✓
17. Uel Ming, Khaw. <i>Soph</i>	Freshman
18. Sana Cheema	Freshman ✓
19. Jig Anderson	Freshman ✓
20. Alex Gabrielli	Freshman ✓
21. Yasmin Bashir	Freshman ✓
22. Ethan Ward	Freshman ✓
23. Nick Giusti	Freshman ✓
24. Matthew Kaciamoto	Freshman ✓ 3/4
25. Juan Torres-Gomez	Freshman ✓

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room # Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather minimum 25 signatures.

University of Kansas  
**Student Senate Elections Commission**

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

KORBIN PAINTER  
 Name

Freshman  
 Division in which candidate

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – n  
 in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Justin Kim Juthikam	Freshman ✓
2. Veronica Hillhard - Veronica Villhard	Freshman ✓
3. Kayla Buckley	Freshman ✓
4. Erin Gabriel	Freshman ✓
5. Sarah Anderson	Freshman ✓
6. Kelsy Gray Kelly Miller	Freshman ✓
7. Vanessa Bronzakes	Freshman ✓
8. TORI MILLER	Freshman ✓
9. Paige Krug	Freshman ✓
10. Rachel Bannon	Freshman ✓
11. Lily Clark	Freshman ✓
12. Helen Pepper	Freshman ✓
13. Jannette Martinez	Freshman ✓
14. Madalyn Carlson	Freshman ✓
15. Devon McQuarters	Freshman ✓
16. Treon Gillon	Freshman ✓
17. Laura Saville	Freshman ✓
18. Helena Schnake	Freshman ✓
19. Emily Evans	Freshman ✓
20. Christian Hicks	Freshman ✓
21. Skyler Brown	Freshman ✓
22. Christian Hardy	Freshman ✓
23. Eric Sverson	Freshman ✓
24. Alex Dyess	Freshman ✓
25. Jessica Bowman	Freshman ✓

W  
 Th  
 mi

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room #  
 Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather  
 minimum 25 signatures.

**Candidacy Petition for Student Senator**  
 2014 FALL STUDENT SENATE FRESHMAN SENATOR

KORBIN PAINTER  
Name

Freshman  
Division in which candidate is running

**Please note: Your signature is valid only if you are currently enrolled – not in the division/school that this candidate seeks to represent.**

Name (please print)	Division/School
1. Danielle Depee	Freshman ✓
2. Antoinette Weedor	Freshman ✓
3.	Freshman
4.	Freshman
5.	Freshman
6.	Freshman
7.	Freshman
8.	Freshman
9.	Freshman
10.	Freshman
11.	Freshman
12.	Freshman
13.	Freshman
14.	Freshman
15.	Freshman
16.	Freshman
17.	Freshman
18.	Freshman
19.	Freshman
20.	Freshman
21.	Freshman
22.	Freshman
23.	Freshman
24.	Freshman
25.	Freshman

I certify that this Declaration is true and correct.  
 Applicant's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Applicant's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
 I hereby certify that the above information is true and correct.  
 Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Wt  
 Thu  
 min

When finished please return this form to the Kansas Union Administration office room #4 Thursday, September 4<sup>th</sup>. It is recommended that you print two of these forms and gather minimum 25 signatures.