

**UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION SPRING 2026
UNOFFICIAL ELECTION REPORT**

Andy Wang, SGA Election Commissioner

Election Commission Staff: Ally Burwell, Milton Chamblee, Emma Seager, Hannah Smith, Kennedy Stewart, Natalie Fernstrom (ex officio)

Pursuant to SGACA Tit. VI Ch. 5 § (1)(h), the following report details the results of the Spring 2026 SGA Elections. Voting for this election took place from April 2nd, 8:00 AM to April 3rd, 8:00 PM.

Projected winners of each race are **bolded** and indicated by an *
The election commission received a total of seven (7) infraction complaints.

- *Seven (7) were heard as formal complaints.*
- *None (0) were considered as unofficial notifications.*

SGA Constitutional Referendums

Removal of Undergraduate Congress Seat Cap

<u>*YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1329, 95.4%	64, 4.59%

Judicial Branch Amendments

<u>*YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1303, 93.76%	90, 6.23%

CAC Chair

2 tickets

*Harrison Powers	878, 63.02%
Cambell Hodge	515, 36.97%

SBA President

1 ticket

*Spencer Wright	22, 84.61%
Prefer not to vote	4, 15.38%

Undergraduate Student Congress Representative:**Arts and Sciences District:****18 candidates, 7 open seats**

*Estrella Quinones	269, 8.75%
*Owen Cunningham	228, 7.42%
*Lorelai Radzanowski	227, 7.39%
*Ava Glaza	214, 6.96%
*Savannah Williams	200, 6.51%
*Choncy Canady	192, 6.25%
*Madelyn Meldrem	184, 5.99%
Krishen Raju	177, 5.76%
Suzanna Medina	167, 5.43%
Angel Martinez	166, 5.40%
Madilynn Sneller	158, 5.14%
Jayden Bass	154, 5.01%
Austin Blackwell	147, 4.78%
Lilith Thompson	131, 4.26%
Maximilian Frehde	125, 4.07%
Audrey Digua	124, 4.03%
Ezekiel Sumang	105, 3.41%
Daniel Shamsee	103, 3.35%

Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences District:**1 candidate, 1 open seat**

*Nolan DeMink	39, 92.85%
Prefer not to vote	3, 7.14%

Business District:**4 candidates, 5 open seats**

*Keeley Daley	360, 29.50%
*Matthew Solomon	325, 26.63%
*De'Kyla Callahan	273, 22.37%
*Haripathy Pasupathy	262, 21.47%

Engineering District:**2 candidates, 3 open seats**

*Matthew Baker	87, 51.17%
*Coleman Morgan	83, 48.82%

International and Areas Studies District:

2 candidates, 1 open seat

*Michael Wintory	19, 57.57%
Yousra Karrar	14, 42.42%

Additional Information

The **Academic Affairs** district has one (1) open seat, and the **Pre-health Sciences** district has two (2) open seats. No candidates filed for either election, so no ballots were created.

INFRACTION REPORTS

CAC CHAIR TICKETS

SGA Election Commission
Anonymous Unofficial Notification
SP26-06 Decided April 4th, 2026

Holding

5-0 against the Candidate
Candidate received 3 points

Facts of the Petition

SP26-06 concerns candidate Harrison Powers. An anonymous report was submitted to the Student Government Association Election Commission on April 2nd, 2026, via the “Unofficial Notification Form Fall 2025.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated to provide SGA members with an electronic form for reporting potential campaign infractions. The report alleges that Powers committed two infractions: One for failing to put “Approved by Harry Powers” on campaign material and one for featuring an OU logo in a social media post. A provided screenshot allegedly shows an Instagram story post featured by the Powers Campaign depicting a tabling event. A wooden board on display with the phrase “Harry Powers for CAC Chair” is shown, along with a window featuring an OU logo in the background. No “Approved by” phrase is visible on the board. Per the SGA Code Annotated, Chapter VI-4, subsection 5a-v, featuring an OU logo is grounds for a Class A Infraction; per subsection c-i, failing to include an “Approved-by” phrase is grounds for Class C infraction. Upon reviewing the evidence, three (3) points were assigned to the candidate.

Statement by the Accused

Powers took full responsibility for neglecting to include “Approved by Harry Powers” on his wooden board. With regards to the OU logo, he argued that the logo was not intentionally meant to be a part of the post, and that his campaign team simply reposted a photograph already published by someone else. He clarified that he was not aware of this post until the infraction notice was given to him and explained that he delegated all social media responsibilities to a member of his campaign team.

Discussion

The Election Commission reasoned that, given the evidence presented, the Class C infraction was clear. The wood board was only used for this tabling event and was not publicized elsewhere; furthermore, the material impact of its presence would not have benefitted nor detracted from the tabling experience. Given the circumstances, the minimum of 0.5 points is considered appropriate.

As to the Class A infraction, the commission disagrees with the candidate's reasoning concerning lack of intent. The distinction lies in the fact that the Powers campaign's Instagram had reposted the image, demonstrating clear intent of campaign publicity. Ignorance of the post is irrelevant, as campaigners are held liable for the actions of their campaign team. Given the circumstances, 2.5 points are considered appropriate.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Petition by Election Commissioner Andy Wang
SP26-06 Decided April 5th, 2026

Holding

4-0 in favor of the Candidate
Candidate received 0 points

Facts of the Petition

SP26-07 concerns candidate Cam Hodge. A report was submitted by Avery Dunlap to the Student Government Association Election Commission on April 3rd, 2026, via the “Unofficial Notification Form Fall 2025.” This form was established in accordance with the SGA Code Annotated to provide SGA members with an electronic form for reporting potential campaign infractions. The report alleges that Hodge committed two infractions: One for failing to put “Approved by Cam Hodge” on a stake sign and for improper placement of said sign in a university flowerbed. A provided screenshot shows the signage in question, though blur made it difficult to verify the text on it. Per the SGA Code Annotated, Chapter VI-4, subsection 5b-vii, improper stake sign placement is grounds for a Class B Infraction; per subsection c-i, failing to include an “Approved By” phrase is grounds for Class C infraction.

Statement by the Accused

Hodge alleges that the design does include an “Approved By” statement from her campaign, and that it was the same design submitted to the Campaign Material Registration Form. The Election Commissioner has verified the truthfulness of this statement. Hodge further explained that she did not think the area the stake sign was installed in was a flowerbed given the lack of flowers and will defer to the commission’s judgement and assume full responsibility if necessary.

Discussion

The Election Commission reasoned that, given the evidence presented, neither alleged infraction occurred. The design submitted by the Hodge campaign features an “Approved by Cam Hodge” statement within a

circular component of the design, and a reasonable person may have missed it without proper scrutiny. No (0) infraction points were deemed necessary.

Upon reviewing the photograph provided, the location of the signage was determined to be between the Oklahoma Memorial Union and Buchanan Hall. Upon closer inspection, the plot appears to be filled with grass that, while different from the turf on either side, cannot be reasonably considered a flowerbed, nor is it clearly marked as such. No (0) infraction points were deemed necessary.

It is so ordered.

INFRACTION REPORTS
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT
CONGRESS
REPRESENTATIVES

SGA Election Commission
Petition by Election Commissioner Andy Wang
SP26-02 Decided April 2nd, 2026

Holding

4-0 to the Candidate
Candidate received 1 point

Facts of the Petition

SP26-02 concerns candidate Owen Cunningham. According to the Election Commissioner's records, Cunningham failed to submit a financial report by the set due date of March 30th, 11:59 PM. Per the SGA Code Annotated, Chapter VI-4, subsection 5b-xi, failure to submit a financial report by the deadline is a Class B infraction. After he was given notice, the candidate requested an oral hearing.

Statement by the Accused

Cunningham takes full responsibility for failing to adhere to the deadline, citing "poor organization" on his part. He explained that he has not incurred any expenses nor received any donations and would like to use this infraction hearing as an opportunity to get more clarity on what is expected of him going forward. After being informed that he should submit his reports via email to the Election Commissioner, he verbally affirmed his intent to do so immediately after the hearing's conclusion.

Discussion

The Election Commission reasoned that, given the evidence presented, the candidate had communicated in a timely fashion and showed clear intent to rectify his mistake. Therefore, a one (1) point assignment was appropriate, so long as the candidate adhered to his commitment to submitting the financial report promptly.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Petition by Election Commissioner Andy Wang
SP26-03 Decided April 2nd, 2026

Holding

4-0 to the Candidate
Candidate received 1 point

Facts of the Petition

SP26-03 concerns candidate Yousra Karrar. According to the Election Commissioner's records, Karrar failed to submit a financial report by the set due date of March 30th, 11:59 PM. Per the SGA Code Annotated, Chapter VI-4, subsection 5b-xi, failure to submit a financial report by the deadline is a Class B infraction. Shortly after receiving the notice of infraction, Karrar reached out to the Election Commissioner with the intent of rectifying her mistake. On March 31st, Karrar shared her financial form with the Election Commissioner, and at the conclusion of this meeting was instructed to fix a minor clerical error to finalize the report.

Statement by the Accused

The following written defense was provided by the accused:

Dear Election Committee,

I am writing in response to the Class B infraction regarding the late submission of my financial reports.

The reports were originally due on March 30th. I notified the Election Commissioner when I realized my mistake and submitted them on the night of March 31st. This delay was not intentional, and I take full responsibility for not meeting the original deadline.

Additionally, I understand that there was a follow-up communication sent on April 1st requesting access. I responded as soon as I was able to, that same morning. There was a short gap in response time due to availability at that moment, not an attempt to delay or avoid compliance.

After recognizing the delay, I made prompt efforts to complete and submit all required materials and to respond as quickly as possible to follow-up communication. There was no intent to withhold information or disregard election procedures.

I respect the importance of these guidelines in maintaining fairness and transparency in the election process. As it is my first time campaigning, I will ensure to be fully informed in all process and expectations moving forward. I appreciate your consideration of the circumstances and the delay involved.

Thank you for your time and understanding.

Sincerely,
Yousra Karrar

The truthfulness of the timeline and facts of the statement were verified by the Election Commissioner. Additionally, Karrar attended the infraction proceedings and reaffirmed her statement.

Discussion

The Election Commission reasoned that, given the evidence presented, the candidate has shown due diligence to communicate with the commission and has already rectified her error by submitting her financial form to the election commissioner. Therefore, the minimum penalty of one (1) point is appropriate.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Petition by Election Commissioner Andy Wang
SP26-04 Decided April 2nd, 2026

Holding

4-0 to the Candidate
Candidate received 2 points

Facts of the Petition

SP26-04 concerns candidate Nolan DeMink. According to the Election Commissioner's records, DeMink failed to submit a financial report by the set due date of March 30th, 11:59 PM. Per the SGA Code Annotated, Chapter VI-4, subsection 5b-xi, failure to submit a financial report by the deadline is a Class B infraction. DeMink did reply to the Election Commissioner upon being notified of his infraction. He first expressed an intent to withdraw from the election and was informed that the deadline to withdraw from the ballot (*Friday, March 27th*) had already passed, after which he expressed indifference regarding the material consequence of the infraction. The candidate has since been notified that a valid financial report is required to certify his representative seat should he win the election, which he submitted shortly before this meeting.

Discussion

The Election Commission reasoned that, given the evidence presented, the candidate's overall attitude towards the election procedures showed a lack of investment and due care that should be expected from a potential representative. Furthermore, the candidate's initial intent to withdraw further signals that the candidate is more likely than not indifferent to the outcome of the election. Though it should be acknowledged that the candidate did communicate in a timely fashion, the committee determines that there is insufficient evidence of goodwill on the candidate's part to adhering to proper election procedures. To set a precedent for future behavior, and to ensure fairness, the maximum of two (2) points is appropriate.

It is so ordered.

SGA Election Commission
Petition by Election Commissioner Andy Wang
SP26-05 Decided April 2nd, 2026

Holding

4-0 against the Candidates
Candidates Dillon Baker, Suzanna Medina, Krishen Raju, Daniel Shamsee,
and Michael Wintory received 2 points

Facts of the Petition

SP26-05 concerns candidates Dillon Baker, Suzanna Medina, Krishen Raju, Daniel Shamsee, and Michael Wintory. According to the Election Commissioner's records, the candidates failed to submit a financial report by the set due date of March 30th, 11:59 PM. Per the SGA Code Annotated, Chapter VI-4, subsection 5b-xi, failure to submit a financial report by the deadline is a Class B infraction. No further communications have been received from most of the candidates, and no reports have been received as of the time of writing. The facts of the case are materially the same across all five candidates, so the committee has deemed it appropriate to consolidate their rulings into a single opinion for brevity's sake.

Discussion

The Election Commission reasoned that, given the evidence presented, the candidates have failed to acknowledge communications or submit their financial forms. Given their lack of engagement, the committee has determined that the maximum of two (2) points is appropriate.

It is so ordered.

MINUTES

SGA Election Committee | SPRING 2026

INFRACTION PROCEEDINGS

April 2nd, 5:45 PM

Call to Order – 5:46 PM

Agenda

The following items shall be considered by the election commission:

Infraction procedures against Candidates

1. The Election Commissioner shall explain to the committee the nature of the infraction and all relevant facts to their knowledge at the time of this meeting.
2. The party accused of the infraction, if present, will be given the opportunity to express their own perspective pertaining to the current situation.
3. The committee shall determine what punishment, if any, is appropriately suited to the infraction. **The committee shall consider the following criteria in making their decision:**
 - a. The severity of the infraction
 - b. The facts of the case
 - c. The language of the SGA Code Annotated
 - d. The conduct of the accused
 - e. Any other factors the committee deems necessary
4. Following this consideration, the committee shall vote on the proposed course of action.

SP26-02: Oral Hearing for Candidate O. Cunningham

Per the rights of the accused, candidate Cunningham has requested a formal oral hearing, to be held after the charges have been explained.

Cunningham: I acknowledge poor coordination on my part and that I missed the deadline. I did not incur any expenses, and I wished to wait to receive definite confirmation of what to do.

Wang: Given how the candidate has made an effort to appear before us and explain his intentions, I am leaning towards the minimum infraction of 1 point.

Fernstrom: I agree, sometimes people forget things like this. As long as he submits his report before the election is over, I think it's OK.

Decided 4-0 against candidate, 1 infraction point assigned.

SP26-03: Yousra Karrar

Karrar: Just to echo what I said on my defense, I took prompt action to address things in a timely manner. I will be more mindful of communications going forward.

Wang: She was very prompt to respond and has provided all relevant materials quickly, I believe the minimum of 1 point is appropriate.

Fernstrom: Agreed, she has shown proper respect for procedures.

Seager: I also believe the minimum point fits this infraction.

Decided 4-0 against candidate, 1 infraction point assigned.

SP26-03: Nolan DeMink

Wang: I have had correspondence with the candidate after notifying him of his infraction. He initially attempted to withdraw from the election, but I told him it was past the Friday deadline. He then asked about whether or not this would disqualify him, and I told him it would at most mean two infraction points. He seemed indifferent about what would happen, and I don't believe he had the intention of submitting the report at all if I hadn't told him that he needed to for his seat to be certified should he win the election. However, he did submit his report shortly before this meeting. Given this flippant attitude, I think the maximum points are appropriate.

Fernstrom: That sounds right, the candidate didn't seem very involved, and I wonder if he had any intent to go through with this.

Seager: Should we perhaps give him 1.5 points, since he submitted the report?

Wang: Normally I'd agree but given the circumstances and the lack of respect he displayed towards proper proceedings, I want to discourage this type of behavior going forwards.

Seager: OK, that's fine.

Decided 4-0 against the candidate, 2 infraction points assigned

SP26-04: Dillon Baker, Suzanna Medina, Krishen Raju, Daniel Shamsee, Michael Wintory

Wang: None of them have responded to the infraction report, nor have I received submissions for financial reports. I believe the maximum two points is appropriate given their lack of engagement.

Smith: I agree, the previous few candidates at least engaged in active communication. Since none of them responded, we can only assume they don't really care about the proper proceedings.

Decided 4-0 against candidate, 2 infraction point assigned

Adjourn – 6:04 PM

Attended By:

Election Commissioner Andy Wang

Hannah Smith

Emma Seager

Natalie Fernstrom (ex officio)

SGA Election Committee | SPRING 2026
INFRACTION PROCEEDINGS and UNOFFICIAL ELECTION
CERTIFICATION
April 4th, 1:00 PM

Call to Order – 1:02 PM

Agenda

The following items shall be considered by the election commission:

Infraction procedures against Candidates

1. The Election Commissioner shall explain to the committee the nature of the infraction and all relevant facts to their knowledge at the time of this meeting.
2. The party accused of the infraction, if present, will be given the opportunity to express their own perspective pertaining to the current situation.
3. The committee shall determine what punishment, if any, is appropriately suited to the infraction. **The committee shall consider the following criteria in making their decision:**
 - a. The severity of the infraction
 - b. The facts of the case
 - c. The language of the SGA Code Annotated
 - d. The conduct of the accused
 - e. Any other factors the committee deems necessary
4. Following this consideration, the committee shall vote on the proposed course of action.

SP26-06: Candidate Harrison Powers

Wang: We've got an infraction report against candidate Powers for a Class C and A infraction. A photo was provided showing a wood board without "Approved By", along with an OU logo in the background on a window. He joined us today to give a statement.

Powers: For the wood board, I take full responsibility for forgetting to include the "Approved By" phrase on it. I would argue that the logo is not an intentional effort to promote the campaign, it just happened to be there. I also outsourced the social media account to a member of my team, and I had no knowledge of the post until I was notified of the infraction.

Wang: The wood board is clearly being used as part of the campaigning activity. I don't think it's worthy of the maximum points, given how the board doesn't have a material effect on the activity, but it is an infraction regardless. I think 0.5 points are appropriate.

Burwell: Agreed, it was just used for this one tabling event and nothing else. The impact isn't that big.

Seager: Given how many campaign materials are being handled by the candidate, it's understandable that things slip through the cracks. I think half a point is good.

Decided 5-0 against candidate, 0.5 infraction points assigned.

Wang: As for the Class A infraction, the candidate is ultimately responsible for the actions of their campaign team. While I agree that it is beyond a candidate's control if someone takes a random photo and posts it as an endorsement, the distinction is that the official campaign Instagram reposted the media. That shows clear intent to publicize the photo for campaigning purposes. I think 2.5 points is appropriate.

Decided 5-0 against candidate, 2.5 infraction point assigned.

Certification of Unofficial Results

Per the SGACA Chapter VI-5, § (7), the SGA Commission shall convene within 24 hours of the closing of the polls to certify the unofficial results.

Wang: This is pretty straightforward, we need to sign off on the unofficial election results before I send it to Superior Court for consideration. Take a look at the results and let me know if there are questions or concerns.

Decided 5-0, the unofficial election results are approved by the commission.

Adjourn – 1:16 PM

Attended by:

Election Commissioner Andy Wang

Ally Burwell

Emma Seager

Hannah Smith

Natalie Fernstrom (ex officio)

SGA Election Committee | SPRING 2026
INFRACTION PROCEEDINGS
April 5th, 5:45 PM

Call to Order – 5:54 PM

Agenda

The following items shall be considered by the election commission:

Infraction procedures against Candidates

1. The Election Commissioner shall explain to the committee the nature of the infraction and all relevant facts to their knowledge at the time of this meeting.
2. The party accused of the infraction, if present, will be given the opportunity to express their own perspective pertaining to the current situation.
3. The committee shall determine what punishment, if any, is appropriately suited to the infraction. **The committee shall consider the following criteria in making their decision:**
 - a. The severity of the infraction
 - b. The facts of the case
 - c. The language of the SGA Code Annotated
 - d. The conduct of the accused
 - e. Any other factors the committee deems necessary
4. Following this consideration, the committee shall vote on the proposed course of action.

SP26-07: Candidate Cam Hodge

Wang: We have received an alleged report of a Class C infraction and Class B infraction. Supposedly, the stake sign pictured did not have “Approved by Cam Hodge” on it, and it was placed in a university flowerbed. The picture was blurry, so the details weren’t as clear.

Cam: The stake sign does have my “Approved By” on it, it’s integrated into the design so it might have been missed. It’s the same design I got approved via the Material Registration form.

Wang: I can confirm that the design does indeed have “Approved By” on it, so I don’t think there’s any infraction. Let me pull up the picture I received now so we can look at the flowerbed.

Ally Burwell: I think that’s grass, not flowers.

Wang: Yeah, I don’t remember any flowerbeds being maintained in the area picture. Posting on turf or bush beds are OK, so long as it doesn’t damage landscaping. I don’t believe there is a class B infraction here either. I recommend no points, as no infractions have been committed.

Decided 4-0 in favor of the candidate, no points assigned

Adjourn – 6:01 PM

Attended by:

Election Commissioner Andy Wang

Ally Burwell

Hannah Smith

Kennedy Stewart

Additional Information

Candidate Sydney McCoy withdrew from elections after infraction ruling **SP26-01**, decided on March 24th. Given the lack of material impact on the ballot results, the minutes and opinion related to the case shall not be disclosed.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION SUPERIOR COURT

*Validation of the Election Report and Results of the 2026 Spring Student
Government Association Election*

[April 9, 2026]

Dunn, CHIEF JUSTICE, joined by Harris, Grace, Stanford, and Dreese, JUSTICES:

The Court has not received any appeals or notices of unresolved complaints pertaining to any election in the Spring 2026 SGA Elections. The Court presumes administrative regularity under 6 S.G.A.C.A. Ch. 5, § 12, and accordingly has not found any irregularity within the Election Report to rebut that presumption.

With regard to both of the proposed Constitutional Amendments – “Removal of Undergraduate Congress Seat Cap” and “Judicial Branch Amendments” – we find that the Amendments were duly passed by the Legislative Branch and ratified by the student body. The SGA Constitution should be updated to reflect these changes.

We note that, while not intrinsically disqualifying, the non-receipt of certain candidates’ financial reports is concerning, and 6 S.G.A.C.A. Ch. 4, § 5(d) forbids the swearing-in of officers-elect who do not provide financial reports.

Notwithstanding those concerns, the 2026 Spring Election is hereby validated in full.

It is so ordered.

Dunn, CHIEF JUSTICE, took no part in the consideration of validating the election as it pertains to the Judicial Branch Amendments.

Wright and Sweet, JUSTICES, took no part in the consideration of the election.