

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION



UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CONGRESS

Session CXIII

General Body Meeting

7:00 pm, Tuesday, March 25, 2025

Dale 103

Call to Order- 7:00 pm

Opening Roll Call

SGA Mission Statement: The mission of the University of Oklahoma Student Government Association is to support the University's advancement by prioritizing student voices at every degree level; to advocate for the holistic development of each student; and to promote civic engagement and community involvement across campus.

Mission Statement: The mission of the University of Oklahoma Student Government Association Undergraduate Student Congress is to represent the interests of undergraduate students in their pursuit of academic and individual achievement. The Undergraduate Student Congress is committed to building a strong campus community, promoting civic engagement, and enhancing the quality of the undergraduate experience at the University of Oklahoma.

Moment of Silence: 20 Second Moment of Silence to allow an opportunity for reflection.

On a motion to approve the minutes Christiansen seconded by Vedra

Approval of Minutes | March 11, 2025

Officer Reports -

- **Chair's Report:** Hello, everyone. As I hope you all know, we have a big meeting ahead of us. Today, we are going to make a decision that will affect the entire student body. This decision will fundamentally change our Student Government for quite some time and should not be taken lightly. No matter the outcome it is a sad day for our student government. This impeachment is not easy for any party involved and all of our actions today should be handled with empathy, care, and respect. Any of today's proceedings should not be met with clapping, cheering, or anything of that nature. Today I want us to keep a few things in mind: 1) Vote based on your convictions and constituents. 2) Our job is not to play politics but to serve the students of OU. 3) Are these charges reflective of what an SGA president should represent? 4) We can debate both passionately and civilly. 5) Once you vote don't let others' votes intimidate you. 6) Do not be afraid to participate in debate; it is your duty to the student body to make sure this process is representative of this process. If anyone has any questions throughout this process, please say on-information and I will answer you. I have full faith that you all will make the right decision for the student body today. The definition of impeachment is as follows: to charge (a public official) before a competent tribunal with misconduct in office. Tonight we are not voting on the removal of President Strickland; that is GSS's job as the Senate. We are only voting on whether the charges we see tonight are impeachable or not. I am now going to outline how this process will work within our body.

We will be seeing this bill in Special Orders because this is not an ordinary resolution. The charges and only the charges will be presented by the author of the bill. Then we will immediately go into 10 minutes for questions of the author. The time for questions can be extended twice. After the time for questions for the author has elapsed. We will go into 10 minutes for time for questions of President Strickland. Time for questions can be extended twice. After time for questions has elapsed, we will automatically go into debate. Any person in the room may engage in debate. There will be 1 minute offered to the proponenty and 1 minute offered to the opponency and so on. Time can be yielded to other people in the room. If debate begins to become unproductive I will ask for a motion to move to the previous question. Once the debate is over both Vice-Chair Gilson Bond and President Strickland will be allowed a 3-minute summation. If either Vice-Chair Gilson Bond or President Strickland engage in debate, they give up their right to an Author's Summation. There will be no executive session due to due process concerns from the General Counsel. Following debate there shall be a recess for the author to finalize the impeachment charges. Following the recess, I will read the final charges to the general body. Then we will vote for each impeachment charge individually. Yes, will mean that you think the Charge is impeachable and should be brought to trial in GSS. No means that you do not believe it is an impeachable charge and should not be brought to trial in GSS. Abstain means that you are not voting in favor or against the charges. Basically, your vote will not affect the final outcome of the vote. Typically, an Abstain is used if you have a moral, financial, or another conflict of interest that would be impacted by your vote. Any charges that are voted in a majority of yes will be moved to trial in GSS. Any charges that are voted a majority of no will not move forward to trial. The trial within GSS will decide if President Strickland is removed from his position or not. I will call decorum I want you to state the truth

- **Vice Chair's Report:** On a more lighthearted note, please make sure you do your CSP! There are currently only 42 submissions, there is still plenty of things to do! If you are going to have issues completing it make sure you reach out to me beforehand!
- **Secretary's Report:** Hi everyone, I hope you all had a nice and relaxing Spring break. I just wanted to give a big congrats to Aaron for the professional development presentation on communication that he had in the Conoco yesterday, it was very informative and well put together.

Committee Reports-

- **Campus Outreach, Safety, and Concerns:** COSCO did not meet for the past two weeks. Despite this, we were able to make good progress over spring break. Specifically, our project regarding the expansion of the hours of the Bizzell Memorial Library was received favorably by both the Dean of University Libraries, Denise Stephens, as well as the senior administration team; I will be meeting with them in person during the first week of April and I will update you all after that meeting. Also, COSCO came up with a new light walk route over spring break. It will be implemented at our next light walk, which is this Sunday, March 30th at 8:30PM; I have sent out a link to the sign up a few minutes ago. As always, it counts for your constituent service point. Lastly, COSCO will also be holding a Cookies with Congress event on Monday, March 31st in the South Oval from 10AM-1PM. I encourage all of you to stop by at some point, and if you want to table for the event, I'll be sending out a Sign Up Genius link; every half hour of tabling will earn you one constituent service point.
- **Congressional Administration:** ConAd met officially Sunday Night at 8:30 pm and we saw both CB-113-22 and CR-113-04 and gave both a Recommendation of No Recommendation. ConAd will be tabling for the election on April 1st and 2nd, next week in the Union. I will send out a SignUp Genius if you want to table with us, which will count as a CSP for April.

- **External Affairs:** EA had a nice and restful Spring break, and we did not officially meet for the past two weekends. Today me and two other EA members has the pleasure of attending OU Day along with a few executive branch members and it was a great successful day where we got to talk about the importance of OU in relation to its impact on Oklahoma. As a reminder higher education day at the capitol sign-up sheet is still open. I am still looking for people to sign up for higher education day since it's been rescheduled for April 15th. It is a great opportunity to meet with fellow legislators and lobby and talk about the impact that higher education has had on your life. As a reminder the last day to sign up for higher education day will be on April 4 which is a Friday. I will be posting the link to the sign-up sheet in the GroupMe once again. I also have some updates regarding our minimum wage forum which will be on Friday, April 25 from 3 to 5 PM. We are now collaborating with Econ club on the panel, and we will be joined by Samantha Johnson as one of our panelists, I hope that everyone had a great and restful spring break and is feeling rejuvenated!
- **Human Diversity:** HD did not meet this past Sunday due to the break. We are anticipating seeing 3 resolutions in committee so be on the lookout for those for next Tuesday. Other than that, we just followed up on projects like the Native American languages requirement, ADRC accommodations, and the open discussion forum.
- **Sustainability:** Good evening, everyone. Susty chose not to meet this past Sunday since most of our members were still traveling back to Oklahoma post-spring break. As a reminder, we have our trash walk this upcoming Sunday, March 30th, at 2:30pm. This will be one of the last opportunities to get a Constituent Service Point for March, but it is also going to be a lot of fun, so I hope you join us! Our member Kayla Hynes has been working diligently to raise awareness about conscious confetti usage on campus, and we are excited to announce that our informational yard signs have been printed and are ready to be posted during peak campus grad-photo season! These signs aim to encourage campus goers to not litter, and to opt for eco-friendly confetti options like flower petals. That's all I have, thank you.
- **University Policy:** Hello, all! UPOL did not meet the last two weeks because of Spring Break. I emailed around 52 professors about showing our minimum wage survey in class and I currently have responses from about 9 of them - the total enrollment in these classes is around 2,500. There is about 386 responses and that is just from the OUMM. I also received feedback from Chair Aslam on our student concerns survey and intend to have that legislation ready in the next week or so. We had our meeting with the interim chief AI officer and we are looking to set up a liaisonship with them.
- **Ways and Means:** Hi everyone! WAM did not meet this week, but as you all know Primary has passed Congress and now needs to be seen in GSS this Thursday, but once it has passed it will just need the Presidents' signature! WAM will be making a few instructional videos to help RSOs with the budgetary process; if you have ideas that you would like to share with us feel free to shoot me an email at sgabudget@ou.edu or drop by my office hours 2-4 Tuesday through Friday. Thank you!

Liaison Reports

- **Harris-** Recently I met with our incumbent mayor Stephen Tyler Holman to discuss our homelessness in Norman project. We got some really good information. We were worried about quite a few things. One thing is the senate bill being proposed currently which would effectively ban homelessness in Norman. It is very sad and currently the biggest issue is finding a location so that being said I am going to do even more outreach to members of this body and anyone who offers. We need people who understand how the legal system

and the zoning rules behind everything, so if you know anyone, any professors especially would be incredibly helpful to help do this with future research. Then once we are able to establish that would really help us to increase our advocacy, increase our ability to help people, but we really need to get that part done.

Special Orders

On a motion to see CR-113-04 Vedra seconded by Robinson

- CR-113-04 “A Resolution for the Impeachment of the SGA President.” (Gilson-Bond) (Rec of no Rec)

Charges:

- a. Created a hostile workplace environment while serving as SGA President
- b. Failed to act in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act and the SGA Code Annotated while serving as SGA President
- c. Went against the Chief Justice’s advisement in electing members to search committees while serving as SGA President
- d. Neglected his duties to the Legislative Branches while serving as SGA President
- e. Hindered the duties and responsibilities of the Chief of Staff

10 minutes for questions for the Author:

- **Kathuria-** Could you please explain to me charge C and how the student body President went against the advice of the Chief Justice in electing members for certain search committees?
 - Kind of a little bit of backstory when it came to the Price College of Business there was a Dean Search Committee and if anyone doesn’t know what a Dean’s search committee it is essentially when there was a vacancy there is going to be a committee found to look for the new Dean. This is for the Price College of Business essentially there is always going to be a student on top of that. In the past what has happened is it’s going to be with consent of Congress obviously it is not a requirement thing where we have to see it here necessarily especially on the time crunch they were on but generally how it is going to be go about is it is going to be consulted with Chair Rhoads and talked about trying to make sure the candidate is going to be the best kind of serve the whole entire body especially a message to the college. There were issues that were raised about transparency, transparency is obviously a huge big deal for our students. What happened was there was an email sent pretty much to go and pretty much go and show like hey there is these transparency issues by Chief Justice Grace. What happened was is he completely ignored that request for transparency went and elected someone in his own EOP that is a freshman to that committee. So that is kind a little bit of backstory I hope that answers your question.
- **Bento-** Regarding Charge C as well and looking at whereas clause 6 with the email that Chief Justice Grace sent out is there missing context in that email and was there more information in the email then what was listed in the whereas clause?
 - So no that is going to be a copy, paste of exactly what the email was. I don’t believe that there is context missing I think it was very clear what the request was to be pretty much like hey this is a transparency problem obviously like I said before transparency is very important in student government especially when you aren’t having open meetings in general. So it kind of helps to when helping students understand what is actually happening especially in the executive branch.

- **Bento-** Did the court take any official action against the President or did it just remain a warning?
 - Did it did remain a warning. It was a warning essentially, especially when as you can see in the next whereas clause explaining what was going to happen, but as of this current moment actually didn't happen but obviously actually could be happening today and in the upcoming months.
- **Robinson-** Just to confirm I can assume that this was the Chief Justice giving us a safety net. President Strickland chose to ignore this go around and thus that would give the court the optional perhaps requirement to take action, but they were attempting to avoid this in first place?
 - Yes.
- **Christiansen-** In the past with these search committees how has the appointment looked like under previous administrations and how has it differed under this administration that is brought up under these charges?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** I would like to direct that question to Chair Rhoads.
 - **Chair Rhoads-** In the past how it actually is supposed to be is it is supposed to go through Congress, but what these being search committees, it is really hard for them to be on your bill process and then also go through GSS. In the past administration with Glasscock and Mortazavi they did suggest a person to me as well as I believe the GSS Chair and said hey are you guys okay with me appointing this person and that did not happen under the Strickland Dunlap Administration.
- **Vedra-** Can you please explain who made those advisements and when and how often they occurred?
 - So going into how often they occurred I am not going to be able to give you like a three, four times kind of situation, but from my understanding he was directed by not only the SGA advisor but by Hope herself told about these problems with when it comes to open meetings. Obviously it is a well-known thing that we are required to do open meetings. It is literally in the job description essentially, so it was a requirement something that every single SGA branch does. So he was told multiple times this semester.
- **Martin-** Just to reinstate on Charge C the Vice President and Chief of Staff were not aware of this appointment occurring?
 - Yes so whenever it came to actually responding and going and sending the email for the electing somebody originally the Chief and Staff and Vice President were on that. Whenever he responded to took off both Vice President, Chief of Staff. They did not know about the decision didn't inform them about the decision it took the Chief of Staff actually going up to him and asking him hey did you see this, you know doing her job informing him of something that was happening and he was like oh I already did it. I just didn't feel the need to include you on the email essentially.
- **Mirza-** In regard to the whereas clause regarding President Strickland's comments on the new positions of the cabinet, it states that this quote created a discouraging work environment through his discouraging remarks and quote could the author please explain how that contributed to a negative work environment and does the author disagree with the comments that the previous cabinet positions were inefficient?
 - So kind of going on both parts, the first one I think the way it creates a negative environment, imagine that you really worked in an administration for a whole entire year you contributed to something and then you were told by your direct superior

hey this is actually really stupid it can completely make you feel inadequate in multiple different ways maybe make you feel that the work that you did wasn't worthwhile and going through I don't believe that any position is not worth it. I think that it is up to that specific administration of what they want to do it is up to them they have the platform they run on they can create positions based on that platform so how they see for the Code Annotated as well. That's why we made it that there is a change to where there is not outlined position of what the secretary has to be. It lets them be able to do what they want with this administration with how this fits.

- **Wintory-** You mentioned the appointment was a freshman, how would their young or lack of experience hinder their ability to perform that role?
 - Yeah so I want to preface that freshman obviously have a unique experience on campus. It is your first year I am not going to say that freshman do not have you know vote or any say on campus because that simply is just not true. I've been a freshman before we have all been freshman before, a lot of us are still freshman but there is going to be kind of a learning curve there in previous years you didn't start off your first year inside that college. That was literally a very very recent thing so to go and elect a freshman who has so little experience inside the college to pretty much help influence the decision on who is going to be running that college for years to come is just unacceptable especially whenever it was a decision made by one person, not by a committee, multiple people, a body or anything like that.
- **Wintory-** But you are not speaking ill of that specific appointment just freshman in general the idea of lack of experience?
 - I will never talk bad about the person I think that person can potentially do a great job that's yet to see it would be nice to look at other candidates for that position because there could have been someone better other than going and choosing a freshman specifically on his EOP.
- **Harris-** This bill includes multiple instances of subjective wording such as "disregarded" "deliberately excluded" and "demeaning." That being said can the author reaffirm that this impeachment is not impartial or political and what steps have you taken to ensure that this process was fair, impartial and unbiased?
 - So I am probably going to have you restate part of your question because it was a long question. But kind of starting off there obviously might be some subjective wording in it. I will go to the last part of your question the way that it was impartial was it wasn't just you know me just solely cooking this in my mind. There was questions asked I wanted to make sure these were worthwhile. The next part is you are all not going to remove him from being President today. That is not how that works. He'll still be President tomorrow at the very least until the next GSS meeting, so it definitely is a lot of people's vote going into this.

On a motion to extend time for questions by 30 minutes Kathuria seconded by Robinson

- **Schonfield-** In regard to Charge C as far as what is significant about how this was handled in this administration previous would you say that it is important that where the previous administration had went out of their way to communicate with the legislative branch leaders without having any advisement from the superior court to do anything of the sort whereas the current administration completely flouted what the superior court instructed them to do despite precedent set that they should reach out to leadership of legislative branches?

- Yes it is very important like nothing wrong with the previous administration I mean they did not have a guideline instruction told by someone who has by the way been in their position for years now telling them hey don't do this you need to do it this way there obviously needs to be more checks and balances on this what you are doing. They didn't have that before he had that this time. So obviously that precedent of what we do in the future was set with this email from the Chief Justice. He simply ignored that.
- **Richardson-** Would you accept a friendly amendment to add me as a co-sponsor?
 - Yes I will
- **Bento-** Circling back to part A whereas clause 19 you just previously stated that Carter Strickland was disparaging of the old cabinet system and implied that he regarded it as stupid. Would you agree that the language is ineffective and what he said was it was ineffective to what we actually do and it can be construed as an opinion on how to improve the current system and not a disparaging comment?
 - I think in coupled with everything else in the bill, I do think it is a disparaging statement. I will stand on that. I think another thing to go more, disparaging in what he said about the previous administration and their cabinet. Kind of going even more obviously there is a lot about this specific charge I don't know if it was explained earlier you can vote on individual charges also so don't feel that one charge negates the whole thing.
- **Kathuria-** Have you come to the realization that the Congress and the Judiciary branch needs to have better oversight over what the Executive branch is doing?
 - I think that oversight in some aspects when it comes to making decisions like this. I do believe also checks and balances where I can't sit there and go to the executive branch and be like don't do this you cant do this, that is just simply not fair. Every branch has it powers but there has to be oversight in aspects especially when it comes to transparency to making things fair for all students those things have to be done.
- **Kathuria-** I want to talk about Charge B failure to act in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act and the SGA Code Annotated while serving as President so basically is the student body president required to post the minutes of their cabinet meeting to a public source?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** I would like to direct that question to our secretary.
 - **Secretary Harris-** Yes, according to the Oklahoma meetings act it is in the code annotated. They are required to post the agendas and the minutes publicly and the ways that we have it public is through the bulletin and the OU SGA website.
- **Robinson-** Do you believe that if we allow this go on ignoring the co-equal branch, the judicial branch, it sets a dangerous precedent of ignoring checks and balances for future administrations?
 - Yes.
- **Robinson-** Are you aware that in Monlux v. SGA this was a case from 2017 the court decided that the only requirement found in the code for all other officers not provided for in the Code that the President received the advice and consent of the legislature thus the court has previously already held in binding precedent not just an email as people may be concerned about that there must be advice and consent of the legislature which the President did not receive?
 - Yes.

- **Granato-** Would you accept a friendly amendment to add me as a co-sponsor?
 - Yes I will.
- **Burnett-** Regarding Charge C I see that you have as you said a copy paste of the email and a summary of that is she said that she does not agree with his actions and then if you skip on whereas clause and you go to the next one and it says that he disregarded their prior guidance what was the guidance that she gave to him and how did he disregard that?
 - So the guidance was in the email essentially maybe the word prior makes it seem like there was way stuff up ahead but prior guidance I was trying to go tie back into that email right there on making it more transparent on essentially going and making it to where like what Hope said having that advise and consent in that manner.
- **Burnett-** How did he disregard that?
 - He disregarded that by taking both the Vice President, Chief of Staff off the email not letting them know what he was doing, not talking to anybody else in officer positions and going and electing somebody in his EOP who is a freshman without anyone else knowing.
- **Burnett-** On this email did she send this before or after he appointed this person?
 - From my aware before.
- **Keupen-** Were other avenues to hold our President accountable explored such as a resolution expressing disapproval and outlining specific actions he needed to avoid impeachment?
 - So whenever you go and talk to someone multiple times and they disregard what you say there is only so much resolution you can do. Obviously a resolution would have done this exact same thing essentially going and being like hey letting the whole entire student body know that President Strickland is not doing his job. He was instructed on especially on the specific code annotated violations that he wasn't doing his job already. Obviously things have been changed then that is why we are doing this avenue here we are looking at these violations right here. These violations are like something not like to just make small. These are huge big deals, not only for the State of Oklahoma but for the University of Oklahoma as well.
- **Duncan-** Was there a situation that led to her sending that email or was it just to make sure that President Strickland was aware to be transparent?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** I would like to direct that question to the Chief of Staff.
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** It was to be aware just to make sure everything is cut and dry, to make sure that this is very clear that has been raised just hey how are these appointments made it is not always super publicized. So this was brought to Chief Justice Grace's attention and she said hey just to avoid future issues so that we do not have to rule on this so that you know please be advised that in the Code this is how it should be done and it is not being done.
- **Carter-** What date was the President notified of OU Day's date and the rescheduling of Higher Ed day?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** Can I direct that question to Chair Rhoads?
 - **Chair Rhoads-** I was directly cc'ed on the email about OU Day at the Capitol, I know it was February 11th. I was informed on March 3rd I forwarded the email to Marilou the day I got it. I do not know about the date that they found out about Higher Education Day at the Capitol.

- **Carter-** Then what is your reasoning for the whereas clause where you are saying that the President delayed his responsibility to the legislative branch?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** Because in the dates then or
 - **Chair Rhoads-** I was in we have a meeting every Monday called Big Exec, in Big Exec I brought up that I did not yet know about OU Day at the Capitol then there was oh yeah Higher Education day at the Capitol. I had never been informed of it so I don't know what date that was but I found out around March 11th or March 3rd, around that time.
- **Wintory-** Could you maybe describe what failures to act in accordance with the Oklahoma Meetings Act would mean for members of student government and the student body?
 - For the members of, specifically I will go I think you mean the members of Congress in that aspect so Congress the meaning behind that there is going to be stuff that is done that we do not know about. For instance, I will kind of give a little bit of my personal answer to that, being told that I went to one EOP meeting and being told this hey like this thing specifically being done when it comes to the social media that we all run together that something is being done with the LinkTree and that was something that if there was minutes based off of the meetings I could go and look at them and hey they were talking about these specific things. These are actually going to affect us, going to affect me, that could affect you, for the student body he is an elected official and he had 846 votes. 846 people were like I want him to be my president. What happened was if he wasn't transparent about what is happening in those meetings, how is the student body going to understand what he is doing for his job. What are they going to understand like hey I elected him is he actually doing what he said he would do in those meetings. What are they talking about in those meetings it is to allow the student body to understand if they really want to know what's going on inside those meetings.
- **Wintory-** In my understanding the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act is a state law are there not fines or punishments for violating that law?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** I would like to direct that question to University Policy Chair Robinson.
 - **Robinson-** Yeah so Oklahoma statute title 25 chapter 8 section 314 says and I quote any person or persons willfully violating any of the provisions of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine not exceeding Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period not exceeding one (1) year or by both such fine and imprisonment. That is in the Oklahoma statutes.
- **Wintory-** Those fines could apply to any member of student congress?
 - **Robinson-** That's not totally sure. We think it is possible it would for sure apply to him or the Chief of Staff potentially although she is not allowed to attend those meetings. It could potentially apply to all four of them or all of us depending on if we were involved in the delay.
- **Harris-** This is on Charge A, has the author consulted with any University office such as the Office of student conduct to determine if this language rises or if this language and actions rise to the level of a hostile environment as defined in university policy?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** I would like to direct that to Chair Rhoads.

- **Chair Rhoads-** When finding out about this impeachment process I have met with our advisor George as well as Brynn Daves about these matters to see if we should bring them. If it is possible to bring them forward about these issues.
- **Harris-** Have these statements been verified in writing and were any formal complaints filed?
 - **Chair Rhoads-** They have all been in person with George and Brynn so no they are not in writing.
- **Mirza-** Also regard to Charge A the two whereas clause that discuss in a toxic and or hostile comments made towards the Chief of Staff have any similar comments been made toward other individuals other than the Chief of Staff that have been verified?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** Can I direct that question to the Chief of Staff real fast.
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yeah so I am not going to speak on other people's behalf. Their stories are their stories and I would absolutely never call that out a big reason why I jumped on this bill is because I am not alone in this. I will not name their situations I will not name their stories, but I hope it is known that I am not alone in this and the quotes and the citations that you see in that bill are 100% truthful and that have happened.
- **Robinson-** Could you compare the work environment and how they differ?
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yes, absolutely. So, as many of you know, and as was just mentioned, I was the staff for President Glasscock and vice President Mortazavi in the house today, as well. I would go up to bat for those two. I went here and presented in front of y'all numerous times, I sold my soul for this in administration, I adored doing what I did, and that is why when asked if I would become Chief of Staff for this administration, I immediately accepted with zero hesitation, because I loved that job and I love those people, and it was a fantastic experience. I felt supported, I felt encouraged, and I felt welcome into every single meeting. They cc'ed on every email, they could have a very insignificant meeting and they would text and say, hey like, come join us for this. Hey like, you have office hours during this time let's schedule a meeting for this. They valued my input; they valued my advice. This administration has obviously been very different as you've can tell from the charges. I have not felt supported, I have not felt encouraged. I have felt demeaned in several different instances in several different ways, based on these comments and others. And that is how it has differed.
- **Iglehart-** What effect did these comments have on your mental health and how you saw your ability to do your job?
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yeah, absolutely in full transparency this semester and I have told people this I felt like a failure entirely. I feel like I am not able to do the job that I love, I can't do it effectively and I have not wanted to go into work. I have not wanted to go into the Conoco. I do not want to be present there because I have not felt encouraged supported or welcomed in those spaces. So, it is definitely been hard. It's taken toll. It's been extremely challenging, and I apologize if any of you have come looking for me in my office hours I've been conducting them in different places in different spaces around campus, so that's a great question it does it has taken a toll on me.
- **Christiansen-** What have been the specific duties of your office that have been hindered through the actions seen in this bill?

- **Chief of Staff Wolthuis**- Absolutely. So, the Chief of Staff is supposed to be very versatile. It is supposed to really go towards whatever the President and Vice President need of you. Now, obviously from the former administration, it's to be known that the Chief of Staff roles would change, because this administration is not like the last administration. They would shift. However, coming into this role in this administration, there was a very clear expectation that we want you to be involved. We want to welcome you into these spaces, we are so happy to have you. That was said, and I was informed that I would be able to do the one on ones with the members of cabinet or EOP. That is something I did for the last administration as well, that is something that I really liked. These one on ones were just one meeting a week with the individual member, where we could check in and touch base saying, hey, how's our project going? How can I support you, what resources can I help you with? And we thought that it was very effective, and that's why this administration adopted it as well. I was under the impression that I would be able to conduct these, especially since I was not able to attend the cabinet meetings any longer, because they picked them on a date I was not able to be there, and essentially they all were scheduled without me. He said that I would be able to schedule them, I could meet and he went and scheduled them all with each and every person individually, even the one person that I said, hey, I would really like to meet this person, I want more hands on in this department. I scheduled a one on one with her. He went behind my back and scheduled another one on one with her so that he can have oversight there as well. It feels like I am not capable in the role that I know I know.
- **Christiansen**- Would you say that these hindrances to your position go beyond just the effectiveness of the cabinet and effect the student body as a whole?
 - Yes I would.
- **Robinson**- Do you believe that the over 20 co-sponsors on this resolution indicates that it is not in any way something that only you were working on and this was something that many of us have seen?
 - I 100% agree with that statement. I did not work on this alone whatsoever and this is nothing personal either for me. This is an obligation, it is an obligation that we all have for transparency for oversight in many aspects so no not personal and I think the co-sponsors definitely show that.
- **Bento**- Regarding Charge B what was your rational of deciding to put this in the impeachment legislation instead of taking another action like filing a report under the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act?
 - Because I didn't want to go to the real like going to like a state government about this, I wanted to pursue this route. This is a violation that is specifically in our code annotated. It was a violation that happened like I don't think there is any way whatsoever with this specific charge that you can be like oh well it didn't happen because it did.
- **Richardson**- Are you aware that with Charge B in theory, so there is 4 more congress meetings, in theory the President could meet his requirement by giving three addresses in that time period?
 - Yes, I acknowledge that too and that was the thought process behind adding this portion. If you didn't hear what he was saying he is talking about how there's multiple meetings we have left, that he can go and schedule these meetings. But the fact of the matter is, we are in, I believe our 10th week of school now, and there has

not been one. There is the very few meetings we're going to have left and so he's going to have the time in between that the delta of each meetings isn't going to be able to provide what actually happened after between that time. So much has happened in this semester already that you have not been addressed on, and we have no, like, no clue what happened what happened during those times. We can't even go and look at the minutes of what happened at those times. So I think that, yes, I acknowledge that there is time for him to go and have those meetings, those meetings will get the after it will be a waste of all our time.

- **Toyos-** Can you explain the Charge D more in detail?
 - So, I have to go look at the specific was whereas clauses. how I mentioned that, but Charge D oh, sorry, that was actually the question we just answered a second ago not coming to the meetings and actually, like saying what they did in addressing the legislative. I apologize on that.
- **Kathuria-** Can you please provide some comparisons and contrasts in terms on how the previous administration followed the Bylaws as prescribed and compared to what we are seeing today with all these impeachment charges especially for impeachment Charge B and D in particular?
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yes, okay, let me try and dissect that real fast. So, okay Charge B. We'll start that with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act. the fact. The last administration complied very well to this I notice because I was able to attend these meetings. They set the cabinet times and one on ones to my schedule. So and as Chief of Staff in the Code Annotated it said that my role is to be the Director of the Executive office of the President. So as the director, they made their cabinet time a time that I could attend, and when I was in these meetings since I was able to be there, I would be the one to ensure the agenda was fully filled out 24 hours in advance. I would send it to Mary Hacker, she would post it on the bulletin board, it would be posted on the website, and I was the one taking the minutes, because again once again, I was able to be present at those meetings because they had set a time that complied with my schedule. I would send out the minutes either immediately after or within 24 hours afterwards, and once again, Mary would post these. So I don't believe that was ever a meeting where we missed the agenda, we never met unofficially, every single week was five of us in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act. This year, once again, that was obviously not the case because I am not able to any meetings. Therefore I do not know when the agenda is fully filled out. For a very long time I was not even sure the date or place that they were meeting because they cannot add to the agenda. So that is a big difference and then going to letter D. Last year, former President Glasscock and Vice President Mortazavi, what's really interesting is they did not have extensive SGA knowledge, coming into that role, they were fairly new to the office and really new to Student Government Association as a whole. They knew a few things but there was still definitely a learning curve. So there was a little bit of a grace there to figure things out to understand his duties. Current president Strickland, however, has been bred in SGA. He has been a member, since his freshman year, he has seen many different administrations. He was in Congress for a very long time. He knows the Code Annotated he was a member of the Congressional Administration committee for his time serving in Congress. He knows what is expected of him. he knows the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act. So that is also a big difference that former President

Vice President were able to hop on, understand expectations immediately. For the current President who should be expert in this area he is not.

- **Christiansen**- Regarding Charge D was there any effort by President Strickland to conduct the addresses to Congress? Any communication at all?
 - No so there wasn't. So the process for that is it has to be seen in special orders, so it has to be communicated to Chair Hope, or Chair Rhoads obviously, it didn't happen I could say, with full certainty that he didn't reach out to go and schedule those to come here and inform you on what he was actually doing.
- **Morgan**- Would you accept a friendly amendment to add me as a co-sponsor?
 - Yes I will.
- **Bento**- Regarding Charge D would you agree that the chair of ConAd had a meeting with the President and the President did agree to come to the meetings and give speeches on behalf of the Executive branch?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond**- I will direct that to the ConAd Chair.
 - **Martin**- I had meeting with President Strickland, we went over this issue, he said that he was his for it. I told him the exact steps he needed to take. It has been over a month since then and he has currently not come to address Congress.
- **Bento**- Have you guys reached out and given him a date to come speak because we know that the legislative branch is often very busy and could this be interpreted as him letting us to take the reins on where he could fit in to our agendas and our meetings?
 - **Martin**- I told him how it should be done and that has to contact Hope. It is not Hope's job or someone else's job in Congress to tell him to show up. He is to show up in special orders he just needs to notify Hope and Hope will put that on the agenda. I even specified this again the Wednesday before Spring Break.
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond**- It also under his section it doesn't say outlined under my position or Hope's or even Chloe's position saying reach out to the SGA President it is under his section to make that happen.
- **Vedra**- Charge D encompasses several different breaches of policy which are listed in the text of the resolution what was the decision behind combining all of these into a singular charge?
 - So I could probably go and be very nitpicky on every single thing and probably make 20 charges. It probably wouldn't be very difficult to do. Obviously, I don't want to waste your time. I'm not going to go and be like we have to vote 20 times. I think that would be unproductive. I think it's better just to encompass all into one and vote, specifically on that. Obviously, these different charges aren't very simple to go and combine here. So that's why there are going to be five different charges in this aspect right here.

On a motion to extend time for questions by 30 minutes Kathuria

On an amendatory motion to extend time for questions by 45 minutes Vedra seconded by Robinson

- **Vedra**- Is there a previous precedent for combining these charges?
 - So, no. I wouldn't say there's previous precedent, because I think this is, from my knowledge, only the second time this has been done.
- **Kathuria**- Could you explain some more examples outside of not speaking to the Congress about how the current Student Body President has neglected his duties to the legislative branch?
 - So, going into more detail, obviously, there is a part where he ignored Chief justices, you know, a request to consult us on what's essentially being done for a Dean search

committee. That's kind of one of the main other things that was on there, but as far as that, that obviously happened, and we saw that inside the bill and then obviously the neglecting to show up to our meetings in special orders and not request to.

- **Harris-** Would you agree that impeachment by definition is not simply an expression of disapproval rather it is a functional equivalent of bringing formal charges against an individual. Given the gravity of that action how do you respond to concerns that this resolution was introduced without any formal complaints, documentation or consultation with SGA Advisors, general council, or the office of student conduct?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** So going in there was consulting, obviously, of an advisor. I wasn't, I didn't go and was like, here George, here's the bill. I didn't do that. I will admit that. But going into letting you know I will love to direct the question to Chair Rhoads.
 - **Chair Rhoads-** When ideas of this bill was brought forth I immediately went to SGA Advisor George. I sat in on meetings with Brynn. I have not filed an official report to student conduct. We have notified general counsel and discussed this process with them to make sure it's fair that is documented so it is not that there has been no oversight from any advisor or student affairs or neutral parties this is not an easy thing for this body to come to. And I just want to make that very clear.
- **Bento-** Regarding Charge A whereas clause 20 which is the February 23rd incident it was said that the Chief of Staff made a lighthearted remark in which the President returned in saying you would be fired I would fire you in an instant. What was the lighthearted remark and why was it omitted from the legislation?
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yeah, so it actually the lighthearted remark was in the legislation originally and then I didn't want it to be misinterpreted. Basically, the remark had to do with our conversations that we were going to have with the legislators while we were in DC. I joked that I was going to bring up Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion because as all of you know, our state and federal legislators, they tend to lean very, very far right. If we were to bring up DEI in a meeting, that would obviously not go well hence why it was not on our agenda to that bring up in that meeting. So, originally, Chief of Staff bringing up the DEI to which President Strickland responded with the quote in there, I removed that because I didn't want anyone in this body to think that I was making fun of DEI or anything like that, I was joking because obviously no one would bring that up with the Republican legislatures if that makes sense.
- **Robinson-** Could you elaborate on more examples of this hostility in the work environment and perhaps when it started?
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yes, absolutely. I would say that to cover when it started first. I would say that we could have seen this behavior last summer during the SEC exchange, for example. obviously, President Strickland was not President during this time, but he was in a position of power, for those of you that may not know, he was the commissioner of the SEC exchange. So he oversaw all of those that worked and were able to put on this very large scale event. At this exchange, he was very, very disrespectful to all of those who were trying to help him put on this event, such as ordering them to go buy his socks because he forgot black socks, ordering them to go back to his room to find his ring that he misplaced. None of this was said kindly, none of this was said in an understanding manner. It was very, very hurtful. He had barked at numerous people and he had remained cold So, that was when I had

started to see this behavior begin. Since then, obviously there are the cases that are cited in the bills, there has also been different comments such as I was having a conversation with someone in the Conoco once, and he was making a joke about my role. I don't even remember what the joke exactly was, by President Strickland called me into his office, told me to shut the door, and then proceeded to tell me he will be the reason our administration fails, so you shouldn't tell him this stuff, he will be the reason we did not succeed. So, hostility is not just toward me not just to hurt those closest to him, but also towards those who are not in the executive branch. That's just a few examples that.

- **Koneru-** Is it in your opinion that this resolution is not an assassination of character but rather Congress engaging in a checks and balances system to ensure that an elected official is held responsible for duties and rules that have not been followed as outlined in our Code Annotated?
 - Yes.
- **Kathuria-** In the future how do you plan on making sure that the Student body president is actually doing their job, being transparent, and doing the work they are supposed to do for the people
 - So one the way that starts is by simply making sure that we are in compliance with the Open meetings act. Making sure the agenda is being done on their part, maybe even checking in on the people in EOP and being like hey is everything all good. Obviously, Chief of Staff, obviously we all work in the same office space we are all literally right down the hall. Literally his office is down the hall from me. GSS is right across the way I can go and talk to them. Making sure that they are doing their job whenever they need to do it and following up when they are told they are not doing their job that they are actually doing it. Obviously it is in the case to where you can only be told so many times if you have been told 3, 4, 5, 6 times and you continuously just don't do it. Obviously I can probably see nothing more happening than this situation right here.
- **Kathuria-** Do you think that this impeachment could cause any political division or tension amongst the OU student body?
 - I can obviously see anything like that happening. I mean, there are people who are loyal to somebody regardless of what happens. People that you would not have to necessarily earn their loyalty to keep it as easily or as hard I would say. So, obviously there would be some tension in the student body. Obviously there's tension inside this room when we were talking about this. Like I said even so much tension that the power went off, but it's not about the tension that you're going to have, obviously anything you do life, this is even after we graduate, the time we are in college people are already put in uncomfortable situations. It's how we can move on. It's about making sure that we continuously do our job correctly and hold people accountable. I would argue saying that if we don't hold someone accountable the student body would be more upset.
- **Fisher-** Earlier you stated that you omitted the lighthearted remark so that there wouldn't be any potential bias is there any other omitted remarks or any other details that we should know about?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** So it wasn't the word bias, it was the word, making sure I forgot what the actual word was.

- **Chief of Staff Wolthuis**- Misconstrued. I didn't want anyone in the body to think that I was making fun of diversity, equity, and inclusion. I did not want that to be taken out of context. I mean especially since this is a very public meeting. But no, no other words have been omitted and if you notice anything or any gaps, please ask and we will answer.
- **Bento**- Are you aware that on my end from what I have seen the organization and the notification of Higher Ed Day was handled by the Vice President and could that be construed in a way that since the President was the main contact for higher education day could be construed that the Vice President would have handled the notification for Higher Education Day?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond**- Can you talk more about Big Exec meetings and how they are ran?
 - **Chair Rhoads**- Within Big Exec meetings we do have agendas and there are certain dates on the agendas when I brought up the March 3rd. On March 3rd I brought up hey I would really appreciate if I was brought up about OU Day at the capitol and then they were like oh my goodness Higher Education Day and said that because it was something that was said in Big Exec and its on the agendas that's why it was placed here.
- **Richardson**- If these impeachment charges do go through and it goes to Graduate Student Senate and Carter Strickland is removed do you believe that the current Vice President is fit to take over as President?
 - I would say yes. Obviously I am not going to go and publicly advocate for anyone in particular, but time goes to tell. I believe that obviously seeing this, she's going to put her best foot forward. She'll understand what the do's and don't's the same way that I have seen in the past. I mean, I know my do's and don't's now, that is why I make sure I do my do's.
- **Robinson**- How has the environment of the EOP and how he has treated you and the others impacted the quality of the work that goes out so far?
 - Yes absolutely. like you mentioned, I have not been able to be in contact. I have been very much excluded from the executive office of the President. I've even remarked to many people in this room, I wish I could tell you what's going on with EOP. I really am not aware. The minutes that are taken at the meetings are not even sent to me. So, I am not completely positive the impact on the other secretaries, and I am not going to call them out and say that different statements have been released, but once again, I will emphasize that I am not alone in the workplace environment, I won't specify if it's from a secretary, if it from other people within this body here, but I know that I am not alone in this charge if that answers your question.
- **Kathuria**- How do you plan on making sure as a Vice Chair and how do you plan on making sure the whole student body is able to ensure that student government can be trusted and serve the will of the people?
 - So, first think, I thought that question was going somewhere else. I thought it would be very political, very quickly, but to make sure that the student body can trust us it is essentially this process right here. I think that this will show what we are able to do, what should be done and that we are willing to hold people accountable for their actions. I think that even in the case that this doesn't go through, which I really 100,000 percent support. I feel like that the student body is just not going to trust us

as much if it didn't go through because it's just shows that we're not willing to hold people accountable for their actions. Especially whenever they literally break the law.

- **Wintory-** Would you agree that the point of this meeting is not to determine, that it's not a character assassination that we don't like, it's not a push of whether we like the President, of whether the student body will trust us, the point of this meeting is whether these charges are applicable to the President and then those determinations can be can be, you know, determined by the set. Our job is just, are these charges applicable given the information?
 - Yes, with the given information that the whole intent behind this resolution is pretty much to like show, is this worthwhile for GSS has to look into? That's why we vote on each charge individually. That's why it's not, you know, voted on as a block. It's individually the ones that go through if any are at later, then, those go through GSS for them to actually pursue. It is not our job here today to convict to this isn't a trial, this is simply just a measure to show, are we going to waste GSS's time? Because they are very, very busy people.
- **Hawkins-** When you built this relationship or when you were appointed, did you not feel that there was kind of some struggle or kind of doubt that you were going to have lack of communication during your time being Chief of Staff?
 - Yeah, there was definitely a concern going into it any concerns have been addressed with President Strickland in the past as well, about communication, transparency, treating coworkers and especially this what's the word not superiors, his workers if you will, with respect. So, there were definitely concerns going into it however once again the term last year ended very well, and I felt like there were no tensions between Congress and the Executive Branch. So I was very much hoping that with that great starting point, we would be able to really take off, things would go very smoothly, obviously it is has proven.
- **Christiansen-** The oath of office that President Strickland took after getting his term is as follows I do solemnly swear that I will basically execute the office of the Student Government Association President and will do the best of my ability to preserve protect and uphold the constitution of the Student Government Association. Author do you believe that the charges represented in this bill represent a violation of that oath of office?
 - Yes.
- **Bento-** In whereas clause number 15 there is the words that the president hindered efforts to ensure transparency, accountability and procedural fairness when it came to the impeachment process. In what ways did the president hinder these efforts? Were they made by actions or just verbal words?
 - **Martin-** So yes in my meeting with President Strickland that took place before Spring break we had passed that process, our impeachment process, how we would run this. In that meeting, he brought up how he thought impeachment was unnecessary, not using the word ridiculous but implying that what we're doing is not necessary and that if he were to be impeached that he would want further message that he did get 6 days notice.
- **Bento-** But you would agree that he did not take any actions to prevent this from happening and simply expressed his opinion, correct?
 - **Martin-** Not how he implied that in the meeting. He explicitly told me that he did not believe that any impeachment process should be going forward and that if there were any problems they should be expressed to him which we have been expressing to him for the past two months.

- **Bento-** You use the words I believe, so that would signify that it his belief and not an action that he took, correct?
 - **Martin-** I think it can be subjective I don't.
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** Also the way we passed this was through also kind of check honest no, all set. The way we passed this was through only so it would go through us because of that belief right there, we could not do it as I forgot the word I think it is concurrent resolution. A concurrent resolution to make that happen. So essentially making it to where if you wanted to put this in the code annotated. It would go if he had to sign on this he would essentially try to veto it based off that belief right there. Obviously, I will admit that that is speculative right there. I can tell that's exactly what you are about to say right there. but I think that belief in this case, the way that you communicate to others, your belief on this kind of thing, you kind of show what you are willing to do to make something not happen.
- **Hallum-** How exactly were you excluded from attending the EOP meetings?
 - **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** Yeah, absolutely. So, we had already mentioned the one on ones, so I'm assuming you're mentioning the meetings that is all of us, correct? So essentially with the EOP meetings, there are three people that really need to be there President, Vice President, and Chief of Staff, once again, I know that I mentioned this earlier, but in the code annotated the Chief of Staff is the director of the executive office of the President. So when they direct these members, they really need to be there. We did a when2meet, which the dates offered, I believe were only Monday through Thursday. There's a chance it was Monday through Friday. I'm 75% sure is Monday through Thursday. Point is, there was no time on Sunday or over the weekend, that was offered to potentially meet. I work at the Capitol. I'm a Capitol scholar, so I go up there and intern in the secretary of State's office. I am not available during the hours of noon to 5 PM Monday through Thursday. Many people have class during that time, that usually is not a problem, but on the when2meet, there were several times where only one person could attend here, one person could attend here, instead of picking a time where one of the EOP secretaries couldn't attend or going and doing a Sunday afternoon, like Congress does, they picked a day in the middle of the day because President Strickland really wanted to have it on Monday during the day, during working hours in his office hours, so that they could execute that meeting then. He chose that time when I was not able to be in attendance. He had said hey you won't be able to attend, this is just kind of the date we are thinking, what are your thoughts? And I had said, I understand my schedule is challenging right now. You can pick that date but I would like to have the one on ones.
- **Vedra-** Should President Strickland remain in this role how do you plan to overcome any obstacles or hard feelings that may come up from this process of impeachment?
 - Part of my job in these situations is to work with people that sometimes maybe don't think the best about me, and maybe sometimes I don't have the greatest opinion about them. That's an opinion, but then there's what you think about people and what you are required to do. I have a duty and obligation to carry out my job and I'm not going to let my personal feelings, not let that happen. So, I hope that kind of answered your question. It really if he didn't want to work with me, that would be on him. That's a question you can ask him. I cannot say how he would work with me if

he continues to stay this position. but I would know if I was in a situation where I still have to work with him. I would deal with it.

- **Burnett-** I was just curious on why did you decide the write this bill and why were you the person to write this bill?
 - It's a good question it's because I'm okay being in the hot seat. I know I can sit up here for after the whole entire time for questions, doesn't it make it like two hours at this point. It feels like, something like that, an hour and a half, I can do that. I am ok you know, after this, I understand people might have their own personal opinions. I can deal with any of y'all hating me for this. That's okay. I'll still go to sleep the same, I will wake up the same way. That's why I felt that I was good to do this.
- **Bento-** Can you clarify on why you decided to go impeachment for these charges instead of something like a censure?
 - So how I see it is if we don't do this route, it is seen as we are not taking action. I mean, you just asked a question earlier to the ConAd Chair about, well, you kept you said this, you said this, what action? Actions are important this is an action, that is an action that is a statement. I don't think that, you know, a statement in this case does justice to what violations this is. I think action is necessary.
- **Ogle-** So you just stated that action is not the same as a statement but your whole argument for previous question by Bento was that he made a statement that you didn't believe in, but that was enough to say it hindered the process of impeachment?
 - So the difference between the two situations is obviously the next point of that is I would take action. He ignored it the next thing would be this essentially. I want to ensure that this situation is not going to happen again for future Presidents, by Presidents I mean SGA Presidents. But then if we do this that really shows that hey this action is going to be taken if I don't do my job. That is a liability same way that if we go back to a little over a month ago I know that if I don't do my job to the best of my ability, what is instantaneously going to happen to me.
- **Robinson-** Is it your opinion that after everyone has testified everyone has talked about the fact that President Strickland has had conversations about these issues in the past and he has failed to change them and censures at this point is just performative and this is us finally taking action after he has already been talked to about these issues?
 - I 100% agree with that.
- **Fisher-** Do you think there would be any incentive doing the President in question a censure over an impeachment?
 - No I think like the question that was just asked he was informed multiple times. He did not fix his action therefore going and being like doing that obviously he has been told multiple times he decided not to do it obviously in that case it is not as important on his things to do so I don't think it would be impactful so I think this is impactful right here.
- **Morgan-** Do you agree that it's a bad precedent to set to simply censure the President when these charges are brought rather than an actual action being taken on behalf of the legislature?
 - Yes.
- **Carter-** Have you spoken to the Vice President about these charges and if so what were her comments?
 - **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** So kind a little bit the only conversation I had with Vice President Dunlap is just working at work essentially.

- **Chair Rhoads-** I have had conversations with Vice President Dunlap. I'm not going to speak on what she has said to me because if she wanted to speak today, that is her choice. We're not going to force anybody to speak. But I have had conversations with people. I've also had conversations with the Graduate Student Senate Chair Chief of Staff Wolthuis, Brynn Daves. We actually had a meeting on Monday with President Strickland, Vice President Dunlap, Chief of Staff Wolthuis, Brynn Daves and George Ahmadi, about these charges and how we would move forward.
- **Vice Chair Gilson-Bond-** And then kind of on that I want to make sure I finish it so there is no speculation. No I did not talk myself to Avery about what she thought about the charges I don't think that would be fair to her because obviously she serves under him so obviously I am not going to be like what do you think about this charge do you agree with it? Do you disagree with it? That just wouldn't be appropriate.
- **Mirza-** Regarding the censure that happened in 2015 around the impeachment to a censure, what were the charges brought against the previous president?
 - **Martin-** Yes, back in 2015, the current President was arrested for public intoxication. He also at that time broke into a person's apartment. He was not charged with that, but that did happen. and then Congress at the time laid out a resolution into the process to start an inquiry, that failed, 18-21-1 and then that following week the Congress unanimously censured the President.
- **Wintory-** Would you agree that this precedent of impeachment or censure is somewhat analogous because those were issues outside of Congress and these are specific violations of the code annotated against the enumerated duties of the Chief of Staff and the two situations are just not comparable?
 - Yes.

On a motion to recess for 5 minutes Oler seconded by Richardson

10 minutes for questions for the impeachable officer:

- **Robinson-** Before tonight was your opinion on the charges before you?
 - I was taken aback being frank. I was shocked to have these sent to me especially because I think of many of you as friendly colleagues, and I was shocked that these have been put to an impeachment bill.
- **Robinson-** After hearing the opposing view so far what do you think about these charges now and their validity?
 - I think that there are things that need be addressed for sure and that there are conversations to be had moving forward and there should have been conversations that were had before these were brought to impeachment.
- **Fisher-** Is there any added context that you would like to add to the incidents from February 23rd and November 2024?
 - Yes, of course. Thank you. I'll start with the second one on the jump off a cliff, idiom, after Avery and I were elected, Ellie and I were in the bull pin of the Conoco and Avery and I were talking about who we would want as our Chief of Staff and we knew without a doubt that we wanted it to be Ellie. So we went into then Ellie and Caden's office and I asked her, would you jump off a cliff for me because I would jump off a cliff for you. I don't remember saying for my presidency, but I do know that I never meant with everything I do I don't mean malice or threats. And I'll watch it to continue to work that Ellie and I were working on last year and that relationship of frankly hard work knew before.

- **Martin-** That is not a no? Was that said or not?
 - I said would you jump off a cliff for me because I would jump off a cliff for you. That is what I said.
- **Bento-** Could you clarify on Charge C on specifically whereas clause number 6 with the email that Chief Justice Grace sent to you was there more to this email or were there other correspondences that you had with Chief Justice Grace following this initial statement?
 - Yes there is more to that email. That was about a 1/3 of the email. The rest of the email said, well, let me the entire email was basically hey the court has found that there is a transparency issue, but we want to work with the Exec branch to remedy that. So when that email was sent to me, which was in about mid-February and that was sent to myself, Avery and Ellie. I responded back to her personally saying thank you for bringing this to my attention. Let's schedule a phone call. We scheduled that for February 26th that afternoon.
- **Bento-** So you would agree that what is in the whereas clause is not a copy paste of that email?
 - I would say that it is a copy paste of a portion of the email, but it is not a full picture.
- **Robinson-** To go back to the previous comments by the President is that what he said or do you have a different opinion on the addition to what he said?
 - I most definitely have a different opinion thank you for that question.
- **Granato-** On charge D when we talk about addressing the legislative branch, talking about addressing Congress. Can you describe more on how it was brought to your attention and how you came onto that?
 - Yes, thank you. So in early March Kyle and Michael Wintory brought this to my attention and they said ConAd is thinking about a bill that would require the President to attend the first meeting of every month of both Congress and the Senate. I said that's a great idea. I did acknowledge the fact that I had not been attending. I had not I had not made addresses to Congress yet like in the code. But neither did my three predecessors and that's not something I knew I was expected to do, so I'm glad that was brought to my attention by those two individuals, and I did say at that meeting. The first meeting of the month for Congress passed, and so my plan was to address it with the Congress Chair to attend the first meeting in April, when we came back from spring break.
- **Richardson-** Is there any way that we can get a copy of this email in question?
 - Sure.

On a motion to extend time for questions by 45 minutes Kathuria seconded by Robinson

- **Vedra-** Can you explain why the appointment still occurred without legislative consent?
 - Yes, I can. So I got this email on February 17th, and then we scheduled a meeting, a phone call for February 26th that afternoon. The morning, which was a Wednesday, that morning at almost 10 AM, I received an email from the provost's office to which was also sent to me, Avery and Ellie, notifying us that the original Price College Dean Search Committee would be dissolved confidentially and would be announced by Provost later that week. But by 9 AM the following day on Thursday, she desired she needed a name to provide the Board of Regents for the new Price Dean College Search Committee. Two hours later, I provided Miss Hanson with Kendell Coppinger's name. I was not made aware during my many years that the text to approve Dean Search Committee picks occurred and I should have asked if that was something that was happening.

- **Vedra-** Can you explain in the heat of this moment you specifically chose the individual in question?
 - Yes, number one, Kendall is from the Price College, and I thought, you know, we should have someone from Price College, but she was also already approved by, she was also in a role in SGA that, you know, she met with Congress, and she's proven herself to serve in a capacity on EOP. But I also did think it was unique to put a freshman on EOP. Older members might be wiser and more, you know, they have more years of education behind them, but I think it's interesting to would have someone that will be in the college for the next three years and provide input to the thought process that way, then a more reflective one..
- **Vedra-** Are there any other members of the Executive office of the President who are members of the Price College?
 - Yes.
- **Martin-** After all of this why did you leave off the Vice President and Chief of Staff off of this decision email?
 - I did not mean to. I will be frank I did not mean to.
- **Martin-** Why did you not tell the next day your Vice President and Chief of Staff the decision and why did the Chief of Staff have to bring it up?
 - I don't know.
- **Mirza-** Could the President speak to those allegations of deliberately excluding the Chief of Staff?
 - Of course, deliberately excluding is not the phrasing I would use by any means. when the when2meet was sent out to all ten members of the EOP including Ellie, Avery and I we filled it out. There were about two or three times for like 30 minutes throughout the week that worked for everyone. I understand that Sundays are congressional committee days and with that, I think it's important that every student that wants to attend any SGA meeting, you know, can choose which one they want to go to, because it's not scheduled at the same time. We chose the option on the when2meet that had an hour to my recollection, and it fell during 2 PM's on Mondays. There was no intention to forcibly make sure Ellie wasn't in the meetings, and I have realized that the EOP meetings before this was ever brought to me, that the EOP meetings do not feel the same as last year, heavily in part because we are lacking Ellie's presence.
- **Wintory-** Would you agree that deliberately choosing a time slot where your Chief of Staff has said they're not available, is the same thing as excluding them from that meeting?
 - We chose the meeting time that worked for the most people, Avery Ellie and I meet weekly. We wanted to be sure to the cabinet secretaries were able to attend those weekly meetings and we wanted to be sure that we were all on the same page and again I didn't mean to exclude her.
- **Wintory-** Would you agree that she was deliberately or in deliberately excluded from the meetings of the EOP and what the EOP is actually doing in direct violation of her enumerated rights and duties as Chief of Staff?
 - No I say that she wasn't at the EOP meetings and that's a problem and that will be remedied like this week. I want to have those conversations. I never said that Ellie could not have one on one meetings she sent out the agenda and she has access to the agenda and there has never purposely been an attempt to not allow her to meet with the EOP secretaries.

- **Estrada-** Is there a reason that the minutes were never sent to her?
 - No well no the agenda is a google docs and it is used as the minutes page. And so it is just the same document which is sent out initially by her. I didn't, it's not intentionally not being sent to anyone because no one is emailed the minutes.
- **Schonfield-** Whenever you made the meeting time for the EOP was it discussed with the Chief of Staff and was part of the agreement that she would get one on ones with each of the members of EOP?
 - We did meet and we did talk about the fact that she was not going to be at the EOP meetings we were all on the same page and she is still allowed to make one on one meetings with the EOP members there is no rule or limit on how many one on one meetings a secretary can have nor anybody can have if anybody wants to meet with somebody I have always encouraged secretaries and anyone to reach out to the people that they deem appropriate.
- **Ball-** What were your intentions behind scheduling the one on one meetings and allowing the Chief of Staff to schedule those one on one meetings as well did you intend to go over her head or undermine her?
 - Not in one bit. Nothing I have ever done is with a malicious intent or a desire to harm people or their feelings that's not who I am. The reason why I scheduled one on one meetings is because I wanted to know what was happening. I wanted to be involved. I want to learn what my secretaries are doing to build up a better community for the school, so its never a cruel intent I just wanted to meet with them because they are all swell people.
- **Koneru-** In I believe it is whereas clause number 5 it states that you have not publicly posted executive cabinet meetings 24 hours prior after multiple advisements by SGA advisors and also having served in Congress that has followed open meetings act how come you did not?
 - Firstly the fact that the question that we were not posting the agendas and the minutes in a timely manner was brought to me once in early March and hearing that it was brought to me before Spring break and when we meet after Spring break and every meeting going forward. I will ensure that those are posted in a timely which they have been starting with yesterday's meeting as promise. I will say in the past it was not the President's responsibility to make sure that the agendas and minutes were posted. That has always been someone else's responsibility.
- **Kathuria-** Could you please tell me who specifically was the individual responsible for making the minutes available for open access?
 - Last year it was the Chief of Staff.
- **Kathuria-** Who was it previously you know if it wasn't the Chief of Staff, in the Firch administration?
 - I would say low level member of EOP under Firch and Schultz so I am not really sure who is was but I would imagine it would be Maria the Chief of Staff at the time.
- **Robinson-** How was your Chief of Staff acting as leadership of EOP since you were conducting one on ones and it was intentionally scheduled where she was not able to make these meetings?
 - I scheduled the one on ones because I wanted to meet with the team. There was no rule saying that one on one's have to happen at all. There is no rule saying that multiple people cannot have one on ones. She is still the Director of the EOP, but you know we can still all meet together individually.

- **Robinson-** What did you do knowing that Ellie was not able to be there, knowing you're your Chief of Staff was not able to be there, what did you do in order to make up for that and why did you not think that sending the minutes was important given this absence?
 - We do take minutes; Avery takes the minutes at the meetings. So Avery Ellie and I meet weekly and Ellie and I have multiple overlapping office hours especially on Mondays and so it was under my impression that we would meet during those times since we were both having office hours or a scheduled weekly meeting but yes.
- **Robinson-** So understanding that the Chief of Staff role is the Director of EOP why did you find it necessary to also have one on ones? I recognize that you mentioned that you wanted to know about the goings on. Is that not her job to report to you about those, so you don't have to have those meetings and it gives her that leadership role?
 - Just because I don't have to have a meeting doesn't mean I do not want to have a meeting and I am open to meeting with anyone and everyone that is open to meeting with me. I don't again anyone can schedule a meeting. Again I am not trying to maliciously or forcefully push someone out of their responsibilities.
- **Duncan-** Was there any discussion of who's role that would fall to, to ensure that you are following the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act?
 - Well we discussed that Ellie would continue to send the agendas for EOP as well as for Big Exec, and we discussed that Avery would take the minutes, but that is obviously what we talk about in every meeting, who is taking the minutes but in regard to posting the agenda and minutes that was not necessarily discussed.
- **Christiansen-** Regarding Charge B and whereas clause 5 which states that you had multiple advisements about not compiling with publicly posting executive cabinet meeting agendas in a previous question you say that you were just notified one, would you disagree with the text of the bill that says you were notified multiple times and if you were notified multiple times do you recall who notified you?
 - I remember receiving one notification.
- **Christiansen-** Were these by email, by text, in person?
 - I do not recall the method, but I remember that the topic of EOP and the Open meetings Act was a one-time conversation.
- **Martin-** A lot of your explanation is saying all of this falls onto the Chief of Staff, so in addressing these issues that you say you are going to address, does it include firing the Chief of Staff?
 - No.
- **Martin-** Has George talked to you about having the agenda out 24 hours in advance?
 - I do not recall. I don't remember who told talked to me about compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act.
- **Keupen-** Is it a fair characterization to say that a lot of these issues have come about just because you didn't know about them?
 - Yes.
- **Keupen-** Given your long involvement in SGA, how do you reconcile your claim of ignorance with your experience and knowledge of standard procedure?
 - I am made aware of standing procedure by asking the questions during Congress, what is happening. I to be frank, I have been in SGA for again yes my entire college tenure but I do think about how I see them happening. If I am not communicated

about the details on how they're operated, I can't continue that style of operation now if we are talking about policy I would like a more specific guiding question?

- **Carter-** In reference to Charge D what was your understanding of the responsibility as President as stated in the Code Annotated in terms of notifying Exec of Capitol events and dates?
 - Firstly, I will talk about Capitol events. I was made aware of the scheduling and then the rescheduling of Higher Ed Day at the same time as the general populace. So I don't have any control over that. The scheduling of OU Day at the Capitol, I did notify Hope, madame Chair that when OU Day at the Capitol was happening in early March and I did take accountability for the fact and I did apologize that it was later than I received that notification, but in the past OU SGA is not necessarily made aware numerous week in advance when OU Day at the Capitol is happening. Sometimes it is a notification from student affairs, 2 weeks before sometimes Presidents get emailed. I don't recall when last year's OU Day was communicated because I was not the one to receive the notification first and the same year before that. I just attend them because I'm sent the GroupMe message.
- **Carter-** Do you believe that it is your responsibility as President to disperse that information or do you believe that is somebody else's responsibility?
 - If it is given to me then yes it is my responsibility.
- **Iglehart-** I take it from your responses and from certain lines of reasoning that the body is being asked to believe in your defense that a lengthy series of problematic and coincidental have occurred in rapid succession from the unfortunate absence of the Chief of Staff to technical difficulties in Microsoft Outlook to conversations with the Chief of Staff being taken out of context is it your defense that these circumstances were unintentional, can be addressed without impeachment and were ultimately not your responsibility as President?
 - If people have a if there were concerns about me, my leadership, my character, my actions I expect there to be a conversation to be had. Now I am not saying that I think what is happening is coming from a place of bad intentions necessarily, but I am saying that I can't remedy the problems that are in this bill before we get to the point of impeachment unless I am notified of every single thing. And I can't move forward with that so it is not unintentional it is just what it is.
- **Martin-** Do you deny all of these charges?
 - I don't think they paint the whole picture.
- **Martin-** Do you deny all of the charges yes or no?
 - No, I do not deny all of them.
- **Martin-** Which of these charges do you not deny?
 - Out of any, what would make most sense would be the final one, but the final one letter E again was not coming from a place of bad intent.
- **Christiansen-** As part of your oath you do have a responsibility to uphold the rules and represent the members of the organization and then as the questions have been seen here I believe that you have stated that you have not been able to because you did not know how to execute some of those functions. What resources were you provided with upon assuming office to be aware of different responsibilities that you had as far as sending out agendas and things that are outlined in these charges. What resources were you made aware of and was there any hinderance to you?
 - That is a lengthy question. So I wasn't advised when I took office about anything policy wise specifically and I will say to my knowledge that it is not the president's

responsibility to send out the agenda in that specific referral but I did not receive any advisement.

- **Richardson**- Is there any possibility that we can see the email that Vice President Dunlap and Chief of Staff Wolthuis?
 - We have already seen that email.
- **Richardson**- Knowing that the Chief of Staff Wolthuis would not be available as much as one would expect in an office of that regard why did you not ask her to, with no disrespect, why did you continue seeking her services knowing that she would be unavailable.
 - So Avery and I asked Ellie to serve as Chief of Staff before we knew that she had an internship but becoming aware of her internship we didn't believe that it would hinder her responsibilities and I don't, there has been no forced hindering. If people want things to happen I have to know about that desire or just if you want to do something do something I have gone about trying to ask people hey can we do this hey can we do that and if I am told no then I am told no and I sit my butt down. But I try to ask
- **Hawley**- Why did you and your Chief of Staff not set a time before you conducted your cabinet interviews? Was that a deliberate decision you made like setting up a large amount of time being like ok we can be available at this time and we can be available at this time, we want people who have an ability to show up when we can both be available?
 - So our office hours are posted in our windows and all three of our office hours are very different and so there is not many schedules of our secretaries that fit with multiple of our office hours. There might be one or two at least that's the one or two there is currently scheduled one on ones with me or during when a either Avery or Ellie has their office hours.
- **Cunningham**- Do you believe that your remarks that are outlined in the bill under Charge A are hostile?
 - I believe that they were rude with no intention of hostility, but they were rude and I do regret saying what I have said.
- **Hallum**- in reference to Chair Martin's question about if these charges are applicable to you and you stated that Charge E was the only one that was not applicable, do you believe that Charge A, B, C, and D are applicable?
 - No sorry just E.
- **Aslam**- Can you respond to the claim that you actively opposed the establishment of a clearly defined impeachment process?
 - Of course throughout the, to my knowledge, throughout the past couple of months before Spring break there was two bills about impeachment happening. I know one from Mr. Keupen and one from Mr. Martin. I know that Mr. Keupen's was tabled, and I know that a few weeks later Congress passed Mr. Martin's. I never saw either of the bills before the agendas that were posted by the Congress Chair. If I ever heard about the word impeachment I was like I either thought ok this is ConAd doing the procedural stuff that Maddie Cantrell left from last semester or if hey should I be worried about impeachment. I was never told that I should be worried about impeachment. So back to the claim that was made in the earlier set of questions Mr. Martin and I met to grab coffee after his impeachment bill passed in Congress during that we talked about who we thought would fall under that and the only people that I explicitly remember opposing would be people from the programming branch that fell underneath the CAC Chair.

- **Harris-** You have stated multiple times that you were informed about many of these issues somewhat recently you said multiple times in early in March and I know you were aware of a lot of the issues Wednesday over Spring break that being said do you feel like you've truly been given a chance to correct your mistakes?
 - This is first opportunity that I have been given asked questions about the Charges and the claims in the impeachment bill and I haven't been provided an opportunity to do so before. But I will say the three things that were brought to my attention and were outlined in the whereas clauses I've either, I promised to remedy them and I still promise to uphold them when it comes to addressing Congress, reworking how EOP meetings work, how EOP meetings work so that we can reincorporate Ellie into the fold on that and to also have EOP meeting agenda and minutes comply with open meetings act.
- **Harris-** Would you say that due to the speed of this impeachment bill and the general timeliness of these responses that this impeachment bill will hinder any potential remedies to be the issues rather than solving the issues themselves?
 - I think if an impeachment bill is passed it makes people worried that I would be cruel or take it as a knife in the back. I think, frankly I do think that the impeachment bill should have been addressed as claims to me personally that we could work out in a tough conversation. You know we are college students we are adults we can have these conversations I am happy to have them, but I can't remedy them unless I am made aware and so what happens tonight I am not being removed unless I am impeached and then unless GSS decides to remove me until then I was elected by SGA students and I continue to work for SGA students and that includes working with you all who I still frankly love regardless of the outcome.
- **Schonfield-** You have mentioned it is your intent to amend the issues listed in this resolution and other than making yesterday's EOP meeting comply with the open meetings act, have you taken any other steps to correct your actions Wednesday when you received the resolution?
 - Well we were on Spring break for a lot of that so I wanted to make sure that we were doing things during school hours, but I've really been focused the past few days making sure that I can answer the questions to the best of my abilities and ensuring that again the meetings were posted, the agendas and minutes, but tomorrow is another day and I have a long list to do in my phone. So they will be talked about.
- **Keupen-** Do you believe that it is reasonable to expect you should be aware of the procedures even if you are not explicitly informed of every detail?
 - I think its, informed about, I know about procedures based on my experience and how I experience them and if I am not in the nitty gritty of those proceedings then I don't know how the nitty gritty gets gritty.
- **Martin-** How long have those meetings been going on that these issues have been addressed with him and talked about to him?
 - **SGA Advisor Ahmadi-** I recall one conversation that I asked him to put the agenda up in regular conversation.
- **Martin-** Do you know how long ago that was?
 - **SGA Advisor Ahmadi** I believe it was just a few weeks ago before Spring break, when this had come up.
- **Kathuria-** I know there's a lot of things I think, you know, we all agree that, you know, you can work on, you know, let's suppose that you end just getting acquitted, how do you plan

on following through on this work? How do you plan on being real to the student body and being sure that you're being fully transparent and following the laws and making sure that you are abiding by the checks and balances of our governing system.

- Well number one, I'm applauding the usage of the checks and balances system, number one. Number two, that's where I need to sort of get on it and meet with Maddie Taylor, meet with Ellie and Avery and Kyle, and whoever has, you know, any opinions or guidelines or interests in how proceedings will happen, how remedies can occur when it comes to addressing these breaks in policy, but there's also making sure that I stay on my own game and, you know, go over what I need to be doing and making sure that I'm doing it.
- **Mirza-** Could you clarify what you meant by the statement made in whereas clause 21?
 - Of course. I'm a tense person and I am a very anxious person, and I was put in a very tense situation it was my first trip to DC, and I take my job to represent OU very seriously, especially when it's with our state's elected officials. With that being said, I could not, I misinterpreted a lighthearted remark, and I spoke out of turn, and I said things I should not have said and I do regret saying that. None of that came from any real intention to follow through on those words I gave. I was just really tense, and I am really sorry that that has happened.
- **Robinson-** You say you want to work to improve all of these charges and some of the allegations yet on Sunday, I remember in the committee meetings that respect to Charge B you tried to shed the blame on you Chief of Staff rather than taking accountability. How do you balance those two statements?
 - I tried to set what I thought the record was straight at that point in time. I will say I was not trying to jab anybody what I was trying to do was just trying to state that in my experience last year Chief of Staff sent out the agenda and the minutes, but there was no intentional offense.
- **Robinson-** Do you acknowledge a violation of the law and are you aware that your actions or perhaps inaction have brought liability on not just yourself but the entire Executive Branch and the SGA as a whole this is of course with respect to Charge B?
 - I am aware that this taking place and I am aware that is the charges brought.

On a motion to extend time for questions by 45 minutes Robinson seconded by Vedra

- **Robinson-** That's not exactly my question I will clarify it's more about you acknowledging that as a result of your inaction to send out minutes to ensure that these were posted as all of our committee agendas are posted in the Conoco. That you have placed both yourself, the executive branch and SGA as a whole at risk of legal action from the State of Oklahoma and the Attorney General. Should a formal complaint have been lodged?
 - I am aware and that was not the intent.
- **Bento-** On the 19 whereas clause regarding the incident on January 26th, where you stated these are new positions all of them, we got rid of the old cabinet system last year. It was ineffective to what we actually do. It is quoted in the whereas clause as being dismissing and demeaning to the efforts of the previous administration. Would you categorize that statement as something that was an attack to the previous administration?
 - Not an attack in the slightest I consider Cyrus and Caden my brothers and I am very proud of the work that happened last year under their leadership. What that is referring to is, I wrote a bill in 2024 that was also authored by then President, Vice

President and the Chief of Staff that was then co-sponsored by the other three directors and because the cabinet system was built long ago decades prior and it was intended for each of the 4 directors listed in the code to have their own teams. Well if you look at 2008 yes the directors had their own teams, but if you keep going to last year there was four of us so we decided that a switcharoo had to be done and so we just got rid of those 4 positions and expanded what the EOP into what it is now.

- **Bento-** Just a quick yes or no it was not meant to be demeaning and it was meant to be a suggestion on how to improve?
 - Yes it was not demeaning and yes it was a suggestion on how to improve.
- **Wintory-** Would you agree that while the intent behind a comment is important however how it is perceived is almost equally as important because that is what contributes to a hostile environment because that is how other people in that work environment are reacting the things you are saying?
 - I do think it is important. No my intentions or the intentions of anyone's words does not outweigh the feelings that someone gets from listening to the words in any conversation, but and I understand that again Ellie was fairly hurt by those comments I have to be made, I regretted saying those and I apologized days later because I had time to reflect and I got out of the you know tense situation of DC. In all I can't know an environment exists if I don't, if people don't bring attention that my comments were out of place and I have had time to reflect on those but if there are any other comments that are made out of place I have to be made aware that they were.
- **Iglehart-** So just a minute ago you stated that the intention of a comment does not outweigh the feelings it invokes in the person being addressed, would you agree the Congress may not concern some with whether those comments necessarily are grounds for removal but rather that the Congress focus on if those comments created the environment and then GSS has to then decide was the environment enough for removal?
 - I think any charges that are impeachable have to be grounded in fact and truth. I cannot dictate how you all will perceive how things will come across to you all.
- **Iglehart-** To rephrase in this hearing we are not hear to decide on removal we are here to decide if these charges are impeachable so would you agree that whether or not the comments, whether or not the environment the comments created was severe enough for removal that the body should allow for the opportunity for, would you agree that there should be an opportunity if the Congress chooses to impeach that it be left for GSS to determine the severity of the environment and we just focus?
 - I will say this I don't I can't dictate or control how GSS or you all will perceive it what you take into consideration is what you take into consideration. Why I am here is to answer the questions to the best of my ability.
- **Fisher-** Do you believe there is any context or any evidence that you would like to add that would help in your case to maybe A?
 - Sure, I mean I sort of talked about what happened in DC and the intentions behind the jump off the cliff remark. I don't know of any other portions of the whereas clauses that would fall under a hostile work environment to comment on Charge A.
- **Hallum-** What exactly was your interaction with ConAd Chair Martin?
 - I never opposed the establishment of an impeachment process and I talked about and I think we sort of both hit on earlier is we sort of talked about after the

impeachment bill was passed that Mr. Martin wrote we talked about who would fall underneath those, who would be eligible for being impeached.

- **Hallum-** Is there any recording of this meeting like some minutes maybe or an email exchange?
 - I think this was over coffee.
- **Toyos-** Do you think Congress should overlook these charges to give you the ability to amend or correct these mistake or should we continue with due process in bringing these charges and letting GSS decide?
 - I am not going to tell you what to do. I will say it would have been not better but in my opinion if conversations happened before this was emailed to me at 6pm during Spring break on a Wednesday I would have been able to address these complaints in conversation with the people that came to me. The problem is that only happened less than 5 times and so I can't remedy problems that I don't know exist.
- **Lapp-** Do you also believe that the working environment was hostile as some members of you EOP have felt or if that was a widely spread feeling?
 - In my personal opinion, it was not but again I go about every interaction with the best intentions and every time I walk into the Conoco it is always smiling faces and chatting and no one gave me any impression otherwise until this week and then the mood sort of shifted which is expected but I come early to my office hours every day and I leave later unless I have an engagement to attend to in my opinion it was not.
- **Vedra-** Can you explain who and what positions you would consider to be low level?
 - So this is not talking about the current EOP of last year's EOP. In the Firch Schultz administration, there was 2 types of cabinet members because there was still cabinet. There were the 4 directors and there were the x amount of people who were also on cabinet. I was one of those x amount of people, I did not know all of the inner workings because how cabinet played out then is we didn't always go to every weekly meeting it was biweekly meetings it was a completely different system than it is now. I don't consider any of these lovely people who are currently in the role or the people last year who were in the director roles as being low level. What everyone does is important and they should be recognized for the importance of their work.
- **Vedra-** Having worked with the previous administration would you say that having that dichotomy would you say that was a disparaging or hostile environment to be in?
 - No, no it was just I felt very included it was just the rank and how it worked out. The directors had teams that's just how it sort of played out so it was not hostile that was just how it was.
- **Harris-** In your opinion for a charge to be impeachable do you believe that there has to be sufficient empirical evidence for a charge to be an impeachable charge?
 - I would hope so.
- **Harris-** Have you received any evidence or been shown any specific evidence had towards any of these charges?
 - I mean no additional you know nothing has been brought to my attention besides the email.
- **Harris-** On clarification lets say a formal complaint from an SGA advisor, from a Congress Chair, from any university policy especially regarding A and B have you received any written warnings anything like that, formal proof?
 - Nothing written.

- **Higareda Castillo** – For clarification are you claiming that you were made aware of most accusations right before Spring break and that most concerns were not brought up to you?
 - Let me clarify what I said. I was made aware of the open meetings act, the other complaints were not brought to my attention before Spring break addressing Congress, and reincorporating Ellie into the EOP meetings, those were the three besides those nothing was brought to my attention in the past 10 weeks of my Presidency.
- **Aslam**- Would you consider resigning if you are not ultimately impeached?
 - I was elected by the to serve the student body, until the court proves me guilty, I am serving my term.
- **Evans**- What plans do you have to take place to change and make better what we have seen happen so far this semester?
 - Two part response. Number one I want to wake up tomorrow I want to put on my polo like I always do. I want to unlock my office door and I will be in my office and the door is going to be open like it is every day. So no one has to worry about that I'm coming to work tomorrow. Number two how I am going to address the problems is you know you are now hearing my experience now it is time for again what ever comes of today I can't decide but tomorrow I can decide my actions and I am choosing to meet with people and listen and if any of you want to talk tomorrow the door is going to be open but I will be reaching out to some people to have those meetings and if people want other people in the room while those meetings happen I'm of course open to that.
- **Schonfield**- Are you alleging that you were unaware of having to comply with the open meetings act, the email from the superior court and the need to discuss with the legislative branches regarding appointments to the Dean's Search committee and of the various conversations had with your Chief of Staff?
 - So I am going to answer all three of those. Let's start with the dean search committee ones because I was able to bring up this point earlier on the afternoon I got the email from the provost office about the confidential committee and I sent Kendall's name forward. That afternoon at 4 pm is when Claire Grace and I had that scheduled meeting, it was a phone call and we talked about a application going forward that would open to all OU students to apply to be on a list. That would then be approved through the advice and consent of legislature. And to my knowledge she is getting Maddie Taylor's input on that but that was in early March and I need to follow up on that. Open meetings act to my recollection that notification, being aware that I was breaking that and that needed to be remedied that was brought to my attention with only one EOP meeting before Spring break and so I promise and upheld that promise to have those minutes posted and the agenda posted in a timely manner and when it comes to incorporate Ellie I felt the shift in the dynamic without Ellie there and so I told her in early March that these things would be addressed and that we would rework her in, now in my mind we had one week before Spring break my intention was to address that this week since we were back from Spring break if that intention was not made clear than I do apologize to everyone for not making that clear.
- **Schonfield**- Are you aware that the open meeting act requirements for all, like all arms of the SGA are a part of the code annotated and in the Constitution, as well as did the

requirement to get the advice and consent of the legislature for governments to the dean search committee as well as in the email that you received from Claire Grace?

- So open meetings I am aware, when it comes to dean search committees, I was not made aware that dean's search committees fell under that, fell under the advice and consent, but I am glad they do and so that is why I sent Kendall's name without checking going forward as a matter as you bet I am going to check with you all regarding any appointments made whether it is a dean's search committee or whatever else.
- **Martin-** Are you aware that the general body has open meetings without being told to do so?
 - Yes, but that is yes but this is yes I am aware.
- **Martin-** Knowing that the EOP can not make the EOP meetings are you going to change your EOP times?
 - That is the hope, we will have that conversation. We will have that conversation in the coming day.
- **Martin-** You have had 2 months to fix this issue, and it has not been fixed and it has been brought to your attention many many times why should we believe you now?
 - Because I am saying it now.
- **Robinson-** Having been a member of this body on specifically the rules-based committee and of the executive branch for correct me if I'm wrong but the two previous administrations, do you really think that you have an excuse to not know about the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act?
 - I know about the Oklahoma Open Meetings act. I will say, again, to my knowledge and throughout the past two years, where the Exec branch fit into open meetings act that was the faded slightly. It and I understand there was speculation on that. How it's published where is if we do that because we don't make any funding decisions when it comes like money, there was some confusion over the past couple of years and now we have you know, made it very clear that we need to abide by that. confusion the haven't I'm I do not that.
- **Robinson-** If there has been confusion in the past couple years, why have the minutes and agendas been sent out those years?
 - I do not know.
- **Kathuria-** Can you please describe to me what you mean by hope that you'll have a time for everybody in the executive cabinet to be able to actually meet? Can you describe what you mean by hope?
 - I am going to talk to them all and we will find a way to make it work.
- **Kathuria-** Do you have a specific action plan to actually make it work alongside just talking about it?
 - I can't do anything without the knowledge of their schedules and I am not going to make any decisions moving forward unilaterally so I have to be made aware of all the details before I make a decision moving forward.
- **Harris-** Do you believe it is important to consult with the members of the EOP committee before you make a decision whether to move the meeting times?
 - Yes. Yes I do.
- **Bento-** Just for clarification on Charge C we saw the email earlier obviously you replied to the Chief Justice would you say that you have come up with a mediating plan of action for

the future on nominating people to the deans search committee or have you discussed a way that you could do this?

- Yes that is sort of what I mentioned earlier about that phone call I had with Claire Grace about the application process. I have not heard anything on that matter or that process since we texted about that on the first week of March and she notified me that she sent to Maddie Taylor but I am very into establishing that process?
- **Bento-** So you are saying that you are just waiting on a response right now, but you have taken action?
 - Yes.
- **Vedra-** Are you aware of any personal bias towards any members of your office?
 - I don't have any bias toward any members and I don't know if any members have any bias towards anyone else I don't to my knowledge no EOP secretary has complained has made a complaint towards me they haven't at least made any feelings aware to me.
- **Oler-** Do you believe that you are primarily responsible for being informed about the responsibilities of your role and for seeking feedback about your performance?
 - Yes I, yes I am responsible for you know how I conduct myself we all are and I do want feedback for my performance. I think that can be handled in conversations about my performance.
- **Oler-** Did you ever seek feedback about your performance throughout your time in office?
 - I have never said give me feedback, but I consider myself a very open and understanding person and if someone has something to say to me I would hope that they would say it to me.
- **Oler-** Since you are the President of SGA do you believe that you are ultimately responsible for ensuring members of your EOP, ensuring that they are following the responsibilities for their positions and taking action to ensure that those members are either supported or replaced?
 - Yes. I hope to support people through discovering issues, but yes, but there is also some self-discovery so yes yes.
- **Robinson-** What was the exact date if you can recall that you appointed Ms. Coppinger to the Dean search committee?
 - I believe it was Wednesday February 26th because that is the same day I got the email.
- **Robinson-** So having received an email from Chief Justice Grace on February 17th about 9 days before you made this appointment where she ends the paragraph saying we are also concerned about these roles not having the advice and consent of the legislative branch how do you answer for that specific line in the email as well as saying I was not aware that they need advice and consent?
 - I knew there were concerns that the court wanted to address, but I didn't know that there was a process into how to how for me to address them I also wanted to ensure that the Provost's office and Board of Regents had a good name to be on the committee in a speedy fashion as the name was due at 9am the next day.
- **Vedra-** Several times tonight you've declared that you wish to make changes in the future to address these concerns what role does the threat of impeachment play in you making these declarations?
 - Zilch like I have stated before I was elected to do to serve and these problems have been brought before me now the manner, whatever, but I now know of them. And

so whatever happens tonight again I am showing up to work tomorrow and having meetings already scheduled I am going to make meetings. I am going to listen and I'm going to understand better and consult people on how to move forward. Whether it is just for whatever.

- **Duncan-** Although this list of charges may not be brought to you, well in advance, I feel like we've been hearing multiple times from multiple people that there has been multiple discussions and meetings with you regarding behavior and issues that are on this resolution, and maybe just one of them were brought up to you, but I feel like we've been hearing from a lot of people that these have been brought up to you separately. So have you been trying to address those, I feel like I have only been hearing that you haven't been made aware but multiple other people have been saying that they made you aware, there has a meetings to bring you aware to these issues multiple weeks ago?
 - I have been made aware of the three that I mentioned earlier, not the others until this Wednesday, last Wednesday.
- **Fisher-** You mentioned earlier that of all the charges, Charge E would apply more, you feel that you should be charged with, with that do you feel like there is any way that that could be put towards anyone that could have maybe led to your situation as of now?
 - I am not blaming, I am not passing blame. That is not a game I want to get into but I do respect you asking me that question.
- **Schonfield-** Which charges are you claiming of the 3 you have claimed that you have been told about. Which did you hear about already and which did you not hear about?
 - Not the charges but the complaints I am more referring to the whereas clauses about the Oklahoma open meetings, about the I said it earlier reworking Ellie into the EOP and addressing Congress as stated in the code annotated. The others were not.
- **Schonfield-** So as far as the charges go on here the 5 charges were you aware of all these issues prior to the week before Spring break as have been discussed?
 - Kind of, not in such a formal, I will say there is sort of a swoosh. Some of the charges incorporate other parts that aren't, I have been made aware about complaints against me that is my answer.
- **Vedra-** Can you go over what you originally ran on in your campaign for Presidency?
 - The REAL platform, yes, relationships with you, embracing the SEC and Arts, aiming for a stronger regional community, and looking towards the future.
- **Kathuria-** Do you believe throughout your Presidency have been able to follow through with the R part of your platform now that you are having to come up and speak before the body?
 - Well, yes, I you say come and speak before the body, that makes it sounds like I'm forced to no I get to it. But well relationships with you goes beyond SGA. It incorporates University leadership, it means the Board of Regents, it means the Deans, it means the people that talk about the strategic plan, the people that are in charge of housing. We, Avery and I have been having these meetings. Members of our staff have, you know, been asking to have these meetings. And we're sending an olive branch and saying, hey, SGA is here and learning what this college is doing. How are you helping your students in your part of campus? That's, I think we're making relationships with people that make the decisions and the students across campus.
- **Martin-** Do you have any due process concerns?
 - Nothing is coming to mind at the moment in regard to where we are now.

- **Martin-** So that is a no?
 - Yes sure.

On a motion to recess for 5 minutes Oler seconded by Hallum

Debate

- **Kathuria-** To my fellow friends, to my public constituents who have come tonight, thank you so much for being here you are practicing important civic engagement. But now I think it's time for me to address, you know, a hard thing. I will be voting in favor of all five impeachment charges. It is not acceptable for the student body president to be continuously saying, using remarks, which are completely inappropriate and unacceptable. Everybody at this campus and at this university is amazing and unique in their own way. Nobody should ever be degraded whatsoever. Additionally, it is important to realize that the president was warned multiple times, and that and unfortunately, that was not happening. Additionally, you cannot just go out there and appoint people without the consent of Congress.
- **Bento-** On charge C on the opponency side, I have serious concerns on this legislation regarding whereas clause number six, which quoted the email from Chief Justice Grace that was put it into the whereas clause. I have issues with how the author claimed that it was copied and pasted, meaning they most likely had access to it and yet omitted the entire last section of the email. I feel like that causes a big transparency issue on that certain charge and things are being omitted. And I don't want to say that it is on purpose. There could have been it could have been accidental. They might have just thought it's not relevant, but in my opinion, I believe it is relevant to what we're discussing tonight.
- **Robinson-** Yeah, so with regard to Charge C regardless of what the rest the email says, the first paragraph is clear. There are concerns from the judicial branch, and there is precedent including the fact that there has to be advice and consent. This is not the Chief Justice coming up and saying, this is something we should look at starting to do. This is something that I want to add. This is the Chief Justice saying, there is precedent, it is clear, you are not following the precedent. Would you like to sit down and meet with me to see if there's something we can do for you to start following this? There's already precedent. Monlux v. the SGA I brought it up. It was in 2017. It's accessible on the SGA website, I recommend you all go look at it. This resolution is not lowering the bar on impeachment. The president did that himself. We were refusing to let it stay there by taking this action. We have seen this all, we have heard from multiple people. Charge C I don't see that concern at all.
- **Mirza-** The particular charge that I have issue with is Charge A. I do not see the invalidated feelings of any individual and the work environment may have indeed been hostile, but the three whereas clauses included in this piece of legislation, include two comments directed at one individual though undoubtedly in bad judgment, and calling old cabinet systems ineffective, I do not believe these comments alone are sufficient grounds for a hostile work environment let alone impeachment.
- **Wintory-** Not necessarily proponenty. however, I'd like to reemphasize that this is not a trial. This is not a sentencing. This is a question of whether the actions listed in these clauses are impeachable and that these violations are impeachable. So every question is valid. However, people asking about whether in the future, he fixed these or things like that, that's not the subject of this impeachment bill. Those questions are left to the Graduate Student Senate who will ask them, who will ask what happens after our job, which we need to focus on, the exact job at hand is whether what he has done is impeachable or not, disregarding any outside factors of what will happen in the future.

- **Kate De Mahy**- Kind of going off of what he just said but on the opposing side, speaking for all five charges, hearing it. I have been in SGA, but on the outside now there is no physical or written evidence. Everything is being said as he said, she said, and if there really was a problem with some of what doesn't seem to be like written in the, like given to certain codes of conduct that should have been put in place in this bill if they if they weren't going to, like actually impeach.
- **Morgan**- As was mentioned earlier, it is not this body's job to determine guilt whether these charges happened or not. It is our job to determine if it is possible that these happened and then move forward to the Graduate Student Senate, with that being said on both charges B and C it is absolutely plausible as it has been admitted by the President that he was unaware of the open meetings Act and was violated, and that he was unaware of the cause of the SGA code annotated that stated that, the legislative branch would have to be consulted when appointing someone to a committee. And so it is not this body's job to determine the guilt of that, but simply to say that it is possible that these happened and refer to her colleagues in the Graduate Student Senate.
- **Bento**- I completely understand the fact that these charges will be tried in GSS. However, we're choosing which charges we're going to move forward, and we're doing that based off of the whereas clauses, which you can call it evidence, you can call it something else, but we're still being provided context for these charges, and we have every reasonable ability to question the legitimacy or decide whether these, the things that have been presented are worth moving forward.
- **Iglehart**- So I would like to note that if this bill, if any charges were to move forward the Graduate Student Senate as part of their trial would handle questions of what should count as evidence when considering whether he should be removed from office and that witnesses may be called in GSS to attest to the legitimacy or lack thereof of whatever charges may or may not be wrong.
- **Harris**- I'd like to talk specifically about the first charge section A, one of the most challenging parts of leadership is that it comes with both personality and responsibility. I've read this book closely, and while there are serious concerns raised, particularly regarding the communication, tone, and the industry of culture, much of it appears to be reflected of frustration with leadership style rather than codified violation of duty for example, while this current language of unkind remarks may be problematic, they not always violations of SGA law. We must be careful not to inflate the problems with impeachable offenses. We should absolutely demand accountability from our leaders, but impeachment is a legal process, not a means to address issues, or not a means to address personal issues. If our issues come, let's address it. If our concern is communication, let's strengthen our norms. But if we move forward with the call for removal, we must make sure that we stands up to standards under the law under our code and under our Constitution.
- **Chief of Staff Wolthuis**- I completely understand those concerns and I want everyone in this body to understand that I would have not put my name on this bill if this was a personal vendetta. I have been a member of student Congress for years now, or not just Congress SGA for years now. And there are issues, people have tensions in the body and you see speak out you express these issues. The reason why I added my name to this bill is because these issues have been brought up on numerous occasions, tone, decorum, just comments that are not appropriate whatsoever in the workplace and should not be made to another human being, whether they work for you, they are equal, or they are above you. Those comments should never be made. And I want you to know that this was my last resort to put

my name on this bill, because I came this role really loving it and loving those that I was going to work for.

- **Ogle-** So when it comes to point B I find it a little odd when we mentioned the meeting minutes and previous discussions saying that the president himself in the Code Annotated has a sole responsible for the meeting minutes being out there. Why are we solely judging him alone? Why not all the big on Exec? Why not all of Executive Cabinet as a whole? I don't think we can solely hold him accountable for the minutes, when it comes to entire executive cabinet when they all have the ability, especially the top three of executive cabinet.
- **Gruenstein-** On point A creating a hostile work environment the President might not have gone against a certain SGA protocol but as I am aware it is against just work environment state and federal it is protected against being in a hostile work environment so in my opinion and from what I am aware in state and federal law you are protected against those so just because it is not against the SGA Bylaws doesn't mean it doesn't go against those Bylaws
- **Finley-** Since we are voting on each charge separately, I want to say that I can see that A and E are the only ones from what I have read, what I have heard, what I have seen that I would legitimately vote on. b, c, and d based on just like not even just the central vibes of what I am seeing I wouldn't say those are the ones I'm saying yes he should be held accountable for I think a and e are the only ones I would see. I do think that we should hold people accountable for their actions and stuff but A and E are the only ones I am seeing.
- **Kathuria-** Okay, I want to go ahead and talk about part of Charge D in particular. If you are the student body president, you have the obligation to be going to the Congress. Yes, Kendall Coppinger is a very qualified individual to be serving on the Price committee. Like, I like Kendall. I have a great I have a great oh, whoops, or I really like that person, but you know at the same time it's just not it's not acceptable for the student body President. to be skipping, you know, talking to the Congress Chair. you know, the student body President has been told, hey come to the Congress meetings and the Student body president should have been informed the Congress Chair when OU Day was, when Higher Ed day was going to be rescheduled. That's what we need. We need cohesion with the executive branch and Congress, not the executive branch hibernating from everybody.
- **Kate De Mahy-** Kind of bouncing off that the past three years of Congress meetings, I can't remember a time when I was there where an SGA president was at least at one a month. So if we're not going to hold past Presidents accountable for those actions, why are we just doing it now?
- **Schonfield-** As far as, something that was mentioned earlier was that the President shouldn't be the only one held accountable for a number of the missteps that are listed here. As with real life government, he Buck stops with the President, he's the head of the executive branch, and even during questions he admitted himself, that he is responsible for any failure to act at all that the executive branch takes. As far as why we might hold Carter accountable for coming to legislative branch activities and not prior Presidents or previous Presidents I think it's important to note that this is something that was brought to the President's attention as a duty of his and something that he still failed to schedule or attempt to do even after finding this was listed as a requirement for him.
- **Harris-** I would quickly like to say that I have an immense amount of respect for the Chief of Staff I think it is incredibly ballsy to come up here and put yourself on the line like that, and honestly I am struggling with it a bit but what I am harkening back to is I am only looking at the legislation. It is hard for me because I do have an immense amount of respect

for you, but solely from what I have read off of the legislation in my I would not be able to vote yes on any of these charges.

- **Robinson-** I don't totally understand this idea of I'm basing it solely off of what's on the legislation. If we are only basing it off of what we see on the legislations, what was the point of us sitting here for three almost four hours asking questions? We have asked questions to round out our understanding of what was in the legislation, to round out what may have been excluded, but to ask questions and say, could you elaborate on this, could you elaborate on this? Those that have been cited in the legislation, such as the Chief of Staff, what were your experiences with this, the impeachable officer, the President himself, we have asked him his thoughts on this, the purpose is not to vote solely on the legislation, otherwise we would not have just spent four hours asking questions. I ask that you take into account everything that you just heard from those who have been cited in the legislation from the author and from the President himself when making your decision, not just what's written here.
- **Carter-** I would just like to say I think when we are talking about basing it off of the legislation its not just this bill it is with the Code Annotated and the Bylaws say about the President's duty within Congress and the Student Government Association. For examples for Charge C, Title 3 Chapter 2 says the SGA President shall have the sole power to appoint personal to these positions just because a former Presidential administration did it a different way and maybe a better way, it doesn't mean that they are not fulfilling their duties.
- **Martin-** So I am having a very hard understanding the reasoning why people are voting against these five charges. I will be voting for these 5 charges. The President has come up here when he gave his explanation, and he has admitted that he has done all 5 of these charges to me that is enough to be impeachable that is our only job as Congress we are not here convict. That is not our job. It is very clear to me that these 5 charges based off of the President's answer to questions and the presentation of this resolution that these 5 charges should be voted, yes upon to me it is very very clear. I do not see why we are questioning this and we are setting a very bad precedent if we vote no to these 5 charges.
- **Bento-** When it comes to setting precedent I will say that I honestly have a different view on this I think that this sets the precedent that mistakes and we call some of the charges aren't true and mistakes the President has made but I think we are setting the precedent that these mistakes need to be acted upon in this big public way in this very Congress focused way and in a way that I don't think is conducive to actually solving any of these issues. And while I do agree that accountability is extremely important there were other steps that could have been taken before impeachment which I consider to be a pretty nuclear option.
- **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** I just want say, I completely understand that this is a very big, severe thing to go to. I completely understand. I completely understand that for a lot of people who have not been in these back door conversations, have not worked very closely with the current President. It might seem all of a sudden, and you might not understand where these are coming from. Once again, I want to say that I jumped on the bill as a last resort because these conversations have been had. every single charge to my knowledge has been brought forward to the current President, and he has been warned. And as I mentioned, hostile work environment for example, they were conversations dating all the way back to last summer when this was happening and repeated conversations about this environment that we are subject to. So I understand it seems like a huge step and a lot of you might feel very blindsided by these charges before you today, and I do apologize for that

because that's not a good feeling to be in. But I want you to know that these this is not our first resort. We are not jumping to this, this is it.

- **Fisher-** I speak on this in a place of in spirit I believe that there is guilt in these charges but in context of this bill in general and setting precedents, something to keep in mind I think is making sure we have a whole picture of it. It is very, like the fact that and you can correct me if I am wrong but the fact that the details of the whereas clause 23 that your lighthearted remark was omitted knowingly, even and I can understand while the point of being maybe mis construed is possible problem. I think leaving it out of there could also lead to misconstruing of the comment in general so keeping that in mind I think making sure that all parts in general are keeping in there.
- **Hawley-** I just want to like, in regards to Charge C, I just want to call back to our meeting where we in late January, early February, where we did put the cabinet in. One of our main concerns as a body was that there freshman being made on the cabin, and I am not trying to make a statement that anyone in this room that is a freshman does not have a lot to do. There are plenty of freshman in this room who out do me every time they are in this room, okay? But I find it hard to believe that our concerns about if a freshman was qualified to do a job that takes experience, were completely disregarded in the actions that were taken where Charge C has been handled. I think that our beliefs in this body were disregarded in that sense.
- **Bento-** First to address the Chief of Staff's comments I totally agree, and I thank you for talking about this. I think it's very important. However, my issue stems on transparency to the body as a whole, once again, then while there have comments talking about, well, why do we sit here and ask questions for an hour and a half? We're asking questions about what is in the legislation. We're not asking questions about situations that could have happened here and there and when. We're asking about what is in the legislation and if what is in the legislation is not detailed enough, not transparent enough, that the body is not getting a full picture, then I feel like there's a fundamental problem with the legislation.
- **Evans-** I'm going to talk about specifically Charge B failure to act in accordance with the Oklahoma open meetings Act is actually illegal. That's a state law and you can't do that, and Mr. President he has admitted to that and at the end of the day, the President is the commander in chief and the responsibility falls on him., even if he didn't know it was his role, his job, but that's illegal, and we could have gone to the real government and, like, made an issue of that, and we're here talking about impeachment which is a way less, way lower rung, so let's think about that, when we're specifically that charge but also all these charges.
- **Bento-** I will admit to the body. I have broken the law before I have made mistakes on releasing my agenda in accordance with the Oklahoma Open meetings Act. In fact, there is a lot of people in this room that have made these mistakes, and it has been a reoccurring issue for a few people. Now, I think that the charge is completely valid in my personal opinion. However, we're not holding people to the same standard when considering we went over in questions about how there was one instance where the President was notified and we confirmed that was the SGA advisor and if I was given a warning and I got to fix it, which has happened in the past, that means that I should be impeached.
- **Aslam-** Just regarding the open meetings act, I do think that the President of the student government should be held to a higher standard than just committee chairs, and it is worth mentioning that it was not just a one-time thing, it was a reoccurring issue and this is a paid position. We pay money to the university, to pay the President, and I don't think our money should be going to someone who cannot abide by these rules. I think that the standards for

that SGA president should be considerably higher than committee chairs, or for really anyone else, because this is the highest position.

- **Bento-** The law does not discriminate on whether you're a committee chair, SGA president, whether you're any part of this branch. The law does not discriminate, you break the law you broke the law and I do understand that we are holding these people to a higher standard, because it's the SGS President, which is totally understandable. But once again, I think that the main issue is that there is not enough time to rectify this issue, considering it was brought up from what I understand, in early March, and that gives about like, what, a week and a half and then spring break, and there was no meetings during spring break as far as I am aware.. It just doesn't really make logical sense and while we should hold people accountable once again, the law does not discriminate on that.
- **Duncan-** I don't think the main reason that we should not have Charge B is just because multiple people made this mistake. It's still against the law, and it still goes against our bylaws, so I don't think that just because of multiple meetings to say that we should just be like, oh, multiple people, we should just disregard it. It's still a problem and it's still should be addressed and just because someone else made a mistake people have said it happened multiple times and multiple issues and when people say mistakes happen, yes, mistakes are possible, you've heard from multiple people it's not just one charge up here. There's five different charges, five different problems, and people have said multiple times that these issues have been addressed multiple times. And if these mistakes kept on happening and they weren't addressed, that not just one mistake happening and it has not been addressed. And there's five different charges, so I feel that cannot just be forgiven.
- **Richardson-** Hello I understand that the President is in the hot seat with us and potentially legally in the spirit of the 5th amendment should we go with pursuing these charges against him, with the government officials and people in the state courts.
- **Granato-** Talking about Charge B, on the open meetings act, how the president could have kept making the mistakes over and over again. I'm just reiterating the President was a number of Congressional administration committee who understands how open meetings function. I am a first semester associate and very much understand how open meetings act work as being a member of the congressional administration. And the president before was part of the cabinet for the previous administration, so I think there should be a little more understanding on the open meetings Act in that sense. And, you know, reading the Code Annotated and bylaws is probably something everyone's done here and understands the open meetings act.
- **Lapp-** I think it's pretty typical when you first start a job that you can meet some pretty embarrassing mistakes. I know I have my fair share at work, and I understand that this is an issue that goes beyond the scope of jamming the paper, but I think that often times mistakes can help improve, and I think that if we set this precedent for being so harsh for the mistake like this, it could cause issues in terms of he could definitely grow through this and I think it's just not impeachable.
- **Mirza-** While I do believe that Charge A meets sufficient criteria or sorry does not meet sufficient criteria preceding in this piece of legislation, the other four charges, as the previous representatives stated these charges, sorry I am blanking is too late. Oh, my goodness circle back to me.
- **Harris-** Members of Congress, let's not lose sight what this resolution truly represents. It is not just any piece of legislations. It is the first impeachment resolution of its time that this Congress has ever seen. With that comes enormous gravity, not only for the individual

name, but for the institution of Congress itself. We are not just responding to one administration or one leader. We are setting a precedent for how this body will treat executive oversight conflict in leadership disagreements for years to come. That means we must approach this moment with extraordinary caution and ensure that every point is grounded in codified law, are clearly established responsibility, not just interpretation or expectations. This is not about whether someone made a mistake. It is about whether their actions in totality amount to a willful violation of duty so significant that the current offices. This is an incredibly high bar and we must be sure we are meeting it fairly, honestly, and with care.

- **Granato-** Going on to you know, Charges A and D, I can understand that those can be more personal charges. More B through D is just a direct violation of like your direct of his direct procedure as president on what to do, but also, again, making the same mistakes over and over again when understanding the mistakes, is it at that point a mistake? Because you are making you are doing the same thing over and over again? So you have to at some point have understood, there should have been a change at some point, or knowing the bylaws and how to the Code annotated works, but as making the mistake over and over again, just like, you know, failure to comply just with the Bylaws or just generally not understanding.
- **Ivester-** So, I think we should all think about what's going to happen after this and what the ultimate goal of this meeting is. Ultimately, we want to solve these issues. Make sure they don't happen again. So, we vote Carter out, we lose a passionate member of SGA and get someone in. We vote no on this, everything he does moving forward is out the open for everyone to see. He won't be able to get away with anything else and the issue will be solved. And if anything else does happen, we'll all know, it won't be able to slip past anybody. I think you should all take a second with this.
- **Morgan-** As you just said, we're not arguing for guilt as was mentioned earlier about the law does not discriminate, it certainly does not. But the fact of the matter here is we're not charging the president with a crime currently. We are upholding him to the standards of organization, he is the leader of. And I don't think that we can say that just because someone else has also violated whatever bylaws these happen to be that it should be a way for him to get out of these impeachment charges.
- **Bento-** It is correct that we are not removing the president tonight. However, we are looking at charges that we believe would be suitable to go to trial for his removal. So, even if we are not directly removing him, we are making a decision on whether we believe these charges could be seen in court as removal or GSS in this instance.
- **Robinson-** There's been a lot of talk about precedent, but if I recall correctly that this is the exact same body that unanimously removed our now former Vice Chair with no precedent, little to no precedent to do so. There's a lot of focus on precedent tonight, and this was done to our former vice chair with far less than we have before us today. The accusations before us today violate actual state law, not just our Code Annotated, which we also have to today. The violations that we saw with the vice chair alone were just within our Bylaws, not state law. Today we have both I urge you to consider that we have set precedent before unanimously, even those of you that are concerned about precedent, you voted to change that precedent. So I ask that you consider that when we vote on this today. It is okay to set precedent sometimes and we have all acknowledged that previously in this session.
- **Bento-** While it is true that what we did have an unprecedented moment in the past regarding the ex-vice chair of the body. I just suppose I want to ask the questions to the body, are we happy with that precedent that we set? This new precedent that we set. Do we

feel comfortable with the fact that we, hurt another genuine person on the other side? And I know that in Congress its not about our feelings. But I just believe that when we're setting the precedent for an impeachment, something and also, yes, what I want to say is yes he was voted in by the student body and the precedent when related to removing the vice chair, which is Congress chosen makes a lot more sense for Congress to make that decision, then Congress making this larger decision on behalf...

- **Aslam-** I think worth mentioning that for those of us who will be voting we are representatives, and we do represent the general student body, all of us were elected by the general body, and I understand that our president was elected by the student body, but we are also representing that same group of people. So, to vote one way or another to remove someone that the student body put it in, is not contradictory in any way, since we do represent the student body itself. It's basically the same group of people that, put in the president is essentially voting today on whether or not we can remove based on any of these charges.
- **Harris-** My issue around specifically just the point of us not following the will of the students is what the impeachment guidelines are after, let's say, he was impeached, and a trial goes on, let's go. We're going to be replacing him with a lot of appointed positions. There's a huge difference between being elected and being appointed. The people elected the president. We would be taking away the people's rights to appoint people to this. That's all.

On a motion to move to the previous question Schonfield seconded by Vedra

Objection Kathuria seconded by Hawley

Objection fails Debate has ended

On a motion to recess for 5 minutes Schonfield seconded by Hallum

On an amendatory motion to recess for 10 minutes Kathuria seconded by Cody Walker

Authors summation:

Good evening or I say good night at this point. I want to stick with all the charges and I'll explain why. One, this is about a accountability as associate Evans said, he is the commander in chief of the student government association. His failures to take accountability, set a precedent for us all. If we're not willing to hold him accountable, than are we willing to be able to hold any us accountable as it was said in debate, we did a similar thing with the previous Vice Chair. That decision sticks with me every single day. I played a part in that vote, and every time I walk into the office, every time I receive email I'm thinking about the things I need be doing. So, this is the set of precedents where every single SGA president for the whole entire future, if we say no to any of these charges, we were saying that they can get away with that. It's not our job to go and outline every piece of evidence, that is what GSS is going to look for, because they're actually going to be the one on that charges him. This is just going to be the hearing to see if these charges are actually worthwhile. One, he absolutely admitted guilt during his time of questions, he literally said that he could see these charges and see how they are applicable to him. And so, if you're saying, no, they're not applicable to him, then you're going against his own word, as well too, saying that previous presidents didn't do something isn't an excuse. Things change. If you want to go based off of history? I mean, just look at the history of Oklahoma in general, look at the history of our institution, and how things change. Basing present basing the future off of the past is a gross thing to do so don't ever sit there and say previous Presidents can do this, so it's unacceptable for us to hold someone accountable now and if you say that, then I'm sorry, and that's kind of ridiculous, in my point of view. As well too saying that other people failed to set of agendas is also not okay to say because those people were committee chairs. Committee chairs are an unpaid position that they do on their duty. They were not elected by the student body, they did not go over, the people who decided to say that they would

get committee chair is one during their interview and us in this student body. So, whenever people do not have open meetings especially whenever they are in a position, that is a failure on their part, that's their responsibility, they knew what their job was especially whenever they have sat here in Congress the whole entire time they've been here. I've been in Congress just as long as he has, and I we have to set out an agenda. I knew whenever I was a committee chair that it was part of my job to do. I would do it if I was the chair myself, I would know that's the thing to do, and if I were to be held accountable based off not doing something, then that's my fault, I think. But whenever you can look at your job description online essentially, and you're failing to do that, that's on him on nobody else. His hindering of other people doing their job is a completely makes student government especially the executive branch dysfunctional. So that is why I want to stick with these charges because each and every one of them is important.

Impeachable Officer's Summation:

Good evening, everyone. Since starting in SGA, my first semester, I have made the effort to handle every situation brought to my attention with compassion. Everything I have worked on was done because I care and am interested in helping students and certainly not with any form of malice. A Wednesday evening, I was emailed with the resolution condemning and defaming me that supported by people I still consider friendly colleagues. The past seven days of my life have happened with warp speed and every emotion and reflection has taken over me. When I left my office, the Friday before spring break, it was my impression that we had looked when we returned, the three problems that were brought to my attention by sponsors of the impeachment would be addressed head on. Starting with yesterday's EOP meeting, and we still plan to rework the current meeting schedule to accommodate everyone's schedules when we are thinking about the EOP. And as I agreed to an early March, I'm still planning to the discuss with the Congress chair about regular addresses to the legislature. Most impactful shocks were that this is the way to address concerns with me and not to have conversations. My door is always open, and I have always considered my office as a safe space. I've always been known as a kind, approachable person. I'm unsure as to why these complaints were not brought to me. Most significantly, besides the three points that I promised to address not any one was brought to me by any student. Impeachment processes are not a laughing matter, and I take any question of my character and abilities incredibly serious. I like to make it very clear that tonight was the first occasion that anyone has asked me questions about the charges made, or that I have been able to address these charges at all. I cannot fix what I have not been made aware was broken. As 20 something year olds elected by other college students, I would like to remind everyone here that this will have a ripple effect that will be felt throughout the larger OU community of students, faculty and staff. We cannot do a reflective job working for the students of OU if we let things fester into boiling points. It is my hope at the university's best intentions are being considered during each vote. I love the University of Oklahoma, and I know all of you do too as well. Thank you for those who have supported me tonight but thank you again for being here you all. Thank you.

Charge 1 20-10-3

Charge 2 31-0-2

Charge 3 27-6-0

Charge 4 17-16-0

Charge 5 27-5-1

Student Concerns

Items to Be Considered

On a motion to see CB-113-22 Vedra seconded by Finley

- CB-113-22 "Appointing Parking Appeals Judges Act of Spring 2025."
(Strickland/Martin/Ousley/Wolthuis)

Author's Explanation:

Martin- Hey y'all so 4 hours to get to parking appeals but yeah 4 nominees for parking appeals. Brocke, Estrella, Robert, and Vignesh. They were all great in their interviews. To clarify, we had 14 applicants, five signed up for interviews, and these 4 showed up to interviews and they all did great in their interviews. **Chief of Staff Wolthuis-** I just want to mention that I told them to be here for 8:30 severely criminally under shooting the amount of time. So I ask that we take it easy on them and kind to them because they have been here now for over three hours.

5:00 remaining for questions

- **Kathuria-** Nominees can you introduce yourselves and tell us why you want to be on parking appeals board?
 - **Graham-** My name is Brocke Graham. I am sophomore majoring in MIS. I wanted to join parking appeals to make it easier and accessible to students to learn about them appealing their parking ticket and making it more accessible for them and I also just having a way for them to get information on that. For example, I want to do like maybe tabling to get people to say hey you can appeal your ticket and we will just work through there.
 - **Quinones-** My name is Estrella Quinones. I wanted to work with the parkin appeals board because I personally do not like driving and I do not like parking and so I am just here on behalf of the students that have a difficult time with that or need help being informed about it, the rules and how the process goes because I know for a fact that if you get a parking ticket for the first time, which I haven't yet thank god but it is probably going to be scary and you're not going to know what to do.
 - **Dollins-** My name is Robert Dollins. I am a sophomore biology major with a special certificate in pre-dental and I am also a band. I wanted to join the parking appeals board because I believe that I have valuable experience as a student and I want to represent the student body and wanted to focus my efforts on helping the students and just being available as a person if someone another student came up to whenever they have an issue and really base that on the lives of students.
 - **Anand-** My name is Vignesh Anand and I am a first year law student. I want to join the parking appeals board because I think that it is really important to me that people who make mistakes when they're parking get the opportunity to learn what they did wrong and improve from that and so I think it's important that the explanation that we give them shows that we consider their point of view and that they have been heard and that they know what to do differently next time they try to park their car at OU. I think that parking is often some people's first impression with the OU campus, that's kind of the first thing they do when they get here and so we want to make sure they have a good impression of the University.
- **Kathuria-** Nominees how do you plan to being an advocate for students while also upholding the parking policies of our university especially because you don't obviously want to see students parking in disabled parking spots?
 - **Anand-** So I would answer that question by saying that I don't really see a conflict between representing student and between upholding our values. I think these two things are very closely aligned with each other because our students include students who are disabled and who need those parking spots or our student include people who have certain types of parking permits. For example people who have commuter permits need their parking spaces set out for them and if other people park in that commuter space than that violates the rules is harming some student body and so

there really isn't a mismatch in my view between representing the student body and between fully abiding by these policies.

- **Dollins**- I want to jump on that. I think my biggest thing is just maintaining fairness for the students I think it is important to enforce rules just because if you don't have rules than what are you going to go by, but I think it's also important to be a representative of the students and recognize that people do make mistakes but also just maintain that fairness.
- **Quinones**- For me my values on being on parking appeals board and upholding the policies of OU they align because you know they are rules that we have to follow not only as people that have disabilities but as students.
- **Graham**- I share these values too because for example we don't want someone having like let's say 10 citations parking in a spot that is not for them. For example, we already know that we have limited spots, limited commuter spots, limited housing spots. So, people parking where they are supposed to be parking because those spots are put in place for those specific people, and I feel like some people don't really follow that.

33-0-0 unanimous pass

Follow-Up Reports

Announcements and Comments

- **Election Commissioner Savage**- I promise its really fast. Elections are next week. Tell all of your friends to vote. If you are running, make sure you are campaigning and stuff like that. Elections next week please vote!
- **Secretary Harris**- Full transparency the minutes will not be out tomorrow.
- **Kathuria**- The OU Women's Basketball team made their first sweet sixteen since the year 2013!

Final Roll Call

On a motion to adjourn Robinson seconded by Vedra

Adjourn- 11:46 pm

Chair: Hope Rhoads

Vice Chair: Aaron Gilson-Bond

Secretary: Chloe Harris

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CONGRESS
CONGRESSIONAL SESSION CXIII

March 25, 2025

CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTION CR-113-04

AS INTRODUCED

A Congressional Resolution requesting the impeachment
of the SGA President; and providing for distribution.

- Whereas: Title I Chapter 6 Section 3 of the Code Annotated states the SGA President must take an oath that states “to the best of [their] ability, preserve, protect, and uphold the Constitution of the Student Government Association”; and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland took this oath on January 13th, 2025, and since has not upheld his duty and obligations; and
- Whereas: Title I Chapter 5 Section 2 of the Code Annotated states “The meetings of the student government associations, organizations, and committees are subject to the mandates and requirements of the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act;” and
- Whereas: Title I Chapter 5 Section 5 of the Code Annotated states “Public bodies must give notice of all meetings;” and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland has not publicly posted Executive Cabinet meetings twenty-four (24) hours prior after multiple advisements by SGA advisors to do so; and
- Whereas: February 17th, 2025, Chief Justice Grace sent an email to President Strickland concerning transparency as follows “The Court has identified transparency concerns regarding the appointment of students to search committees, as well as the accessibility of information about who holds these roles. We are also concerned about these roles not having the advice and consent of the legislative branch. Because there is a lack of transparency in the appointment system, there is no way for students to seek recourse to amend the system. While the Court could address this issue *Sua sponte*, we would prefer not to take that approach;” and
- Whereas: *Sua sponte* refers to a court taking action on its own initiative; and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland disregarded the prior guidance on Search Committee transparency mentioned in the previous whereas clause by appointing a member of his EOP staff to a search committee without informing his Vice President or Chief of Staff; and
- Whereas: Title I Chapter 8 of the Code Annotated states “the mission of the University of Oklahoma Student Government Association is to support the University’s advancement by prioritizing student voices at every degree level;” and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland violated this mission by unilaterally appointing a member of his EOP staff to a Search Committee without actively seeking input from students across all degree levels, thereby failing to prioritize diverse student representation in the decision-making process; and

- Whereas: Carter Strickland neglected to inform the legislative branch about the rescheduling of Higher Ed Day and OU Day at the Capitol until March 3rd, leaving the branch with less than a month to prepare for OU Day on March 25th; and
- Whereas: Title III Chapter 2 Section 2c of the Code Annotated states “The SGA President shall address the Legislature and/or the House of the Legislature. Said addresses shall include, but not be limited to, a report on the official activity, policy, and agenda of the SGA President. At the time of such addresses, the SGA President shall answer questions relating to the SGA and/or the Executive Branch from members of the Legislature and any members of the SGA present... but in no case shall there be fewer than three in each of the fall and spring semesters. This duty shall not be delegated;” and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland has not addressed the legislative branches once since being inaugurated January 13th, 2025, as outlined in the previous whereas clause therefore neglecting his responsibilities to the Legislature; and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland repeatedly failed to effectively communicate and manage his responsibilities as demonstrated by his actions on March 3rd and March 4th, during which he canceled a scheduled meeting set up on February 27th with the Congressional Administration Chair due to a conflicting engagement, rescheduled the meeting for the following day, and then limited the rescheduled meeting to no more than 15 minutes, thereby neglecting his duties to engage with the legislative branch in a timely and professional manner; and
- Whereas: Carter Strickland actively opposed the establishment of a clearly defined impeachment process to the Congressional Administration Chair, thereby hindering efforts to ensure transparency, accountability, and procedural fairness within the organization; and
- Whereas: Title III Chapter 4 Section 2 of the Code Annotated states “the overseer of the EOP shall be known as the Chief of Staff;” and
- Whereas: The Chief of Staff in the Strickland-Dunlap Administration has been prevented from fulfilling this oversight responsibility, as Carter Strickland has deliberately excluded the Chief of Staff from EOP meetings, thereby obstructing the Chief of Staff’s ability to perform their designated duties outlined in the previous whereas clause; and
- Whereas: Despite agreeing to allow the Chief of Staff to schedule one-on-one meetings with cabinet members to fulfill their oversight responsibilities, Carter Strickland deliberately circumvented this arrangement by independently scheduling his own one-on-one meetings with each cabinet member. As a result, the Chief of Staff was unable to meet with any cabinet members except for the Director of Communications, who has been required to attend two separate meetings- one with the Chief of Staff and one with President Strickland-thereby undermining the Chief of Staff’s authority and inhibiting her ability to effectively perform her designated duties as outlined in the Code Annotated; and
- Whereas: On January 26th 2025, during a presentation in front of the Congressional Administration Committee regarding cabinet nominees, Carter Strickland stated, “These are new positions, all of them — we got rid of the old cabinet system last year; it was ineffective to what we actually do,” thereby dismissing and demeaning the efforts of his own Chief of Staff, his predecessors, and the work he and his Vice President contributed to the cabinet system the

previous year, creating a discouraging work environment through his disparaging remarks; and

Whereas: On February 23rd, 2025, during a conversation with Carter Strickland, the Chief of Staff made a lighthearted remark about what they might say in a meeting to a legislator. In response, Carter Strickland turned to the Chief of Staff and, with complete sincerity stated, "You would be fired. I would fire you in an instant," creating an intimidating and hostile work environment through his disproportionate and threatening response; and

Whereas: In November 2024, Carter Strickland asked the Chief of Staff if she would "jump off a cliff" for his administration and insisted repeatedly that she needed to be willing to "die for his presidency," making inappropriate and extreme demands that fostered a toxic work environment; and

Whereas: The Undergraduate Student Congress does not support the actions of Carter Strickland during his time within the Presidential Office and does not believe his behavior has been appropriate from that of an elected official.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CONGRESS:

Section 1: Title: This resolution shall be known and may be cited as the "A Resolution for the Impeachment of the SGA President."

Section 2: The Undergraduate Student Congress calls for the Impeachment charge stated to be brought to the Graduate Student Senate for an Impeachment trial as outlined in Title II Chapter 1 of the Code Annotated on the grounds that President Strickland

- A) Created a hostile workplace environment while serving as SGA President
- B) Failed to act in accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act and the SGA Code Annotated while serving as SGA President
- C) Went against the Chief Justice's advisement in electing members to search committees while serving as SGA President
- D) Neglected his duties to the Legislative Branches while serving as SGA President
- E) Hindered the duties and responsibilities of the Chief of Staff

Section 3: Copies of this resolution will be sent to:

- Graduate Student Senate
- Claire Grace, Chief Justice of the Student Government Association

Author(s): Aaron Gilson-Bond, Undergraduate Student Congress Vice Chair

Co-Sponsor(s): Ellie Wolthuis, Chief of Staff
Chloe Harris, Undergraduate Student Congress Secretary
Kyle Martin, Congressional Administration Committee Chair
Caleb Robinson, University Policy Committee Chair
Jacob Schonfield, Ways and Means Committee Chair
Syed Aslam, Campus Outreach Safety and Concerns Committee Chair

Kyle Oler, Sustainability Committee Chair
Henry Christiansen, Business Representative
Kayla Hawley, Arts and Sciences Representative
Michael Wintory, Arts and Sciences Representative
Owen Cunningham, Arts and Sciences Representative
Cody Walker, Arts and Sciences Representative
Nicole Estrada, Arts and Sciences Representative
Cade Walker, Engineering Representative
Elizabeth Duncan, Business Representative
William Beasley, University College Representative
Elias Hallum, Arts and Sciences Representative
Hayden Vedra, Earth and Energy Representative
Brianna Cisneros, Associate
Alexis Evans, Associate
Nicholas Iglehart, Associate
Coleman Morgan, Associate
Michael Granato, Associate
Thomas Richardson, Associate

Submitted on a motion by: Representative Vedra seconded by Representative Robinson
Action taken by Congress: Charge A: 20-10-3; Charge B: 31-0-2; Charge C: 27-6-0; Charge D: 17-16-0; C
Charge E: 27-5-1

Verified by Chair of Congress: _____ Date: _____

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT CONGRESS
CONGRESSIONAL SESSION CXIII
March 25, 2025

GRADUATE STUDENT SENATE
SENATE SESSION GSXX/GFXX
Month DD, YYYY

CONGRESSIONAL BILL CB-113-22
SENATE BILL GSXX-XX/GFXX-XX

AS INTRODUCED

An Act of Legislation appointing judges to the Student
Parking Appeals Board; providing for short title, providing
for codification, and providing for an effective date.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA STUDENT GOVERNMENT
ASSOCIATION:

Section 1: Title: This act shall be known and may be cited as the “Appointing Parking Appeals Judges
Act of Spring 2025.”

Section 2: Purpose: The purpose of this act shall be to name and appoint judges for the Student
Parking Appeals Board.

Section 3: In accordance with SGACA Title IV, Chapter 4, section 2, “Judges of the Student Parking
Appeals Board shall be appointed by the SGA President.
The following shall be Judges on the Parking Appeals Board:

- Robert Dollins
- Vignesh Anand
- Brocke Graham
- Estrella Quinones

Section 4: This act shall become effective when passed in accordance with the SGA Constitution.

Author(s): Carter Strickland, SGA President
Kyle Martin, Co-Chief Justice for the Parking Appeals Board
Mike Ousley, Co-Chief Justice for the Parking Appeals Board
Ellie Wolthuis, SGA Chief of Staff

Submitted on a Motion by: Representative Vedra seconded by Representative Finley

Action taken by Congress: 33-0-0 unanimous pass

Verified by Chair of Congress: _____ Date: _____

Submitted on a Motion by:

Action taken by Senate

Verified by Chair of Senate: _____ Date: _____

Approved by SGA President: _____ Date: _____

			25-Mar
Last	First	Initial	Final
Aslam	Syed	x	x
Ball	Reese	x	x
Beasley	William	x	x
Benitez Mendoza	Delia	ex	ex
Bento	Marilou	x	x
Bertotti	Hayden	x	a
Burnett	Ava	x	x
Carter	Leo	x	x
Christiansen	Henry	x	x
Cunningham	Owen	x	x
Duncan	Elizabeth	x	x
Estrada	Nicole	x	x
Fazzani	Diego	x	x
Finley	Jael	x	x
Fisher	Mecca	x	x
Hallum	Elias	x	x
Harris	Hudson	x	x
Hawley	Kayla	x	x
Higareda Castillo	Lilian	ex	x
Kathuria	Shrey	x	x
Keupen	Ben	x	x
Koneru	Aniketh	x	x
Lapp	Bridget	ex	x
Martin	Kyle	x	x
Ogle	Pierce	x	x
Oler	Kyle	x	x
Pruitt	Aydan	x	x
Richardson	Thomas	x	x
Robinson	Caleb	x	x
Schonfield	Jacob	x	x
Schroeder	Brooklyn	x	ex
Toyos	Alexandra	x	x
Vedra	Hayden	x	x
Walker	Cade	x	x
Walker	Cody	x	x
Wang	Andy	ex	ex
Wintory	Michael	x	x
PRESENT		33	33
ABSENT		0	1
EXCUSED		4	3

Last	First	Hostile work environment charge	Oklahoma Open Meetings Act Charge	Chief Justice advisement charge	Neglected duties to legislative branch charge	Hindered duties and responsibilities of Chief of Staff charge	CB-113-22	move to previous question
Aslam	Syed	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Ball	Reese	n	y	y	n	n	y	y
Beasley	William	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
Benitez Mendoza	Delia							
Bento	Marlou	n	y	n	n	n	y	n
Bertotti	Hayden							
Burnett	Ava	ab	ab	n	n	ab	y	y
Carter	Lauren	n	y	y	n	n	y	y
Christiansen	Henry	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Cunningham	Owen	y	y	y	n	y	y	n
Duncan	Elizabeth	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
Estrada	Nicole	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
Fazzani	Diego	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Finley	Jael	ab	ab	y	n	y	y	y
Fisher	Mecca	n	y	n	n	y	y	y
Halum	Elias	n	y	y	y	y	y	y
Harris	Hudson	n	y	n	n	n	y	n
Hawley	Kayla	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Higareda Castillo	Lilian	ab	y	n	n	y	y	y
Kathuria	Shrey	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Keupen	Ben	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Koneru	Aniketh	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Lapp	Bridget	n	y	y	n	n	y	y
Martin	Kyle	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Ogle	Pierce	n	y	y	n	y	y	y
Oler	Kyle	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
Pruitt	Aydan	y	y	n	n	y	y	y
Richardson	Thomas	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Robinson	Caleb	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Schonfield	Jacob	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Schroeder	Brooklyn							
Toyos	Alexandra	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
Vedra	Hayden	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Walker	Cade	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Walker	Cody	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Wang	Andy							
Wintory	Michael	y	y	y	n	y	y	n
Yes		20	31	27	17	27	33	25
No		10	0	6	16	5	0	8
Abstain		3	2	0	0	1	0	0