

SGA Judicial Meeting (Preliminary Hearing)

Date: Monday, March 18, 2024

Time: 9:00 p.m

Location: Office of Student Involvement Suite, Conference Room A

Minutes by: Hannah Hollis, hth0014@auburn.edu

Chief Justice Maurelli called the roll at 9:10 p.m.

Chief Justice Maurelli – Present

Justice Cade Allen - Present

Justice Alex Ducheim – Present

Justice Walker Hartfield – Present

Justice Matt Wilson – Present

Justice/Clerk Lucy Allen – Present

Justice Sam Jones – Present

Chief Justice Maurelli: Alright, everyone, I just wanted to thank you all for being here tonight so late on such short notice. We appreciate you all. We are here today to discuss a case that Jake Yohn has presented to us.

Justice Hartfield: He is a senator, I am assuming?

Chief Justice Maurelli: Yes. He is saying that the current VP of Outreach did not include his goals whenever he was elected, and you will see this on the SGA goal sheet. His name is George Turner. When he delivered his goals, they were for the VP of Initiative, which is what he initially was trying to be. During his interview process, the people interviewing him thought that he would be a better fit for Outreach, but he never updated his current goal sheet for that. Rather, he had the same goal sheet for Initiatives. During the Senate meeting, Jake Yohn pointed this out and because George could not be there, he was not able to verbally give his goals which would have been acceptable. The only people that were there to somewhat help George out were Will and Cara that were present. They tried their best to give an explanation for his goals and what he wanted to do with his position, but obviously because they are not George, they could not give as many details as he may have wanted. I want to turn everyone's attention to the minutes from that meeting, so we can be on the same page of what was actually said. It starts out by saying, Senator Yohn is concerned because there is no clear goals set in stone on Turner's part. VP Herring and Treasurer Goodner who were there to talk about it. Just Treasurer Goodner and VP Herring there to speak on George's behalf. They do not have much to add because they read the same goal sheet that we have. Does anyone have questions or anything to add? Now that we have all of the facts, let's look at the response to the alleged violation. There are a few claims on this

and that is what we will be going over tonight. Everyone looks at Claim 1: **The Code of laws violation occurred in regards to George Turner's nomination. The code stipulates that each nominee must have a list of objectives for their proposed position. George Turner's goal sheet was attached for EVP of Initiatives however he was nominated for EVP of Outreach.** Essentially, as said earlier, his goal sheet did not match what he applied for. But, in response to claim one, under that bolded portion it states that the document is categorized by branches that have traditionally fallen under the initiatives branch of executive cabinet. However, the Code of Laws does not explicitly state that those goals and objectives must stay under initiatives. In my opinion, this claim of goals attached were irrelevant to outreach, I must disagree with that. It states it is not in concrete it is only for initiatives. It can be gray area towards outreach as well. Does anyone have anything to add to that?

Justice Jones: I would add that Initiatives are nowhere on the goal sheet.

Chief Justice Maurelli: That is true.

Justice Walker: SGA goal sheet. That could mean anything.

Chief Justice Maurelli: That is something that Senator Yohn brought up as well. Initiatives nor outreach were explicitly stated, but it was a more generalized goal sheet.

Justice Walker: What about the other candidates? What did their goal sheets look like? Did they not specify? Or was this the only one that did not specify?

Chief Justice Maurelli: I wish I had the other ones, but this is the only one we must go off. I agree with both of you in saying that it neither states initiative nor outreach, but just a generic goal sheet. This is why I think there is so much misinterpretation and gray area between where initiatives stop, and outreach starts because it is not stated. We will think more on that, but let's move onto Claim 2. Claim 2 states that: **Turner was not present nor President Jack Hilton to discuss his qualifications.** It does not state in the code of laws that they must be there. Obviously, in my opinion, if you are being interviewed for a position you should be there to present your qualifications for yourself, but that is just my opinion. Turner was not present nor was President Hilton. That left Treasurer and VP to essentially to do their best with what was given. What do we think about that?

Justice Ducheim: I think this is pretty easy. It says in the Code of Laws that the executive cabinet may be considered by the student senate without the nominee's attendance.

Chief Justice Maurelli: I agree there. Especially since it is explicitly stated there. Does everyone agree with that?

All Justices nod.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Let's jump back to claim one. What do we think about the goal sheet, y'all? Do we think his goals were too ambiguous or not clear on whether it was for outreach or initiatives? Or do we think that it was enough.

Justice Walker: It walks both lines.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Yeah.

Justice Jones: If he was able to make the claim it was Initiatives goal sheet you could make an equal claim that it was okay.

Justice Allen: I do not know how fine the line is split here, but the only thing that would be a problem would be if he was elected to outreach and originally applied for outreach and had these same exact goals, or if he was elected to Initiatives and had these same goals of he would be able to do with that.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Another point I am struggling with is that Turner said he verbally gave his goals in his interview. We do not have minutes from that interview because that is not something that they do, but he did say he gave his goals verbally and essentially did not restate them or write them on paper. This left VP and treasurer to talk about it during the actual hearing.

Justice Walker: Were the VP and Treasurer in his interview?

Chief Justice Maurelli: Yes.

Justice Walker: Okay, so they vouched for him.

Chief Justice Maurelli: They vouched for him but did not restate the goals. I am still stuck on that one. I can see it on both sides on how it is kind of ambiguous about the goal sheet. But also, the goals submitted are usually under the initiatives branch, but do not have to be.

Justice Sam: When you look at athletics it says 'reach out', moving down, 320 crosswalk, student parking.

Justice Walker: Blue lights. I mean it can go either way for either initiatives or outreach as far as my understanding of it.

Chief Justice Maurelli: I agree with you there.

Justice Duchheim: The big question is should you be required to specify whether you were talking about initiatives or outreach.

Chief Justice Maurelli: That is a very big question.

Justice Walker: I think the Senate needs to clarify that. They need to clarify code of laws. Justice Duchheim: I do not think it is more on Turner in this case, but on the senate.

Justice Walker: Yeah, the senate needs to clarify the code of laws if this is an issue for them.

Chief Justice Maurelli: I can see an amendment being made that goals need to be specifically stated. Goals of Outreach. Goals of Initiatives. I could see that happening. There is too much gray area here between initiatives and outreach to know clearly which he is listing these goals for. Some of these goals look like initiatives and some look like outreach. According to the code of laws they could be under either.

Justice Jones: That would take a huge constitutional process.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Yes, that would be a large process.

Justice Jones: That does not make sense to have the senate change that.

Chief Justice Maurelli: I would have to see a past goal sheet because I do not have anything to compare it to. Walker made a good point. Still looking at this one by itself, I see some points for outreach and some for initiatives. It is just not clear.

Justice Hartfield: What speaks to me, I mean the senate voted 25-2 to confirm him. The senate clearly thought it was not an issue in the debate and voted almost unanimously to approve him for Outreach instead of Initiatives. I do not see the substance there to go and have a hearing and back that up after the senate has made a decision. They had it all in front of them and in the email.

Justice Wilson: Claim one has no merit unless we have another goal sheet because of how gray it is unless we were able to see another SGA goal sheet. I think that would bring up a new problem.

Chief Justice Maurelli: I agree with you there. Does everyone else have any discussion on claim one?

Justice Hartfield: The executive team of SGA think that he is a good fit for outreach. The senate voted 25-2 for VP of Outreach, so I do not think us as a court should go against that. I mean I do not see a clear code of laws against it.

Chief Justice Maurelli: I read something on one of these sheets that essentially during the interview that Turner had, he was interviewing for initiatives, and they got to talking. They realized he was more aligned with outreach. He then agreed and was nominated and elected to outreach.

Justice Ducheim: Senate looked at these goals and approved of them. How much is going to change if he specifies it to outreach? Probably not that much. And the senate will probably have the same decision.

Justice Hartfield: Senate heard all of this and still voted 25-2. Their opinion was that it did not matter evidently.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Is there any more discussion on claim one?

No further discussion.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Let's move onto claim 3. "*Senate was not presented with any objectives whatsoever for his PROPOSED position.*" / "*When asked about George Turner's outreach experience, neither Herring or Goodner could point to anything on Turner's resume that suggested he had any. They also refused to discuss any goals he had for the position and told Senate he gave them verbally in his interview. I've attached minutes from the meeting because Eagle Eye TV was not present to live stream.*" Put a pin in that and I want everyone to move over to his resume. We can go line for line in this one. Start back from the first thing in the experience section, Selma Country Club May 2021. He was a manager for them. Moving on he was school president for his SGA then he was on Freshmen Forum then he was elected for Fraternity VP, SGA assistant VP. That is where Yohn lost me here because he has experience with outreach. He has experience with outreach positions. Assistant VP, Fraternity VP, Director, School President. Do we all agree those are soft learned skills that could apply to outreach?

All Justices nod heads in agreement.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Turner never had designated set and stone outreach position previously on his resume. But he had positions that were very applicable to that type of position. I think we can cross out claim three what do yall think?

All Justices: Yes

Justice Wilson: I think any VP position can translate somewhat to another VP position anyway.

With no more discussion, the court moves into vote.

Chief Justice Maurelli: Claim 1 states "*The Code of Laws violation occurred in regard to George Turner's nomination. The Code stipulates that each nominee must have a list of objectives for their PROPOSED position. George Turner's goal sheet, which is attached, was for EVP of Initiatives. However, he was nominated for EVP of Outreach.*" Do we find as a court that this claim has any merit?

All Justices Vote: No merit

Chief Justice Maurelli: Claim 2 states "*Turner was not present to discuss his alleged qualifications or objectives. SGA President Jack Hilton was not present to discuss his nominees qualifications either.*" Do we find as a court that this claim has any merit?

All Justices Vote: No merit

Chief Justice Maurelli: Claim 3 states "*Senate was not presented with any objectives whatsoever for his PROPOSED position.*" / "*When asked about George Turner's outreach experience, neither Herring or Goodner could point to anything on Turner's resume that suggested he had any. They also refused to discuss any goals he had for the position and told Senate he gave them verbally in his interview. I've attached*

minutes from the meeting because Eagle Eye TV was not present to live stream.”Does this claim have any merit?

All Justices Vote: No merit

The Court holds, by a vote of 7-0, that the claims brought forth by the grieving party have no merit.

Chief Justice Maurelli: **Does the court believe this needs to go to a formal hearing?**

Chief Justice Maurelli – No

Justice Cade Allen - No

Justice Alex Ducheim – No

Justice Walker Hartfield – No

Justice Matt Wilson – No

Justice/Clerk Lucy Allen – No

Justice Sam Jones – No

The Court holds, by a vote of 7-0, that this case does not need to move to a formal hearing.

Meeting Adjourned