ASUCI JUDICIAL BOARD

Article 8, Section 2(l) of the ASUCI Constitution grants the ASUCI Judicial Board the authority to "investigate charges of violations of the ASUCI governing documents committed by the Office of the Student Advocate General."

INVESTIGATION REPORT ON CONCERNS REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF THE INTERNAL STUDENT ADVOCATE GENERAL AND CHIEF ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICER

In response to a complaint submitted by the Student Advocate General against the Internal Student Advocate General and the Chief Accountability Officer.

Redacted Report Summary

Dated April 28th, 2025

RINGDAHL, N.; VISWANATH G.; & JAUCH, T. authored this report.

Investigation Information

Complaint ID: #H16P4
Complaint Submission Date: March 3rd, 2025
Complaint Submission Method: Email (judicial.justices@asuci.uci.edu)
Complainant:
Student Advocate General
Complainee:
Chief Accountability Officer

Report Submission Date: April 26th, 2025
Report Authors:
Natalie Ringdahl, Associate Justice

Gayathri Viswanath, Associate Justice

Tayla Jauch, Judicial Board Clerk

Executive Summary

On March 3rd, the ASUCI Judicial Board received a complaint submitted by the Student Advocate General against the Chief Accountability Officer, alleging that they failed to perform the required duties of their role, and violated procedure in the process of a sanction request. Pursuant to the Article 8, § 2(l) of the ASUCI Constitution, members of the Judicial Board investigated these allegations. The investigating committee has not found sufficient evidence to indicate the alleged violations did occur.

I. Introduction

Article 8, § 2(l) of the ASUCI Constitution grants the ASUCI Judicial Board the authority to "investigate charges of violations of the ASUCI governing documents committed by the Office of the Student Advocate General." It is by this authority that this investigation was conducted and this report compiled. This report aims to present matters of fact related to the presented allegations. As the Judicial Board does not have the authority to enact structural measures in response to an investigation, this report shall not contain any recommendation of action.

Given that the submitted complaint contained distinct allegations against two individuals, the Investigative Committee chose to separate the investigative report into two separate reports, one delineating the Allegations and Findings regarding the Chief Accountability Officer's actions, and one regarding the Internal Student Advocate General's. The following report addresses the allegations levied against the CAO.

II. Allegations

After considering the allegations originally presented by the complainant and as discussed in later interviews, we have broadly organized the allegations against the CAO into three distinct points in two categories: alleged failure to fulfil duties of the role (2), and alleged procedural violations(1).

III. Sequence of Events

On Thursday, February 27th the Student Advocate General submitted a Petition for Hearing directly via email to the ASUCI Judicial Board Account. On that date, the Board informed the SAG that weekly Board meetings took place on Mondays, and after the Judicial Board met and reviewed the submitted petition, updates would be provided.

On Monday, March 3rd the Board requested that complaints within the submitted petition for hearing be formally and appropriately submitted as separate complaint documents via direct email to the Judicial Board with SGSM Executive Director Stephanie Van Ginkel copied.

On Monday, March 3rd, the SAG submitted their complaint via direct email to the Judicial Board with Executive Director Van Ginkel copied.

On Wednesday, April 2nd, during the first Judicial Board meeting of the Spring quarter, Associate Justices Ringdahl and Viswanath alongside Judicial Board Clerk Jauch were assigned to conduct the investigation of this complaint.

On Wednesday, April 2nd, Vice Chief Justice invited the SAG to complete an interview regarding the complaint.

On Monday, April 7th, Associate Justices Ringdahl and Viswanath and the Judicial Board Clerk interviewed the SAG. Vice Chief Justice Arun Malani was present in a procedural advisory capacity for this interview.

On Monday, April 7th following the interview with the complainant, the investigative team made the decision to separate the investigations of each individual within the Student Advocate General's complaint into two separate reports.

On Tuesday, April 8th, the Chief Accountability Officer was interviewed by Associate Justices Ringdahl and Viswanath and the Judicial Board Clerk.

On Friday, April 11th, the Internal Student Advocate General was interviewed by Associate Justices Ringdahl and Viswanath.

On April 26th, Chief Justice Colin Bolek assisted in a procedural capacity.

On April 26th, a preliminary version of this report was submitted to SGSM Executive Director Van Ginkel for review. On April 26th, SGSM Executive Director Van Ginkel approved this report for release. Later on April 27th, the full version of this report was released to the complainant On April 28th, a redacted summary version of the report was released to the subject of the complaint and posted on the ASUCI website.

This concludes the timeline of this investigation.

V. Conclusion

The investigative committee has not found sufficient evidence in support of any of the allegations and finds that the actions taken by the CAO were not in violation of the 24-25 SAG Handbook, ASUCI Bylaws, and ASUCI Constitution.

I

April 25,2025

Tayla Jauch — Date
Judicial Clerk, Judicial Board, ASUCI

April 25,2025

Natalie Ringdahl — Date
Associate Justice, Judicial Board, ASUCI

April 25,2025

Gayathri Viswanath — Date
Associate Justice, Judicial Board, ASUCI