I. Call to Order: 4:35 pm

II. Attendance
   A. IESC Em McNay: Attended
   B. Funding Board Carolina Zamudio: Attended
   C. Assembly Hannah Garcia: Attended
   D. Senate Solenne De Tassigny: Attended
   E. Student At Large Emily Hester: Attended
   F. Student At Large Shyanne Massie: Attended
   G. Student At Large Raelee Rohan: Attended
   H. Ethics Officer Kenneth Huston: Attended
   I. Administrative Director Sarah Smith: Attended
   J. Advisor to Ethics Officer Erin Mahn: Attended
   K. Defendant ASBSU President Angel Cantu: Attended
   L. Advisor to Angel Cantu: Forfeited
   M. Witness Ryann Banks: Attended
   N. Witness Amanda Hawks: Attended
   O. Witness Emily White: Not attended
   P. Witness Matt Lester: Attended

III. Expectations
   A. Viewpoint Neutrality is expected in these proceedings. If you don’t believe you can uphold this expectation, please abstain from vote— you are not required to do so however.
   B. Raise Hand function is to be utilized when a question arises. The Chair will call on you at the appropriate time, and in the order of hands raised.
This time for questions will be in an entirely different time of the meeting (during Q and A). I advise taking notes on what you hear so you don’t forget the question.

C. I expect fairness, equal protection, respect, and consideration for all parties. This includes members of this committee, the defendant, those un-named complainants, and any witnesses that are in attendance.

D. There is an expectation that questions are asked for clarification, not for predatory reasons for all parties (Ethics, Defendant, Witnesses, and Advisors)-- at discretion of chair what qualifies.

E. Discussion between any individuals besides between members of the Ethics Committee during deliberation is prohibited

F. Open discussion for other expectations to set
   1. Ryann - Can everyone please put their pronouns in their zoom names?
   2. Kenneth - Thank you Ryann.

IV. Reading of Complaint Document and Submitted Evidence
   A. Does anyone have a misunderstanding of what was read or would like to re-read a section?
   B. Solenne motions to fast track the reading of the complaint. Hannah seconds.
   C. Angel approves fast tracking the reading of the complaint.
   D. Em - I know many of the folks were anonymous on the complaint form and I want to emphasize that we should be using gender neutral language and we should ensure anonymity.
      1. Angel - my understanding is that the reason for anonymity is to prevent retaliation from me. I think it would be difficult for me to share my story without revealing who was a part of the situation.
   E. Everyone consents to fast tracking the reading of the complaint.

V. Testimony- Emily White
   A. Reading of a pre prepared statement (Emily is unable to be present)
      1. Kenneth reads Emily’s statement
   B. Solenne - Is there a date on the email?

VI. Testimony- Ryann Banks
   A. Ryann - Introductions. The first code breach was the constitutional code breach. In July I supported a mail writing campaign regarding the BPD and also leading the BLM rallies in Boise. Angel sent an email telling us to “chill out” and used Dr. Tromp as an ally. This was in official communication to IESC. He did not fully recognize or acknowledge the trauma or harm that is caused by police. He came off in a way that was hurtful and disregarded our thoughts and feelings. We were never consulted as a group. We were then asked if we would be a part of the group later on. While I was consulted in being a part of the committee
earlier on, I declined since I did not want to be tokenized. He continued to spew rhetoric and ignored the request to remove BPD. I was accused of spreading fake news. I am going to share a part of the letter that Angel emailed out earlier this week. Ryann reads part of her letter to Dr. Tromp. You can find that letter in Angel’s email that he sent out. This is what he considered misinformation. IESC sent a letter out to hold Angel accountable. He refused to hold himself accountable and said he didn’t have time for it. After my initial experience with Angel, I did not want to cause conflict or be around someone who bashes people’s characters. A few weeks ago it was proposed to host our Exec meeting in person. I did not want to take the risk of exposing myself and my family. It was inaccessible because I could not hear my other exec members. My brown body felt unsafe and constantly vulnerable to harm from Angel. After we were asked to “chill out” in the email from Angel, IESC sent a collaborative email to Angel. Ryann reads part of the IESC collaborative email.

1. Kenneth - To uphold the respect for boundaries, please do not make attacks at Angel.
2. Angel - I am fine with it.

B. Ryann - Ryann continues to read the email. I am referencing this email because it shows the lack of accountability. I told him how I was harmed and what I expected him to do so that we could move forward. This was the first time we communicated with Angel. He did respond with a letter where he did not hold any accountability or recognize any of his actions. Angel sent an email to all of Assembly and Senate and in that he sent multiple screenshots of my personal Instagram sharing my personal trauma and harm. I was not sent the email so I was unable to explain anything or be visible in that conversation. In addition to maliciously being attacked, he has discriminated against me for my political affiliations. His response is that he felt oppressed for his political affiliations when I have given him multiple opportunities to explain his stance. He intentionally circled ACAB on my post in an attempt to sway Assembly and Senate in his impeachment. This was malicious in how he circled my political stance and within his manifesto. He did not give me a space to respond and this shows his commitment to anti-blackness and he uses my positions against me to discredit me and he has created a hostile work environment. I hope in a way we can find peace after this and move through this as a community.

1. Kenneth - What was described as the manifesto, was shared ASBSU wide, the arbiter, and a few administrators.
2. Angel - Yes that will be provided.
3. Ryann - IESC was not a part of that email either.

C. Questions from Committee to Ryann Banks

1. Solenne - When you asked Angel to administer an apology letter did you get one?
   a) Ryann - No. No acknowledgment of harm.
2. Solenne - Will members have access to that email that Ryann referenced?
   a) Kenneth - Yes Angel is presenting that later on.
3. Em - I want to share that that IESC letter is in evidence as well. What would justice look like to you today?
   a) Ryann - Justice for me is always going to go back to reparations and that is a discussion between Angel and I since there was not an adequate harm acknowledgment. I think justice within y’all’s decision would be full impeachment because I do not believe he is capable of accountability currently.
4. Em - Based off of your experiences, how has Angel done in fulfilling his role as ASBSU President
   a) Ryann - I think he has done well at the bare minimum of creating agendas and attending committee meetings. When it comes to giving a voice to marginalized students, he has not done a good job and in this current climate students need that right now. I do not want to be a part of a student government that silences or oppresses a marginalized student and I do not want anyone else to go through what I have gone through.

VII. Testimony-Amanda Hawks
A. Introductions. The first four words I ever heard from Angel was “I need y’all to chill”. This was in response to a community initiative, not an IESC member, and this was something we chose to share before we were employed. This immediately sent the message that we are not allowed to post certain things. Initially he said that we were not allowed to contact Dr. Tromp or deliver our opinions on the subject. Right away this email came off as hostile and created conditions that made me feel that there was someone against me. When we responded we explained how he created harm and asked him to do some research and to give us a formal apology. Instead he sent us a 7 page letter about how he was right and that we did not know enough about the BPD contract. This discounted our experiences. After this I did not feel comfortable talking with Angel and that lasted until now. I do not feel safe talking with Angel and feel disconnected from ASBSU because I was played off as an unreasonable person. I did not have contact with him until the Big City Coffee email chain. Many students chimed in and Angel came in and dissented. I responded and said I was disappointed with his response and that it showed anti-blackness. It was once again Angel deciding what harm is valid and what isn’t. He shared that entire email chain to many. He shared my first name and both places that I work. I had to hear about this from someone else and learn that my information had been shared.

B. Questions from Committee to Amanda Hawks
1. Em - In what ways has Angel caused you and the community you are a part of harm?
   a) Amanda - All of the letters I received from Angel caused harm. I felt like I was going to come into this position and be hated on campus because of my personal views. I feel unsafe now that my information has been shared and it is impeding on my schoolwork as well.

2. Em - How many hours of emotional labor work have you had to navigate to Angel and his harm?
   a) Amanda - I cannot give an estimate because it is all day. Before I even started the job I have been having this.

3. Em - I know you had yet to be involved with ASBSU so can you elaborate on how it felt for you to come into ASBSU and have your first communication with the President be like this?
   a) Amanda - I was really excited to be on IESC and I am excited to have my voice shared and to help others share their voices. I knew IESC gets pushback but I didn’t think it would be this bad. This caused a lot of emotional harm.

VIII. Opening Statement- Angel Cantu
A. Angel - It feels obvious that Em McNay has a heavy bias in this based off of their questions to the witnesses. In the interest of neutrality, I think it would only be appropriate for Em to recuse themself from voting.
   1. Kenneth - Your request has been acknowledged and that will be discussed in the deliberation section.

B. Angel - I think the committee should be able to read the core content and foundation of this. This is all in the shared drive in the foundational evidence folder so if everyone could read this in chronological order I think this would serve a context of what was happening and who was involved. I know we heard a lot of testimony about what went on and I want to explain that more. A lot of this is going to be at the core of this issue. Just so everyone is aware of that email that was sent out. Angel shares an email that was sent out earlier this week. This is social media from Ryann and Tanisha. This shows email threads. The texts between Cambree and I were not shared and neither was the letter that was shared regarding BPD with IESC. The Dear ASBSU and Colleagues letter will share as my opening statement. I did BCC Ryann in this so that that information could be shared with IESC so I am unsure why she says she did not get it. My concern with redacting all personal information is that then you cannot see the motivations behind each individual and I think that is important to understand. I know there is a lot of evidence that my accusers used that I will also use as my defense. It will come down to how you interpret our constitution and code. It seems hypocritical for my accusers to accuse me of not upholding the ASBSU Constitution Article 1 Section 3. I will be frank that I am liberal and a democrat and I do follow politics very well. Given that it is our stance as ASBSU to stay balanced,
since my colleagues on Exec and on IESC chose to take stances that were all one side. ASBSU’s responsibility is to represent all students no matter political affiliation. In an effort to follow that true spirit of ASBSU and in balance and moderation, I did this to promote this important section of our constitution. So if it felt that we are leaning too far one way I want to represent the other side.

IX. Presentation of counter arguments/evidence- Angel Cantu

A. Testimony-Matt Lester

1. Matt - Introductions. I was more than thrilled to be coming back to ASBSU as a Funding Board member until I saw the training that was going on. I read through the training since I was unable to attend and it was about destroying the white supremacist culture. I have served with people of every ethnic, racial, and gender background. I don’t care what your gender is or what your skin color is. It is all about your character. When I read the training I felt like it was directed towards me since I am a white male. I felt that without ever getting to know me that I was being judged. I told Angel that I did not feel comfortable being a part of ASBSU. I respect everyone’s opinions and I know that 99% of those police are just doing a job. Yes there are bad cops, I will be the first one to tell you that. I do not think that abolishing police is the right answer. You can change laws but they are needed and I believe they do a fantastic job. I reached out to Angel and told him that I do not feel comfortable being there and that it would be a hostile environment for me. Angel requested that I stay for a variance of opinion, but I did not feel comfortable being a part of ASBSU because it seemed it would be a hostile environment for me since I am a white male. As far as the Coffee shop thing, I was unaware that that was a thing. Angel shared a post with me that the owner made. I support law enforcement as a whole, not all of their actions but I do as a whole. I really do not think that we should be denouncing the owner’s opinion simply because it does not reflect your opinion. I do lean towards the conservative side but I try to stay out of politics as much as I can. I do appreciate Angel leaning towards that neutral state. I don’t think we should shut people down because you do not like what they have to say.

2. Questions from Committee to Matt Lester

a) Hannah - Do you have an example of what made you feel unsafe?
   
   (1) Matt - It has been a couple months but it was the White Supremacist culture article. My parents did not teach me to be racist and it felt like it was directed towards me since I am a white male.
   
   (2) Hannah - Was it a reading or like an assignment?
(a) Matt - I believe it was an article. Since I could not attend the training it was emailed to me.

(3) Angel - Someone from IESC sent that document to Cambree and requested that it would be a part of training. I think the biggest issue with the document was the title. I don’t think we needed to target white folks. I think that is really where we went wrong since we shared a document that targeted our white folks. I could tell you right now that the ones who were there were also uncomfortable.

(4) Matt - There were some varying Instagram posts also done by ASBSU. I share a different opinion on that and did not feel comfortable being a part of a group where that is the majority of the opinion.

b) Carolina - It makes me sad that you felt like you were not valued because you really did so much work for ASBSU last year. Was this an ongoing feeling or was it just a couple instances?

   (1) Matt - It started sometime over the summer. I saw a couple posts. I would guess maybe a month or so between the posts and the training. I progressively felt like that my opinion would not be welcome.

c) Solenne - Do you have any kind of personal relationship with Angel?

   (1) Matt - I worked with him in ASBSU last year.

d) Solenne - Can you say for sure that the posts denouncing white supremacy were posted by the ASBSU account?

   (1) Matt - No I cannot say for certainty

e) Solenne - Other than the posts and the training, was there any other way that ASBSU demonstrated any issues?

   (1) Matt - No

f) Em - Why do you feel like after a year of collaboration on a committee regarding IESC pay, why do you feel that this year your opinion means less to us?

   (1) Kenneth - I would like questions to be directed towards Angel or the charges. Matt, you can answer if you’d like.

   (2) Matt - ASBSU did not make those posts last year and there was not a training like that last year.

g) Em - Of all of the charges, have you attended any Exec or IESC meetings and what has been your ASBSU involvement that would give credit to your testimony?

   (1) Matt - I have not. When I resigned that was my last communication until he told me about the coffee
shop. I do not have much communication with Angel or ASBSU.

h) Em - You are testifying here as a character witness?
   (1) Matt - We have not talked. I did not give him any advice or any advice since. I am here on his character and for his efforts to keep things in the middle.

i) Carolina - You are also here to share your experience as well?
   (1) Matt - Yes

X. Closing Statement- Angel Cantu
   A. Thank you Matt for your testimony. I brought Matt in here to talk about and get y’all to understand that there are populations in our student body that feel alienated in our continued favoritism in political conversations. People should not know our political affiliations in ASBSU. Since Matt did not know my political affiliation that shows that I am doing my job. Like I said in my letter, we have been able to accomplish good by being liberal. But we cannot continue to do that and tell people that their opinion is not valid. With regards to the BPD contract Angel Cantu attempted to silence members' statements, I did not. In the “Letter to IESC” I made a statement regarding core purpose and requested for them to reframe their message. I am asking if you all can do me a favor because this is making my job very difficult. This rhetoric is making my job very difficult. We have professors who are ex-cops. Obviously the University would hire someone who has that experience to be in that position. It is not ridiculous for an ex-cop and the head of public safety to be in the BPD committee. This is all represented in our committee recommendation that we made to Dr. Tromp. I would also like to make it clear that 3/7 people on that committee were people of color, including myself. We did have BIPOC individuals on that committee and we did reach out to members of the community. I would also like to say that the notion that I am white passing and that I am somehow less of a person of color than any of my colleagues in IESC is frankly insulting to my heritage and to me as a person to be discounted because of your initiatives. It is so frustrating to hear those comments and not lash out but I am not going. I will say that both my parents are from hispanic descent and I am full blooded latino as far as I am aware. I am not white so please stop calling me that. In the ASBSU constitution, the President has to maintain relations with the University administration. If a member of ASBSU is burning bridges and using inflammatory language, it is within my responsibility to maintain those relations and I did and that is what I was trying to do. Like I said in my emails, there is a time and place to condemn the departments at Boise State. When they ignore us and their intention is not to help students and we have done everything we can, then we should condemn those departments. But it seems as though IESC and ASBSU as a whole as
frequently bought into these polarized politics and reactive legislation. I think we need to be more constructive and talk more with these individuals. In the ASBSU constitution, the President is responsible to hold ASBSU officers accountable. Ryann was being paid during that time and I was attempting to hold her accountable. As a student representative you cannot say that cops are bastards or bitches. What would happen if a conservative said that about a liberal? That would be a problem. Maybe I came off wrong and was read differently than I meant it to be. I did want to have a conversation over Zoom but that was not possible as you can see in the emails. I tried to find a way to compromise. As you saw in the email, Tanisha, who I vouched for to be on the committee, said that compromise is inherently racist and that we can’t compromise because of the compromise. I don’t get that. I understand what the compromise is but it was just about voting. I disagreed with that stance and the reason I bring up Tanisha and their posts is because when I was on this committee, I asked Ryann to be a part of it because I do not represent all communities. Ryann could not attend and recommended I invite someone else. Tanisha is an alumni of Boise State and actually ran for ASBSU President. I agreed and allowed Tanisha and the student that Ryann recommended join the committee. I reached out to our committee head and asked if we could invite these individuals to join. The notion that I did not seek student input is false. Dr. Tromp sent us all of the emails that Ryann requested people send. Dr. Tromp got many responses and not all of them were in agreement with Ryann. Many were students saying that they would feel unsafe if we removed BPD. I vouched for Tanisha and her Instagram post reflected poorly on me. The next day Tanisha went on social media and said the committee sucks. I believe that it was incredibly disrespectful. It made ASBSU look bad and after that the committee head requested that we do not invite any guests and I knew that they were talking about Tanisha because I was the only person who invited guests. Because of that the committee no longer trusts me to bring in guests. In ASBSU Constitution, it says that IESC has to be approved and Ryann’s social media posts were not approved by me. The code says that I have the authority to inquire about it and hold them accountable. In Executive Code, all members must maintain proper decorum when representing ASBSU and I do not believe that Ryann maintained proper decorum and Ryann was being paid during this time. I wanted to make everyone aware because code is not clear whether or not if social media posts apply. In IESC code it says that they have to represent ASBSU on and off campus so I would say that the social media posts do apply. These were pieces of code and constitution that I was acting under. Did I abuse my hierarchical power when I asked IESC to reframe their message? No. I did not demand anything I only suggested and I did not threaten any retaliation if they ignored my request so this notion that I am a scary person and threatening IESC is frankly a little ridiculous and anyone who read my letters would not consider myself scary. I said I would treat them as a friend. I simply
stated that I disagreed and explained why. I did seek student feedback during the BPD contract review. I invited both Tanisha and Dele. It is in the folder that I shared with all of you. Not all of the letters to Dr. Tromp wanted to remove BPD and some of our students were afraid that we wouldn’t have BPD on campus because these students see them as safety and security. There were two types of students communicating with our committee. That is also in the folder that I shared with all of you. We unanimously agreed to extend the contract because we realized we had no choice. A lot of bad things would happen if we did not extend the contract. We did have other services within that contract besides BPD like the radio systems that campus security uses. They provide 24 hour dispatch services on campus. It does take about 2 months to hire someone for this position and we wouldn’t have had enough time. Nobody would be answering the 24 hour dispatch line. They also help with our maintenance and sporting events. There are a lot of services that are lumped in there. We rely on them to be compliant on the Clery Act. BPD is the one who files all of that paperwork so if we removed them and did not have anyone doing that job then we would be sued and fined by the federal government and the University would be even more broke than it already is. There was a concern about committees that I am on. I did notify the executive council that despite what Chey said.

1. Kenneth - I am going to cut you off there out of respect for people. I do not appreciate those remarks towards members present or not.

B. Angel - Here are the minutes from one of our meetings where an individual on our executive team asked what committees I am on and I listed. The concern in the complaint seemed to imply that I was on many committees. It is committees and meetings that take up most of my time. Committees and meetings are the same to me. It is hard to say how many committees I am on. Some of the committees I chose to sit on and others I am expected to sit on as ASBSU President. It allows me to maintain and build those relationships with campus partners. Did I offer committee opportunities to other students? Yes I did. A lot of committees requested for me to sit on them but the ones that reached out to me for a student representative and they did not care who I did send out. The provost search committee I did try and pass off and no one picked it up. Here are the opportunities that I shared to Assembly and Senate in the general chat on the Slack. On September 13th I sent this out and no one replied. If there are any vacant committee positions it is not my fault. I asked. The ones I did not put out I do myself. Here is one I sent out to Senate. In the ASBSU Constitution the President is the primary diplomat that will maintain these relationships so I need to be on these committees to maintain these relationships. In the ASBSU Constitution, the President will perform or delegate any duties necessary to promote and maintain the general welfare. It says perform OR delegate. I am not required to delegate I choose to. If someone reached out to me then I would gladly send them that way and hook them up and put them in contact with whoever is in...
charge of that on campus. If I do not sit on the committees that I sit on then I would not be doing anything until legislation is passed. Executive is in charge of executing legislation so if there is no legislation I wouldn't be doing anything. I need to be out there to maintain these relationships. This is not being brought up by my accusers because of who was appointed to the new law enforcement committee. You all can read the documents in the evidence folder and basically Dr. Tromp emailed me and said because of my experience in the last committee and my critical role in there, they want me to be on this new committee. I said I would and they asked me to nominate a member from IESC to sit on it as well. I asked IESC and they said they wanted 2 seats on that committee. I was fine with that and relayed that to Dr. Tromp’s executive assistant. They said I could only nominate 1 IESC member so I think they reached out to Dr. Tromp separately but I do not think anything came of that since they only nominated Em for the position. This seems like members of the executive committee said this because I had conversations with Kenny, Chey, and Cambree about this. They all went like this. I know things are rocky with IESC right now so you should step down and allow a second IESC member to sit on this committee. I told them why I did not think this is a good idea and so I believe this is on the complaint because members of the executive team didn’t like that. I do not think Dr. Tromp’s intention was for me to pick a student representative. I don’t think it was an issue of room. I believe Dr. Tromp specifically wanted me there and an IESC member. Not a different combination of that. I also had a lot of knowledge from that first committee. Not everyone was brought back from the last committee so I think it was important for me to bring this information to the new committee. IESC’s role is to represent marginalized students. This situation does disproportionately affect marginalized students but that does not mean that our other students cannot have another voice. There were students who would be scared if we got rid of BPD and students like Matt who support BPD and those opinions should be represented. The purpose of this committee is to develop strategies and analyze ways to see what public safety looks like in the future. We do not need everyone there on this committee to have these experiences with police because we were going to gather this from the community. I was very glad that IESC was there. If it could be me and 2 IESC members I would appreciate that. But for me to step down seems wrong. Did I track the hours I spent working on the Steering Committee as ASBSU office hours? No. Everyone received a $1,000 stipend to sit on this committee. The concern is that I am double dipping by counting this towards my ASBSU hours. Before I was on this steering committee I was already maxing out my hours. There is no way I could abuse that. I never lied to anyone. I didn’t even think about that until I brought it up to Kenny one day. I didn’t think this was a big deal. Charlie Varland does approve all hours. I guess I broke that by not disclosing that. If there is anything sketchy going on then Charlie would catch that. Did I pressure the VP of Academic Affairs’ hiring
committee? No. In the ASBSU constitution it states that I can nominate who I want and the Exec, Assembly, and Senate approve it. I could have picked anyone and submitted them. I did not think that that is how the process should go. Kenny and I had a conversation about how this should go. I told Kenny that since we cannot do this in a way that is supposed to be done, then I think it would be most effective to have me and Cambree and anyone on the Executive team that was elected. Kayla, Ryann, and Kenny sat on this committee and were a part of this hiring process. Sorry to put you on blast Kenny but here are texts that show that I did not have a part in the decision of who got an interview. Cade is my roommate. As you can see in these texts, I realized that they already sent out the interview offers. I was fine with that. I trusted Cambree and Kenny. As you can see here, Kenny and Cambree have reasons for not giving the others interviews. Nowhere in this conversation did I say we should give Cade an interview. I did not say he was my roommate until we interviewed him. I did not pressure anyone or tell anyone to give him an interview. Here are more texts on that. I did voice some concerns with Bayley. Cambree did say that Cade was her least favorite. When we did interview the individuals, I liked Bayley and Cade to the same extent but Cambree really liked Bayley so I was trying to even it out. I really like to be the counterbalance. We all decided unanimously that Leah was the weakest and that Cade and Bayley were the top 2. I do admit that I was heavily advocating for Cade and because Cambree was advocating for Bayley so much. There was merit to Cade being in this role as well. I could tell everyone already picked Bayley and since I couldn’t choose it did not matter how I voted so I did vote for Cade. It was a 4-1 but I really could not decide so that is how that went. As you can see, no one was pressured to offer an interview to Cade. I was not cleared by the public health office to go to the office. Kenny was there. The public health office emailed me and that should be in the folder as well. They said I could return on the 14th and I went on the 12th. I read my calendar wrong. When I opened my calendar it was in September so I thought it was Monday the 14th. I saw this and I was in a rush to get a bill signed for Sarah. I made a mistake. I did not put anyone's health at risk. It was more than 14 days since the last time I was near my roommate who tested positive. When they asked me when I was around my roommate last, I was unsure and couldn’t remember the last time I was within close proximity to him. So since I did not know they did 14 days since I talked with them. I got my COVID results that morning and I was negative and did not have any contact with my roommate so there was no way for me to get infected. So all of this says that I was in no way infectious. It had been more than 14 days. My quarantine away from my roommate was a lot longer than 14 days. There are additional factors. Cambree would become President if I am impeached who may or may not be a part of this impeachment. A bill to remove Big City was being drafted during this. Big City packed up and moved out on their own so this shows a possibility. We had a discussion
about Big City on Thursday and complaints were filed on Friday. That tells me that someone wants to silence me since I have a differing opinion on how that resolution should be written. I don’t care if Big City stays or goes. I am fine if we want to remove them for targeted attacks but just to focus on that one Instagram post. That was not okay to take a students story, it was inappropriate and if I was the owner I would be kind of mad. I think Ryann shared this, that was not the problem with Big City. Ryann and the rest of the executive team agreed that we should focus on their support of the police and that is why we should condemn them. Correct me if I am wrong but quite a few of them agree that all cops are bad. People have family members who are cops and ASBSU as a whole should not take that stance. If IESC takes this stance then it would create the same problem as the BPD Contract. We as officials have to represent the broader community. Nobody talked to me before this impeachment was filed. It was very abrupt. Like I said in my letter it feels like this was preplanned, methodical, and strategic. That is unethical and immoral. And to my knowledge the ASBSU President has never been impeached. I think individuals in ASBSU are falling into the polarization of politics right now. I formally request that this committee does not find me innocent of the code violations and that you let the Assembly and Senate decide my fate. I will not change my behavior because I was not out of line. I will continue to represent students in the way that I believe is right. I will continue to speak out against initiatives or actions that I believe are harmful. Sanctions will not do any good. It will be you all sorta punishing me but not too much. You will have to decide. I do have some closing remarks but Kenny can I make those after questions?

1. Kenneth - What does the ethics committee think? I am impartial either way.
2. Em - I can ask questions right now.
3. Everyone consents to allowing questions before Angel’s closing remarks.

C. Questions regarding content of statements and/or evidence
1. Solenne - Regarding the posts made by individuals, were they on private accounts or ASBSU accounts?
   a) Angel - private accounts
2. Solenne - Did they mention their relationship with IESC or ASBSU in the posts?
   a) Angel - I don’t remember
3. Solenne - Did you disclose during the interview that Cade was your roommate?
   a) Angel - Yes
4. Solenne - Did you inform interviews that you were in the quarantine process?
   a) Angel - I thought my quarantine was over. I was wrong about that
5. Solenne - Regarding appointing a member, are you sure that was the committee appointment that was mentioned in the complaints?
   a) Angel - No the correlation I drew was because I have heard these before and so this is from certain individuals so I know the individual who had an issue with the committee appointments. I did offer those to the Senate and Assembly and that did not seem sufficient to this individual. So I could tell that this push to get me to delegate more committees. That first little fight we had in the summer showed that some of my peers did not want me on that second BPD committee. I know exactly who has contributed to this complaint.

6. Solenne - Are members of ASBSU required to reveal their political affiliations?
   a) Angel - no.

7. Raelee - You said that you decided not to vote for Cade or did you vote for Cade?
   a) Angel - I voted very last. I think we used an anonymous link. I did vote and I voted for Cade because I wanted to have the 4-1. I could have just nominated Cade from the start. I did not have to go through this process.

8. Raelee - You said that others may think you are unethical for voting for Cade. Why is that?
   a) Angel - In the complaint it says that I advocated for Cade and kept other students from getting interviewed which was proven untrue in those texts. I think that is where that came from.

9. Raelee - You said that you did not do anything wrong. During this whole process, you often bring up the fact that other people don’t get to feel a certain way that you are making them feel. So if you were to acknowledge that you had some kind of issue, how would you change your rhetoric to be more understanding and acceptable?
   a) Angel - I would not say I am always perfect or that I go about it in the right way. I will reframe that statement to instead say that my intention is always good. I believe that I did acknowledge in my letter to IESC that my words may have been harmful and that I didn’t know. I won’t say chill out I won’t do that again. I will modify my language and my actions if individuals voice the concern. There may be some disagreement in that I don’t want that to stipple disagreement which is why I will change my language to accommodate concerns but there are concerns like the Big City email. It was pretty concise and as long as individuals can still make a very simple and valid argument, I will change my vocabulary and the way I say things. But if I
can still disagree with individuals then that is the extent that I will change my language. I want to be accommodating but there is a line.

10. Raelee - Obviously our society is unprecedented and no one knew that anything like this would happen. Do you not think that some of the decisions that need to be made should be out there or that we should continue along the way it has been?
   a) Angel - I have my own personal beliefs. My personal belief is that I would like to see a world in the future that racism and white supremacy is eliminated. We should purge the world of this harmful rhetoric but there is an extent to how far we can do that. We are now suppressing diversity. If we really want to be moderate and balanced then that is what we have to do to do that. If a group of students said that they wanted a conservative speaker to come, then yes I would support that in my position.

11. Emily - Do you think that for all of the committees that you are being asked to serve on do you represent all of them?
   a) Angel - No I do not think I am the perfect one to be on all of those committees. A lot of how it started is that there were not a lot of individuals to have sat on those committees over the summer so since I put so much work into these committees I felt obligated to finish the work I started. I get paid more and have more hours than anyone else. I am expected to put more work in than others and I should be proactive. I do not think that I am the best person for all of the committees but I have put in a lot of work on them or that it is appropriate for the ASBSU President to sit on the committee. It wouldn’t be appropriate for an Assembly or Senate member to sit on certain committees like the admin team.

12. Em - Did you have diversity and inclusion as your ASBSU platform?
   a) Angel - Yes

13. Em - For context, members of IESC have been contacted and attacked by the Idaho Freedom Foundation because you released their personal information. Do you understand why that is an issue?
   a) Angel - Yes that is not okay

14. Em - Have you been reporting your 25 hours every time?
   a) Angel - Yes sometimes it is less.

15. Em - Does this number reflect what is on your calendar?
   a) Angel - I don’t spend all my time in committees. I do have emails and such.

16. Em - You are getting a stipend for steering committee?
   a) Angel - Yes?
17. Em - Do you have training on police reform or abolition?
    a) Angel - no

18. Em - You said that your intention was not to harm but intention and impact are different. Why have you avoided accountability?
    a) Angel - The individuals trying to hold me accountable are using that to discount and invalidate the disagreement that I have so once my argument is validated I would be more than happy to accommodate what other people want me to do. You asked me if I looked at information resources and I told you that if I had time I would and you told me I should make time. I was busy with school so if that falls within my role I will.

19. Em - So you were on 2 committees regarding police. It was months prior when you and I had a conversation about you doing a bare minimum. There is a documentary that is less than 2 hours and with you also agreeing to accountability practices and having extra time, why are you not doing your responsibilities as ASBSU President and what you agreed on?
    a) Angel - Those committees are not about police brutality it is about the dynamic between BPD and the University. I do not need to be a justice on police brutality to play a critical role on how that affects our students. I am an expert in representing our students. I am an expert in politics. I will read about it if it has to do with politics. A lot of politics has to do with race relations. This is what I educate myself on because it is what I believe is important.

20. Em - Cambree, I have questions for you is this allowed?
    a) Kenneth - This is testimony. Angel if you consent then it is allowed.
    b) Angel - I do not consent to this.

XI. Final questions from the Committee to Angel, advisors, or witnesses
   A. Angel - I am sorry this is so long. I tried to be as comprehensive and thorough as possible. In conclusion, I really do not like being in this position. I am very emotionally drained and very stressed and exhausted. I have put off all my work as ASBSU President and as a student to prepare for this. I have talked to many individuals about this because I wanted to know if I was the bad guy in this situation. This does seem like there are a lot of individuals against me. I have talked to many people and so many have shared their support for me privately. None of them are here today because they are scared of receiving backlash or they are not represented in this space at all. People are scared to say what I have said. I feel like I have a responsibility to stand here and say the things that no one else will say. I knew when I responded to that Big City email that it would be a shit storm. Did I want that? Do you all think that I want to be here right now? Do you think I want everyone on my team to turn on me and condemn
me? I did it anyways because everything I do in my life is to speak up for those who are not being heard. With that comes criticism and backlash. That does not make me feel good and I know when I hit send that I have to face it. It would be so much easier for me not to say anything but I have to say something because I feel like it is the right thing to do. I might be wrong in my stance but right now it feels right to do this and I hope that you all can respect that. These are the words I need to say and the stance that I need to take. This has created a lot of friction and fractures in ASBSU. Although we disagree, I would never replace any individuals who I work with. I believe that all of you are the best individuals for the roles you are in. I will never try to remove you from your positions because you are the best ones for your job. I will not seek any retaliation against you. I was recently in a long term relationship with a girl who is very religious and I am not. I told her the one thing that I respect is that devotion to forgiveness. Everyday I try to be a better person and work on that. I do seek revenge in past situations. I try not to be vengeful. I am trying to be a better person so because of that I am going to forgive the individuals who put me in this position. Even though these individuals are trying to take away my only source of income and my ability to inspire young hispanics. Carolina knows that this is something that those kids need. These individuals are trying to take away my biggest achievement and even though, I am still going to forgive you, even if I am impeached.

XII. Description of next steps
   A. Deliberation
   B. Communication of votes on each charge within 24 hours

XIII. Dismissal of all participants with the exception of Ethics Committee members and Advisors
   A. Off-record deliberations and anonymous voting

XIV. Meeting Adjourned 8:12 pm

Angel’s Folder of Evidence