

Internal Affairs

Job Performance Evaluation: Meeting Minutes and Relevant Documents

Coulter-Durst Administration

2025-26

Notes:

These Meeting Minutes are subject to release for a few distinct reasons.

1. This hearing was conducted on an elected WSGA official, which means that all meetings are to remain open, per WSGA policy.
2. The Internal Affairs Committee is a Committee, and as such, is subject to the sharing of public meeting minutes.

These meeting minutes, while public, are not to be used in a deleterious or pernicious manner. Not all information contained in these minutes are objective, and thus, not all information in this report should be deemed objective facts.

These meeting minutes do indicate that this particular issue has already achieved resolve. What this means is that another investigation shall not be opened to discuss this particular Job Performance Evaluation.

Any member of the Washburn University student body is able to submit a Job Performance Evaluation on any member of the WSGA senate.

The information contained in this report is finalized. Members of any WSGA committee should not be subject to intense scrutiny or questioning regarding their role in the compilation of these minutes, the proceedings of the meetings, or their participation in any of these events.

All names of parties other than the party under investigation have been redacted.

Job Performance Evaluation: Meeting Minutes and Relevant Documents

Job Performance Evaluation:

According to **Article III, Section 1** of the WSGA Constitution, the President is charged with “*creating, overseeing, and managing the WSGA Cabinet ... and chairing all WSGA Cabinet meetings.*” The President must also uphold Washburn University’s **Non-Discrimination Policy (Article I, Section 3)** and the **Expectation of Participation** for all members (**Article IV, Section 2**). The office of the President demands not only strong leadership and professional communication but also a working understanding of the governing documents that define the association’s processes and protections.

Performance Evaluation

1. Communication Failures

The President has repeatedly used shouting as a means of communication during Cabinet discussions and meetings. Beyond this, there is also a tendency to communicate in a poor fashion, even without shouting being necessary. This behavior has created a hostile and unproductive environment that discourages collaboration and open dialogue. It directly conflicts with the professional standards expected of WSGA leadership and violates the constitutional duty to manage and oversee the Cabinet in a constructive manner.

2. Lack of Clarity in Expectations

Numerous parties have expressed confusion about their duties, timelines, and performance expectations. These expectations are either left unstated or communicated inconsistently, or again, unkindly. This lack of organization and clarity impedes all-around efficiency and represents a failure to fulfill the President’s managerial responsibilities under **Article III, Section 1** of the Constitution.

3. Unequal Treatment and Double Standards

The President has shown favoritism toward certain Cabinet members or Senate members while being dismissive or adversarial toward others, particularly when ideas are viewed as “threatening” to the administration. Such double standards contradict the constitutional **Non-Discrimination Policy (Article I, Section 3)**, which ensures equal opportunity for all members and ideas. This behavior undermines inclusivity and the collaborative ethos expected within student government.

4. Violation of Student Code of Conduct Principles

The President's communication style and selective treatment of members contradict the fairness and respect standards outlined in the Washburn Student Code of Conduct. These actions diminish the sense of safety and equality within the Cabinet, and the organization as a whole. Per **Article II, Section 1.3** of the Constitution, such conduct may constitute grounds for removal if it rises to the level of violating the Code.

5. Failure to Uphold Participation Standards

The Constitution requires that the Administration “*maintain ... expectations for participation of sworn-in WSGA members*” (**Article IV, Section 2**). The President's poor communication, inconsistent management of expectations, and unequal treatment have weakened the Cabinet's participation and cohesion, impairing WSGA's ability to operate effectively.

6. Lack of Knowledge and Misapplication of WSGA Governing Documents

A notable concern is the President's demonstrable lack of understanding of the **WSGA Constitution, Restated By-laws, and Senate procedures**.

- She has attempted to contest and reinterpret established rules without basis in the governing documents.
- She failed to fully gather or understand the procedural details for forming an **ad-hoc committee**, despite the Constitution and By-laws clearly outlining those processes (Article II, Section 2.2; Article III, Section 1).
- She has argued procedural points already settled in the Standing Senate Rules or Robert's Rules of Order on multiple different occasions.
- She has failed to follow all necessary procedures for ensuring the proper swearing-in of particular members of the Senate, leading to confusion and unnecessary articles and bills being added and removed to the agenda weeks after they were needed.

Such actions disrupt the legislative process, confuse members, and erode the integrity of WSGA's adherence to its own governing framework. A President is expected to lead within the bounds of these documents—not contest them out of misunderstanding.

Conclusion: Misfeasance in Office

Taken together, these issues—hostile communication, unclear expectations, unequal treatment, disregard for participation standards, and a lack of constitutional and procedural knowledge—constitute **misfeasance in office**. The President has failed to uphold the duties to manage and oversee the Cabinet and to adhere to the guiding documents that ensure fairness, transparency, and lawful governance within WSGA.

These ongoing issues have materially impaired Cabinet functionality and undermined WSGA's credibility as a representative student body. Accordingly, this evaluation should be referred to the

Internal Affairs Committee for further review and possible action pursuant to **Article II, Section 1.3** of the WSGA Constitution and **By-laws, Article I, Section 4.1**.

Personal Testimonies:

Given the testimonies of various parties, the decision was made to move to a Due Process Hearing. This occurs when there is enough evidence presented to determine that the alleged actions have more than likely occurred, and this threshold was met as a result of these testimonies.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- a. President Coulter has repeatedly raised her voice at/with [REDACTED]. This has happened on a number of occasions in a variety of different meetings. I think that this is usually as a result of frustration, but it always creates a hostile environment where opinions are shared less freely.
- b. President Coulter has overstepped and completed tasks assigned to [REDACTED] on a number of occasions. This usually stems from a deadline or expectation not being communicated, which turns into frustration that a task has not been completed, which leads to President Coulter taking over and doing things [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- a. I have also felt overstepped on a variety of occasions, in a manner similar to that of [REDACTED]
- b. I often feel as though the immediate assumption is that I am not doing my job, even when I do not believe that I have shown in any way that I am incapable of doing so.
- c. I feel as though the job is also placed on a higher priority than friendships or personal relationships or care for others. I know that there have been times where I have sent messages and talked to President Coulter as a friend and have only gotten responses related to work and WSGA.
- d. I have been placed in situations and positions where I am forced to mediate conversations; this, as I understand it, is not my job. I do not enjoy that phrasing, but I also do not believe that I should feel obligated to stand in a room and be forced to listen to two grown adults duke it out and shout.
- e. I have also seen that a number of people in WSGA are treated differently by the administration.

- i. [REDACTED], and other folks,
periodically

[REDACTED]

- a. There are a lot of times where [REDACTED] has not been trusted to do her job.
- b. [REDACTED] has a lot of great forms that are incredibly organized, but the administration seems to misbelieve her and assume that she is not working.
- c. [REDACTED] was incredibly frustrated about the fact that she was not included on this series of budget meetings without an apparent cause. In addition to this, there was no communication about the fact that President Coulter knowingly chose to overlap her schedule.

[REDACTED]

- a. President Coulter asked [REDACTED] to reschedule an event that [REDACTED] was collaborating on with multiple other organizations, which caused undue stress on [REDACTED]
- b. [REDACTED] has also been frustrated about the lack of communication with the administration; this has caused problems for her in her position.

[REDACTED]

- a. When the administration demonstrates that they don't know what the policies and bylaws are, this usually falls directly on [REDACTED] because he has to remedy these misconceptions.
- b. The President is currently working on revamping documents, a process that she did not discuss with [REDACTED] until she started work on the project.
- c. [REDACTED] was also one of the folks that left the agenda meeting that went wrong because he was frustrated
- d. President Coulter has also failed to communicate with [REDACTED] on various issues.
- e. [REDACTED] was, in fact, told that he was not permitted to answer questions directly from certain senators.
- f. Told to treat senators differently based on the senator, relating to senators bringing legislation; both members of administration asked this. Specifically told to treat [REDACTED] differently. During the attempt to create a sub-committee, he was directed specifically not to give him yes or no answers. Exclude senators with independent thought.

[REDACTED]

- a. [REDACTED] does not seem to have any qualms with President Coulter

[REDACTED]

a. President Coulter frequently seems to overstep and give feedback to [REDACTED] in times, places, and manners that she does not do with any other cabinet member or member of senate.

b. [REDACTED]

c. President Coulter has, again, treated [REDACTED] differently than other cabinet members. This does not seem to be just a matter of this being President Coulter's past position in senate, it seems to go beyond that. There are other members of cabinet that have held other positions, and they do not feel the same need to micromanage the folks that currently hold their position.

[REDACTED]

a. [REDACTED] has heard President Coulter raising her voice/tone at others in the office.

b. While at WU Fest, President Coulter told [REDACTED] during the event that she "had some notes for next year" after [REDACTED] mentioned that she felt really good about the event and how it went.

c. Over the summer, President Coulter repeatedly made the assumption that [REDACTED] was double-counting her hours: that she was logging the same hours for both WSGA and Homecoming, thereby double-dipping and being paid twice for the same hours. This was not true.

d. President Coulter also neglected to take notes on a meeting where it was decided that [REDACTED] would be working full hours over the summer. This lack of planning resulted in another conversation needing to be had, just because the conversation was not conducted properly originally.

Interactions with Specific People:

[REDACTED]

a. After any interaction in the office with [REDACTED] am always asked what the content of the conversation was. This does not happen with any other member of senate.

- b. When [REDACTED] tried to participate in senate, in various ways, as he has a right to do, he has often been shut down, or at least denied the opportunity to participate in the same way.

[REDACTED]

- a. There was a conversation where [REDACTED] was frustrated with the happenings of senate. Since that point, President Coulter has seemed hesitant to hear [REDACTED] out on other things.

Questions (asked of President Coulter by Internal Affairs)

These were questions that Internal Affairs used throughout this process. We asked the same questions of all that we spoke to. These questions were based on the content of the Performance Evaluation and are listed below.

1. Has the administration demonstrated clear and consistent communication?
 1. Have you ever seen the administration exhibit poor communication styles, including but not limited to: shouting, hostility, dismissiveness
 2. How has this behavior, if any, affected the office or WSGA environment?
2. Does the administration make it clear to you what your responsibilities are in your position?
 1. Are you well aware of the requirements, limitations, expectations, and any potential deadlines that you may encounter in your position in WSGA?
3. Have you ever witnessed the administration demonstrate different treatment to any member of the senate, either favorable or unfavorable?
4. Do you feel empowered and encouraged to participate in this organization?
 1. Do you feel that you are able to participate in this organization joyfully under the administration?
5. Do you feel that the administration demonstrates a working knowledge of the WSGA governing documents and applicable policies?
 1. Do they demonstrate an effort to gain more knowledge about these documents?
 2. When they make mistakes with these documents, do they make clear efforts to remedy this?

Response (from President Coulter to Internal Affairs)

Upon being asked these questions and being made aware that the Internal Affairs Committee had made the weighty decision to move to a Due Process Hearing, President Coulter sent an email containing this document to Internal Affairs members. This article was mentioned briefly in the meeting minutes, so it is provided here.

Dear IA Committee Members,

I am writing this in response to being informed that I will be going through a Due Process Hearing. Honestly, I'm shocked and deeply hurt. I've been trying to keep myself together, but this has put me in a really unhealthy and mentally draining space. Still, I'm going to try my best to explain my perspective- because I haven't fully been given that chance yet.

What feels most unfair is that this decision was made before I even got to fully share my side or have my questions answered. This process seems to also be used out of utility instead of legitimacy. I understand from your most recent email that I will be given another opportunity to meet with you and ask those questions- but that opportunity is coming after you have already decided to move forward with a Due Process Hearing. It seems like there were still a lot of unresolved thoughts and feelings after our meeting on Thursday, yet things were pushed forward anyway. That alone feels wrong. It feels like the decision to escalate was made before truly hearing me out, and now the space to speak is happening only once the outcome has already been set in motion.

I'm also upset that during our meeting; I didn't get the time I was promised to ask my questions. I came prepared, but I only got to respond to what was brought up in the moment. You told me I'd have that space - but instead, I'm getting it now, in a much more serious and tense setting where I feel the need to defend myself. That's not fair, and it's not right, and you have set me up for failure.

It feels like you've made decisions about me without ever really listening *to* me. You've discussed me, judged me, and moved forward with something that directly impacts me- all without letting me truly speak for myself. I don't think you realize how isolating that feels. I walk into rooms now and feel like the air changes. I can tell when I walk by and conversations stop. I can tell that people know things about me that I didn't get to explain. That kind of isolation is heavy- it keeps me awake at night. And I've been trying to carry that silently while still showing up every day as president, as a leader, and as a person who genuinely cares about WSGA.

I want you to hear how this has looked and felt from my side:

1. **The performance evaluation:** Everything mentioned in it was never directly discussed with me. How can that be legitimate? If someone had concerns about me, why wasn't I told earlier so I could address them? If your professor forgot to remind you about an assignment or raised their voice when they got passionate about a topic- are you going to take him to the provost with expectations of the professor getting fully investigated as your first choice?
2. **You questioned its legitimacy,** but then brought it to all of cabinet, which just made everything more public and more humiliating. If there were issues with me, why weren't they talked through privately? Instead, now everyone's aware, and I'm left feeling like I'm being talked *about* rather than talked *to*.
3. **You told me during Homecoming week,** one of the most stressful times of the month for me. That timing added even more pressure when I was already stretched thin.
4. **The meeting:** I got 45 minutes. I asked for time to share my side and my questions, and I was told I'd get another meeting. Instead, IA debriefed without me and decided to escalate it further. I never got the chance to really defend myself or explain in a setting that is comfortable and not hostile.
5. **After all of this,** not one person from IA (apart from [REDACTED] has checked in on me, even after I said my mental health was not in a good place. That really hurts. It makes me feel like I'm not seen as a person, just a problem to deal with.

Right now, I don't feel comfortable around the IA committee. It feels like the people who should've had my back are the same people standing against me. It feels like decisions were made without compassion, without honesty, and without grace.

What hurts the most is that I've always tried to lead with heart. I've given this role everything I have, my time, my energy, my voice, and my empathy. I've spent late nights worrying, reflecting, and trying to be better. I've given people chances, offered understanding, and led with patience, even when I didn't have much left to give. And yet, when it came time for me to need understanding and grace, I didn't get it. I got a formal hearing.

I've worked incredibly hard in this role. This whole situation has made me question my worth- not just as a leader, but as a person. I've tried to be strong and professional, but this has chipped away at my confidence and my sense of safety in a space that's supposed to feel supportive. I've been told to be open to feedback, but what's the point if the feedback comes after decisions are already made? How am I supposed to grow when no one gives me a chance to?

I've even thought about resigning- not because I don't care, but because I *do*. I care enough to know that my mental health and self-worth shouldn't be destroyed by a process that feels unfair

and one-sided. I don't deserve to be treated like this. I have given my best to be resilient and give grace and I deserve at least the same honesty and respect I've given everyone else.

I'm getting mentally tired of this. If you want me gone, just say that. I'm done trying to read minds or pretend like this is about growth when it feels more like unfair treatment and punishment.

I know this is your first time handling something like this. It's my first time too, my first time as president. I've tried to give grace, to answer questions, and to cooperate. But all I got in return was one 45 minute meeting and an escalation without a discussion with me. That's all the time you thought my side of the story deserved. That's all the space I was given to defend the work, time, and care I've poured into this organization. I can't describe how much that hurts.

I understand you have processes and methods for why you do what you do- but just because a process exists doesn't mean it has to be followed blindly. Every IA situation is different and should be handled with empathy and understanding. This isn't a violation of policy, a misuse of funds, or an ethical breach. This is a complaint about my behavior- something that should have started with an in-depth conversation, which I still haven't gotten.

Please, just try to see me as a person- not a title, not a case, but a person who is doing their best and feels completely unseen in this process.

Questions I Wanted to Ask Before the First IA Meeting:

- If I've made every effort to be open, honest, and supportive, why were mediation or formal questioning chosen as the *first* official step instead of an honest, in-person conversation with the person involved?
- Can you help me understand what specific examples of "miscommunication" you're referring to, so I can reflect and improve?
- If raised voices or passionate conversations are immediately labeled "hostile," are we saying there's no room for emotion in leadership? Where is that line drawn?
- If I've made it clear I'm open to feedback, have an open-door policy, and consistently ask people what they need from me- what else is expected before I'm no longer seen as "dismissive" or "hostile"?
- If no one has taken the time to address these concerns with me directly, how exactly am I supposed to improve?
- Why is it assumed that I alone am responsible for creating clarity across WSGA, when this is supposed to be a shared leadership model?

- Is it possible that the perception of unfairness comes more from people not liking outcomes, rather than from actual unequal treatment?

Questions to ask after being informed that I will be going through a Due Process Hearing:

1. Do you believe you're treating me fairly by putting me through a due process hearing when other cabinet members have shown similar issues but aren't facing the same treatment? (If you had given me time, I would've happily provided examples.)
 1. If you do think this is fair, are you expecting others to go through this same process as well?
 2. If you don't think this fair- how else do you intend to hold people accountable? Will it be through this same process or a much less straining one?
2. Why did you make a decision that is so clearly damaging to my reputation and mental health- considering I believe that these issues do not warrant a reputation damaging process?
3. I understand that you are giving me another testimony- but why? Seeing you have already made up your mind as to what should happen after WITHOUT letting me share my full side.
4. Seeing that I have owned up when I have fallen short & have shown efforts in improvements- do you think this escalation was truly necessary?
5. Why was more time given to the rest of cabinet than to me before escalating this situation?
6. Do you really believe I'm doing that poorly in my role when I've shown that I respond and improve when corrections ARE communicated to me?
7. Do you care about me as a person or just as a president?
 1. What actions since this evaluation show that you do care about me as a person instead of a president?
8. Are you aware you gave me no timeline or notice to correct myself before making a decision about me that will affect me for the remainder of my time in WSGA?
9. How can you expect this to be resolved when IA members spend more time talking about me than with and has not given me equal time to explain myself or make changes?
10. I've only been in office for two months- do you expect perfection without correction or conversation first?

1. If not- what about this process says you don't?
11. I understand you have a guiding policy—but the lack of compassion and grace I have received has led me to spiral and has negatively affected my physical, mental, and emotional state. Again, do you believe this was the most ethical approach?
12. Are you aware that no cabinet member has addressed any of these concerns clearly or directly with me?
13. I ask you to reflect on the questions you have previously asked me. Do you see any resemblance in your actions? Dismissive towards what I had to say or my questions? Putting our conversation in a tense and hostile setting? Lack of knowledge of the IA policy, seeing as once a Due Process Hearing begins, the accused shall be able to respond to allegations against them. I have not received anything to start prepping my defense.
14. Do you think that you are handling this the best way possible? Why or why not?
15. Are you aware that this feels as if you are using this process simply because you can, not because you should? Do you truly believe this level of formality is necessary?
16. The email that was sent to me stated that this decision was made “after much deliberation and intentional conversation.” Do you believe that is accurate, considering the discussion was cut off at 6:00 and followed by only a “brief five-minute” deliberation before Yell Like Hell?
17. Do you feel like the only way to resolve this situation is by micromanaging me? Seeing that is how I feel right now?
18. What more do you want from me? What changes am I not making that you think I should start?
 1. Why wasn't that communicated from the start? Why were 7 additional people brought in to get to that- when you could have just talked to me directly?

This process has changed how I see this space- a space that used to make me proud to belong in. It used to feel like a team that lifted each other up. But lately, it's felt cold. It's felt judgmental. It's felt like the only thing people notice are my mistakes, not the heart or the effort behind what I do.

I'm not asking you to ignore my flaws. I'm asking you to *see me*- to see that I've been trying, to see that I care, to see that this role means something to me. I've spent months fighting for others, but I feel like no one is fighting for me right now.

This has taken more out of me than I can explain. The sleepless nights, the constant anxiety, the feeling that everything I say or do will be misinterpreted- it's exhausting and nothing I would

wish upon anyone. I can't keep giving everything I have to a system that doesn't seem to care how much it's taking from me in return.

I'm asking for honesty, empathy, and basic human decency. I'm asking to be heard- not in a formal hearing where I'm on trial, but in an actual conversation where my words matter and my feelings are respected. Because at the end of the day, I'm not just "the president." I'm a person who loves this organization and the people in it- and I'm tired of feeling like that doesn't count for anything.

I hope you take this letter seriously. I hope when you read it, you don't just see a complaint, but the pain of someone who has tried so hard to lead, only to be left feeling small, silenced, and alone.

I'm not asking for perfection- from me or from you. I'm asking for grace. I'm asking for fairness. And I'm asking for the kindness and compassion.

Sincerely, Kate.

Internal Affairs - Special Session – Due Process Hearing – 10/13/2025

Main Body of Meeting:

- Kate is given the entirety of the Job Performance Evaluation
- [REDACTED] There have been conversations with Cabinet in regards to these 6 issues, so yes, there is evidence for all of these points.
 - o Yelling, [REDACTED]
 - o 3 counts of misfeasance: exec interference in passage of legislation, procedural manipulation of vice chair appointments (didn't follow the by-laws), preventing cabinet from carrying out their duties through various means
- [REDACTED] We just think that these are misfeasance, which means that they are unintentional
 - o Coulter: Vice Chairperson was corrected
 - This was something that VP did wrong too, and it happened over a long course of time. Working knowledge vs other knowledge of documents
 - o Budget Meeting cancelled
 - The purpose of the meeting changed, which meant that the meeting was no longer essential. [REDACTED] was then no longer in the meeting. There was no account as to why the meeting with [REDACTED] was cancelled or why she was not included in the meeting as a part of her job duties originally. There are struggles with [REDACTED] as a VP because he is invalidating. This creates defensiveness.
 - None of these things have been presented to Kate directly. This is the first that she is hearing of them, which means that she has been required to do a lot of self reflection as opposed to being able to engage in conversations.
- Coulter: Kate has lacked any and all support as a result of the absence of [REDACTED] and this meeting has made everything worse. People in Internal Affairs have shared information, which is even more hurtful. There is a lot of grace is due from IA and other folks. We need to make sure that we are supporting people, because there is a lack of support from higher-ups.
 - o [REDACTED] Internal Affairs does understand and empathize with the fact that this process has been frustrating. This is a highly reactive body, but we do have empathy and want to make sure that we handle this in the best way possible.

- [REDACTED] There are drawbacks to being President. There is a lot of looking upward and different expectations. This was submitted anonymously, and there is debate over whether we proceeded in the most equitable manner. We do apologize for any unintended consequences, but this is a part of the processes.
 - In terms of those 3 counts of misfeasance: do you acknowledge that the legislation was killed in that room?
 - Yes, I acknowledge this, but I was not the only person in the room. I recognize that I was at fault, but I was not the only person at fault
 - Do you recognize that the Vice Chair appointment was a mistake?
 - Yes
 - Do you think that you have done everything to the best of your ability to make sure that cabinet can work in their full capacity?
 - Without feedback, I think that I have done my best, yes.
 - This is without feedback?
 - Yes, because I have not gotten feedback. If there is feedback, I want to know what it was and who said it.
- Coulter: Are there other instances that cabinet has mentioned in regard to a failure in my leadership?
 - [REDACTED]
 - [REDACTED] poor way, but in the best way possible through the ways that we could
 - [REDACTED] There are different things that Chief of Staff mentioned in terms of issues and different things.
 - Coulter: When do you feel that you have been overstepped?
 - [REDACTED] testimony

- Coulter: Are you aware that nobody has broached these concerns to Kate directly? There were some attachment issues with MarComms, there have been some learning curves, and there have been some other issues.
- [REDACTED] The issue with the budget meeting seemed to be that there was a scheduling overlap that was not communicated, not that the purpose changed
 - Coulter: This was not intentional, they changed the meeting but they also knew that the purpose was going to shift, so the scheduling concern would not have been real.
- [REDACTED] So the meeting was cancelled basically without the consultation of [REDACTED]? Was there a conversation with [REDACTED] about whether or not it would be okay to take the shift?
 - Coulter: I knew that [REDACTED] would have just handled the meeting, so there was no reason for me to let him know that it was going to be cancelled.
- [REDACTED] Do you think that there has been anything that you may have done to make people feel like you are not approachable
 - Coulter: I think that I make my best effort, but I do have a strong personality. Maybe I do need to make more effort to be more approachable, but I don't think that this is something that I can reflect upon alone and I do not think that my support systems of the VP and CoS have brought those issues to me.
- [REDACTED] How do we move forward past the Internal Affairs meeting?
 - Coulter: I think that this comes in the form of tearing down the wall that the Internal Affairs committee built. There has been a hard time connecting with cabinet. There are things that I need to address and actions that I want to take as we move toward next steps. There is no way that we can move forward if we don't address it. This is not just internal anymore, so we have to make changes.
- [REDACTED] Do you think that you have personally made mistakes, not just referencing past administrations? Do you think that you don't deserve to be here?
 - Coulter: No, I don't think that I need to be here. There was not an issue brought to me, so there is nothing that I could have done to change. You had to do work to find more information, which proves that there is nothing that I did wrong. There is not an issue, but there is an issue obviously. There was nothing brought to my attention

- [REDACTED] In an investigation, you are going to look for evidence. That is how that works.
- [REDACTED] The sentiment in the beginning was that people did not feel that they could approach you. This would be the reasoning for the JPE being turned in. This is the concern with this conversation
- Coulter: I do think that people do reach out to [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] instead of me, so there still should have been some communication to me
- [REDACTED] When cabinet members have not approached you, this is likely because people talk amongst each other and they may have had the fear that those kinds of communication styles would effect the meetings
 - Coulter: And maybe we need to remove emotion from the office, but I think that this is a real world thing that we need to do a better job of just handling. I provided options for how to handle this issue, but it is hard to not be emotional when you feel invalidated
 - [REDACTED] You can be emotional without yelling. Maybe this means that you take a break, but there is not a reason to yell because yelling is not an effective means of communication
 - Coulter: That requires a lot of self-reflection to discover
- [REDACTED] Do you think that it would be a better response to say “I am feeling this way” opposed to yelling?
 - Coulter: I think that this is one of the first time I’ve ever felt this, so I agree that this is probably a better option. We have done a better job since both of these conversations happened.
- [REDACTED] Has cabinet brought concerns to CoS, and does the CoS share those concerns with Administration?
 - [REDACTED] Yes, and yes. There’s a lot of discretion here
- Coulter: The issues that [REDACTED] has brought forward have been resolved
- [REDACTED] Have you talked to [REDACTED] directly about the way that he makes you feel invalidated?
 - Coulter: Yes, I brought it up in one of the heated conversations that we had, so I haven’t talked to him about it since then. We have both talked to [REDACTED] about feeling that way, and [REDACTED] told us that we needed to talk with one another instead. I have gotten better at feeling validated and there have not been many conversations of that nature since then.

- [REDACTED] Do you think that you respond openly or defensively?
 - o Coulter: I think that I am very open and solve lots of problems. I do become defensive quickly when being accused of something.
- [REDACTED] My biggest thing is that we had witnessed discrimination against a senator directly with the killing of a bill. When you feel as though you can discriminate against someone in this way, this will continue to happen, and this is a big concern.
 - o Coulter: Yes. I would also like to say that I was not the only person in that conversation. I removed myself from those meetings. During this whole process, I have also felt really discriminated against because I know that people have talked to other people about this entire process and this is discrimination. This is supposed to be internal, so it is hard for me to not flip the narrative here. This instance has not happened again, since. But, I have also felt discriminated against.
- [REDACTED] The concern is more that executive power was misused, not that there was discrimination. There was legislative obstruction.
- [REDACTED] Do you mind elaborating as to how you think that people have made this external?
 - o [REDACTED] Point of order?
- Coulter: Share of feelings regarding the proceedings of Internal Affairs. It's incredibly harmful to know that there are multiple folks on campus that know about this. It feels discriminatory to know that we heard all of cabinet prior to hearing from President Coulter. This should not have been moved to a Due Process hearing prior to hearing Kate's testimony. There are people treating her differently as a result of some unintentional mistakes. I have no problem admitting to those mistakes. I am more than happy to share information and names of who has shared information outside of this committee.
- [REDACTED] I move to an executive session.
- Coulter: I think that we should not move to mutual consent. You didn't follow those same standards, so it would be hypocritical of you to move to a mutual consent agreement. I want to move on. I want this to be addressed with senate. I feel like people don't trust me, so I will have to address this with senate. IA also had shortcomings and it should never happen again that people outside of Internal Affairs should know about matters of IA
- [REDACTED] There are 3 counts on the table, and the executive session would be to determine the best course of action on those counts.
- [REDACTED] Do we leave [REDACTED] sequestered?

- [REDACTED] We know that [REDACTED] will dismiss the allegations, and I have wanted to dismiss the allegations as well, so there is no benefit in bringing him back in.
- Coulter: Are there any other questions that I can answer for you before you move to deliberation?

Executive Session

- [REDACTED] President Coulter, would you remove yourself?
- [REDACTED] Why could I not ask who has shared information outside of IA?
 - o [REDACTED] I don't think that this question was pertinent to the information at hand
- [REDACTED] Could we bring in Kate and move [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED] Do we believe that Kate is guilty of the action of legislative obstruction?
 - o Based on the evidence, did this happen, yes or no?
- [REDACTED] There was an issue of how the Vice Chair election was handled improperly
- Coulter: There isn't a by-law violation here because there is not a timeline specified for vice chairpersons
- [REDACTED] What do you all want? Can we put our cards on the table?
- [REDACTED] I would be okay with a warning, but I do not want a mutual consent agreement either.
- [REDACTED] I don't want a written warning because I don't want to go further with the allegations.
- [REDACTED] The only way that I think that we should consider this an offense is if we think that yelling should be banned in the office.
- [REDACTED] Technically, yelling is not banned in the by-laws. The issue is the obstruction of cabinet in their ability to complete their roles. If cabinet has not brought these up, then there are other questions here
- Coulter: I would also like to highlight that the only people that I yelled at were [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
- Count 1: Guilty.
- Count 2: Dismissed.
- Count 3: Dismissed.

- [REDACTED] With a warning, we would need to also give a warning to Internal Affairs. This would perhaps constitute a dismissal of the charges. We should have reacted more quickly.
- [REDACTED] We do have to come to a mutual consent agreement, seeing as we have sustained one count of those allegations.
- Coulter: I was going to ask what the conditions of a mutual consent agreement would be and if I can make conditions. I brought conditions to this meeting.
- [REDACTED] We have the authority to interpret what guilt means. She is less guilty because other parties were involved and there are grounds to dismiss.
- [REDACTED] Seeing as though she did make the claim that she was guilty, this should be held in high esteem. We need to hold everyone accountable for what has happened. IA is highly reactive. This does not dictate how things are “supposed” to go. We have the power to change things. This discussion is not about reform.
- [REDACTED] An admission of guilt and we would have to consider all of the other parties that were in that meeting.
- Coulter: Are you going to bring in the other people that participated in that meeting
- [REDACTED] IA does not look for charges to bring to people, we are only reactive. Someone else would have to bring those charges up.
- Coulter: Can you not bring charges against other people?
- [REDACTED] Since we brought in other people, I think that we can continue to talk to those people. It is unfair to tie these directly to Kate.
- Coulter: In the case that another person gets something else against them, are they going to be held to the same level of scrutiny
- [REDACTED] IF they are all guilty, then they are all guilty. We would bring charges against every individual
- [REDACTED] I think that we could still absolve people of all responsibility. If things can be fixed in the future, then it no longer applies here. I think that we should dismiss
- [REDACTED] Seeing as President Coulter is the President, I do think that it is fair to hold her to a higher standard. I do still think that this is guilty and we need to move to the next steps. What do we want in the mutual consent agreement.
- [REDACTED] I would move to reevaluate the allegations on a vote.
- Coulter: I am interested to see what happens on the mutual consent agreement, seeing as all of those issues have been resolved.

- [REDACTED] I see no purpose in the mutual consent agreement
- [REDACTED] I am okay with saying, “Kate, ensure adherence to the bylaws and constitution.” This is a written warning and I am okay with doing this. There is nothing wrong with doing this process. It should be on record to make sure that all future executives know.
- [REDACTED] If that is the case, a written warning, is not binding. We would have to do a mutual consent agreement. What is the utility of the agreement? It is up to us to determine whether or not the charges are important.
- Coulter: I did have conditions that I would like to implement in the mutual consent form.
- A written warning is achieved.
- Coulter: I do want you to know that I have to do damage control on myself. There are next steps that need to be taken. A public forum will be put on the agenda to take accountability. I would also like to talk to Internal Affairs about the way that we move forward with this kind of process in the future. A timeline, a point-person of communication, and an approach for how they will attain things.
- [REDACTED] I don’t think that we need to do a public forum.
- Coulter: I want to encourage the open door policy. I want there to be sincerity.

Final Determination:

The final determination of the Internal Affairs Committee was to provide President Coulter with a Written Warning. This decision was made on the basis that there are now multiple systems that have been implemented that work to prevent this same action from occurring again, so the committee felt that it would be prudent to allow for a Written Warning. The Written Warning itself, as well as the statement and report made at the following Senate are provided below.

Report:

The Internal Affairs Committee, as the entity that oversees the investigation of Job Performance Evaluations, has been working through an investigation. As per our policies, we are to provide a report of the conclusions of the meetings, when the meetings conclude. This means that our verdict on this particular matter is final. Internal Affairs and all parties to this matter shall not be subject to further questions or scrutiny from the senate. Internal Affairs has followed all of the processes laid out in our governing documents, By-Laws, and IA policy to reach this conclusion. Internal Affairs has made the decision to provide Kate Coulter with a Written Warning. The Warning reads as follows:

Written Warning:

Per the investigation of Internal Affairs, all members of the WSGA Senate are to adhere to all standing rules of the Senate. This written warning dictates that President Coulter shall maintain adherence to SB100: The Open Floor Act, as well as all other Legislative Actions and Writings. This is a determination made and completed by the Internal Affairs Committee; there is no need for further action or continued discussion. Further discussion of this topic is strongly discouraged.

Conclusion:

Again, this is the final say on this matter. All members of senate are encouraged to move forward from this matter knowing that all issues, if found, have been resolved. Speculation and further discussion are discouraged. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.