



University of Washington

Board of Directors | Session 123

February 15, 2024 | Husky Union Building 303 | 5:30 PM

The ASUW acknowledges the stewards of Coast Salish lands, the lands on which we currently sit, and the UW occupies. We acknowledge the original and current caretakers; Duwamish, Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations and peoples.

Zoom: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/4769215522> | Meeting ID: 476 921 5522

AGENDA

Call to order

Jacob Feleke calls meeting to order at 5:41 pm.

Land Acknowledgement

Roll call

Jacob Feleke - President (present)

Ellis Andrews - Vice President (present)

Thomas Sefair-Lopez - Personnel Director (present)

Melody Fung - Finance and Budget Director (present)

Yazmine Mendoza - Communications Director (present)

Francisco Dojenia - Director of Internal Policy (present)

Leah Sishu - Director of Diversity Efforts (present)

Nandana Jaideep - Director of University Affairs (present)

Naomi Snow - Director of Programming (tardy, present)

Anastacia Mikaele - Director of Community Relations (present)

Azaan Leslie Brown - Director of Campus Partnerships (present)

Andal Sridhar - Student Senate Vice Speaker (present)

Amanda Chin - GPSS Vice President of Internal Affairs (present)

Christina Coop - Associate Director of Student Activities (present)

Carrie Moore - Husky Union Building Director (present)

Maya Lukalapu – Board of Directors Coordinator (present)

Approval of Agenda

Francisco motions to include the request for information

Ellis seconds.

Motion carries. Agenda item added.

Ellis motions to approve agenda.

Francisco seconds.

Vote is unanimous. Agenda approved. 8.o.o.

Approval of Minutes

[feb 8th minutes.docx](#)

Nandana motions to approve minutes.

Leah seconds.

Vote is unanimous. Minutes passed.

PUBLIC FORUM
CONSENT AGENDA

NEW BUSINESS

- [BOARD BILL 4.08 - An Act to Approve Bean Basket Memorandum of Understanding with the Husky Union Building](#)

Melody reads the bill. This bill aims to approve the bean basket memorandum of understanding with the husky union building.

Ellis explains that the Bean Basket paid \$3,000 in the entirety of their operation last year. Remarkably, in just one quarter of this year, in the new space, they made the same amount. She is wholeheartedly in support of continuing their presence in the new space, as she believes these numbers speak for themselves.

Melody states that it's worth noting that the Bean Basket made \$3,000 in revenue for the last quarter, and within the first four months of opening in the new space, they have already generated \$4,000. This suggests that the new space has significantly benefited their operations.

Leah motions to approve.

Azaan seconds.

Vote is unanimous. Bill is adopted.

OLD BUSINESS

FUNDING UPDATES

- [FINANCE BILL 6.19 - An Act to Grant Modality.docx](#)

Melody provides an update that they passed a request for \$288.81 for modality purposes from the Special Appropriation Fund. This funding is allocated for an event scheduled for February 16th, which is tomorrow.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- OGR Lobbying- Jacob
 - o [5904](#)
 - o [2114](#)
 - o [2112](#)
 - o [2214](#)
 - o [6038](#)

Jacob explains that OGR has been making incredible progress throughout this legislative process. He recommends taking at least 5 to 10 minutes to read and sign approval on these bills.

Jacob motions to have a recess until 6:00 PM.

Ellis objects.

Ellis explains that this should be done as private citizens on their own time, and the board meeting should be reserved for official business. She emphasizes her wholehearted support for the bills but suggests addressing this matter after the meeting.

Jacob defends the motion, stating that OGR has been working hard, and there has been a lack of general ASUW support. He suggests using the time during the recess because they are the main individuals supposed to be advocating.

Jacob motions for a five-minute recess.

Francisco seconds.

Motion carries. Recess until 5:58 pm.

Jacob calls the meeting back to order at 5:59 pm.

- BOARD BILL 4.06 - An Act to Establish a Task Force for the examination of creating the South Asian Student Commission at the ASUW – Leah Sishu
 - o [Survey Responses Excel](#)

Leah Sishu, Maya Lukalapu and Khushi Loomba give a presentation about the taskforce.

Maya and **Khushi** explain the goals and objectives of the South Asian Student Commission (SASC) task force. They state that they aim to address the lack of representation and support within ASC for South Asian students, centralize information and resources for South Asian organizations, increase awareness of ASUW among these organizations, properly distribute ASUW resources to them, and celebrate South Asian cultures. The task force intends to foster better communication between ASUW and South Asian Registered Student Organizations and create a dedicated space for underrepresented populations without diminishing the value of existing groups. They highlight the structure and purpose of ASUW commissions, emphasizing that SASC would represent students who have faced historical or social discrimination.

Leah provides an example of what SASC could look like by pointing to the ASUW Pacific Islander Student Commission. PISC was established due to constituents not feeling represented by ASC. They currently have one director and **Khushi** explains how budgets for commissions work.

Leah explains that the timeline that the taskforce is following is in the ASUW Bylaws on page 51. **Maya** provides details about their next steps. They will have their general meeting on Friday from 4 to 5 and they invite everyone formally to join. The Finance and Budget directors' recommendations are due on February 23rd and the final written report and board bill are due on February 28th and 29th.

Leah directs everyone to the Excel sheet with the survey responses, which is available on the ASUW Agenda.

Khushi highlights that many South Asian RSOs have indicated in the survey that they believe they do not have funding access or are unaware of available resources. She emphasizes that everyone has equal funding access but stresses the importance of addressing the lack of awareness about available resources.

Maya explains that the survey is still open for responses, and all the data collected will be included in the written report.

Leah points to their link tree and opens the floor for questions, comments and concerns.

Coop inquires about the methodology behind the survey that was recently conducted, expressing interest in understanding how the survey identified respondent demographics to accurately analyze and extrapolate data. They are curious about the specific demographic questions included in the survey and seek clarification on the strategies used for distributing the survey.

Jacob F. yields his time to **Khushi**. She thanks Coop for their questions and answers saying that the form was kept anonymous for the public, but herself, **Leah**, and **Maya** were able to see who the respondents were. She explains that this allowed them to identify the diversity of their respondents, including South Asian students and other groups within the campus, enabling them to gather sufficient data for comparative analysis. For distribution, they ensured it was widespread. They used flyers and also relied heavily on word-of-mouth, which was crucial for making personal connections with people in their classes and teams. They would approach people walking on the street, asking them to fill out the survey.

Ellis asks if there could be further details provided regarding the timeline for the submission of the written report. Specifically, she is asking if the report is scheduled to be submitted to the board during the last meeting of the quarter. **Leah** responds by clarifying the timeline for the task force's activities, pointing out that it is outlined in the ASUW bylaws.

Ellis inquires further about the plans for presenting the final report to both the Senate and the JCC, noting that this was not included in the timeline provided. **Leah** explains that the final report will be distributed to all relevant parties on the same day.

Melody yields her time to **Rohini**. **Rohini** emphasizes an important procedural detail regarding the presentation of the report to the Senate. She explains that for the report presentation to comply with the bylaws, it must be presented during an official Senate meeting, as the Senate needs to be convened for such a presentation to be considered

valid. This specification is made to ensure there's a clear understanding that simply sending the report to an individual member of the Senate does not meet the requirement. She insists on making this procedural necessity clear and officially recorded, highlighting the importance of adhering to the bylaws in the process of presenting the final report to the Senate.

Melody asks whether the plan is to establish this commission within the upcoming fiscal year. **Leah** confirms that next year is the goal, but the taskforce will decide based on **Thomas** and her recommendations.

Melody explains that her question centers around the proposed commission's timeline and its implications. She sees the value in the initiative, but she is concerned about its feasibility within the upcoming fiscal year, given their immediate deadlines. The F&B budget request is due tomorrow, and they're scheduled for a budget retreat next week to deliberate the entire budget. She explains that this timing makes it challenging to establish the commission for the next year. She adds that it's important to consider the financial aspects. The commission is not just a one-time expense but involves recurring costs. She explains that establishing a commission typically requires an annual budget of \$30,000 for wages and operations. This would mean an ongoing financial commitment from ASUW, which necessitates careful planning and preparation. She believes that more groundwork is needed if they aim to launch the commission in the upcoming year. However, she feels reassured by the mention of a resolution to continue exploring this initiative, even if it doesn't materialize as quickly as hoped. She explains that it is crucial that they have a plan for how to carry this effort forward, beyond just the next fiscal period.

Leah clarifies that the timeline they're working against was informed by the dates provided by Melody, and they've been making efforts to align their recommendations accordingly.

Ellis expresses her support for the commission, emphasizing that her forthcoming questions stem from a desire to fully understand the initiative and ensure a thorough investigation by the board before proceeding. Following this, she asks if there has been any communication with SAO regarding the additional costs associated with advising a new entity. **Leah** explains that **Rick** is their SAO advisor and that she is planning on talking to him about this at their next meeting.

Anastacia asks whether Delta Kappa Delta would be one of the constituents. **Khushi** confirms that they will be and that they reached out to them, along with all the other

South Asian RSOs, when they sent out their open letter. She clarifies that the ones mentioned in the presentation are members of the taskforce.

Andal yields her time to **Haley Chee**. She questions the surveying methods regarding demographic information collection. She notes that the survey asks respondents to indicate if they are part of an RSO or not, but she seeks clarification on how this method is used to collect demographic information about survey respondents.

Jacob F. yields his time to **Khushi**. She explains that as the survey is ongoing, they are still ensuring they gather enough responses and proper information. The full report with results will be provided later.

Haley seeks further clarification on how demographic information is distinguished, especially if an individual responds multiple times. **Khushi** explains that if individuals are responding, they would be able to discern their experiences through the form and also be able to see if there are any double responses. **Leah** explains that respondents should only be able to respond once but that they will keep double responses in mind when compiling the final report.

Anastacia asks if they have considered sending their survey through OMAD or the ECC and explains that through her knowledge of the creation of the PISC and conversations, they already have lists of constituents that could be used for the survey. **Leah** explains that currently they have been relying heavily on JCC and their constituents, but they will reach out to OMAD and ECC.

Yazmine suggests the possibility of sharing data through graphs that preserve anonymity but include time stamps for various dates since many people have concerns with the anonymity of the survey. They suggest providing current graphs of all collected information, with the understanding that they will be updated when the final results are compiled. **Leah** explains that she will discuss this with the taskforce at their upcoming meeting on Friday.

Jacob F. yields his time to **Maya**. She explains that they have communicated with **Jacob F.** about including the survey in his all-student email to ensure it reaches the entire student population, thereby enhancing visibility and response rates. She emphasizes that efforts are being made to maximize the use of available resources to engage the student body, despite the frequent difficulty of capturing their attention. She

mentions the creation of their linktree which is being used to centralize access to various initiatives such as petitions and open letters in one accessible location, aiming to improve transparency and accessibility for everyone.

Ellis expresses concern that the task force is facing significant pushback due to the survey's methodology, particularly regarding its approach to anonymity and data collection. She acknowledges the good intentions behind the survey but points out that the anonymity of demographic information obscures who is actually participating. She explains that this ambiguity extends to submissions by RSOs and that it's unclear how a single response from an RSO should be interpreted, given that it could represent a much larger group than individual responses suggest. She suggests that a comprehensive redesign of the survey, rather than just adding more questions to the existing one, could greatly enhance its effectiveness and support the task force's objectives.

Leah elaborates on the survey's design choice, emphasizing the priority of protecting the identities of individuals and RSOs, particularly within the South Asian community, which led to the decision to conduct the survey anonymously. She explains that this methodology was adopted not to obscure the process or introduce inaccuracies but to ensure participants felt secure in their responses. She expresses a willingness to receive suggestions on how to maintain this level of confidentiality while addressing any concerns about clarity or potential misinformation in the data collection process.

Ellis suggests including questions about affiliation with RSOs, academic standing such as what year the respondent is in, and identification with the South Asian community. Additionally, she recommends asking participants about their awareness of the ASUW's resources available for the South Asian community. She explains that this approach could yield insightful data, especially if it reveals that a significant number of senior students who identify as South Asian are unaware of the resources provided by the ASUW. She says that such findings would indicate a lack of outreach to this demographic over their college years, providing concrete evidence of an area needing improvement. She acknowledges the original intent behind the survey's methodology but expresses concern that the anonymity of demographic details might detract from the survey's potential impact by obscuring important insights.

Naomi emphasizes the broader objective behind the survey, suggesting that focusing excessively on its imperfections might overlook its primary goal. She acknowledges that while the survey may have flaws, its essential purpose is to demonstrate a clear need and interest in establishing the commission. She argues that dwelling too much on the survey's imperfections could be counterproductive, emphasizing that the survey

currently serves as valuable evidence of demand for the commission. She advocates for a perspective that considers the survey's efficacy in highlighting this need, cautioning against letting detailed critiques detract from its overall contribution to the cause.

Ellis counters **Naomi's** perspective, emphasizing the importance of a solid foundation when proposing the establishment of a new commission. She argues that the strength of such a proposal relies heavily on the integrity of the surveying process, including both its results and methodology.

Azaan counters **Ellis's** perspective, suggesting that the imperfections in the survey should not wholly undermine its validity or the insights it provides. He draws a parallel with the low turnout in campaign elections despite dedicated efforts to engage the student body. He argues that while the survey may not be perfect, it still holds significant value. He believes the survey's findings are crucial in illustrating the necessity for creating the commission, indicating that the data collected, despite potential flaws, contributes meaningfully towards understanding the need for this new entity.

Maya explains that the approach to creating the survey was significantly influenced by input from RSOs participating in the task force. These RSOs expressed a preference for anonymity in the survey, a stance supported not only by them but also unanimously by all attendees of the relevant meeting. She emphasizes that the decision to avoid asking for identifiable information was a collective recommendation, aimed at ensuring the comfort and security of all participants. Furthermore, she expresses a wish that more individuals had attended the meeting, indicating that additional perspectives would have been welcome and considered in the survey's design process.

Leah notes that prior advice from her SAO advisor suggested that ASUW might be restricted in collecting demographic information, which led to her initial hesitation to include such questions in the survey. She acknowledges the potential utility of demographic data in understanding the survey results more deeply. She emphasizes the importance of considering the survey's content and the responses received, along with testimonies that highlight a lack of representation, transparency, and inclusion among students. She suggests that these concerns should not be overshadowed by the debate over the survey's methodology.

Anastacia recommends collaborating with the Burke Museum, highlighting that professional insights on cultural backgrounds from the museum could significantly

bolster support for the cause. She volunteers to facilitate this connection, indicating her commitment to assisting the initiative's success. Additionally, she advises working with the Office of Minority Affairs & Diversity to explore potential funding sources for RSOs. She explains that this could help in addressing the concerns raised by students and ensuring the proposed actions are well-supported financially. She also suggests finding ways to streamline information access for students, enhancing their ability to engage with and benefit from the proposed changes. She highlights the importance of student voices in driving change, noting that while the discussions start within the ASUW, their implications extend far beyond, touching on broader aspects of student representation and support.

Andal asks whether this is a public forum and explains that in a public forum, everyone's comments should be prioritized and not just board members. **Jacob** explains that the agenda topic was approved as a discussion item and that he is limiting it to board members and the individuals that they are yielding their time to.

Azaan asks about the contingency timeline for issuing a new survey. **Leah** answers that the timeline and success would largely depend on the level of support received, particularly from RSOs, which could potentially give them two weeks. She emphasizes the importance of prioritizing the community's voice in deciding whether to proceed with a new survey. She suggests that if there's a belief that a revised survey would yield better insights or stronger reasoning for the initiative, then it might be worth considering. However, she also raises a concern about the potential to undermine the contributions of those who have already participated in the original survey.

Jacob F. yields his time to **Khushi**. She explains that RSOs, having been integral to the task force and that they requested specific features for the survey. Creating a new form that deviates significantly from these requests might not only disregard the initial contributions but also risk perpetuating a perception of elitism associated with ASUW. She expresses concern over the potential dismissal of initial responses and the challenge of eliciting genuine feedback on a second survey, given that participants may feel their initial efforts were not valued. She stresses the importance of representing constituents accurately and suggests that the decision on how to proceed should consider the best interests of the community they aim to serve. Furthermore, she highlights the impact of hearing personal experiences spanning 20 years, describing it as a powerful reminder of the ongoing issues being addressed.

Jacob F. yields time to **Rohini**. She shares an important observation regarding the survey's vulnerability to multiple submissions from the same individual. By testing the

survey both in a normal browser and an Incognito window, she discovered that the survey does not save responses before submission and allows for the initiation of a completely new form upon each access. She explains that this flaw permits an individual to submit multiple responses by simply reopening the survey in an Incognito window or a normal browser session repeatedly. She says that it is a significant consideration for the board in evaluating the survey's integrity and the reliability of its results.

Jacob F. calls for a bad faith argument.

Jacob F. yields time to **Khushi**. She responds by expressing confidence in the integrity of the survey respondents, particularly the RSOs who participated in the survey during the task force meeting. She believes these groups are engaging with the survey genuinely, motivated by a sincere cause, and unlikely to manipulate the survey results through multiple submissions. She acknowledges **Rohini's** demonstration as a valuable exercise to identify a flaw in the survey mechanism, indicating an openness to address and resolve this identified vulnerability.

Jacob F. yields time to **Rohini**. She elaborates on her concerns, emphasizing that the ability to submit multiple responses to the survey reveals a significant vulnerability in the survey's design. She suggests that this issue could have been mitigated by requiring respondents to log in or provide an email address, ensuring that each participant could only submit the survey once. She argues that this oversight in the survey's creation opens the potential for manipulation of the results, which should be a key consideration when evaluating the survey's responses and its overall integrity. Her point is not to accuse anyone of exploiting this flaw but to highlight that the possibility exists and needs to be addressed to safeguard the survey's validity.

Jacob F. yields time to **Maya**. She asks about what the best practices for securing the survey against multiple submissions without compromising respondent anonymity or breaching privacy norms would be. She explains that ASUW may not have the capacity to request personal identifiers like names or student IDs, which informed their decision to avoid such data collection. She extends an open-ended question to anyone within ASUW who has conducted a survey, inquiring if they solicited email addresses or student IDs as part of their data collection efforts, seeking to understand how others have navigated these challenges.

Nandana suggests shifting the focus away from the specifics of the survey methodology to the overarching objectives of the discussion. She expresses concern that the current

conversation may not be productively addressing the central issue, which is the validity and representation of RSOs' opinions. She highlights that over 13 RSOs have already demonstrated their stance and concerns through an open letter, indicating a clear communication of their issues and demands. This, she argues, should be the focal point of the discussion, implying that understanding and addressing these expressed needs might be a more effective use of time than debating survey technicalities.

Ellis raises two questions regarding the strategic direction and evaluation of the task force's efforts. First, she asks if the task force plans to leverage the open letter to formalize student opinion through the Senate, seeking to understand the proposed process for turning the letter's contents into actionable resolutions. Second, she questions the criteria for measuring the success of the task force, or more precisely, the commission, should it be established. She asks about the specific metrics or indicators that will be used to assess the commission's effectiveness five years into the future.

Jacob F. yields time to **Khushi**. She acknowledges the proposal of pursuing legislation or resolution through the Senate as a valuable direction for the task force to consider. However, she emphasizes the inherent value and weight of the open letter, which has been directly endorsed by constituents. She argues that while the Senate is an important democratic representation of the student body, the direct endorsement from those most affected by the issues at hand, specifically, South Asian students and RSOs on campus, carries significant importance. She suggests that the resolution through the Senate might not necessarily enhance the legitimacy or urgency of the issues highlighted by the open letter. The genuine concerns and demands articulated by students provide sufficient validation of the problem.

Jacob F. motions to close debate at 7:00 pm.

Naomi seconds.

Vote is unanimous. Motion passes.

Khushi continues her response. She believes that while the Senate represents student opinion, in this case, it's more relevant to directly engage with the students who are directly impacted, such as those involved in Registered Student Organizations (RSOs). She argues that the decision to bypass the Senate was to ensure comprehensive input from all 30 RSOs, as they are the ones directly affected. Furthermore, she discusses her vision for inclusivity, particularly focusing on the establishment of events by the South Asian Student Commission. She suggests that the metric for measuring inclusivity

would be the occurrence of these events on an annual basis, like longstanding East Asian events. She emphasizes the importance of involvement from various RSOs, including participation in events like the Makers Fair, to represent South Asian culture effectively. Ultimately, she believes that engaging with RSOs directly and incorporating their voices is crucial for making informed decisions and achieving inclusivity goals. She suggests that qualitative measures, such as the representation of constituents and the diversity of events, are more meaningful indicators of success than purely numerical metrics.

Andal expresses her disagreement with the notion of undermining the Senate's role and decision-making power. As a member of Senate leadership, she highlights the rigorous process that resolutions undergo, emphasizing the high standards set for them. These standards include conducting surveys, incorporating statistics and quotes, and engaging in public meetings where input from various stakeholders, including South Asians, is welcomed. She mentions that individuals can also join the Senate as representatives from RSOs. She then transitions to her second point, expressing frustration at not receiving a satisfactory answer to her question despite repeated inquiries. She doesn't understand why a task force wasn't created to examine the Asian Student Commission (ASC) first, particularly addressing its lack of representation and providing recommendations for improvement before pursuing other initiatives. She argues that without concrete steps taken to rectify this historical precedent of representation issues, it's premature to assume that ASC cannot improve on its own. She emphasizes the importance of going through this process before making any claims about ASC's future viability.

Jacob F. quickly points out that **Brandon Mendoza**, a director of ASC, attended the JCC meeting the previous day and clarified that the formation of a task force to examine the constitution of a new commission is not prompted by shortcomings of the current administration of the Asian Student Commission. Rather, it is primarily influenced by historical factors, potentially related to the large number of students encompassed by the ASC compared to other commissions. He emphasizes **Brandon's** statement that it's important to understand that the current administration is not the cause for the task force but rather it's rooted in historical context.

Andal clarifies her previous statement, specifying that she wasn't referring to the current administration's shortcomings but rather acknowledging the historical lack of representation for South Asian students, spanning the past 20 years. She emphasizes that while one cannot expect this situation to change on its own, concrete steps can be taken to address it, potentially through measures such as forming a task force or holding town hall meetings or public forums within ASC itself.

Jacob F. yields his time to **Khushi**. She clarifies that she did not have intentions to undermine the Senate's authority or significance. She reiterates her emphasis on the importance of RSOs, which she views as representing a significant voice in the matter under discussion. She highlights that the support of nearly 800 individuals aligns with her and **Maya's** perspective, which she believes holds more weight than the opinions of a 100 people within the Senate. She emphasizes the importance of considering the direct constituents represented by these RSOs when evaluating the influence and significance of different viewpoints.

Ellis motions to extend debate for five minutes, until 7:05 pm.

Azaan seconds.

Vote is unanimous. Motion passes.

Khushi continues her response. She reiterates the purpose and scope of the task force, emphasizing that it is not solely focused on creating a South Asian Student Commission but rather aims to explore the issues raised, including those concerning ASC. She stresses that the task force's establishment was not arbitrary and that there is a deliberate intention behind its formation. Furthermore, she emphasizes that there is collaboration and alignment between the task force and ASC, with both entities working towards the same goal rather than being in opposition to each other. She clarifies that the intention behind establishing a South Asian Student Commission is not to diminish the efforts of existing groups but rather to address a historical lack of representation for South Asian students on campus. She highlights the importance of ensuring inclusion and awareness among South Asian students about available resources and opportunities on campus. She explains that establishing the commission would provide a platform for students to engage, participate, and access resources effectively. Lastly, she asserts that the goal is to ensure that South Asian students are informed and empowered, addressing historical gaps in representation and awareness.

Jacob F. adds that in the creation of a task force, Section 4, Letter G specifies the opportunity for dissenting opinions to be included in a minority report. He mentions that individuals can join the task force discussions, which take place on Fridays from 4 to 5, and have their dissent recorded and transmitted to relevant parties. He explains that this is an avenue for participation and ensures that diverse perspectives are considered in the decision-making process.

Jacob F. yields time to **Ishaan**. He raises two points. Firstly, he questions why the selective opinions and voices included in the open letter are not presented as part of a resolution's "whereas" clause to represent student body opinion. Secondly, he inquires about the last instance of consistent annual South Asian-centric or inclusive ASC hosted events on campus.

Leah states that, based on discussions with previous ASC Assistant Directors and other sources, there hasn't been consistent annual South Asian-centric or inclusive ASC hosted events on campus. She mentions that while there may have been some efforts towards inclusivity in the past, these were limited, and their sustainability was often dependent on specific individuals in leadership roles within ASC. She specifically notes a there was an event in 2017 but emphasizes that consistent annual South Asian-centric or inclusive events were still lacking. She explains that efforts towards inclusivity during that time were attributed to the efforts of the ASC Assistant Director from 2017. She clarifies that their intention is not to oppose submitting legislation through Senate for inclusion in a resolution's "whereas" clause. She emphasizes that this possibility will be explored within their task force discussions. Additionally, she invites further discussion and recommendations on this matter at their upcoming meeting.

Jacob F. announces the end of the debate.

- [Request for Information](#) – Andal Sridhar

Andal reads out the request for information. This request is an order to request further information from the taskforce created by Board Bill 4.06.

Jacob F. asks whether this request came from the Student Senate or Senate Steering. **Andal** answers that it came from Senate Steering and that it is not a bill.

Jacob F. points out a grammatical error about the title saying Student Senate instead of Senate Steering.

Jacob F. asks if Senate Steering is a public meeting and governed by OPMA. **Andal** confirms that it is a public meeting, and they are governed by OPMA. He further questions whether they are aware that they are governed by RCW's. **Andal** confirms yes.

Rohini calls for point of order and asks **Jacob F.** to make his statement instead of asking leading questions. **Jacob F.** points out that she is not a member of this committee and therefore, out of order.

Ellis yields her time to **Rohini**. She explains that initially, there was a motion for the vote to be conducted privately regarding a request for information, due to concerns among members of steering. However, this decision was later invalidated, and the vote was conducted publicly to replace it. She emphasizes that the final vote that passed was conducted publicly, and any private votes were deemed invalid and rectified to the best of steering's capacity. She provides this clarification assuming it aligns with the questions being asked, to ensure transparency and understanding among those involved.

Jacob F. points out that they violated RCW 42.30.060, which pertains to public meetings and actions taken during such meetings. He indicates that the initial secret ballot conducted during the steering session violated this regulation.

Rohini explains that the invalidated vote is not considered legitimate or official within the steering committee's proceedings. She clarifies that the mistake was rectified by invalidating the vote and ensuring it is not considered in any official capacity. She notes that since the rectification didn't involve posting the meeting, the action taken remains valid within their rights.

Jacob F. seeks clarification, asking if the use of secret ballots ceased only after the committee was told they were conducting a secret ballot.

Rohini asks **Jacob F.** to clarify what he's asking by that.

Jacob F. explains that the secret balloting ceased only after the committee was informed of the violation of RCW 42.30.060. He says that all individuals who knowingly participated in the secret ballot, even after being informed of its illegality, are also implicated in the illegal behavior.

Rohini explains that initially, the committee was unaware that the secret ballot would be in violation of regulations. However, upon realizing that there might be questions or concerns about its legality, they took action to invalidate it. She emphasizes that the committee did not intentionally engage in the secret balloting with full knowledge of its potential violation.

Jacob F. seeks clarification on the initial vote being a secret ballot and then it becoming a public vote after it was rectified. **Francisco** provides clarification, stating that after realizing they couldn't conduct a secret ballot, the committee rectified the situation by holding a public vote. He emphasizes that this public vote occurred after the secret ballot and that ultimately, the initial secret ballot vote was nullified. He expresses his view that the lines of questioning are disingenuous to the steering committee.

Ellis defends the steering committee, suggesting that they deserve leniency for their mistake. She points out that they (board of directors) themselves have also made errors in following RCWs correctly, particularly in previous executive sessions where they did not publicly disclose the reason for the executive sessions. She cautions against disingenuously bringing up past accidental violations of RCWs, asserting that such actions have occurred before within ASUW. **Jacob F.** states that there was a clear announcement of executive sessions before they were conducted and the reason for them as well.

Anastacia yields her time to **Rohini**. She redirects the focus of the discussion, expressing a desire to avoid circular questioning about the mistake made by the steering committee. She emphasizes that this is a time for the board of directors to ask questions specifically related to the request for information, and she encourages the discussion to remain focused on that topic.

Jacob F. reminds **Rohini** that she is not a member of this committee and must wait to be recognized. **Francisco** concurs with the President and that she must wait to be recognized.

Ellis asks about the motivations behind putting forward the request for information and seeks clarity on what specific benefits they believe would result from accessing the requested information.

Andal explains that several senators expressed dissatisfaction with the way certain questions were answered during the meeting. She indicates that these senators sought more context but were unable to gather any beyond the Excel spreadsheet. She then clarifies that the request for information is aimed at obtaining the basis for assumptions made in task force discussions and survey information to address the confusion faced by the task force.

Jacob F. yields time to **Khushi**. She expresses confusion about how their personal messages could convey information about the task force and emphasizes their accessibility to answer any questions from senators. She believes that handling the situation by requesting formal information is extreme, suggesting that one-on-one meetings would be more appropriate for addressing senators' questions. She explains that the lack of information provided is not due to withholding it, but rather because the process is still ongoing and not finalized. She assures that the intention is not malicious and that they are willing to engage in conversations with both the board members and senators.

Naomi agrees with **Khushi's** sentiments and expresses frustration, suggesting that the current process is inefficient and a waste of time. She believes that instead of going through the formal steering process, senators could have simply asked for the information directly. She also mentions the possibility of requesting the information through the OPMA if it falls under its jurisdiction, implying that there are alternative methods to obtain the information.

Yazmine yields time to **Jacob Gannon**. He provides additional insight into conversations that took place during the steering session and after the last Senate meeting. He expresses senators' concerns that the responses given to their questions during the Senate meeting felt a bit on the offensive and became a bit aggressive at times. Consequently, senators felt discouraged from seeking clarification by meeting with them in the office or during their personal time.

Jacob F. rules that out of order. He explains that discussion is supposed to be about motions or bills and that it's not meant to discuss personal characters. He explains that characterizing people as aggressive is a character attack.

Ellis yields time to **Jacob G.** He asks for guidance on how he is allowed to respond. instead. **Jacob F.** suggests refraining from describing people in general and emphasizes that discussions should solely focus on actions related to bills and the task force. He says that characterizing people is not the purpose of the discussion.

Andal calls for point of information for clarification and explains that she believes that **Jacob G.** was explaining conversations and comments from senators.

Jacob F. explains that it was out of order because it was inappropriate. He explains that he doesn't want to hear characterization of people in terms of an argument. He asks everyone to base the discussion on a bill or a motion, but not the character.

Andal asks if they can talk about the background. **Jacob F.** confirms that they can.

Jacob F. yields time to **Jacob G.** He explains because of discussions within the Senate steering committee, they decided it was necessary to compel members of the taskforce to provide further information about their forums and the work that went into them. Specifically, he mentions a question raised during the Senate meeting on Tuesday regarding how data was being used to support the claim that students from the South Asian community were increasingly unaware of ASUW business and opportunities compared to other groups of students. He notes that there was no data to support this claim, and when the question was asked, no answer was provided. Also, it was stated that the data that could answer those questions was not available.

Leah expresses that alongside **Maya** and **Khushi**, they have publicly stated multiple times their willingness to meet with anyone and have made themselves accessible to answer questions. She emphasized that their meetings are public, and they are open to providing more information upon request. She adds that they were indeed willing to meet and had received no comments, questions, or concerns after the Senate meeting. She explains that the decision not to share certain survey responses was based on the promise of anonymity given to survey participants. They assured participants that their responses would remain anonymous, except to task force members for safety reasons. She mentions that they have taken notes and recommendations from the presentation and plan to implement them in future surveys to ensure more accurate responses. However, she emphasizes that anonymity will still be maintained as promised. She further explains that she was advised by **Rohini** to delete any columns containing revealing information from the survey responses to maintain anonymity, as promised to the participants. She expresses concern that changing this now would be unfair to the survey participants and would go against the initial promise of anonymity. She stresses that maintaining anonymity is crucial for student safety and trust. She expresses disappointment at being labeled as aggressive for responding and emphasizes their efforts to be accessible and responsive to concerns.

Francisco asks to redirect the discussion to focus on what the steering committee specifically wants from the task force and **Leah**. He says that the decision has already been passed and cannot be reversed. He emphasizes the importance of cooperation moving forward and expresses confidence that **Leah** will collaborate effectively. He asks what the steering committee specifically wants.

Rohini answered that it includes all information collected from the survey that does not personally identify anyone, such as emails or names. However, it may include information about specific responses from various groups. Additionally, all records, communications, and relevant documents related to the task force's meetings are requested. Furthermore, any written communication relevant to the task force's discussion, especially if referenced in previous forums, is also requested. She emphasizes that the request does not ask for personally identifiable information but rather non-personally identifiable demographic information, such as whether an RSO filled out the survey or the names of RSOs listed and that it does not conflict what she had told **Leah** previously.

Jacob F. asks the parliamentarian, **Francisco**, about whether a taskforce is a public meeting. **Francisco** explains that they are an internal working group, so it is not necessarily public. He further questions if they are governed by OPMA. **Francisco** says that they are not.

Jacob F. questions if they can demand this information or if they are simply demanding it. **Francisco** says that it's a request and that **Leah** does not have to do it.

Anastacia asks whether this was just supposed to be a quick update on the progress that has been made within the task force and if there's anything saying that a commission is being established.

Leah clarifies that the final decision regarding the creation of a new commission will only be discussed when presenting the final written report and board bill. She emphasizes that the task force is exploring the possibility of creating the commission but also considering the possibility of not creating it. She stresses that the outcome may not necessarily be the establishment of a new commission, as the decision will be based on the findings of the task force. She emphasizes that both options, creating or not creating the commission, are feasible and will be considered based on the task force's assessment.

Jacob G. calls for a point of information. He requests a review of the bylaws to ascertain whether it is accurate that the Senate bylaws and governing documents of ASUW stipulate that non-compliance with the Senate's request for information could potentially trigger a recall vote.

Jacob F. proposes that the first step should be to determine whether the request for information is subject to the same regulations as public versus non-public meetings governed by OPMA. Additionally, he suggests examining the language of the request to ensure consistency, pointing out potential contradictions regarding anonymity and full disclosure of task force communications. Finally, he expresses an opinion that, if he were a member of the task force, he might not feel compelled to continue participating based on the request for information and the recall.

Jacob F. motions to close debate.

Francisco seconds.

Vote is unanimous. Motion has passed.

- [Proposal Constitution](#) – Francisco Dojenia

Francisco informs the group about the progress of the Constitutional Reform Task Force and encourages their input and comments before the finalization of the report and proposals. He emphasizes the importance of attending meetings and participating in discussions to ensure the best outcome for the proposal.

- Dead Week Meeting? – Francisco Dojenia

Francisco questions whether the board is planning to have a meeting during dead week. He mentions that he plans on presenting the final task force report and Constitutional proposal on March 7th which is dead week. **Jacob F.** confirms that they have a meeting scheduled for dead week.

Jacob F. asks for questions, comments or concerns on the dead week meeting or the constitutional proposal.

Jacob F. comments on how they included the Chicago Statement. **Francisco** explains that that is still up for discussion and that there is still a bill in the Senate.

Jacob F. asks Francisco to give a quick overview of the Chicago Statement. **Francisco** explains that the Chicago statement is this overall set of ideals about having civil discussion rather than restricting certain speech like by the university or by just in principle so that more collaboration and open dialogue is fostered. He explains that he believes that that's very important because when there's a lack of communication, there's going to be a lack of understanding of each other's perspectives.

- [ASUW Town Hall Agenda and ROE's.docx](#) – Nandana Jaideep

Nandana informs the group about the Town Hall agenda, mentioning that she has already prepared it and shared it via a link. She encourages members to provide suggestions or feedback by adding comments or texting her directly. She emphasizes that if no changes are made, she will assume that everyone approves of the agenda and will proceed with it for the Town Hall meeting scheduled on the 26th.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Historical Photography – Francisco Dojenja

Francisco, as the historian, shares his plans to take photos starting from next week's board meeting and senate meeting. He intends to continue this practice every week. Additionally, he mentions his consideration of capturing official portraits and acquiring a UW flag with a stand for this purpose.

- [Transition Handbook](#) – Ellis

Ellis mentions that **Thomas** and her have created a transition handbook to address the issue of lost knowledge during transitions from year to year. She highlights that

transition knowledge is often not recorded or documented apart from basic schedules. The handbook is still in a tentative draft stage, with plans to add more content. The goal is to improve and upgrade transition mechanisms to ensure that ASUW can start operating more efficiently from the beginning.

ADJOURNMENT

Francisco motions to adjourn.

Azaan seconds.

6.1.0. No objections. Meeting is adjourned at 7:49pm.