



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Board of Directors | [Agenda](#) | Session 125

November 6, 2025 | 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 Link](#) | [ASUW Board of Directors Agendas and Minutes](#) | [Captions](#)

Call to Order

Nandana calls this meeting to order at 5:33 pm.

Land Acknowledgement

Roll Call | 16 total. *10 voting. 6 quorum | # present (P). # excused (E). # absent (A).

P | *President – **Nandana Jaideep**

P | *Vice President – **Sonal Virk**

P | Director of Personnel – **Owen Rivera**

AE | Director of Finance and Budget – **Khushi Loomba**

P | Director of Communications – **Peyton Sax**

P | *Director of Internal Policy – **Ashwin Anand**

P | *Director of Diversity Efforts – **Valeria Perez-Levy**

P | *Director of University Affairs – **Kate Lawson**

P | *Director of Programming – **Grace Clarke**

P | *Director of Community Relations – **Jessica Phan**

P | *Director of Campus Partnerships – **Audriana Scott**

P | *GPSS Vice President of Internal Affairs – **Juan Mora**

P | *Student Senate Speaker – **Erick Jacobsen**

P | Board of Directors Coordinator – **Caroline Huguely**

P | Associate Director of Student Activities – **Marshall Traverse**

P | Husky Union Building Director – **Carrie Moore**

Public Forum

None.

Approval of the Agenda

Kate motions to approve.

Erick seconds.

Agenda approved with unanimous consent. 5:35 pm.

Approval of the Minutes

Kate motions to approve.

Jessica seconds.

10/23 minutes approved with unanimous consent. 5:37 pm.

Consent Agenda

Sonal says she gets to appoint three people, through an open-selection process, to the Student Technology Fee Committee. She explains that they'll bring different, diverse perspectives to the committee as the appointees are from a range of majors.

Nandana explains that the University Bookstore Board of Trustees needed one undergraduate student to serve a two-year appointment. She says she interviewed two people and selected one of them for the role.

Owen explains that his Board Bill is to hire a new Frontend Developer for the Office of Communications. He says he is excited to start working with him.

Erick motions to approve.

Sonal seconds.

Consent Agenda passes unanimously. 5:39 pm.

New Business

- [BOARD BILL 3.16 An Act to Allocate More Funds for Office Supplies and Furnishings](#)

Sonal reads Board Bill 3.16 aloud in its entirety.

Erick asks what furnishings and supplies this money will be used for.

Sonal says three people need new desks, one for OID, one for ASC, and one for SDC. She explains that the money for furniture has already been used up, so most of the funds will go toward the new desks. She explains that the rest will go toward small couches, basic supplies, and lamps.

Audriana asks if there is a sheet where Sonal is keeping track of supply requests.

Sonal says yes, and everyone should have access to it.

Kate asks if there will be a different request form for new items, or if these funds are only to fulfill current requests.

Sonal explains that there are a lot of items on backorder right now as she was waiting to ask for more funds from the Board. She says she has had people submit things to order to her via Teams.

Kate motions to approve.

Erick seconds.

Board Bill 3.16 passes unanimously. 5:45 pm.

- [BOARD BILL 3.17 - An Act to Establish an Annual Board of Directors Travel Fund for Conferences and Representation](#)

Nandana reads Board Bill 3.17 aloud in its entirety.

Erick asks how the money was calculated.

Nandana says she allocated a large lump sum for right now. She explains that the Associated Big Ten Students have a lot of great deals on hotels and food, helping to reduce costs. She says if they run out of this money, she will come back to ask for more money.

Peyton asks who and how many people would go to these conferences.

Nandana says that the ABTS Fall Conference is in November. She says that herself, **Grace**, **Jessica**, and **Audrey** are planning on going. She explains that the \$10,000 is an overestimation, so she doesn't have to come back time and time again to ask for more funds.

Peyton asks if these funds can also go to other conferences throughout the year.

Nandana says yes.

Erick asks if the expectation is to add a fund like this to next year's budget.

Nandana says it'll be up to **Khushi**, but ideally, yes.

Erick motions to approve.

Audriana seconds.

Board Bill 3.17 passes unanimously. 5:49 pm.

- [BOARD BILL 4.04 An Act to Amend the Personnel Policy for the Clarification of Provisions Applicable to the ASUW Student Senate](#)

Erick reads Board Bill 4.04 aloud in its entirety.

Erick explains this is exempting Student Senate committee chairs from things hourly employees are required to do. He provides the examples of committee chairs from being exempt from all-staff meetings and ASUW orientation. He explains that committee chairs do not have a lot of hours to work with, and those meetings are largely irrelevant to their roles. He explains that this change will also require the Senate Speaker to serve on the hiring committee for the Senate Clerk, a common practice that has not been codified anywhere. He says that if this is to be amended, it would be required to go through the Senate.

Ashwin asks why this section of the Personnel Policy has to go through Senate.

Erick explains that the Constitution says that anything related to the Student Senate in the Bylaws must go through the Senate.

Peyton asks why the precedence was that committee chairs don't have to abide by the Volunteer Policy.

Erick says his guess would be because the Volunteer Policy never made a clear distinction between a Senator and a volunteer. He says that the uniqueness of Senators sometimes requires them to work more than 5 hours a week, which would violate the Volunteer Policy.

Peyton asks what the minimum number of hours someone, including volunteers, needs to be paid for.

Sonal says if someone works more than 5 hours a week, they are required to be paid.

Peyton shares her concern over not including Senators in the Volunteer Policy, possibly causing them to miss out on work they should be paid for. She explains that, while Senators are in a unique position in ASUW, she doesn't want Senators to do work that other ASUW volunteers would be paid for.

Sonal asks if **Erick** has an average on how many hours a Senator works on a week-to-week basis.

Erick says that 90% of Senators are only going to the once a week, 2-hour Senate meeting. He explains, however, that there are some Senators who are doing things somewhat outside of their Senator role. He explains that is where some of the gray area comes in, since the committees they liaison to are a separate process but still semi-related to their Senator roles. He explains that some committees with Senate appointees offer pay, like STF, and it could be difficult to iron out all the intricacies with other organizations if they were to integrate Senators into the Volunteer Policy. He says that the average Senator is only working 2 hours a week, and a smaller number of Senators are working 5-6 hours a week.

Ashwin motions to approve.

Kate seconds.

Board Bill 4.04 passes 8.0.2. 5:58 pm.

- [BOARD BILL 5.03 \(LD-32-1\) A Legislative Directive to Adopt the ASUW Legislative Agenda](#)

Erick explains that the Legislative Agenda is the document that guides what OGR lobbies are on. He says that the agenda first went through the Legislative Steering Committee, then the Student Senate, and now it is here at Board for its final approval.

Erick says the first subsection is “Funding University of Washington, and the Washington College Grant.” He explains this is a longstanding lobbying point. He says the section supports increasing the median family income threshold to 65%.

Kate motions to approve this subsection.

Ashwin seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:00 pm.

Erick says the second subsection is “Workforce Education Investment Account (WEIA).” He explains that a tax on computing goes into this fund, which all used to go toward the Washington College Grant. He says, however, a rule was amended allowing the account to be used for anything. He explains that this subsection supports codifying and protecting the account to only be used to support students and not used to cover institutional costs.

Nandana says the WEIA money comes from taxing large corporations.

Kate motions to approve this subsection.

Peyton seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:01 pm.

Erick says the next subsection is “Textbook Tax Exemption and Promotion of Open Educational Resources.” He explains that this subsection supports making educational materials, like textbooks, tax exempt.

Peyton motions to approve this subsection.

Jessica seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:02 pm.

Erick says the next section is “Research Funding.” He explains that this subsection supports funding for all research, with an emphasis on undergraduate research and the Undergraduate Research Collective.

Ashwin motions to approve this subsection.

Grace seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:03 pm.

Nandana clarifies that a majority of Board members have worked on the Agenda in Legislative Steering or saw it in Senate, so this is not the first time they are seeing it.

Erick says the next subsection is “Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness.” He explains that this subsection supports access to confidential resource advisors, notices of survivor rights, trauma informed support, and consistent reporting processes. He adds that there is also a line for increasing funding for SANE nurses, which they discussed a couple weeks ago in Board.

Peyton motions to approve this subsection.

Sonal seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:04 pm.

Erick says the next subsection is “Expanding Access to the Students Experiencing Homelessness (SEH) Grant.” He explains that there is an oversight in the law, and this grant can only be given to one campus per institution. He explains that, right now, Seattle is not that campus. He says this supports expanding the grant so every UW campus and institution can apply for it. He adds that the subsection also includes a line supporting increased funding for the food pantry and emergency housing resources.

Kate motions to approve this subsection.

Ashwin seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:05 pm.

Erick says the next section is “Post-Undergraduate Unemployment Exemptions.” He explains that, currently, if you want to receive unemployment benefits you are required to work a certain number of hours in a certain period of time. He says, however, hours accumulated while working at an institution don’t count. He explains that this subsection supports removing that restriction.

Peyton motions to approve this subsection.

Kate seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:06 pm.

Erick says the next subsection is “Supporting Students with Dependents.” He explains that this supports expanding the working childcare connections program and priority registration for students with dependents.

Kate motions to approve this subsection.

Audriana seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:07 pm.

Erick says the next section is “Supporting Undocumented Students.” He adds that this section also includes international students because of the recent increase in cases of international students’ visas being revoked. He explains that this subsection supports protecting student data, working in financial aid opportunities, student representation on issues, and ensuring that ICE is not allowed on campus.

Ashwin asks if it would draw away from this subsection to add international students to the title.

Erick explains that they can’t amend this in Board without it going back through the Senate.

Nandana says they could possibly take it as a grammatical change.

Peyton asks if there was a reason it wasn’t included in the title.

Erick says he believes that the international students angle of the subsection was added during LSC, so the lack of a title change was probably an oversight.

Jessica explains that she thinks the main focus of this subsection is if international students get their visas revoked, which would pertain to “undocumented.”

Kate says she was in LSC, and the lack of a title change was an oversight rather than an intentional choice.

Ashwin says he thinks the title is fine as is since the subsection represents a holistic definition of “undocumented.”

Ashwin motions to approve this subsection.

Jessica seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:10 pm.

Erick says the next subsection is “Supporting Financial Literacy Education Initiative.” He adds that this was proposed by **Ashwin**.

Ashwin says financial literacy is becoming more important amidst current financial crises, and this supports expanding state funding for financial literacy initiatives.

Kate motions to approve this subsection.

Peyton seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:10 pm.

Erick says the next subsection is “Campus Decarbonization.” He says the Institutional Climate Action RSO submitted a resolution to the Senate two years ago. He explains, last year, they attempted to independently go to Olympia to lobby on the issue, and a legislator recommended getting the issue in ASUW’s Legislative Agenda. He explains the subsection supports UW’s only capital ask at the upcoming session, which is to get electric boilers so the institution can move away from natural gas in the power plant.

Nandana says this is three years in the making, and she is proud of all the work ICA has done.

Peyton motions to approve this subsection.

Kate seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:12 pm.

Erick says the next section is “Artificial Intelligence Property and Privacy Rights.” He explains this section supports updating the RCW that covers individuals’ property rights with their name, voice, signature, and more, to also explicitly prevent people from creating AI generated images or deep fakes of other people. He adds that this also supports protecting student data from being used to train large language models.

Peyton says this is extremely important, and AI companies are constantly trying to sell data, including all students’ data. She says that companies are selling student data for their own financial gain, so this is very important to advocate for.

Peyton motions to approve this subsection.

Sonal seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:13 pm.

Nandana says **Brandon** was inspired to write that subsection after reading about a similar AI policy in Denmark.

Erick says the next five are position statements, which are shorter and a bit vaguer since they do not currently have a bill associated with them. He explains that these enable OGR to advocate on these issues in the event that a bill arises.

Erick says the first is “Native Student Tuition Waivers.” He explains that these tuition waivers would not only apply to native students who are a part of Washington tribes.

Kate motions to approve this position statement.

Peyton seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:14 pm.

Erick says the next second is “Public Transportation.” He explains that this supports more affordable, accessible, and sustainable public transit.

Kate motions to approve this position statement.

Jessica seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:15 pm.

Erick says the third is “Data Privacy.” He explains that five years ago, the Student Senate passed a resolution to end UW Libraries’ contract with LexisNexis since it is a database that has collaborated with ICE for a long time.

Peyton motions to approve this position statement.

Sonal seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:16 pm.

Erick says the fourth is “Asynchronous Work Opportunities.” He explains that this supports making lecture slides available and specifies that these opportunities will be provided to students experiencing medical or family emergencies and students engaging in civic activities.

Sonal motions to approve this position statement.

Kate seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:16 pm.

Erick says the final position statement is “Shared Governance and Civic Engagement.” He explains that this advocates for removing language in RCW 28B.10.281, which says a student can get all of their financial aid taken away if they are in the area of a protest that could be construed as disruptive in any way. He says this RCW is incredibly broad and scary.

Peyton motions to approve this position statement.

Jessica seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:17 pm.

Nandana explains that if the Board wants to amend anything, then the Bill is required to return to Senate, so they can approve it once again. She shouts out **Brandon** and his team for all of his hard work on this.

Kate motions to approve the 2025-2026 Legislative Agenda.

Ashwin seconds.

Board Bill 4.04 passes unanimously. 10.0.0. 6:19 pm.

Nandana says they will present this at the Legislative Reception, so she asks everyone to attend.

- [BOARD BILL 4.03 - An Act to Approve the 2026 Elections Policies and Procedures](#)

Ashwin says they will go section by section, and **Reaa** from the Elections Administration Committee will speak on changes made.

Reaa says all marks in red, blue, or purple are changes that were made last year. She adds that there are some changes that have been made that are not highlighted since they were approved by the Judicial Committee. She says they added a few sentences to the preamble.

Erick motions to approve the cover page.

Kate seconds.

Motion passes. 6:23 pm.

Peyton motions to approve the preamble.

Erick seconds.

Motion passes. 6:23 pm.

Ashwin says there have been a few changes to the dates.

Reaa says they have clarified who the EPP applies to and that if the election period is extended, then campaigning will be extended as well. She adds that they expanded the definition of what a campaign affiliate is.

Nandana asks what a campaign affiliate, “unpaid or paid,” means. She says candidates don’t typically pay people to help with campaign work.

Reaa says that was the Judicial Committee's decision, not hers.

Nandana asks if there was a discussion about it.

Reaa says Judicial wanted clarification, and that was the language they suggested.

Peyton says she understands what a campaign affiliate is. She asks what the difference is between affiliate and volunteer. She says the line says, "assisting candidates," but then all the subsections speak about ballot measures.

Jessica asks if this means that paid affiliates are condoned.

Kate says that raises a campaign finance problem.

Ashwin says, technically, if an affiliate is being paid, it won't go into campaign finances.

Reaa explains that there is nothing in the EPP that says candidates can't pay affiliates. She clarifies, however, it will still apply to the campaign's spending limits. She says that all affiliates must be registered with the EAC, so they can track who is connected to who, so violations are easier to charge.

Peyton says the language surrounding affiliate is far clearer than volunteer. She suggests picking either an affiliate or volunteer but not having both.

Kate says she is confused if affiliates need to register, and volunteers don't.

Ashwin explains that if a direct campaign affiliate asks a friend to do something for the campaign, like reposting a story or post, then that person would fall under the volunteer definition.

Peyton says if they are trying to provide a distinction, then a volunteer for a campaign would be a better term than an affiliate. She explains, to her, a volunteer would be putting in time to campaigning efforts, whilst an affiliate would be someone doing simple favors, like reposting a story.

Kate agrees with **Peyton**. She asks how high their interest is in bringing any affiliate, even someone doing a simple favor, in front of Judicial to be arbitrated. She says that would mean Judicial cases could apply to anyone that has ever reposted something, which would be intense.

Jessica asks where they would draw the line between who is a supporter and who is a direct affiliate.

Ashwin suggests striking the word volunteer, and granting more clarification as to what an affiliate is.

Sonal asks how a random affiliate would be held accountable for a violation.

Reaa explains an affiliate would need to be registered to the EAC so they can be held accountable, which is why she is okay with striking the language of “volunteer.” She says that any UW student can be brought to Judicial, as currently stated in their Bylaws.

Owen asks what constitutes assisting a campaign. He asks if someone just reposting something would constitute assisting a campaign.

Reaa explains that someone actively assisting the campaign by tabling or managing campaign activities would be classed as an affiliate. She says someone simply reposting something would not be an affiliate. She explains that it is under EAC’s jurisdiction, and EAC, this year, would not view someone reposting a story as an affiliate.

Peyton asks if they could say that an affiliate is someone actively advocating for a campaign, and they can outline some examples of what that means.

Erick motions to strike the “volunteer” line and add the word, “substantively” between “who” and “assist.”

Peyton seconds.

Nandana says they will make suggestions as they go and then approve all amendments at once at the end of each section.

Kate explains that defining what an affiliate is further would help prevent loopholes where people wouldn’t register themselves since they could claim they weren’t actually an affiliate.

Nandana says there are a lot of loopholes here since an affiliate can substantively be interpreted in many ways.

Skylar explains that later in the EPP, a lot of the duties and tasks of the affiliates are brought up in detail. She suggests looking into the later descriptions so they can come up with stronger details of what affiliates do.

Ashwin echoes **Skylar’s** point.

Reaa explains that she thinks what an affiliate is should be left up to the discretion of the EAC.

Nandana says she is okay leaving it up to the discretion of the EAC, but there should still be more details on what an affiliate is to prevent too many unregistered affiliate cases going to the Judicial hearing.

Reaa says they can mention what they count as an affiliate during the ethics seminar.

Peyton explains with complete discretion being up to the EAC, it creates a lot of potential loopholes since future EAC directors may have different opinions on what an

affiliate is. She says that she worries, in the worst case, that EAC co-chair could favor one campaign over and differ on who is an affiliate even if they are doing the same tasks.

Owen echoes **Peyton's** point.

Reaa asks how many loopholes they can fight in a single sentence. She says that the EPP is a document that people find a loophole in every single year. She explains they can add a bit more detail to what an affiliate is, but they can't possibly cover for every single thing, which is why EAC should maintain final say in what an affiliate is.

Erick motions to tentatively approve this section.

Audriana seconds.

Ashwin objects.

Ashwin says they are not through the entirety of the section.

Erick says they can motion to approve everything up until the time schedule.

Ashwin says they should do the schedule and then approve the entire schedule.

Erick withdraws his motion.

Reaa says the voting period has been changed to Monday, April 28, at 9am and extended to Thursday at 12 pm. She says this is a good way to test if extending the voting period extends voter turnout. She explains that the campaign start date has been moved to the start of Spring Quarter instead of the end of Winter Quarter. She says the financial disclosure form has also been extended to allow candidates to recover from elections a bit more.

Nandana asks if they are increasing the voting period or only shifting the times in which they open and close.

Reaa says that it is technically a 3-hour increase.

Peyton asks why the elections official resignation deadline is on February 6 when ballot measure filing doesn't open until February 20.

Reaa says this change stemmed from last year. She explains one of her interns resigned the day filing opened, which made it difficult to upkeep the EAC website. She says to prevent this from happening, EAC members will not be required to resign two weeks before filing opens to give the EAC time to re-hire that position.

Peyton asks if the verbiage can be changed to clarify that deadline only applies to EAC members.

Reaa says Section 1, subsection a.2 clarifies what an elections official and member of EAC is.

Peyton says okay.

Kate motions to approve Section 1.

Peyton seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:46 pm.

Reaa explains that a lot of the changes in the EPP this year are regarding ballot measures and ballot measure advocates, and what sections of the EPP apply to them. She says ballot measure advocates will now be held to the entire EPP to clarify confusion.

Nandana motions to approve Section 2.

Ashwin seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:49 pm.

Reaa says they have added things from the Bylaws into this section. She explains that they have also clarified that candidates must be ASUW members and must be registered for over six credit hours. She explains they also clarified that any student in consideration for student regent can't run for the ASUW BOD.

Nandana explains that graduate students can also run for a BOD position, which the language currently neglects.

Erick says it includes that.

Nandana says okay.

Reaa explains that in Section 3, subsection b, clause 2, they talk about what it means to properly fill out a financial disclosure form. She says, last year multiple candidates left the form entirely blank and only signed their name, which EAC deemed invalid. She adds that Section 3, subsection E, clause 1.1, clearly outlines what an election official is and when they must resign if they wish to run or be an affiliate in the election.

Erick asks if a different section defines when a Judicial Committee must resign.

Reaa says it should be in the Judicial Committee's Bylaws.

Ashwin motions to approve Section 3.

Erick seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:52 pm.

Reaa says there are no changes made to Section 4.

Erick motions to approve Section 4.

Ashwin seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 6:53 pm.

Reaa says they added a new part to Section 5, subsection L, clarifying RSO endorsements. She reads the new addition aloud in its entirety:

“Any RSOs or University-recognized Student Groups that endorse candidates or ballot measures are not required to promote all candidates on their promotional materials that endorse said candidates and ballot measures. However, if these groups choose to create promotional materials endorsing candidates, a financial disclosure transparency form must be filed to the EAC by the endorsed candidate. The financial disclosure form shall be part of the Endorsement Filing/Retraction form established by the EAC. If the corresponding candidate fails to submit a financial transparency form within 3 business days of the publication date of these promotional materials, it is a major violation. EAC does not have the authority to enforce how much an RSO or university-affiliated student group spends on campaigns; thus, they have no spending limit.”

Peyton says even if RSOs endorsements don't directly promote all candidates, linking to the voters' guide should be a requirement. She says it is an equity issue when a flyer goes all over a dorm without a link to the voters' guide.

Reaa says she agrees, but they don't have authority over how RSOs choose to promote candidates.

Nandana asks if that applies to an RSO like RCSA with more exposure and power.

Reaa says they can't hold any RSOs accountable since they have their own freedom of speech.

Jessica clarifies that an RSO can do whatever they want, but it is a candidate's responsibility to submit financial transparency for an RSOs' actions.

Reaa explains that she wanted to make the RSOs be held accountable to submit financial transparency, but SAO said she can't do that. She explains that as long as the candidate shows any proof that they communicated with the RSO about the endorsement, they will not be charged with a violation. She says leeway will be provided to candidates.

Nandana clarifies that any RSO at UW can spend however much they want on elections.

Reaa says yes.

Erick motions to approve Section 5.

Ashwin seconds.

Peyton objects.

Peyton suggests adding in saying "we advise" the RSOs to provide a link to the voters' guide. She says she understands they can't force them to do so, but they can at least promote it.

Erick withdraws his motion.

Ashwin says he will include **Peyton's** suggestion.

Nandana asks if the RSO doesn't file a financial disclosure form, then a candidate will be held responsible.

Reaa says that RSOs don't file, only candidates.

Nandana asks why financial disclosure is mentioned in this subsection. She asks if an RSO endorses a candidate then a candidate is required to submit a financial disclosure form on the RSOs' behalf.

Reaa explains that last year, RCSA, who endorsed candidates, hired Dubs for an hour to promote elections. She says the endorsed candidates would take the total cost to hire Dubs for one hour, \$350, divide it amongst themselves, and submit that cost to the EAC.

Nandana asks that if even a candidate did not want that endorsement, it is still held against their limited campaign expenditures.

Reaa says it is different and separate from campaign expenditures. She adds that they standardized campaign spending to a \$150 limit for all candidates.

Nandana asks if a candidate is not aware of the funds spent on them, and therefore they fail to file a financial disclosure form, how will the candidate be held responsible.

Reaa says the EAC can provide a 24-hour warning to file the form, and as long as significant effort is shown that you tried to reach out to the RSOs, then the candidate will not be charged with a violation.

Nandana provides the example of an RSO not wanting a candidate to win, endorsing the candidate and depriving them of the financial information, which would lead to the candidate receiving and major violation.

Reaa explains that as long as the candidate shows that they tried to reach out for financial information, even if they don't receive a response, they will not be charged with a violation.

Peyton asks if there is a way to check that support a candidate is receiving is coming from an RSO and not a friend or family member of the candidate. She says that person could receive donations from a friend or family member, which would typically impact their campaign spending limit, but then claim it came from an RSO, which would not affect their campaign spending limit.

Ashwin says that while that is a fair point, there is no verifiable way to check behind that funding.

Kate says all endorsements have to go through HuskyLink with a designated executive RSO member.

Sonal says it is great that they are pointing out loopholes, but there is a point where they can't prevent them.

Ashwin motions to approve Section 5.

Erick seconds.

Motion passes unanimously. 7:05 pm.

Ashwin says they are moving on to Section 6, which has a lot of edits. He says they will go through A-E first, then F-G.

Nandana says they will take a minute to look at the changes made to A-E.

Kate motions to approve Section 6, subsections A-E.

Peyton seconds.

Ashwin objects.

Kate withdraws her motion.

Ashwin says they will go through the whole section, including F-G, before motioning to approve.

Nandana asks if an RSO that has endorsed a candidate can't use the RSO resource center.

Reaa says that RSOs can use the resource center, but candidates and affiliates cannot use the RSOs' resources for their own campaigns.

Nandana asks if candidates can use the resource center for their normal RSO duties.

Reaa says RSOs can print endorsements using the resource center, but candidates can't.

Kate says she thinks there is a difference between advocate, affiliate, candidate, and endorser. She says if she was an RSO looking at this, she would think she is an endorser, not an affiliate, and therefore this restriction would not apply.

Ashwin asks what they do if affiliates are in RSO leadership.

Owen asks if this clause ensures that an RSO can't print flyers for a specific candidate using the Resource Center.

Reaa says, to **Ashwin's** point, that person would then become a candidate affiliate, and therefore they can't use their RSO money to print materials for the candidate they are affiliated with. She says an RSO could print endorsement fliers in the resource center, but not a candidate's official materials.

Ashwin asks if a campaign affiliate in RSO leadership can print endorsement materials in the resource center.

Reaa says yes, since that is official RSO business.

Nandana clarifies if an RSO couldn't print out a candidate's own material for endorsements, and instead they would have to create their own campaign material.

Reaa explains that if an RSO is printing a flyer that is a copy of a candidate's materials, the EAC would not charge the candidate with a violation. She says if a candidate goes to the resource center and prints out their official campaign materials, that would be a violation.

Kate says this is why the distinction between affiliate, candidate, and endorser is so important.

Erick motions to add to Section 6, subsection F, clause 12, "An affiliate shall be exempt from this clause if the material they are producing is a byproduct of an endorsement of a group that they are a part of."

Audriana seconds.

Nandana objects.

Erick yields his time.

Nandana says she still thinks this is very vague and makes it hard to prosecute. She thinks the “byproduct of an endorsement” should be less vague.

Erick says that it would be up to the Judicial Committee, but a byproduct of an endorsement would be a group making a flyer to advertise said endorsement.

Nandana asks if it matters what that flyer looks like.

Erick says not in his current wording, but he would be open to clarifying that endorsement materials must state that they are an endorsement.

Kate explains that she thinks the current wording is a blanket statement about no affiliates not being able to use the RSO resource center. She explains that any candidate affiliate, even if it is a person in an RSO, should not be allowed to print any endorsement materials. She says that someone else in that RSO should print out the materials for the endorsement, or the candidate affiliate can use their own money to print them.

Erick withdraws his motion.

Owen asks about the case where a club leader makes an endorsement and then becomes an affiliate after the endorsement.

Kate says that person would be able to use the resource center until they are an affiliate.

Owen asks if they can ask RSOs to clarify that the flyers are endorsements.

Ashwin says that while he understands where they are coming from, he hesitates to not allow candidates who are RSO leaders to print RSO endorsements because some RSO leadership teams can be very small.

Reaa agrees with **Kate**, but she says, however, requiring an endorsement statement on campaign materials over-regulates and can make the document even harder to understand. She says that Erick’s suggestion works just fine, and they can go into more detail at the ethics seminar.

Peyton asks if it is fully necessary to hold affiliates accountable for using the RSO resource center. She asks if this restriction should be extended to affiliates.

Reaa says they added affiliates because printing campaigning materials in the RSO center is a violation of SAF.

Kate asks if there is further clarification in the EPP on what an affiliate is and what they can and cannot do.

Ashwin says there can't be more clarification, since their registration with the EAC makes them an affiliate.

Kate says an affiliate needs to be regulated and subject to a penalty if they are going to define it. She asks why affiliates in RSOs can make endorsements at all.

Reaa says it's because affiliates are not candidates.

Ashwin clarifies that an affiliate can use the RSO resource center to print out their RSO's endorsement, but they cannot use the resource center to print out official campaign materials for the campaign they are affiliated with.

Jessica says that while affiliates did agree to a level of responsibility, they are not candidates. She says they need to remember that candidates will always be held accountable, so the affiliate role can't be held to the same standards as a candidate.

Erick suggests moving on a coming back to this question later. He says he doesn't see an amendment that could be made to this section at this time.

Juan asks if he, as an affiliate, couldn't use the resource center to print official campaign materials, but he could use the resource center to print his RSO's endorsements for the candidate they are affiliated with.

Peyton says yes.

Ashwin says he doesn't think they should revisit this, and they should approve it now.

Nandana asks if it is in someone's best interest to not be an affiliate if you are in an RSO that plans to endorse said candidate.

Reaa says no, since the affiliates' restriction to the RSO resource center only applies to the printing of any campaign materials using their RSO's money. She says RSO endorsements are separate since they are official RSO business, not official campaign business.

Nandana says okay.

Ashwin motions to approve Section 6.

Jessica seconds.

Nandana objects.

Nandana says they have not gotten through all of section 6 yet.

Ashwin withdraws his motion.

Ashwin reads subsection F, clauses 3, 4, and 5 aloud.

Reaa explains they added these points to clarify that EAC will try their best to keep candidates up to date with UW tabling policies, but it is ultimately the candidates' responsibility to be aware of the policies in the areas they are tabling in.

Ashwin reads subsection F, clauses 6, 7, 8, and 9 aloud.

Nandana asks even if candidates have explicit permission from a university building, they are still not allowed to campaign inside.

Reaa says no. She says candidates can campaign in the buildings as long as they have received explicit written consent.

Kate says that this is not what this says. She says this only allows candidates to campaign in classrooms only.

Reaa says you can't campaign in Odegaard.

Ashwin says he doesn't think any building should be off limits as long as the candidate has received written consent.

Peyton says her only concern with that is building policies, since the EPP does not supersede UW buildings' policies.

Erick points out that this doesn't ban campaigning in a way that doesn't interfere with academic instruction. He says as long as the campaigning didn't interfere with academic instruction, most cases they are concerned about will be okay.

Ashwin explains that the staff should be aware of all the policies of the buildings they operate in. He explains that if staff have granted approval to campaign in a way that aligns with building policy, then it should be okay.

Reaa agrees with **Peyton**, since a lot of buildings do not allow solicitation. She says that they can allow the specific buildings, but she doesn't think there are very many that would allow campaigning.

Peyton explains that last year, "building supervisor" was the verbiage used in the EPP. She asks for that to be re-included. She says that candidates could email a building supervisor, but not a student employee, since they may not know all the policy.

Audriana agrees with **Peyton**.

Erick says he doesn't foresee any way in which a candidate could receive permission to campaign in a building while also interfering with academic instruction. He says he doesn't see the need for this exception.

Ashwin says that, technically, Odegaard is a place where academic instruction is happening, and there is a difference between soliciting people at their tables versus

having a stationary table for students to walk up to. He explains that he fully supports adding “approval by the building supervisor” back in the language of the EPP.

Peyton asks if they can bring back “campaigning without permission from the building or facility supervisor,” and “campaigning without written permission from the instructor.”

Ashwin asks if they should include facilities in the language.

Peyton says her only fear with including “facilities” is that people could contact HFS, and they might get frustrated with telling multiple people no to campaigning in the dorms.

Kate says they should cover these details in the ethics seminar.

Ashwin explains that adding “and facilities” will allow for a broader range of possibilities to be covered by the EPP. He asks if they should add “faculty supervisor.”

Ashwin suggests the change:

“Campaign in any library, residence hall, or any other university building or facility in any way that may interfere with the academic instruction and mission of the University; For classrooms, RSOs, and facilities only, an exception can be made so long as candidates and ballot advocates meet the following requirements: Obtain explicit proof from the relevant instructor, an RSO officer, or building/facility supervisor, such as but not limited to a screenshot of the email thread between themselves and the faculty, RSO officer, or supervisor, respectively.”

Nandana says they should clarify written consent.

Peyton agrees.

Nandana says the change looks good.

Audriana says that “faculty” is still too broad since it could be interpreted as anyone working at a front desk.

Nandana explains that faculty specifically pertains to campaigning in classrooms.

Reaa says that people at a front desk are staff, but “faculty” is a professor.

Erick suggests saying the “relevant instructor” to dispel that potential confusion.

Kate motions to make all the amendments to subsection F, clause 9.

Ashwin seconds.

Nandana objects.

Kate yields her time.

Nandana says they will approve Section 6 as a whole instead of approving individual clauses.

Kate withdraws her motion.

Ashwin reads subsection F, clauses 10 and 11 aloud.

Ashwin reads subsection G aloud.

Kate asks about subsection G, clause 1. She asks if an unaffiliated posting occurs, and a candidate is unaware of this posting, how they are meant to take it down within 48 hours. She says this is an unreasonable standard to set.

Reaa explains that the 48-hour period starts after the EAC notifies the candidate about it.

Kate says okay.

Ashwin points out that someone could theoretically distribute such a large number of unaffiliated advertisements that the candidate could not possibly take all of them down in 48 hours. He says if a person with ill intent realizes this, they could possibly try and sabotage that person and cause them to receive a violation.

Kate agrees with **Ashwin**. She explains that the timeline needs to be clarified, and there needs to be clarification on what a candidate should do in a potential sabotage situation.

Reaa says in subsection G, clause 2, that if all official posters are in the EAC's registry, then candidates can use that as proof during the Judicial hearing. She says if someone tries to sabotage the candidate with unofficial material, the candidate can easily prove the material was not theirs by pointing to the EAC's registry. She recommends adding that the 48-hour rule will not apply to flyers handed out, but only posters.

Ashwin says if someone wanted to sabotage a campaign, they could theoretically put up thousands of posters, making it impossible for the candidate to manage to take all of those down.

Reaa says she understands that, but the extra 48-hour period is enough. She explains that they understand the posters are not the candidate's mistake, but any material being posted in disallowed places could provide an unfair advantage to candidates.

Nandana says that is another weird loophole. She asks what a candidate would do if they were asked to take down unofficial materials in a dorm they don't have access to.

Peyton asks why it would fall on the candidate rather than the person who actually distributed the disallowed material. She says this assists with a potential sabotage, as it would take away from campaigning time for the candidate. She says this doesn't seem fair.

Erick says there is leniency in the Judicial Committee, and there were no unfair punishments for the candidates affected by similar issues last year.

Ashwin agrees with **Erick's** point. He asks if it would be reasonable for EAC to take on the responsibility to take down unofficial flyers not affiliated with campaigns.

Reaa says that it can fall on EAC, but only if they can make submitting campaign materials to the EAC's registry mandatory. She says EAC will need to know what is official versus what is unofficial if EAC takes on that responsibility.

Kate and **Peyton** say that is completely fair.

Nandana asks if it would count as official campaign material if a candidate posted something elections-related on their Instagram account, and then someone prints that out and posts it everywhere.

Reaa says that EAC can make the determination that anything that is printed would go into that registry.

Ashwin says he is okay with making the registry required. He asks if there should be a time by which all campaign materials should be uploaded to the registry.

Reaa says 24 hours.

Ashwin says he will reflect the change to make the EAC campaign material registry a requirement in subsection G, clause 1. He reads all intended edits aloud in their entirety.

Reaa suggests clarifying that any material that is posted around campus must appear on the registry within 24 hours of the first posting. She suggests adding that candidates will be made aware of the registry for continuous filing at the Ethics Seminar. She says failure to post to the registry should be a major violation.

Ashwin says it should be a minor violation.

Reaa says a poster being posted in a place where it is not allowed to be is already a major violation. She says this is similar.

Nandana clarifies if not registering campaign material will be a major violation.

Reaa says yes. She explains that she is equating the violation to posters being placed in areas where they are not allowed to be to this.

Nandana asks if candidates are allowed to continuously file materials throughout the entire campaigning season.

Reaa says yes.

Ashwin says he wanted clarification on whether the posters need to be registered 24 hours before or after they have been put up.

Peyton says it should be 24 hours before they are intended to be put up.

Ashwin says that campaign materials can be made quickly and sometimes impulsively.

Reaa explains that the EAC is not approving materials, so as long as the poster is registered 24 hours before it is put up, it's okay.

Ashwin agrees.

Nandana says they can't have any sort of approval process for materials because it will infringe on freedom of speech.

Nandana motions to tentatively approve Section 6.

Erick seconds.

Motion passes. 8:12 pm.

Ashwin reads Section 7, subsections A, and B aloud.

Ashwin says the main changes are an addition of an RSVP form and the clarification that groups can't endorse candidates prior to their respective forums.

Nandana clarifies if an organization is set on hosting a forum, that organization is not allowed to endorse until after that forum.

Reaa says only if it is EAC co-sponsored. She says The Daily, who puts on a non-EAC co-sponsored forum, could endorse prior to their forum if they would like to.

Erick says he is happy with these changes.

Ashwin continues reading Section 7, subsection B aloud.

Audriana says they shouldn't rush through this, and if they feel the need to rush, table it for next time.

Reaa explains that she would agree with tabling if these changes were controversial, but this set of changes are mostly just codifying things.

Erick asks if clauses 11, 12, and 13 are requiring the mentioned forums to be hosted.

Reaa says that these changes say that the EAC can still put on a forum even if a co-sponsor cancels.

Erick says that clause 10 should be after 13.

Kate agrees.

Nandana asks why "President and VP are required to attend all forums unless excused before the forum" was struck.

Reaa explains that last year's EAC Co-Chair wanted to codify everything, which made the document a bit bloated. She adds that the codification made it seem that only certain positions were required to attend certain forums. She explains that she thinks it is better to have everyone engage with every forum instead of picking out certain positions.

Nandana passes off chairship to **Sonal**.

Ashwin reads section 7, subsections C and D aloud in their entirety.

Peyton asks why there is an elections ambassador training within the Ethics Seminar. She asks if candidates are required to be there for that.

Reaa explains that the elections ambassador training will take place directly after the Ethics Seminar.

Peyton says candidates should not be required to attend.

Ashwin says he believes the elections ambassador training is mostly listed for future EAC Co-chairs' reference.

Reaa says the training is part of the schedule, but it is not required for candidates to attend.

Peyton asks if the elections ambassador training can be listed in the co-chairs' transition documents instead of the EPP.

Reaa says the reason she wants to codify it is to prevent it from getting forgotten if the co-chairs do not read their transition documents. She says she wants to ensure that future poll workers are extremely trained.

Kate shares her support for **Erick's** suggested amendment.

Erick says that his amendment clarifies that only elections ambassadors are required to attend that portion of the Ethics Seminar.

Ashwin says he will make that change.

Erick motions to approve Section 7.

Ashwin seconds.

Motion passes. 8:23 pm.

Peyton motions to table Board Bill 4.03.

Ashwin seconds.

Board Bill 4.03 tabled unanimously. 8:23 pm.

Old Business

None.

Executive Session

None.

Funding Updates

None.

Discussion Items

Sonal says they need to get a contract going with NYT for Cooking + Games 90 days prior to March. She says, at this moment, they are paying \$18,200 for 52,000 NYT Games codes. She adds that they are paying \$4,000 for 4,000 NYT Cooking codes. She asks if they should reduce the number of codes. She says 2,000 cooking codes and 3,000 games codes have been redeemed. She says that she was thinking they could reduce the number of codes to 5,000, which would be \$12,000. She says they could also reduce to 7,000 codes, which would be \$14,000.

Peyton asks why 47,000 more codes costs only \$4,000 more.

Sonal says they have a specific discount that multiplies per code.

Peyton shouts out the past Vice President **Ellis** for starting this initiative. She explains that the promotion and the directions on how to access this program have not been well executed so far. She says that with a \$4,000 difference, it is not justifiable to pay almost as much to pay for 47,000 less codes. She says that they could marginalize the number of subscriptions to what their goal in voter turnout is.

Sonal corrects herself. She says it is \$22,000 total for the 57,000 codes. She says only 2,834 have redeemed the games codes, and only 1,333 have redeemed the cooking + games codes. She says that she can see where **Peyton** is coming from, and that the advertisement of the program has not been well done so far. She says that she doesn't think, even with good promotion, they can get 57,000 people to redeem the codes.

Nandana says they can start with a lower amount of codes, and if they see an uptick in engagement, they can increase the amount next year.

Peyton says that is why she suggested to reduce the number to projected voter turnout.

Sonal says she asked **Reaa** about this, and she said 7,000 codes would be perfect.

Nandana asks how much 8,000 codes would cost.

Sonal says it would probably be around \$15,000.

Peyton asks what the discount is.

Sonal says she thinks it 0.25 on each account, so the larger the number of codes, the more the discount is.

Kate says she likes 8,000 codes.

Sonal says she will let NYT know ASAP.

Owen explains that a while back, he and **Ashwin** came up with the idea for the Board to volunteer at the University District Food Bank. He says that **Audriana** proposed volunteering right before Thanksgiving.

Kate and **Peyton** say that sounds great.

Owen says he'll send out a When2Meet for that week, and they can set a specific date and time from that.

Nandana thanks **Owen** and **Ashwin** for being so proactive.

Nandana says both the Bylaws and Constitution need a lot of fixing, and she was wondering who would want to join to help work on these documents.

Kate, **Ashwin**, **Jessica**, and **Owen** raise their hands.

Nandana says she will ask **Erick** to join as well.

Announcements

Ashwin says that OPMA sent out a form for committee meetings scheduling for the 2026-2027 school year. He says if any BOD member leads a committee, they are required to fill out this form with a location for where that committee will meet for the 26-27 school year. He says the deadline is December 14.

Sonal explains that she has encountered many issues with committees and room bookings this year. She asks if they are expected to have rooms for the rest of this year.

Ashwin says the form is for next year's room bookings.

Jessica says she technically chairs the Undergraduate Transfer Advocacy Student Committee, but it has not gone on for a few years. She asks if that committee falls under OPMA and if she will need to fill out the form. She says she is trying to restart this committee since it is in the Bylaws, but it has been a slow process.

Marshall says he is not sure if it is OPMA.

Ashwin says **Jessica** shouldn't fill out the form since the committee is not established yet.

Nandana says that she doesn't believe that a lot of committees are OPMA bound because there are not many elected officials involved.

Peyton asks if the Publicity & Programming Committee would fall under OPMA. She says she has gotten conflicting answers all year.

Ashwin asks if P&P sends agendas to OPMA.

Peyton says no.

Ashwin says that anyone who sends agendas to OPMA will need to fill out the form.

Nandana says that the Legislative Reception is on November 19. She says there are 300 open spots, and they have only filled 54 slots.

Adjournment

Kate motions to adjourn.

Peyton seconds.

Meeting adjourned with unanimous consent at 8:43 pm.