



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

10/13/2025

HUB 307

Call to Order 4:04 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

Joseph Riggio (he/him), Vice Speaker | P

Julia Tanner (she/her), Public Relations Officer | P

Tanya Bandhari (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair E

Abigail Appleyard (she/her), Off-Campus Committee Chair | P

Pierce Wallbaum (he/him), General Affairs Committee Chair | P

Dylan Bianchi (he/him), Academic & Administrative Affairs Committee Chair | P

Maitri Karia (she/her), GPSS Director of University Affairs | P

Nandana Jaideep (she/her), ASUW President | E

Ashwin Anand (he/him), Director of Internal Policy | A

Kate Lawson (she/her), Director of University Affairs | A

Jothsna Sundar (she/her), Senate Clerk | P

Christina Coop (he/him), SAO Advisor | A

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve agenda.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds.

Joseph Riggio objects.

Dylan Bianchi moves the previous question.

Julia Tanner seconds.

6-0-0

Dylan Bianchi rescinds motion.

Joseph Riggio moves to add Organic Act 32-1.

Erick Jacobsen: OA-32-1 is highlighted in proposals do I hear a second?

Abigail Appleyard seconds

4-0-1

Approved

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

Julia Tanner seconds

5-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Erick Jacobsen reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Hello, everyone. We had our first meeting last week, which was amazing and we will get into talking about that later, but I thought it went pretty good all things considered. I also wanted to touch base on. I know you all have received emails from Owen as committee chairs, you do not have to fill out the hours work sheet. I met with Owen earlier today. He clarified that really the only parts of the personnel policy that you all should concern yourself with are the conduct expectations, which I hope you will all follow anyway. And when it gets down to payroll, that's something that we can figure out towards the end of the quarter because you will not be paid until the end of the quarter as per the OA we passed last year. But just wanted to clear that up. And if you do have any questions, you can always ask me or Owen. We also have a new member today. Matri is our director of University of Affairs from GPSS. Would you like to introduce yourself?

Maitri Karia: Hi guys, like Erick mentioned I'm part of GPSS as the University Affairs director. I'm from India and I'm doing digital marketing here and pursuing UI/UX content strategy. I have an MBA and during my MBA I was part of the student government there. So it was a different process than what it is here so I'm excited to learn from you all and engage with you all. Thank you for having me.

Erick Jacobsen: Great. It's wonderful to have you. With that, moving on to the Vice speakers report, Joseph?

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, so hi, everyone. First of all, congratulations getting through the first Senate meeting last week. Yeah. I know we had a couple hiccups here and there, so thanks for bearing with us, especially during committees. We now have the committees set up on teams properly, hopefully. So it should be a lot smoother. We also have a voting form now and everything and when we get to elections, hopefully that's going to be smoother as well. So thank you for bearing with us. Second, I just sent out an email. Maybe you saw it about GAVEL I decided to extend the deadline to October 20th for applications just because of we had to take down the application for a little bit, so we wanted to give people the full two weeks to apply. So it was only fair and equitable to do that. And so if anybody is interested, refer them to that link in that email. And then second, I also sent out warnings for anybody who is an active senator that had an unexcused absence. Now, even though if a senator comes to you and's like, oh God, I received this scary looking email from the vice speaker saying I was unexcused, but I was there and I don't know what to do. It's okay. Tell them, first of all, tell them, like, this is the first senate meeting. We're still figuring things out. The email just looks really scary so that way people come to senate meetings. Just have them talk to me or whatnot. There are two main ways that they can prove that they were there, that they show me a receipt of their form of like a voting form or whatnot. So make sure you tell your senators save those Microsoft forms so that they can refer to them later. It's the easiest way to just check it off. Or if they could prove via a recorded method, whether it's something they said that's recorded on the minutes or during the team's recording that I could refer to or if something special happened like last week we gave out the placards, for example, some people were sending pictures of their placards because they knew that was the only time they can pick it up so far. So stuff like that, right? So just have them work with me, have them send me, we have a proxy policy. That's pretty forgiving. So please just remind them to reach out to me and communicate. And that's all for me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Yeah, kind to echo what Joseph was saying about hiccups in the process. We're gonna keep having them, especially because it's pretty tedious for the activation, I have to put them into different Excel sheets and then also send the email and also put them into Teams. So just patience with you with that as well and please do not hesitate to reach out if you're having issues. It is most likely, it is because of stuff on my end. But yeah, last week we had like 56 around 56 senators activated by the first meeting and this week we'll have over 75. So that's super awesome and then we'll have like, hall senators come in eventually in a few weeks so very exciting stuff. Yeah, and that's all that there is. I should be making a committee chair Instagram post, either this week or next week. I'm starting with leadership and then I'll go to you guys.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Christina Coop: Brendan is sick today so he asked me to attend in his place. Nice to see some new and familiar faces. Don't have much on our end to report, there's exciting things coming up in giving ASUW and GPSS team account access to Canva so you don't have to buy your own subscription anymore or use your personal Net ID. UW IT is going to create a team account for you guys as an exception to the contract. Alas, I could not do the same thing with Zoom, but their IT guy gave me some ideas on how to better utilize teams for your hybrid meetings or if you are going to use your personal net ID to do a Zoom something or other just how you have to say that unloading is an extra step. But we could talk more about that. Also, question, your Zoom's webinar subscription has lapsed, yes or no?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah we don't use Zoom anymore just Teams.

Christina Coop: Awesome, you're three steps ahead of me, I love knowing that. Last thing is me of the name and personal net ID for Senate Oversight Chair and GAVEL Chair so that I can make sure that I think you guys do have access to your net ID for that, but I just want to make sure that we have our onboarding form all updated.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, we don't have the oversight or GAVEL chair anymore

Joseph Riggio: Do you want me to give you my Net ID right now for GAVEL specifically?

Christina Coop: No we have an onboarding checklist that we created for ASUW and so I included all of the executive committees in there and everybody's Net IDs so that when we change the passwords in the summer, it's all in the same spot. So there is a Net ID for Senate oversight, should I go ahead and retire that now?

Erick Jacobsen: Have you received all the documents you want to transfer?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah

Christina Coop: And that's all.

Joseph Riggio: Quick question for you Coop, for the Teams, for like exploring what we can do with our teams, is there a way to connect with IT on like admin permissions that we can have access to? Because there's some things that I've noticed are locked behind admin perms for like categorizing or like adding members in mass that might be really useful but I was just checking if there was any reason why those were locked behind admin permissions.

Christina Coop: I have a feeling it has to do with a physical UW staff person has to own your SharePoint so I'll do some digging with Brendan.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the minutes, we do have linked here, they're still in progress, I do encourage you all to look at those but I would entertain a motion to table them for a week.

Dylan Bianchi moves to table the minutes for a week

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 4-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: moving on to proposals an Organic Act updating the Senate bylaws and rules, and that is sponsored by **Joseph Riggio**. Take it away.

Joseph Riggio: Okay, great. So, I'll go ahead and read off the bill summary. I just do want to preface by saying, this is going to be a little bit of jargon, just because it has to do with the bylaws and rules. And just a refamiliarize ourselves with organic acts organic acts are the primary and official way to amend our Senate by laws or rules. And so by doing this, our process, we go through committee first, and then if it passes committee, then next week or when it goes on the floor, it'll automatically be in second readings or old business for considerations. Reads Organic Act 32-1 summary

Erick Jacobsen: You could just summarize if you'd like because I know it's a lot of verbiage.

Joseph Riggio: Thank you Erick for relieving me. long story short if there's any point in time where you'd like some clarification, most of the changes are either very minor, like, for instance, for no confidence votes, it used to be simple majority and Robert's Rules is actually requires a two-third super majority, so it was looking and going back and comparing to Robert's Rules, 12th edition to what we have now, and I consulted with Senate leadership with Julia and Eric on what made the most sense. We worked on this over the summer, and it's pretty much a lengthy document just making sure that our bylaws and our rules are also consistent. I noticed when I was reading in June that some of the rules, especially with the Organic Acts that pass in the spring, there were inconsistencies between our Senate rules that we outline versus the bylaws. For instance, Committee Orders were not a type of legislation that was mentioned in the Senate rules, which is weird because they're referenced in the bylaws, but there was no clear mention of that legislation type in the rules. So it's stuff like that. It's little things to clarify. I do want to note some sort of bigger changes mainly to Article 7, section 1A. If you go to line 6, I think it's starts at 54. So we, not a whole lot has changed with the committee leadership. It's just we took a lot of different clauses from the elections article and from some articles clarifying the committee compensation or sections clarifying your committee chair compensation, and just merged it into one readable section that's just a lot easier to understand. So that way you're not scrolling all over the place, trying to say like, oh, how does my compensation work? How does the vice chair elections work? Like, we had a provision that was

explaining vice chairs in a redundant way that was also explained in the vice chair section of Article 7. So it was in two different articles. So we just condensed it to one article because vice chairs are elected internally and they don't follow the typical Senate process for elections because they are internal. So it's stuff like that. Please, if you have questions or concerns regarding any of these changes, because they are a lot, and some of them are minor, some of them are not. Please, reach out to me via email Teams and we can kind of go over them and we can draft concerns for the floor tomorrow or if we decide to table it.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, **Joseph**, and because of our OA last year OAs are considered in steering as if it was a regular committee, so you can propose amendments, but as like Joseph said, you're always welcome to work with him on amendments on the floor as well. Now, are there any questions?

Christina Coop: I just actually had a comment for our GPSS Director. So the Senate elects their executive body the same way that GPSS does. So the GPSS, Senators elect their president and all of the vice presidents and likewise, the ASUW Senate elects its chair, vice chair, internal to the body so more informational.

Dylan Bianchi: Can I motion for a brief recess just to like read all of this?

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add that we have till 5:00 pm to approve the agenda because it does need to be posted at 5:00 but we do have 35 minutes which I think is enough time.

Dylan Bianchi moves for 5 minute recess to read through the fine print.

Abigail Appleyard seconds

5-0-1

Recess 4:25 PM

Back in session at 4:30 pm

Erick Jacobsen: any questions, comments or motions? Any amendments anyone wants to make? Anything confusing to anyone? Is there anything that you think maybe Joseph missed that you want added?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the OA

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

5-0-1

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: moving on to Approval of floor agenda itself, we will need to add this OA at the bottom of old business.

Dylan Bianchi: is the font weird for anyone else

Pierce Wallbaum: I just wanted to ask about the On Campus committee chair being held?

Erick Jacobsen: We were going to have this conversation, but Tanya did get her 5 constituents but if she hadn't received her five constituents by today, she would not be a senator for the second week, which would mean that she would be unable to hold her committee to her position. So if that were the case, we would have to reopen elections, but thankfully, she has received her constituents and is activated as a senator.

Joseph Riggio: And I just want to clarify that you may have noticed in the organic Act that there's language clarifying that procedure. We consulted Brendan and whatnot, and it is Robert's rule. Robert's just imagine, like, okay, if it's ambiguous or not clear in the bylaws, like, it defaults to Roberts rules. So Roberts rules 12th addition, it's in our public records files, and if you need access to it, shoot me an email. I can give it to you

Erick Jacobsen: I'll go to Julia and then Pierce.

Julia: for the nominations and elections do we want to specify that the Student Technology Fee and the JCC are just nominations?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, thank you.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, I'm looking at old business item line B, and I've been talking with some of the other co-sponsors about this bill and I'm not exactly sure where they want to go with this, but it is not ready to be presented to the floor yet So can I move here to, like, table it or does it have to be on the floor?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. Any member of steering can move the table a bill from the agenda from here or on the floor

Pierce Wallbaum moves to table R-31-25 for a week

Dylan Bianchi seconds

3-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions, comments or motions?

Maitri Karia: This is just a general question, I'm not very familiar with how you run things here, but the Student Sustainability council, is it yet to be formed?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, so the students of Sustainability council is I'm not sure. I believe that is an ASUW committee. It may not be. I'm kind of unclear on that, but what it does is basically, it's like a student advisory board concerning like environmental or sustainability issues on campus. And thank you for bringing that up because it reminds me that we have not we do not have questions for three

of our elections. And so I was hoping that we would make those today. So if any of you have ideas for questions for these, liaisons, then please go ahead and make your motions. With that, are there any other questions, comments, or motions?

Pierce Wallbaum: STF gets a thousand dollars a quarter?

Erick Jacobsen: I believe they do; they get more than you. I'm sorry.

Dylan Bianchi: moves to amend Student Technology Fee sub clause I to read The STF committee handles budgets and finances. What experiences do you have in finance and budget.

Erick Jacobsen: I think it could be helpful to add the actual sum they have. don't know if it's millions. I definitely don't think it's a millions, but if someone could pull up how much money the STF committee deals with, that'd be great.

Abigail Appleyard: just a comment about the question, I feel like we should add something about like what candidates might value putting money towards. I think having experience is really important since it's like really technical stuff, but also in terms of like, if it's Senate's liaison, what they care about matters.

Dylan Bianchi: Also last year's STF total budget was 3.1 million dollars.

Joseph Riggio: Full disclosure gonna go off topic a little bit, also thank you Dylan. The Campus Sustainability Fund is a SAF unit.

Erick Jacobsen: I believe we were specifically talking about the Student Sustainability council.

Joseph Riggio: Never mind me I rescind.

Erick Jacobsen: Now do we want something that includes both experience and priorities or is there one we might wanna prefer in the question?

Dylan Bianchi: I really like what Abigail said, but if we have to prioritize one, I prefer experience, just because I think the reality of Senate liaisons is we're probably gonna be putting forward a freshman who's gonna learn on the job what kind of stuff STF does

Pierce Wallbaum: Well, do we have to prioritize one? Or can we include both?

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like we can do both

Dylan Bianchi: Then let's just do both.

Erick Jacobsen: So currently what we have is, "The STF Committee handles and budgets about \$3 million per year in student fees. What experience do you have with finance management, and what technological projects or programs would you advocate for funding?"

Abigail Appleyard: Is that 3.1 million per year?

Erick Jacobsen: Any questions or comments with this question?

Dylan Bianchi: This is incredibly granular for the sake of accuracy, do we want to say, “budget about a \$3 million per year” because technically it was just last year

Erick Jacobsen: Are we okay with this question? I’m seeing nods and thumbs up. Now, what should we do for the Joint Commission Committee question? As a reminder, the Joint Commissions Committee brings together all of the diversity committees from ASUW as well as our four advocacy programs, which are SARVA, the sexual assault and relationship violence activists, as well as the Office of Inclusive design, the Office of International Student Advocacy, wow that’s big fun, and the Office of Student Health Relations. So it’s all of our nine, I believe, diversity commissions, as well as those four programs. With that in mind, what sort of question would you want to craft for that?

Pierce Wallbaum: really like the style of the question that Dylan proposed, and considering that it is a lot of freshmen, I think a lot of them probably don't know what the JCC is, and so maybe just saying, like, it does bring together the nine different diversity commissions, and then for a question, I guess, would just be “what experience do you have working with marginalized voices or how have you navigated uplifting voices?” Something like that.

Erick Jacobsen: What experience do you have working to uplift marginalized voices and how do you vote to navigate institutional barriers, maybe within UW or something?

Julia Tanner: We should keep in mind what are they going to do as a liaison to senate.

Erick Jacobsen: That's a good point. Our JCC liaison, I believe it's one of the most commonly met committees that we liaison to. And our Senate liaison is tasked with reporting everything that happens in Senate to JCC and everything that happens in JCC to Senate. So open dialogue between the two so that we can support each other however we can. And in the past, we've also employed the liaison in the task of encouraging JCC members to activate their Senate seats. So with that in mind, are there any adjustments you all would like to suggest to the question?

Maitri Karia: I just have an input. The question is already really covering everything but we can ask what diversity equity and inclusion mean to them.

Erick Jacobsen: So I think that's great as the first part. Like, what does, and then we can incorporate experiences maybe a second part? So that would make the question, “What do diversity, equity, and inclusion and belonging mean to you, and what experience do you have working with diverse voices.”

Pierce Wallbaum: I just noticed under each election and under each question there’s no time limit.

Erick Jacobsen: That’s specified within our rules and bylaws I believed it is 15 seconds for an introduction and conclusion and then 30 seconds to answer each question.

Dylan Bianchi: maybe to tie it all together for the second half of the question, “how would you use your experience to facilitate communication between JCC and Senate?”

Erick Jacobsen: So instead of asking what experience you do have, how would you use experience? Okay. And how would you utilize any experience you have to streamline communication?

Julia Tanner: This is minor I would strike “any experience” just say “utilize experience”

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other comments on this question? Then we can move on to the Student Sustainability council, can you pull up information on that?

Joseph Riggio: I can't three's like nothing.

Erick Jacobsen: It was only formed last year. I don't think we even had a liaison last year.

Dylan Bianchi: Who asked us to send a liaison?

Erick Jacobsen: That's a good question, let me check my notebook. I know I met with all the members of the Board over the summer, I think maybe Audrianna mentioned it. We have two liaisons to the Student Sustainability council. With that in mind we can also do what we did with legislative steering and elect one from the floor and one from steering that way we reduce election fatigue. We have about 16 liaisons we need to appoint or elect. What sort of questions do we have.

Dylan Bianchi: what does sustainability mean to you.

Erick Jacobsen: any edits, adjustments?

Abigail Appleyard: I'm working on it

Joseph Riggio: I found the resolution that created it so I'll just drop it in our chat real quick.

Dylan Bianchi: We created this by Senate resolution last year?

Erick Jacobsen: It was drafted through a resolution and adopted I believe through an amendment to the ASUW bylaws.

Julia Tanner: This is generic but we can ask, “What does sustainability mean to you and why are you interested in being a liaison to the Student Sustainability Council?”

Erick Jacobsen: And for clarification, I do have the bylaws clause that establishes it. It says, “the Student Sustainability Council shall steer university wide sustainability initiatives, oversee the implementation of campus sustainability projects, ensure the implementation of the sustainability action plan and other sustainability policy, and make recommendations to the Student Senate and the Board of Directors on current sustainability policies affecting university students.” With that in mind, it could also be useful to ask if they have any ideas for projects or initiatives. Sounds like y'all like that.

Julia Tanner: You could also just delete my – never mind.

Erick Jacobsen: “What does sustainability mean to you and what projects and initiatives would you advocate for to the ASUW?” How does that question sound?

Maitri Karia: We can add one more thing “what sustainability related initiatives do you already observe around campus and where do you see the scope of improvement?” Because there are a lot of things the campus is already doing regarding sustainability, but students or maybe all of us are not following it diligently. So where do you see the scope of improvement?

Julia Tanner: I think the room for improvement for sure especially because it sounds like the council was like, formed directly in reaction to that improvement.

Erick Jacobsen: So, like Maitri's point, I'm putting “what sustainability related initiatives or projects are you aware of and what projects or initiatives would you like to see implemented on campus?” So that way it's something of a background and a future, sort of dichotomy, I guess.

Pierce Wallbaum: It seems like a lot of stuff to answer in 30 seconds. I don't know. What do you guys think? I just feel like it's like, what, three or four questions that they only have 30 seconds to answer? I don't think I could do that, honestly.

Abigail Appleyard: I think one way to address that I think we do like, “what is one sustainability product you've seen on campus?” the aspect of it that you think is good in an aspect that you think, could need an improvement, like, I think it's good that we have composting bins everywhere, but most people don't know what actually goes in the compost and it's not useable. So, I think, like, that kind of merges them.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah. That's great. I like that. In my policy, implementation class in the Evans School, we talk about, like, identifying problems with the existing, with the implementation of existing policies. So I think that's that's really good. So ‘what is one sustainably project or policy seen on campus, and what is one thing you like and dislike?’ I think this is effective and like maybe “what is one way it works well and one way in which it can improve?” then I'm going to go to **Joseph**.

Joseph Riggio: Yeah. There's a little bit of important context, still a little bit vague, but I dropped the resolution in the steering chat that formed or at least proposed the formation. It was Francisco's bill, last session, R-31-16. Honestly, just by happenstance, it seems like we were talking about what the purpose and intent was anyway. So, yay. But this provides a little bit more context as to why it was implemented and what it serves to do. So just thinking about that when we're creating a question

Erick Jacobsen: with that in mind is there anything else you all would like to add or alter with this question? Are we all happy with all the questions we've established for our liaison elections.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve floor agenda

Julia Tanner seconds

5-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: thank you all. And now moving back to the steering agenda and moving forward to discussion items. Yes, Abigail?

Abigail Appleyard: Sorry are all of the elections being held this week?

Erick Jacobsen: No, so the if it's labeled nominations, it'll be next week, we will only be electing legislative steering committee this week. Our first item of discussion is our October 7th meeting feedback. We had our first Senate meeting, everyone. Yay! How did I do? If anyone has anything they'd like to comment on. Actually, I think we can do Rosebud Thorn for this. So. So one thing, one thing you thought went well, one thing you're looking forward to, and one thing you thought, didn't go so well. I guess we'll start with **Joseph**.

Joseph Riggio: So being voluntold My rose is, we had a really good turnout, and people were pretty enthusiastic. I know the forums sections was a little bit – I guess my thorn segue is that the forums are pretty hard to keep people's attention, it was a lot of jargon, a lot of talking at senators not with senators. It was unfortunate we couldn't do the mock bill we have prepared just because of time. Also next time, something I'm looking forward to is having a proper voting system in place because it was a nightmare having to go back and see who was active and who was not.

Jothsna Sundar: come back to me

Pierce Wallbaum: Rose I feel like there was a lot of people there, honestly, I didn't really know what to expect. last year's first Senate meeting was a little foggy, I was all over the place, but I felt like a lot of people were pretty, like casual, everybody seemed to be like, pretty engaged. Looking forward to I would say working more with my committee. They all seem pretty pretty into it. They're all really great people. And I notice I have more now, so that's something to be excited about, I guess. And then, what was it? Thorn? I guess, like, just, yeah, like the committee stuff with the teams, that was it. I feel like everything went pretty well all things considered.

Abigail Appleyard: I felt like my committee was really good. Like, I was worried people weren't going to be chatty, but I think people were pretty social, and I felt like we were having good conversation, even though we didn't really have any bills to talk about. I had a couple of people who, like, weren't actually in Senate yet, so I was, my bud would be seeing who my committee actually ends up being, just if there's people who don't stick with it or join any way. And then trying, this is all about committees, trying to explain like what we actually do when there's no legislation to, like, talk about was kind of difficult, I think, especially, like, being on Off Campus where there's, like, not that many bills that we get there, like, super focused on our topic anyway. I was like, it's gonna, you know, we're gonna try to work on some drafting legislation and stuff, but, like, it was kind of hard to explain what we actually do.

Erick Jacobsen: That's fair. And to that point, I think one of our overall goals for this year is that if there is a committee that has a week or two where they don't have legislation to consider, having a maybe not as formal, but a structured legislative workshop so that they can make legislation.

Dylan Bianchi: My rose, I think, would be how active it seemed like a lot of these senators didn't seem to be too scared to speak up. Thorn maybe the enthusiasm of my committee. I need to get them out of there shell a little bit more, but we'll work on that, and then, Bud would be probably actually having some legislation to work with my committee on.

Julia Tanner: I wasn't sure how many people would show up and I did have a guess that a lot of or not a lot, but some of the people there were not active senators and I was right. So people were willing to come up to me and talk to me, which was really good. I definitely feel like this group of students, they are very appreciative and willing to like work with the system even though it doesn't make any sense. And then Bud, I'm excited for more people and more of the Instagram stuff. I don't know, the Instagram things were so. It was so fun over the summer. So I'm excited to get more back to that like outreach stuff. And thorn was definitely like how long it took for us in the beginning and how stressful it was.

Erick Jacobsen: Rose I also thought it was great that there were so many people there. It was, honestly, the room was jam-packed and that was great. And not only were there, what, 56 senators, but most almost all of them were in person. And we've historically struggled a lot with people attending on teams and not contributing. So I think we definitely saw a correlation with, there were a lot of people in the room and there were a lot more comments than we usually get in questions and motions. which is especially great, because I could tell that some people were nervous. Even like Samira, for example, he had an amendment. He didn't know how to make it, but he was still engaging. And I think that's great. I think that's exactly what we want. Bud, I think also getting through more legislation, I think we're still in an awkward phase where once we get through our old legislation and start seeing new things on the agenda, then we're going to be well into the swing of things, and I'm really excited for that because I think there's going to be some great new legislation this year. And then my thorn is the same as Julia's. It was very stressful and difficult at the beginning. I know we delayed a few minutes, but it was also just so frantic. Joseph and Dylan were downstairs, printing placards. Thankfully Andal was there to help, which was great, but we were struggling with the teams. Meeting and with answering questions and arranging the room and everything. But I got some notes from Andal on things that we can work on. And I spoke extensively with Brendan in our one-on-one. So with that and all this, I think I think it's fair to say that we're going to do a lot better with that sort of thing next week. Like Joseph said, we've worked hard on the voting system. We've also worked hard on teams and now we have a link trait so that we won't have to struggle with getting links out to senators, with the website down. So we've done a lot of quality of life changes around that that I think are just going to streamline. The setup process and make the meeting a lot better.

Pierce Wallbaum: I just remembered one of the senators in my committee who shall not be named, but it was Jenna Miller, asked if I planned on running committee meetings more like informally or more along Robert's Rules, and I guess I just kind of like had a question like, what that more formal procedure would look like, or if it's supposed to be like that.

Erick Jacobsen: So I think my hope for this year is that, um, obviously when we don't have legislation in committees, it can be really informal as it relates to icebreakers, committee bonding planning, or legislative workshops, but when it comes to legislation in committee, I think running it along the lines of steering, maybe a little bit more informally. Definitely a cue. Definitely prompting people for questions and comments and motions. Just so that we get more participation and it's more structured. so that if it's run more informally and someone has a thought and everyone's talking, it's difficult for them to get their voice in, but if we use Robert's Rules and we at least somewhat, and queue people out, then that's a lot more equitable. So I'd say that, and then also, once you do all have legislation, and even when you don't, I'll be walking around and if you ever have questions or things that you'd like to clarify or get my opinion on, please do ask.

Pierce Wallbaum: I guess, also, we're talking about the committees and everything. Are we sending out a pre meeting message tomorrow?

Erick Jacobsen: I appreciate if you send out a premeeting message in your Teams chat about, basically summarizing what Julia sends out. And I think encouraging them especially to nominate themselves for the different positions we have open. Alrighty moving on to our next discussion item, which is liaison election scheduling. As I said, we have about 16, maybe 17, liaisons, we need to elect one. And that is a lot. So I wanted to have a conversation in the steering because according to our bylaws, the way we choose our liaisons is completely up to us. If we do an election, it follows the procedures of Article 10, but we don't have to do an election. So if we can do an election in steering as well, or we can appoint someone from steering, I also had the thought that maybe, because there's so many elections in fall quarter, we could do some of them where we appoint one of you to serve for at least a couple weeks and then if you step down and we open up the election so that they're not so concentrated because almost every one of the positions that we're electing for, I've heard that they wanted them elected week three, four, or five. And the problem is, I believe it is now week four. We have not elected some of the some of the positions that people wanted week three, and we will not be able to elect all of the ones that people wanted by week four. So next week and the week after there will be a lot of elections and a lot of nominations. So what I wanted to discuss was what do you all think we should do in terms of streamlining elections?

Abigail Appleyard: is it possible to have people answer a question over forms and we just review them and appoint people at least like for a time. Like, if we decided that we did want to have the elections, we could say, like, intermittent, like, ways on it until we can have somebody be elected.

Erick Jacobsen: So like an appointment process?

Abigail Appleyard: It's still an application not an election but you're not just like picking someone random to do it. So then, I don't know, you still get a sense of like, what people's motivations are if they can handle it. But it's, like, doesn't have to be done all before we can do it in the steering

Julia Tanner: I like that idea.

Dylan Bianchi: One thing with appointing someone or having someone temporarily, I'm not sure that makes the situation better if the people running the committee, like, if they really want their Senate representative, because if we just give them one person and we're like, here's your temporary person, we'll send you the real liaison in a few weeks when we can get around to it. Like, is that necessarily meeting what they're asking for?

Julia Tanner: Yeah, I think I think we could go with Abigail's idea of, like, it's an appointee for real, like, it's not an interim and appointee. That's a way to avoid that.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just gonna mention that, like, for a lot of these committees, at least ones I've been on, they don't meet that often anyway, and a lot of times, like, something might come up where the real liaison couldn't go. Maybe they changed the schedule and they have class or, like, there's some appointment or something they have to go to, like, when your meetings are only every month, and, like, I don't know how to explain it. Like, if your schedule's changing every three months, you're only going to three meetings, like, in that schedule. There's really not that much consistency anyway, because you might not even be able to be the liaison for our next quarter. If they keep the meeting time and you have to take certain classes. I don't think it's, I think it's good because we need people who can accurately relay information to and from committees, but I don't think it needs to be the same person every single time as long as there's like a good turnover between people because, like that kind of communication consistency, I think is more important than, like, having it be the same person, because that's just not super realistic with the way that our university is set up.

Erick Jacobsen: That's fair. And to that point, I know at least one of our positions has only one meeting in a quarter. And it may be that even if we elect someone, they were unable to make the next quarter meeting. Some like JCC, I think, especially, they work each quarterly schedule around you, but sometimes it's not so easy. And it will be Joseph's job this year to check in with our liaison, make sure that if they resign or anything, there can be a good turnover and make sure they're getting the reports.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, I really do like the application idea, but my question, I guess, is, like, is it was this suggestion for all of us true review the applications, like, in steering as opposed to an election in the floor? Or, like, who whose responsibility is it to read these applications and take that time, I guess?

Erick Jacobsen: that can be something we do in steering.

Abigail Appleyard: Well, that was my thought when I, like, initially proposed it. I mean another option is to assign, like, each response, like an A, B and C, and then just have people anonymously vote which one they want outside of Senate. So they're still being elected, but it's just not in Senate. I don't know if we're allowed to do that.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, I would say maybe not do that because that gets into the question of like voting outside of a meeting. But I do like the idea of doing it in steering and I think we do have time.

Joseph Riggio: long story short we'll have to consult Brendan on that. But we have to be really, I'll just Okay, so I'll say this, parliamentarian here, hi. So I have the bylaws pulled up because this is very important to get this right. I say we need to proceed with the question of appointing cautiously, even though there's nothing explicit in our bylaws that say liaisons ought to be elected, we have a lot of language that suggests that the only outline process is electing a liaison article 10 or elections processes. I'll just kind of show you. So when we talk about committee chairs and vice chairs, liaisons will be elected as necessary, according to a timeline prescribed by the Committee on Steering. So it's. There is no language and no precedent in our bylaws right now that says appointing. That's why we need to be careful about that. I will just say from a parliamentarian perspective, we need to be careful. But that's a good idea. I think we should consult Brendan on that. But if, I mean, I said this to leadership earlier, if we have to tough out like 13 different elections because that's what our bylaws say, then we'll have to find a way to manage that. But to Erick's point, though, my personal recommendation is we can, if we're allowed to, appoint one of us temporarily, and then hold an election, as so long as an election occurs at some point; In my interpretation, that should be fine, but again, we should consult Brendan on that.

Eric Jacobsen: Yeah, adding to that currently, if we do not have a liaison, it defaults to me to be the proxy. So, for example, I am attending JCC right after this meeting, because we do not have a JCC liaison yet. Julia will be there with me. And so ultimately, if it comes down to it, I may have to attend a bunch of different meetings.

Christina Coop: So it's in your bylaws that if you don't have a liaison selected it defaults all to you to just the chair?

Erick Jacobsen: that's something we can consider amending to like lighten the load from my understanding it's vague on if I can even proxy my proxy, so that's something we can review and consider. Joseph and I will talk to Brendan about the appointment idea. In the meantime I think we do elections for all of the most pressing elections and maybe limit elections times somewhat to say 30 minutes each meeting. That way even if we have four or five elections which is quite a lot, we either move on if we can't get to it or we're encouraged to go more quickly.

Abigail Appleyard: If we're doing elections like this week and we don't business to go in to committees for, can we just get committees and keep doing elections or like, are we allowed to not go into committees?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes and no, we can always move to not like to move past that. It's odd because you can't really table committee meetings, but you can kind of, like, change the agenda in that. Yeah. Which is the other option. But it also comes down to right now, we also have we have a a front load of a bunch of liaisons that need to be elected and a backload of all of the resolutions that didn't pass last year. And we sort of need to balance that. And that's the tricky part. So I think we can consider

30 minute timestamp 45 minutes for elections and then maybe limit committee meetings as necessary. It's completely up to me when they end so that we can try and do both. Are there thoughts on whether 30 or 45 minutes is preferable?

Dylan Bianchi: 45 minutes is preferable I think the timestamp thing is the best solution, and I think we should maybe purge that by kind of ranking the best we can, the liaison positions, by how urgent they are. And I think the primary consideration there is honestly, like the frequency of meetings and then how much does the committee question, like, need a Senate person there. I mean, do need to these committees feel like they need a Senate liaison to, like, function properly?

Erick Jacobsen: I just like the idea of having as many student representatives on these things as possible. I am already working on, this is my Trello board, trying to prioritize. This is where we are. But I'm working on that based on the timelines that the members of the Board of Directors gave me, as well as the general importance of the committee. and what has been communicated. Like, for example, the UPASS Advisory Board communicated that they would really like a Senate representative as soon as physically possible, but when it comes to things like STF, JCC, I am prioritizing those slightly. It's going to be a difficult process. I'm not done sorting all of them, but I will I'll keep in touch with the chairs, and I'll keep you all informed.

Abigail Appleyard: do you think we'll have new business next week

Erick Jacobsen: If we don't have any new business next week and we get through however much business we want tomorrow, then we can always in steering, change the floor agenda, and add a bunch of elections. I know of at least two resolutions, I know of at least one resolution that's close to being finished. Which is on student workers, as a response to the Bridges Center study last year and I know that there is a resolution in progress from the engineering RSOs with relation to the fees that we spoke about.

Christina Coop: where is legislative steering and judicial priority?

Erick Jacobsen: Leg Steering is at the top we elect tomorrow. Judicial, I'm working with Ashwin, I haven't received the question yet. To my understanding, I guess, do you know when the EPP is going to go through Judicial?

Christina Coop: Their bylaws have to be done very early winter quarter but in practice we heavily encourage that they be done by the end of fall.

Erick Jacobsen: So do you think, based on your experience, that Judicial should be elected in October or would November be good?

Christina Coop: October would be better.

Erick Jacobsen: OK. Thank you.

Christina Coop: You guys can consider maybe a change in your rules that maybe some of these committee appointments are done in the spring.

Erick Jacobsen: There are a couple but there should be more I agree. That is something we can do without specific authorization from the bylaws but I think we should also get an amendment in. I think this year, at the end of spring, we will definitely elect Legislative Steering, SAF, STF, UPASS, because I think that's also paid, and maybe more depending.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to our next and final discussion item, Committee minutes, Jothsna would you like to take it away?

Jothsna Sundar: This is fun taking minutes and talking at the same time. Okay, committee minutes, they are not particularly strict. I would say note who says what. Definitely note, any edits, any motions that are made and by whom, what gets approved. They don't have to be verbatim as far as I can recall. So it can be brief and just email them to me. After, do you have anything to add, Erick?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, just as long as there's a record of what we do, that's the most important thing. If you want to take those notes yourself, you can. If you want to appoint someone, like maybe a returning senator, if there's one in your committee, you can do that. Pierce can make Jenna do that. She has experience. But if you want to temporarily have someone do that, we are waiting to elect vice chairs until we get our hall senators in so that they all have a fair chance. But until then, I do recommend either having a volunteer do it or doing it yourself. Are there any thoughts, questions?

Abigail Appleyard: if we don't have any legislation to work on how do we take minutes for that?

Julia Tanner: as a committee chair last year what I would do is I would just write the activities we did.

Erick Jacobsen: any other questions

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erick Jacobsen: are there any announcements

Christina Coop: we are at 1143 RSOs registered. I have a bet in the office that we're going to reach 1300 by January.

Erick Jacobsen: any other announcements

ADJOURNMENT

Julia Tanner moves to adjourn

Abigail Appleyard seconds

4-1-0

Adjourned 5:22 pm

minutes prepared by Jothsna Sundar

ASUW Student Senate Clerk
