



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

10/27/2025

HUB 307

Call to Order 4:01 PM

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

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

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

Tanya Bhandari (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair | A

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 | A

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

Brendan Chang (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve agenda

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

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: I don't have much to talk about. I'll talk more in our discussion item, but I think Senate went great last week. As a reminder, please speak up and raise your hands and be recognized to speak in steering and senate. And we're trying to get people to say their names before they speak in Senate. So if you could remind your committees of that, that would be great. We have two new resolutions that are on our agenda. That's great. One's from me, one's from Pierce. But I'm in consultation with a lot of different people on resolution ideas, and hopefully we'll see some of those be submitted soon as well. Moving on to the vice Speaker's report, Joseph?

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hi, everyone, so first of all, I'm super excited that tomorrow we're going to have GAVEL intern applications. This is going to be more of administrative role in GAVEL, so facilitating the work of GAVEL members and also helping me with the back end, with like emailing and scheduling and that sort of stuff. So let your committees know that that's going to happen. It's open to all students as well. And so, yeah, the other thing I'll talk about, I sent attendance again. Unfortunately, we did have to deactivate a few people that's just because they didn't attend all three meetings of the past. So hopefully we can work with them and see how we can help them with attendance for. And then also, I just want to give an update over the weekend I've been working on a new legislative template. It looks the exact same as the one you're used to seeing that was made last year, except the back end is so much nicer. You'll notice that if you like press enter where the bill title is, the borders don't like do weird things anymore. So it's like cleaning stuff like that. So the formatting's nicer. I did automatic bookmarking, so sources should automatically be bookmarks so people can find them easier. So hopefully it's a lot easier and user friendly to use, but please let me know if you're using it and something's going horribly wrong so I can go in and fix it. Thank you. That's all.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: so first off, who would be willing to take over my position tomorrow at around 6 o'clock, 6 p.m.? That would just be editing the agenda when we have changes and taking Queue

down if there's more than two people raising their hand and it's clear that Eric's struggling, which we haven't had a need to do that yet. and then lean on teams and just monitor or the chat

Dylan Bianchi: I can handle it

Julia Tanner: I'll be teamsing you about this. and then also, would anyone be able to help out with tabling on Wednesday from 2:00 to 4:00?

Joathsna Sundar: I'm available.

Julia Tanner: Okay cool. And then, if anyone hasn't filled out the When2Meet that I sent in the steering chat, please do that. We're going to do bonding, hopefully in a few weeks. And we're just going to do like uno what we talked about, like Uno and cards. So stay tuned for that and please fill out the When2Meet. And then also for floor bonding, I'm going to send part of my leadership tomorrow leadership report is like a QR code with feedback for the floor bonding. So stay tuned for that as well. And then just like Joseph, I also am starting an internship application tomorrow. It'll open and that'll just be creating reels for the Instagram. So just like marketing, advertisement and fun stuff on the Instagram, and then, yeah, that's basically it

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Y'all doing great. Your word of the week is procrastination which is the art of keeping up with yesterday's task tomorrow. Next weekend I will be gone, I will be at a wedding but I will be back for Tuesday.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Recess 4:09

Back in order 4:14

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve all the minutes

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to Proposals. We have our first resolution of the year! R-32-1 A Resolution to Increase Academic Transparency during Registration.

Pierce Wallbaum reads [R-32-1 A Resolution to Increase Academic Transparency During Registration](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you Pierce, can you read the summary now please?

Pierce Wallbaum reads bill summary

Abigail Appleyard: I don't know if I just missed it, I can't access the document, but is there something in there about, like, having what the GPA weight is, I know that some people would be interested in that, or if there's reason not to include it?

Pierce Wallbaum: So, if you went on to MyPlan, they already have a link that will provide statistics for you on every course, if enough students have taken it. That's not something, I mean, that can be included in a syllabus. I just was thinking, since that's already accessible in almost all courses, it wasn't necessary for this, or it wasn't my exact intentions. But if that's something people are passionate about or anything like that, I'd be open to adding that. But there's no specific reason why I didn't include it.

Erick Jacobsen: The link should be fixed now thank you Joseph. Julia?

Julia Tanner: As far as because the faculty Senate was mentioned, have you talked to them at all about this proposal?

Pierce Wallbaum: No.

Joseph Riggio: Point of personal privilege teams can't hear anything

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions?

Julia Tanner: I guess this is a follow-up just because I'm curious. Who did you talk to about this legislation as you researched?

Pierce Wallbaum: I haven't talked to any department specifically as to why they weren't listing it. I was using already provided information from the university and individual departments that they posted online because more often than not, a question could be answered and asking them in person would most likely just be redundant. And so, yeah, if that answers your question

Erick Jacobsen: Any further questions?

Joseph Riggio: I know that I would highly look into Faculty Council Teaching and Learning, just because ADA was a huge topic last year as they're trying to migrate 2026, the federal guidelines are ever changing now. But during the Biden administration, they had a revamp of ADA requirements for specifically digital materials, which the syllabi would encompass. And I know that they were trying to get legislation through their faculty Senate to have a universal syllabi template so that something that I know they're working on that I think it would be good for you to talk to them just to see if anything's going on with that.

Erick Jacobsen: Any further questions, or comments

Pierce Wallbaum: I think a template would be really amazing, especially for these lectures. It's just my biggest issue was nothing is required. So they could all have the template, but there's nothing mandating them from posting it in any sense. But that would be great if they had that.

Brendan Chang: When it comes to a syllabus, it's actually like a contract between a student, an agreement a student has with a professor. So you might get a lot of resistance with this because professors might not want to be locked into something. So there might be a lot of resistance to all of that so that's probably something you'll hear. Maybe like a potential option could be like a previous syllabus.

Pierce Wallbaum: I think that's a really great point, and that's why I try to include several clauses that state, that within the minimum required fields, number seven, is that details are subject to reasonable change. I also included that in line 67, it's a 'THAT' clause to protect instructor intellectual property as well as in lines 75 to 80, I include where maybe there's no instructor, that it's up to the department to post that. So they're more than welcome to publish a either provisional, which is what the words I used, but as well as a previous syllabus as well. That's up to their discretion, I suppose.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, and we can in committee add more specific language on that too. I added Laura McGarrity, the chair on the of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning to the forwarding class. Is that okay, Pierce?

Pierce Wallbaum: I did include Aarti Bhat already.

Erick Jacobsen: The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning will probably be the first place it goes before the full senate based on my limited knowledge on faculty governance. Alrighty are there any further questions or comments? Are there any motions?

Julia Tanner moves to refer R-32-1 to committee on On Campus Affairs

Motion fails without being seconded.

Dylan Bianchi moves to refer bill to committee on Academic and Administrative Affairs

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to R-32-2

Erick Jacobsen passes Chair to **Joseph Riggio**

Erick Jacobsen reads [R-32-2 A Resolution to Participate in the Western Undergraduate Exchange](#)

Joseph Riggio: Awesome, thank you Erick, do you want to provide a little bit of information as to why you're bringing this legislation up now?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes! So I'm from California. And I pay too much money to go here. And I don't get enough financial aid. And I was looking into it, and one of the things that I was keeping in mind

when I was applying to colleges was the Western Undergraduate Exchange because it made things a lot more affordable. Ultimately, I chose UW instead, but it'd be nice if people could have both. Every other public four-year institution in Washington does this. It is only us that does not. All the state schools, all the regional schools, even Evergreen. We are the only ones that are not doing it. So I thought it would be great if we did this. We are in the graduate equivalent. We're in the health related profession equivalent. And I thought it would be great. It would just be a great way to lower costs for students. And I see no reason why we shouldn't join.

Joseph Riggio: Any questions, comments, or motions?

Dylan Bianchi: I know we're the only four year institution, public constitution here in Washington doesn't do it, but looking over the list of WUE schools, it also looks like UC Boulder doesn't do it, Oregon doesn't do it. It looks like the only or UC Boulder, the only UC school that does it is UC Merced. and I I don't want to impinge the reputation of UC Merced, I hope my thrust there is understood. Do you think, or do you do you know why it is that schools like UW, that tend to be viewed just higher and academic institutions, you know, more research oriented institutions, don't participate in WUE like schools with, frankly, lower acceptance rates. Do not tend to participate in WUE the same way other schools in their states do?

Erick Jacobsen: No, I don't know. It's not something that, like, I could find any information on. If I were to guess, it's because the generally more prestigious schools want or require more funding. And the best way to do this is to raise tuition. And the best way to do that is to raise it on out of state students, because fewer people in the state care. So that would be my guess.

Julia Tanner: I had the same question.

Abigail Appleyard: Is an institutional grant the same as a scholarship?

Erick Jacobsen: Probably? Are you referring to a line I said?

Abigail Appleyard: There's a line that says out of state students can't get any institutional grants.

Erick Jacobsen: Can you tell me the line number?

Abigail Appleyard: Line 41, University of Washington does not offer any State or Institutional Grants to out of state students. If that's referring to scholarships then that's not correct.

Erick Jacobsen: It may be only referring to a specific kind of scholarship because that link that is the source includes the only scholarship I'm aware of which is Purple and Gold.

Brendan Chang: A grant is usually awarded based on financial need. A scholarship is usually awarded based off applications. There is a difference. Institutions can have both. Generally in-state grants are not awarded to out of state.

Joseph Riggio: Pierce did you have something?

Pierce Wallbaum: I was going to mention the Purple and Gold scholarship as well as it looks like there are other, I don't know if these are not considered institutional scholarships, but there's also the UW diversity scholarship that looks like that is more need-based, but I believe that's. Oh, wait, no, that is resident state of Washington. Well, I guess I was just going to say the purple and gold one then, as well, but, yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: To my knowledge the Purple and Gold is the only scholarship that's for out of state students.

Pierce Wallbaum: It looks like there might be some ROTC and other similar scholarships that could apply to out of state as well. But nonetheless I was going to say that maybe that should be reworded to clarify that there is a Purple and Gold scholarship or at least very limited out of state scholarships. Maybe you could even say that they're like selective or just competitive in nature and don't apply to most out of state.

Erick Jacobsen: I've added a suggest edit which can be adopted in committee for specifying need based grant.

Joseph Riggio: Any other questions, comments, motions? Dylan?

Dylan Bianchi: Do you know what percentage of out of state students are students who could potentially claim WUE, like, come from WUE states?

Erick Jacobsen: That's a good question. I can look more into that, I don't know but based on the amount of people I've met from the Bay Area, probably a lot.

General laughter ensues

Joseph Riggio: Is that sufficiently answering your question? Abigail?

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like just going back to the earlier point, could the University even afford to do this? With smaller schools, there's a fewer number of people who are coming from out of state and reaping the benefit benefits of the lower tuition, but, there are so many people here from out of state. I mean, there's ton of people who are in state, but when you're making the only way the university can sustain itself is by having out of state students. and so many of them are coming from these schools, like, are those states. I just don't know. I guess it depends how much they cut tuition by, but, like, if it makes it in state tuition, then it just doesn't seem feasible

Erick Jacobsen: I don't know. Honestly, institutional funding has been really tight with Washington public institutions of higher ed. So I wouldn't be surprised if this was rejected on those grounds. I think it's still worth a shot. I can calculate how much how much tuition will be lowered per out of state student and then get back to you.

Abigail Appleyard: Is it basically just that it makes tuition in state?

Erick Jacobsen: No it's 150% so it would be \$20,109 instead of \$40,640.

Dylan Bianchi: As I understand it WUE is often, you do have to apply for it as a separate thing to admission to the school, I think. I didn't look at WUE when I was doing my college applications, but could someone correct me on that if I'm wrong?

Erick Jacobsen: I wasn't aware of that being a thing. Based on my research into WUE, I was under the impression that it just applies automatically. But I can look into that.

Joseph Riggio: Any other questions, comments, motions?

Dylan Bianchi: According to the WICHE website, it's not automatically awarded. "No the WUE rate is not automatically awarded even if you meet the institution's criteria which may be more rigorous than the admissions criteria, there are no guarantees. Many institutions limit the number of new WUE awards each academic year so apply early." So my two takeaways from that statement is that UW could adjust how we handle WUE relative to other schools but my concern would be that if its like an additional based on the strength of the applicant, I don't know if that's like need or like merit. Like UW definitely has higher standards than other institutions within the state of Washington. We would probably need to either have a higher standard for WUE or have to give a greater percentage of out of state students WUE.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah I found that same website. I can maybe draft up some committee edits to make that more clear.

Joseph Riggio: Other questions, comments, motions? Any motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to refer R-32-2 to General Affairs committee

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Joseph Riggio yields Speakership to Erick Jacobsen

Erick Jacobsen: Yay.

Pierce Wallbaum: I have a general question. So now that I am going to go to Dylan's committee and you were going to take chair while I was in his, but now your bill's in mine. How is that gonna work?

Erick Jacobsen: Joseph is going to chair. Yeah he and I spoke about that earlier.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the agenda, this link has been removed. We have the Student Health Fee survey in our forums. Joseph how long will that take?

Joseph Riggio: Depends how many questions. My recommendation is putting a timestamp, or I guess it's your call. because the actual form itself only take like 10 minutes. But I anticipate that there will be a lot of questions about this.

Erick Jacobsen: Do we think 15 minutes is long enough then, Joseph said the forum would take about 10 minutes on the stone, so that would be five minutes is for questions, which may be cutting it close, so I'm interested in hearing thoughts. We do have a lot of elections, we have four elections, and two new bills and three old bills. I'll go to Joseph.

Joseph Riggio: We can either do five minutes or ten minutes, depending on how we feel for questions and any question we don't get to, I can create a form and people can submit their question via that form too. So that's an option.

Erick Jacobsen: So I'll put it in 15 minutes tentatively, and then, we'll keep track of that. We have four elections, five elections, because we didn't do JCC. So we have JCC, Personnel, Husky Health, UPASS, First Year Experience Student Advisory Council. We also have vice chair elections in committee and then new bells. So we'll need a fair bit of time in committee. And we'll need a fair bit of time for elections. Julia?

Julia Tanner: Can we add the legislation to summary of new business.

Erick Jacobsen: In the meantime we should also think about our questions for the Finance and Budget, Student Safety Advisory Board, and Hub Board of Representatives elections. I suppose we'll lead with finance and budget, any thoughts? Dylan.

Dylan Bianchi: I think we should keep it simple. What experience do you have with financing and budgeting, and how would you apply it to this position.

Julia Tanner seconds

Erick Jacobsen: I see head nods, so we'll move on to the Student Safety Advisory Board, um, no, yes. Sorry, I saw the word board and I got confused. Question ideas. Anyone? Abigail.

Abigail Appleyard: Can you give a little background? What kind of student safety stuff?

Erick Jacobsen: Student Safety Advisory Board is an ASUW committee that the Director of Campus Partnerships chairs the committee and Director of Campus Partnerships liaises with UWPD and other campus security and safety sort of stuff. If that helps.

Abigail Appleyard: We could kind of do, like, what we did with the sustainability one and ask people, like, what's a problem that they're seeing on campus and, like, a potential solution.

Erick Jacobsen: I will, say that there's also been a lot of Senate resolutions on safety that have been not implemented quite yet with regards to there's parking lot security last year, but there even before that, many years in a row, we were advocating for more blue light poles on campus. We were doing that, OGR was doing that and ultimately, we've received, like, no movement from admin. So if that's

something that we want to incorporate a little bit,, then we can think about that, but this could also be fine. Does anyone have any thoughts?

Dylan Bianchi: I like this question

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on I guess, HUB board of representatives. This meets like once a quarter. So it's pretty chill. The liaison would be working with Carrie more, the executive director of the Hub. Julia did this two years ago. Do you have anything to speak on it?

Julia Tanner: Yeah. I guess it would be good for the liaison to come with ideas about how to improve for the HUB. Sometimes they have extra money and so they like hearing what students want to see from the HUB. And so the question can be around like, what experience do you have or what, yeah, what personal experience do you have using the HUB's resources and what would you like to see going forward from the HUB?

Erick Jacobsen: What experience do you have accessing the HUB's resources and what suggestions do you have for improving them.

Abigail Appleyard: I think we could change accessing to utilizing.

Erick Jacobsen: Anyone else.

Pierce Wallbaum: I like that

Erick Jacobsen: Now overall do we want to put a 30 minute timer on elections? This is something we sort of talked about before. I think it's probably worth it because we have five elections and we need to be able to get to committee meetings because it's very important to get to committee meetings. and we still have old business from last year that we haven't gotten through. It's already week six.

Dylan Bianchi: In all honesty, I think we should just kind of accept that old bills are going to stay on the back burner. And the new bills and committees are also probably have to stay on the back burner, and focus on getting through all these elections, getting the vice chairs elected.

Erick Jacobsen: Further thoughts? anyone agree or disagree? Or have no opinion whatsoever Julia!

Julia Tanner: I agree with the unfortunate circumstance that we should focus on elections and vice chair elections, because that's just representation and that's important.

Joseph Riggio: Did we parse out any elections that we can put off until winner quarter? Has that already been done or is that something ...

Erick Jacobsen: Presuming that no one's plans have changed without telling me, all of the ASUW stuff has to be done. The Hub Board of Representatives has to be elected by the November 4th because their first meeting is November 13th, and we don't have a meeting on November 11th. for Veterans' Day. So that one has to be done. Finance and budget and all the other ASUW ones, definitely by the time. Husky Health, definitely. We already missed one meeting. The only one I

don't know about is the First year Experience Student Advisory Council. But we have already taken nominations for that, so I think it'd be unfair to push it off. Pierce?

Pierce Wallbaum: I think I like your 30 minute timestamp. I think that's probably enough time to get through most of the elections. And if not, then I think we should still prioritize the Senate vice chair elections. So even if we don't finish them all by then, I think it's important to go to committees, but I don't think that's too long that we won't be able to do the rest on the agenda still.

Abigail Appleyard: If we're concerned about old business is it possible to just put new business after old business?

Erick Jacobsen: We would have to have committee chairs first anyway.

Abigail Appleyard: What if we just didn't talk about it in committee?

Erick Jacobsen: That could be up to you all if you want to people make emotion to table it in committee, they can, and that can be something that you advise upon Pierce as a sponsor, what are your thoughts on that?

Pierce Wallbaum: Wait can you clarify?

Erick Jacobsen: Putting off legislation in committees for another week.

Pierce Wallbaum: I like that idea. I think it's more important that because I kind of felt bad having vice chair elections and then I leave right away. And so I would be totally fine with pushing legislation back for a week, but you're also another sponsor, so

Erick Jacobsen: I'm fine with it I've waited this long. Then if we want to table it here and now because we have the sponsors like looped in.

Abigail Appleyard: I think this is probably the only time in the year this is feasible too because both of you guys are here and we don't have a ton of legislation going on so just for the sake of like getting stuff done I think it might make sense.

Erick Jacobsen: Do I hear any motions?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to table R-32-1 and R-32-2 for one week.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 3-0-2

Brendan Chang: when is the Legislative Agenda being introduced?

Erick Jacobsen: And then the week after that is the last day of the legislative agenda and the presidential forum.

Brendan Chang: I don't know if we can get to any committee legislation in the next couple of weeks.

Erick Jacobsen: That can also be something that we talk about next meeting. Okay.. And we also will talk about. Next week we'll talk about the veterans Day week because we may not, we just may not meet for steering then either. So keep that on your radar. Okay. So we have no time stamp for elections, 15 minute time stamp for forums, legislation's tabled Are there any other questions, comments, or motions on the agenda right now?

Pierce Wallbaum: I know we kind of talked about this, but I just want to get a reminder. I did talk to some of the other sponsors about the first bill and item A under old business and they're all fine with me just tabling it indefinitely. Can I do that here? Or did you guys want me to do that on the floor? Because the sponsors are fine with it. It's just whether I can't do it now because I'd rather just do it to get.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to table R-31-25 indefinitely

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Pierce Wallbaum: I did speak with multiple people who, um, were part of this bill. I was also part of this bill, and we've all decided not to move forward with the bill specifically, but we are still working with Odegard Faculty Council to discuss extending the hours. It's just the bill itself is being kind of away with.

Joesph Riggio: I agree with that; ethically, I would recommend doing this on the floor, tabling it indefinitely, just so people at least know what's going on.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of open debate. I'll go to Julia and then Dylan.

Julia Tanner moves to previous question

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Motion to table R-31-25 indefinitely fails 2-3-0

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve agenda

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Approved 4-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to discussion. Our first item of discussion is resolution Revolution debrief. How did y'all think it went? Oh, wow, all at once. Okay, I'll go to Abigail and Dylan, then Pierce.

Abigail Appleyard: I got a lot of questions about, like, what the point of Senate legislation even is, like, what it does. and I was kind of talking about how it like, sets student opinion and, like, help guide, like, other decisions and stuff but I don't know. I feel like it's a little bit late for that now, but maybe, like, at the start of next quarter just kind of reminding people, like, the ways that the legislation is useful and, like, gets employed and that sort of thing, just because it seems like people are having fun and they're enjoying Senate and they, like, listening to other people's pills, but they just don't really understand like, when it leaves Senate, what is the point?

Erick Jacobsen: I've also gotten a few questions on that, like, outside of Senate, so we can definitely clarify that. I can even clarify it in my leadership report tomorrow

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I was gonna say it went better than the less formal workshops I've been doing the couple weeks previous. I think we made the right decision, making it a whole Senate thing, because I do think that along with that and hall senators made it easier to get a conversation going, because there were more people involved, and also, I do think you're better at this than at least I am. Yeah, To Abigail's point, though, I do think, like, we just kind of need legislation in the committees. Like, it's hard to get these senators, like, excited about writing their own legislation before they've had substantial experience point in other people's legislation. I think one really needs to come before the other.

Pierce Wallbaum: I was just going to say, within my committee at least, I thought it was pretty successful. A lot of people were kind of excited to add things, and I was explaining it to them, like, what WHEREAS clauses do and the corresponding THAT clauses, they all seem to really like it. I thought it was really good. I think those were great ideas, but maybe we should at least do one resolution revolution a quarter, just because there's always new senators each quarter. And so I think that I thought it was pretty successful

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, I'm going to come back to that, but I wanted to ask Dylan, and the other the others of you can chime in as well, but he made the point specifically. Do you think that we shouldn't do any committee specific workshops, like within committees?

Dylan Bianchi: I don't know about not doing any. Honestly, I think the main issue is how early we're doing them. Like, to Pierce's point, I think it might be best a way to do those into, like, middle of the quarter when presumably you don't have like a ton of new new senators. I think getting senators to draft legislation are encouraging them to like draft legislation is hard until they are used to what legislation looks like, until they have kind of a gut sense for it.

Erick Jacobsen: Any further thoughts on that point specifically? Thumbs up from Abigail Going back to Pierce's point, I was initially playing to do two a quarter, one as just a general one and one as a topic specific one in conjunction with either a member of the Board of Directors, another ASUW employee, or some department or some RSO, maybe, to focus on what the different topics are that people can write legislation in. I was wondering what everyone had to say about that, or do you think it's a good idea? Do you think it's too limiting? We should just focus on the general ones. Do you think it's too much in one quarter? What's up? Abigail?

Abigail Appleyard: I think it's good because I think what happens is that people kind of get stuck on like the same three things, which is like microwaves, district market is expensive. Like, obviously people talk about other stuff too, but it would be nice to, like, just be kind of told what you have to do, and then work around that and, like, really practice finding information for stuff that you don't know that much about instead of, like, oh, well, I'm leaning on my personal experience of knowing that the DM is more expensive. Like, that's important and that's good, but I think it's also, like a much bigger exercise to be told what somebody wants to write legislation about and go in finding the resources for that.

Erick Jacobsen: We were talking about this amongst leadership and someone suggested, I don't remember who. Wait, I forgot what was going to say. I swear it was profound. And you know what because it wasn't my thought. Oh, about coming up with the ideas within each committee, rather than all at once, and then still rotating. What are thoughts on that? That was Julia's idea, everyone.

Pierce Wallbaum: I think it's a good idea, but every week I've been asking them, like, what do you guys thinking for legislation? Does anyone have anything? And they just stare at me. Like, it's very humbling, very even off-putting. Like, they just stare at me like, I'm supposed to give them the ideas. And I just, maybe this is just like a fall quarter thing, but they definitely are not just bustling with ideas quite yet. So maybe later in the year asking them more directly, because I remember like last year in general affairs Tanya would ask sometimes thoughts on legislation, and some people did have some ideas, but that was even more like spring time. And so at least not yet. I don't think asking to you guys have ideas because that just has seemed pretty brick wall.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll note for the record very vigorous head nods from Dylan. I wanted to ask Pierce. how were you phrasing it? Was it like, ideas for legislation or things that you want to change about the university?

Pierce Wallbaum: Honestly both. I tried multiple ways to put it, even breaking it down to like, what's a small thing that annoys you on your walk to class or what's something that kind of pops in your head that maybe you thought it worked a different way, but it doesn't, and it can work both ways, you know, stuff like that. I tried to really break it down and that did nothing.

Erick Jacobsen: Maybe we'll see where people are at now, now that we've done like one workshop maybe that'll inspire some ideas, I get that, that's something we'll definitely think about.

Dylan Bianchi: The cow was milked, the well has run dry. There's not any ideas that people have had. I think we should steer away from these workshops until midway through winter quarter. That's my honest opinion. Because we have stuff to do in Senate if we have not that many bills, so be it, but it's not like we're starting down the barrel of no legislation. Definitely not, I mean, frankly, I bet the bills we talked about today won't be pass towards the end of fall quarter. So I think we really just need to give time for senators to settle in and to get out of their shells, and I think we need to worry, like, a little less about getting legislation out.

Joseph Riggio: I'm just going to come forward and say, I initially disagree with Dylan, but after hearing him out, I do actually second what are you saying. I would rather see quality legislation being produced even if it means sacrificing some of our internal goals, right, about the quantity of resolutions, because I know we're expecting some good quality resolutions soon from a couple of people. But also, yeah, I would much rather focus on integrating senators, making sure they're not feeling too terribly overwhelmed and as Pierce kindly pointed out, it's been kind of it sounds like it's been quote unquote humbling experience trying to get people to say ideas. So thank you for that feedback and I'm going to agree with Dylan on this.

Erick Jacobsen: Great. So it sounds like the general consensus is to not do another resolution of revolutions until next quarter and then maybe then think about maybe doing a topic based. Do I have any volunteers to help me email the 44 people who submitted ideas?

Jothsna Sundar: I volunteer.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you Jothsna. We'll split it in half. I'll do 222. You do 22. Great, thank you. So we're going to get back to them, hopefully we get a few new resolutions from that. Are there any final thoughts on this topic?

Abigail Appleyard: I have a thought on what you just said. One, I think a lot of people, you should email everyone anyway, but I think a lot of people submitted stuff because they thought it was just like, a word cloud to, like, for in Senate. They didn't think it was like, for future stuff that they wanted to write legislation for. So I wouldn't be shocked if like, don't hear back from that many people. And then you can see about like grouping people who had similar ideas if you want to reduce the amount of emails or just like get people talking to each other too.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, I was planning on sending one email to everyone who said district market food prices.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, I think that's a great idea. And just like to add to that, I had several questions from the committee members about what the difference between like a sponsor versus co-sponsors were or if you're allowed to have like two sponsors or how many co-sponsors you can have. It seems like there's a lot of confusion around that. And so maybe if you're planning on reaching out to a lot of people, just giving out general note that, you know, you can have multiple sponsors, multiple co-sponsors, and maybe why they differ because that there were several questions on that

Julia Tanner: And I will say, based off of what Naomi Law said about after the meeting the district market emails, I would suggest adding in there to either talk to Naomi if you don't wanna bear the bad news or be like, by the way, this is not feasible and HFS will not go for this. I still submit the initiative as student opinion if you want.

Erick Jacobsen: I was planning on CCing Naomi on all the agent test related ones anyway. So so she can get back to them on that. I don't want to necessarily discourage anyone from writing a

resolution. Although I do want them to be as knowledgeable on the thing as possible. Okay, we'll move on to forwarding clauses reform, Joseph, did you want to take the lead?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, so I'll expand the scope of this by saying, we have a new legislation template. You can find it on our link tree and our SharePoint website. So if you click on the link tree and then go to resources or Senator resources, there it is. Oh my goodness. So it looks the exact same and you're probably thinking Joseph like what you spent like an hour on this and it looks the exact same. Why are you just copying and pasted it? Well, actually, my very in between the lines, literally, you'll notice, the abstract art and the title is gone. from last session. So some little things about the formatting and the back end of it, how the sections were broken out and word, long story short, it was not great to work with, and it was very hard to replicate. And trying to go in and make sure all the resolutions were consistent was just a hassle. So I redid a lot of the back end, and to me, at least, it looks a little bit nicer from a technical standpoint. The main thing that we want to drive your attention towards, though, is the forwarding clause. So, Erick and I have been speaking a lot about GAVEL's role and whatnot. ever since we took the committee and made it its own thing, and now it can properly follow up on the implementation of resolutions. It makes sense to us that the forwarding clause, nothing changes when people write bills, by the way. They're still going to add a forwarding clause, especially to resolutions, and it's still going to be sent out by those people. However, now the forwarding clauses charges GAVEL with doing that. So it empowers GAVEL member, it gives GAVEL members something to do when the legislation is passed. And also this can be something I delegate to my interns or whatnot as well. But essentially, we are just taking the role of what Senate leadership used to do in trying to forward these bills and giving it to the GAVEL committee, just because they're already going to be helping bill's sponsors out with following up and implementing their resolutions. To us, it just makes sense. giving it to GAVEL Committee, because they already do that. I love thoughts on this, concerns?

Brendan Chang: I would just make sure to clarify that with Caroline. Because it is in her job description to forward things.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, Have you spoken with Caroline? I'll speak with her. But yeah, that was something that we were talking about as well. And if we need to change something in the board bylaws or her job description, I can consult the appropriate individuals.

Brendan Chang: I don't know if it needs to go through bylaws but just letting her know she doesn't need to forward those anymore.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll definitely talk to her. Any further thoughts, questions, comments?

Joseph Riggio: I can also, for now, um, and say the Board of Directors too, and just add that in the forwarding clause, just so that it's both. But yeah, we'll follow up with her about that.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm curious as to what people think about the I guess what should be included in this initial forwarding email, how it currently works, is it's just you have been. I'm I'm hazy on the exact wording, but it's just notifying someone, hey, you were you listed in this bill to be forward too.

This bill has passed the board of directors. Please contact email for the sponsor for any details. And it's pretty bare bones. where it comes to gavel, the idea is that gavel would be more proactive in saying, hey, do you want to meet to talk about this? How does this. Is this possible? Is this something that you're willing to do? This is why you should do it that sort of thing. So it's more along the lines of that advocacy on the bill rather than notification of the bill. And so I was wondering if there was things that we should be aware of going into that, if anyone had thoughts on how we should approach that.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, I just want to say, I work for student Legal Services, and we received the bill that Samir wrote for SARVA about the SANE nurses and nursing exams that with Husky Health and the email I'm looking at it, and it's just very brief. It's a hello, all, the attached is this bill. Please reach out to Erick for any questions. Like that, it's very, if I was not in Senate and I received this email, I would have no idea what that even means, who Erick is or what a board like, you know, I'm not I'm not saying it like, it gives me the bill. I can look at it, but I have no idea like, what we're supposed to do with it to be completely honest. And it just gets moved to a different folder and an email. Like. Yeah, I think it's very, what did you call it? Bare bones. Yeah. And so I would definitely like to see more context provided in these for or yeah, in the forward emails. because, yeah, there's just not a lot to go off of.

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like because the bills vary so much and like what you need out of each recipient the forwarding, like from the boarding also varies. it probably makes more sense to kind of go case by case. I mean, you can have, like, a general template, but I would be pretty careful about checking over emails before you send them and making sure, like, you're asking. Would you like to meet about this? Like, or providing more context, just because, like, I don't think every person on each forwarding clause is, like, probably, exactly who it needs to go to and you need to have meetings with every single one of them. Like, I don't know, I mean, it varies by bill, I'm sure, but, like, it probably makes more sense to just handle it. Like, person by person than having this, like, default, blank, basically email that just, like, says, here's the document.

Brendan Chang: What are you hoping for with GAVEL and these forwarding clauses?

Joseph Riggio: I think those points that you covered are kind of what I was hoping for, that we would, like to Pierce's concern, because I was just reading over, I just pulled up the email and I agree with you. It's very bare bones. And I'm sure that also might have to do with just the amount of work that they have to do. Given their responsibilities, so they might not have time to create a fully fleshed out email where GAVEL members will have that time. So especially even during the meetings. So yeah, I would hope to provide some context to the bill, whether that's maybe repurposing the bill summary on these emails or personalizing the emails to the different departments or whatnot, just do a little bit of that extra work so that way it's not, like you said Pierce move to a folder and never seen again. So that's the hope of what GAVEL can accomplish.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah. I'll add to that and say, Senate resolutions are really unique in terms of board bills because I don't know if any other board bills really go out to anyone who hasn't already heard about the bill. Because, like, sure, funding requests that might be forwarded to the RSO or

representative. They know because they' submitted the funding request. It might go to Khushi or the FB Committee. They're probably already aware of it. Bylaws Amendments might go to Ashwin, who was likely there. Senate resolutions are really the only ones that have such a broad scope in terms of who's being contacted. And that's another reason why it might be better for this to fall to us. Going back to Abigail's point on who is included in the forwarding classes. I was wondering if we could discuss whether how we want to approach that in terms of. I had an idea of, do we need forwarding clauses at all? Could GAVEL figure out who to contact? And Joseph's response to this was that it's good to have a starting place. So I'm wondering, if any of you have thoughts on what we should consider when defining the scope of this starting place? Do we want to try to work closely with sponsors to make sure it's everyone that could be relevant and no one that wouldn't be? Or do we want to leave it more up to them? Do we want to keep advise them to keep it limited or add as much people as possible? I'll go to Abigail.

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like contacting a ton of people is a little bit, like, frantic, quite frankly. I just think that it makes more sense to go to either the first person in the, like, line of people or a more direct person than being like, well, this is everyone who could possibly be related to this task. Like, if you want to, like, later have a meeting with more of those people, I think that makes sense, but I just don't think, like.. I think it makes us kind of look a little bit less professional if we're like, let's send it out to, you, every single person. Just, like, keeping it more concise I think is better

Julia Tanner: With that, I think it is good, you have excellent insight into who would be good to send legislation to and Joseph does as well. So if there is just a little bit of oversight over the boarding clause as to eliminating to the people that are the most relevant, or if there's someone who would be more relevant, that isn't on the forwarding clause that you know about and just having oversight. I think that Abigail makes a great point that it should be pointed and intentional. So oversight into that would be important.

Erick Jacobsen: Any final thoughts on this topic before we move on to our last discussion item?

Joseph Riggio: Worst case scenario with that. We'll GAVEL and board would be tasked for sending this out. If they want to do like the bare bones sending it out to anyone who's list on the forwarding clause and then GAVEL could help work with the bill's sponsors and say, okay, who really do we need to target communication and effort and that's where we can do that personalized email a little bit more and provide that context, provide that scope, see how we can work with them. Because I do agree with you. We're frivolously like just sending out the bill to whoever will see it in the department. I think it's going to hurt credibility.

Erick Jacobsen: And I'll add that. It probably wouldn't be a good look if they get an email from one part of ASUW saying, hey, this passed, and then an email from another part of ASUW with more detail and more information and stuff Because that looks like we're not communicating. So, yeah. Final thoughts? All righty, moving on to steering bonding.

Julia Tanner: So I added this, like, I talked about this a little bit in my leadership report earlier, but just to solidify our ideas, so I'll next meeting, I'll be like, this is the day that seems the most available

for everyone. But for now, so are we still good with like Uno BS, like card games kind of, like a night to chill? Cool. And then do we want to do, like, hot look version of snacks or do you want me to figure out, like, pizza or some other snacks through your Senate?

Dylan Bianchi: I vote potlucking it

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like that's good, too, because then at least you know there's one thing there that you'll be happy to eat and enjoy.

Julia Tanner: And then as far as place goes, would you guys have any ideas of where you'd like to be I feel like the HUB is a little bit sterile. For like bonding purposes. Like I could invite you guys to Hansee because it's pretty cozy there. There's places to play play card games or we could go somewhere on the Av or something ideas for that

Dylan Bianchi: I can probably offer my apartment.

Pierce Wallbaum: I'm honestly, fine with the hub, if that, like, makes it convenient for everybody. It kind of feel bad, like, having to go to your apartment to host this. But if you're comfortable with that, but I'm also fine with the hub. It's the people, not the place, right?

Abigail Appleyard: I'm good with whatever.

Julia Tanner: I'll make an executive decision like next week and get back to you guys.

Erick Jacobsen: Any final thoughts?

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the announcements and public comments period does anyone have any announcements? Joseph

Joseph Riggio: I'm going to turn it over to Maitri because they had an announcement.

Maitri Karia: So the program that I'm a part of, communication leadership, and I'm pursuing digital marketing, we have an open house where information about the program will be communicated so since there are no professors in the program, it is like professionals from Amazon and Microsoft to teaching so any undergraduate students who are interested in digital marketing can join and you know have a one-on-one session. the advisors about if the pro and the right fit so I wanted to share this information with you and if you can help me share it with the undergraduate community who are about to select the undergraduate programs.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, any other announcements?

Joseph Riggio: I just wanted to say before, and I'll remind you guys again before we get to vice chair elections, do keep in mind that the vice chair responsibilities have changed. They now sit on GAVEL. They are automatically members of the GAVEL committee our organic, yes, if you look at

the organic, I had to look at it again, too, but yes, it does say in our bylaws currently that vice chairs are automatically members of the GAVEL Committee, so that's added responsibility. So just make sure you're communicating that with them, that they'll, if they're available to attend the Thursdays, 3:30 to 4:30, which also gives hall senators a chance to be part of GAVEL too, which that's exciting. So, yeah.

Pierce Wallbaum: can you clarify exactly what their responsibility with GAVEL would be?

Joseph Riggio: They'd be GAVEL members. So they'd be assigned legislation to track.

Erick Jacobsen: So to summarize vice chairs would be in charge of taking notes for committees, attending and serving on GAVEL, and filling in for you all in the event that you cannot make it. Although in that you would also not be paid for your time here.

Abigail Appleyard: If I wanted to make a public comment tomorrow and it required a QR code can I like send you a slide?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. Any other announcements? Any motions?

ADJOURNMENT

Julia Tanner moves to adjourn

Dylan Bianchi seconds

3-2-0

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar

Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
