



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXI

Date: Wednesday October 22, 2024

Location: HUB 250

CALL TO ORDER

5:00 pm

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.

APPROVAL OF SENATE AGENDA

Adam Ford moves to approve the agenda

James Yu seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

LEADERSHIP REPORT

[Leadership Reports](#) | Erick Jacobsen, Joseph Riggio, Julia Tanner

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Shreyan Mitra: Hi everyone. So I'm the President of an RSO on campus called CESA Computing for Environmental and Social Advocacy. What we basically do is we are trying to make computing more sustainable and we do stuff like see how we can tackle the digital divide. Make sure all code, including AI, is ethical. And so we are not just looking for computer science majors like myself, but we are also looking for people who are passionate about the social impact of technology and people who are willing to devote time to discuss for organizing and advertising and so forth. So if you are interested, feel free to just go to Husky Link and you should if you just type up CESA, C-E-S-A or Computing for Environmental and Social Advocacy, you can just sign up there. Thank you.

Dylan Bianchi: AAA folks, I sent a poll in the teams chat. Please fill that out.

Alex Ren: Hey, Joseph, I'm here for attendance. So yeah, cool, yeah. That works right?

Joseph Riggio: It's in the minutes now so yeah but please don't all do that.

Nandana Jaideep: Hi everyone. I'm Nandana. I'm the ASUW President. I just have a couple event announcements for you guys. So OGR is hosting a lobbyist career panel this Friday. It's on Zoom from 5:15 to 6:15. All the information and the link to like RSVP is on their Instagram @asuwoqr. So please feel free to come by, check it out. And very, very important. We have our legislative reception on November 19th also the RSVP link is on the Instagram. We have a lot of cool people coming. It's a great place to network with legislators. We have a keynote speaker. We have dinner served like it's a great time. It's one of the ASUW. Biggest events. So we have a lot of capacity. So if you have an RSVP yet, make sure to do so because it does fill up really, really fast. And this is an event you don't want to miss. Like, trust me. So yeah, I hope to see you guys there. Thank you.

Abigail Appleyard: I was inspired by Dylan to ask my committee to also fill out the bonding survey that I sent out. Thank you.

Audrianna Scott: Hello everybody. If you didn't know, Test Fest is on right now from the 4th through the 18th. What is Test Fest you might ask. It is free STI testing for students and yeah, you guys should definitely go get tested. Husky Health and go to ASUW's Instagram to see the flyer and sign up link. Appointment only, no walk-ins.

Joseph Riggio: Just a reminder that the student health fee campus survey is going to launch on November 6th. I'm happy to provide QR codes and links to that. If you're interested in filling that out, please, you want to hear your voice on this matter. It's a pretty big feat, so thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements? Any last announcements?

Julia Tanner: With the attendance slash RSVP form I just had up. I just sent a link in the teams chat in the general channel. If you guys weren't able to access it through the QR code

FORUMS

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Erick Jacobsen: Come to bonding. It's fun. All right, we have no public forums. We'll move on to nominations and elections for full transparency, we tabled two of our elections for a week so that we can give more time to the legislative agenda. But we will be having our HUB Board of Representatives and Finance and Budget elections because those are important and they can't really wait. So we'll begin with the HUB Board of Representatives. We have two nominees already, but if we have any nominations you can still nominate yourself for anyone else. I'll go to Elizabeth.

Elizabeth McAleer rescinds nomination

Jayden Kim nominates himself

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any nominations? Seeing none, the nominations period has closed and with will our two candidates please come up to the front. We will go in order as you appear on the agenda. You will have 15 seconds for an introduction. Then we will go in reverse order. You will

have 30 seconds to answer the question, and we'll reverse it again for 15 second conclusion beginning with Gavin. You have 15 seconds for your introduction whenever you're ready.

Gavin Horton: Hi everyone. My name is Gavin. I'm a second year studying political science and economics. I'm a residential advisor for McMahon. Shout out to McMahon. I am deeply passionate about the Hub. Oh yeah, sorry. I'm deeply passionate about the Hub and what goes on here.

Erick Jacobsen: That's your time. Thank you. Moving on to Jayden, you have 15 seconds for an introduction whenever you're ready.

Jayden Kim: Hi everyone, I'm Jayden. I'm a first year here at UW. I'm intending on majoring in neuroscience and psychology, and I live off campus, which means I stay at the HUB a lot. And I guess that's my time.

Erick Jacobsen: Can you stay up please for you have 30 seconds to answer the question. Would you like me to repeat it? Our question for the HUB Board of Representatives is what experience do you have utilizing the Hub's resources and what suggestions do you have for improving them? You have 30 seconds whenever you're ready.

Jayden Kim: I come to the Hub every day that I'm on campus. Whether it be eating in the den or using the facilities by the fireplace to study. One thing I noticed was that the HUB administrative staff have attempted to arrange their furniture to prevent homeless members of the public from sleeping on them, which I believe is fine, but there should be alternative methods.

Erick Jacobsen: That is your time. Moving on to Gavin, you have 30 seconds. Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is what experience do you have utilizing the hub's resources and what suggestions do you have for improving them? You have 30 seconds whenever you're ready.

Gavin Horton: So yeah, the HUB is like the heart of student life on campus. It is a place where community and connection thrive. I have been in the HUB a lot. I study here a lot. I eat here almost every day for lunch. I bowl here occasionally. As HUB liaison, I would want to make it more accessible for a lot of students, whether RSOS are a better connection between ASUW and RSOS and trying to extend hours possibly so more students can feel comfortable being here. But yeah, I just want to improve the overall flow of

Erick Jacobsen: That is your time, thank you. Would you stay up here for a 15 second conclusion whenever you're ready.

Gavin Horton: A vote for me is a vote for a more open, inclusive and connected HUB, one that every student can feel proud to call their space. Together we can make the hub not just the center for campus, but the center for student life for everyone. Thank you so much.

Erick Jacobsen: Jayden you have 15 seconds for a conclusion whenever you're ready.

Jayden Kim: Voting for me would ensure that students can call this place a hub for everyone. Not just only staff, not just RSOs, not just students, but for everyone. And I hope that you'll help me and join me in this mission.

Erick Jacobsen: That is your time. Thank you both. Can we have a round of applause for round of applause for our candidates, please? The voting form is active. Again, we do our elections via Husky link. The link is in our link tree and the link tree is on the agenda.

Drumroll commences

Gavin Horton elected HUB Board of Representatives Liaison.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on, we have our Finance and Budget Committee elections. This is the ASUW Committee that handles our over \$1 million budget. So if you want budgeting experiences, this is great for that. Do I hear any nominations? With that, the nominations period closes and with an uncontested election, Kira McKey is elected via acclamation. Congratulations, Kira.

Kira McKey elected Finance and Budget Liaison

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Erick Jacobsen: Now moving on, we have our special order of the day, the legislative agenda. MJ, would you please come up here?

MJ Mencias: Hello, everybody. Good evening. Thank you for being here. My name is MJ Mencias and I am the Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs for the ASUW and this is our 2026 Legislative Agenda.

Erick Jacobsen: All right would you please read through the bill whenever you're ready?

MJ Mencias: Read the entire bill? Why? OK I guess this is what we're doing. Section 1, protecting and promoting access to quality and education. All right. So we're gonna read the entire bill while going through this? Question, does everybody know how to read and write in here?

Dylan Bianchi moves to recess for 20 minutes to read through the bill.

Gavin Cruz seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Recess 5:23 pm

Back on floor 5:43 PM

Dylan Bianchi moves to suspend the rules and allow MJ to summarize portions of the bill instead of reading it in full.

Gavin Cruz seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Erick Jacobsen: Just as an explanation, it turns out that our Senate rules say that you have to read through the full thing so we can suspend the rules. In this case, this just makes it more streamlined and easy. with that, the motion passes. So if you'd like to start with the first subsection, just summarize it and then we'll go into discussion and we'll vote on each subsection with a raised hand vote. And at the end, we'll have one big vote for the entire legislative agenda. Whenever you're ready

Julia Tanner: Personal privilege, can you make sure it's shared on Teams.

Nandana Jaideep: Hey everyone. OK, this is the legislative agenda, which is like our official student body, like opinion of what we want to lobby for when we go to Olympia in the winter. I just want to say that our Office of Government Relations and the leg steering committee has put a lot of effort into this. And it is sort of time sensitive because we just have this one meeting to pass this ideally because we do not have Senate next week and it has to go through Board. And the following week is a legislative reception where we will be presenting this in front of all the legislators. And after that it's committee days. It's almost time to be down there during session. So I urge you guys to like be as efficient as possible and ask us any questions you may have and just try to be like approach us with a sense of urgency essentially. But yeah, thank you guys.

Erick Jacobsen: I'd like to also emphasize that any student can submit a legislative directive later on in consultation with the OGR office, and if there's anything glaring that you'd like to see covered additionally.

MJ Mencias: And I'm here to answer questions. So if you have questions, please raise your hands. Please let me know. I am, this is why I'm here for. I want to know your questions. I want to be make sure that you have the answers that you need. So the very first one is the Washington College Grant. The Washington College Grant is that money that you get on financial aid, that little bump that you get that pays for your education? That's the that's the Washington College grant. We have been advocating for the Washington College grant since 2019. This is funding for education, for your books, for your courses. And we go every year to session to ask for this.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions or comments?

Gavin Cruz moves to approve subsection

Jayden Kim seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

MJ Mencias: For subsection B this is the Workforce Education Investment Account, also known as the WEIA account. The WEIA account is money that big companies kind of like Google, Microsoft, Amazon, they put a 1% into this account and this account pays for that Washington College grant. This WEA account, we're fighting to protect it because now instead of being used to fund for your education, is being used to pay for buildings, to pay for salaries and other things. So this bill essentially all it's asking is for us to protect that WEIA account. Any questions?

Maddy Pittis: When you say it's used to fund jobs, does that include student jobs like on campus? Or is it only like professors and like professional jobs?

MJ Mencias: So when I said this is the WEIA account is funded by big businesses as in Amazon as in Google. These are major companies that pay 1% or 2%. I think Microsoft is capped at like 5% if I'm not mistaken. They put out of their profits, their earnings, that percentage into the WEIA account, right? And this account originally was used to pay for that Washington College Grant. Now it's being used to pay for buildings, as in the remodeling probably of building of the of the Husky Union, right? That's what I mean when I say that it's paying for salaries, as in professor salaries or salaries or other, it's not being used as it was intended, which was meant to pay for students education.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions?

Mohammad Motadel: I have a question about the WEIA account that is originally to pay for the grant for the grants for students. It's now the money is being used for buildings and other expenses. Minding the cuts of the federal government, if we if this bill will move the usage of the WEIA account to its original purpose of paying for the grants, so what funds will be used for remodeling buildings, as you mentioned, considering the cuts that are coming from the federal government and understanding that remodeling buildings and provision of those is part of providing a better educational environment for students. Thank you.

MJ Mencias: Completely understand your question. Normally when, let's say, and this is an example that I'm giving, this is not, let's say the University of Washington goes and asks the the legislator, the Senate, hey, we need 50, \$50 million to fix Building A, right? Building A normally the people that give that right is taxpayers. So our taxpayers pay for that, for the buildings and everything to get fixed. Now they're using the account that is being made specifically for students, which was intended only for student education, meaning only for your education for you to go to school for free so that students don't get into student debt is being used for all these other things. So what we're trying to do, we're just trying to protect that funding, right? And telling them go back to funding it with with tax dollars instead of funding it with this business money that was specifically intended for students.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah. So there are other funding that is allocated specifically to UW rather than to like the Washington College grant in particular, which is what this account was originally intended for.

Wesley Andrus: My question was just given that money is fungible, does this does this mean there will be more money available to the UW overall if you do do this? Or is this just a change of where the money is coming from and the same amount of money will be spent on both things either way?

MJ Mencias: This is a change from instead of going to the building that it goes into the students pockets for your education. Instead of going into a \$50,000 building, it's going to go directly to you to pay for your education. That's the difference, right? Instead of asking, hey \$50,000 to pay for the building from out of this WEIA account. We're asking that instead of them taking the money from there to take it away from somewhere else instead of this WEIA account. The WEIA account was created in 2019 specifically for students for their education for the Washington College Grant. Does that make sense? Am I explaining myself?

Erick Jacobsen: I think the question was related to when it comes to the Washington College Grant, if parts of WEIA are funding other things, it can't fund the Washington College Grant. So would this raise the amount of money going into the Washington College Grant?

MJ Mencias: Instead of paying for those other things, we would have more money for students to go to school. Does that make sense?

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions?

Liam Knochen: So that would be the case, provided that we managed to appropriate funding from general revenues instead of WEIA, correct?

MJ Mencias: Exactly.

Shreyan Mitra: I just was wondering if you could provide some context as to if this was original that WEA was originally for students and what was the reasoning behind it suddenly being used? Like why do we need? Did this in the 1st place because if WEA was and I might be

misunderstanding something here, which is why I'm asking for clarification is that if WEA was intended for students and only for students you from based on my understanding of what you said, it's not being used for that purpose. Why is it not being used for that purpose if it was done that way? Like what? What? But what is the context here?

MJ Mencias: So like everything else, if it's not codified into law, then we can use those funds for absolutely anything, right? So that's exactly what's happening right now because the WEIA account was created in 2019 and it was created for students, right? It wasn't quite specified what for students. So yeah, a building is for the students, right? Paying for professor salaries is for students, right? So what we want to make sure is that it's codified specifically for student education funding. Does that make sense? We want to make sure. This is why we say that language does matter because those that little word funding is what makes the difference in the entire bill.

Isac Pasco: I am curious if education funding includes things like housing and food or if it's just exclusively for tuition.

MJ Mencias: , whether you use it for food, for your books, or to pay for your education, that's definitely So when you get your financial aid, right, they calculate all that in financial aid and the Washington College grant is just another grant added. So whether you use it for you know, food, whether you use it for your books or pay for your education, that's definitely that's a financial aid thing. But we want to make sure it's to save that WEA account to ensure that you have those fundings.

Russel Ross: So my question is sort of in light of these federal budget constraints, it seems like a lot of departments are having to cut down on salaries for professors on budgets for their academic programs. Are you suggesting that the WEIA budget should not be used to help the plant that funding and that it should only be used to help with student, I guess, budgeting constraints or budgeting support. Is that kind of the premise here?

Nandana Jaideep: OK. So as far as I understand, the intention of this account was for student education funding. The intention was to help students go to school, pay for financial aid, all these other things. The state is in a deficit right now of 16,000,000. So obviously they're looking for any sort of funding source for them to be able to fund all these other things. That go into like education, which could be salaries, buildings, but that wasn't the original purpose of this account. Hence why we're trying to codify that into law so that the money from this specifically goes towards financial aid because we're also facing federal cuts in terms of FAFSA and all these other things. It's important that we make sure these funding sources stay secure, at least at the state level.

Aiden Reeder: I think the question just to summarize other stuff has been is there an idea of where this, these other projects where they would obtain this funding because I don't think that is necessarily in the purview of what we're trying to do here, but I think that's the concern of people here is that where will that funding come from and it do we have an idea of that to replace the stuff that's then going to go to students.

MJ Mencias: So originally when the University of Washington go ask the state or the legislator for money comes from again, taxpayers, right? Everybody pays taxes. When you go to the store, you know you pay your taxes, right? Where you at the end of the year, you pay your taxes, your taxes pay for the roads, for the buildings. This is a public building, so it is does get paid with your taxes. What we're asking is that this specific funding stays specifically for students, especially after the federal government just literally cut all types of funding to higher education.

Nandana Jaideep: I'll briefly add on to see if I can help answer that question. We don't know that, but the state has multiple avenues of funding to fund all these other things like infrastructure. And even if there are things like buildings, there's always like private sponsors and other things that always have helped UW pay for buildings and such, but for financial aid. We don't have multiple avenues of, you know, income or funds funding sources, hence it has to be through the state. So it just makes more sense if WEIA is used for its original intended purpose and that higher education funding isn't like at jeopardy where the state can just like access it and use it to fill gaps anywhere else where they might see fit.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah so to summarize, it's a difference between a general revenue thing, where general revenue typically funds buildings, et cetera, and a specific account, WEA, which funds the Washington College grant. That money does not come from general revenue. So the UW gets its money from the general revenue.

Parker Holmes: Knowing that funding in the state legislature and funding appropriation is less and less guaranteed, do you see any advantage in leaving the flexibility in this fund to potentially fund other things?

MJ Mencias: To be completely honest, no, not right now, especially with, you know, the Grad Plus loans being cut down, especially for undergrads. I am one of those very few undergrads that graduated the University of Washington without paying one penny without getting into debt. So yes, the Washington College Grant helped me. And because I'm a living proof that if you get these funds, you can't go to school completely for free. This is why I'm so intended in protecting it. Right now is when we need funding the most. Education is in jeopardy.

James Yu: My question is is not really a concern for me specifically, but I feel like some people might have this question is that not only is the federal government cutting funding from for like financial aid and all that stuff. Government is also cutting funding for school infrastructure, all the stuff that this this bill right now is partially funding. So I want to ask why do you think this bill would benefit students more by going completely to financial aid and not going to any other building infrastructure because even though that yes, the building of infrastructure and all that stuff does have other supporters, for example, private funding and all that, the funding for students also have private scholarships and all of that. So I just want to see where the balance is at.

MJ Mencias: OK, like I like you said, it doesn't apply to you, right? But for many people that are poor, that don't have the ability that this is a dream, right? To become higher education, to be the first one in your family that do that does not have the funds. Yes, the Washington College grant may be a lifeline, and especially to move out of poverty, to be able to afford an actual meal on your own, and to be able to afford rent, a livable life, right? It makes a difference. The Washington College grant makes a difference. And when we talk about infrastructure, right, your tax dollars normally pay for infrastructure. They pay for your lights, they pay for your roads, they pay for your stop signs. They pay for absolutely everything all of a sudden, because the state is in a deficit, which we're still paying taxes. Now they're saying, well, you know what, we're going to take it out of the student's account, especially at a moment where education is being cut down. Funding for education is being cut down. So yes, we want to protect this because we don't know what it's going to look like in a year or two, especially after grad plus loans and other forms of funding is going to be cut off.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, I'm gonna go to Tyler and then we've had a hand on teams for a while. Zain and then I'll open the floor again for questions, comments and motions. You can make a motion to

limit debate. We have about 15 or 16 of these sections to go through. This is our second one and for the sake of time, I will be putting a 30 second limit on the amount of time each person can speak.

Tyler Kunz: At the end of the first clause in the RCW that's linked in the bill, it says expenditure from the account being used for higher education programs, higher education operations, higher education, often compensation, state funded student aids and it kind of goes over more stuff. To me this seems like pretty broad authority for how the fund may use. If this initiative passed, would we want it to be more narrow or what exactly are we advocating for in light of this pretty broad RCW?

MJ Mencias: So because when we go down to Olympia, we have to negotiate it with senators and representatives, right? We have to leave it broadly open like this. So that we can negotiate that language down in Olympia. It makes no sense for me to negotiate that language down here when I'm going to have to rewrite or probably ask something that you guys didn't vote for. So when we leave it open like this, it is easier for us to negotiate it with senators and representatives and so that we can both get what we want out of this

Zain Asif: Do we know where WEIA gets the funding from federally or statewide?

MJ Mencias: It gets it from the state funding. Again, these are local companies like, you know, Microsoft, Google and Amazon among among the many other companies get deposit to it.

Gavin Cruz moves to approve subsection

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Gavin Cruz moves to limit debate per subsection to 5 minutes.

Collin Saywers seconds

Parker Holmes objects

Gavin Cruz: Just for consideration, we still have 14 subsections that we do and we although we love your public comments, you know as MJ mentioned, we need to pass this today because we have the holiday off next week and then the week after Board of Directors need approval and then that same week or even the next week we have to present this to our legislators. It's vital that yes, we do love your public comment as well, but at the same time we are so constrained with time and especially for legislators that want to support us, this is very important that we get them the information prior to that so although, yes, I respect the public comment, we do need to move in a more efficient manner.

Parker Holmes: This is like the most important thing we do, and I'd just like to make sure everyone's voice gets heard.

Aiden Reeder moves to previous question

Approved by raised hand vote

Motion to limit debate approved by raised hand vote

MJ Mencias: So this section is talking about research funding. As you already know, a lot of funding has been cut for PhD students, especially here at the Jackson School.

Erick Jacobsen: So this is Section C did we do the OER and the tax exemption for textbooks?

MJ Mencias: So this is simply to have textbooks, exemptions and promotion to open education. Yeah, this is to simply provide education with open sources to books instead of having us pay \$300.00 for per book.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, this was also something we pursued last year, but obviously anything with the fiscal note is really hard to pass with the current state, current budget state. So we're bringing this back this year just to make sure that we have a tax exemption on all educational textbooks. It's pretty straightforward.

Naomi Law: I just wanted to make sure everyone was aware this. It's best if this is like broader so that they can work within the scope that they have and they can negotiate while they're lobbying rather than fine-tuning it. So we don't want to constrict them. We want to give them opportunities to be able to renegotiate should that be necessary because it will be. So I just want everyone to know that.

Wesley Andrus moves to approve subsection

Isac Pasco seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

MJ Mencias: Subsection D It's about research funding. As you already know, I said earlier, a lot of PhD students are losing their funding. A lot of like the Henry Jackson School is losing funding. Funding is actually it's fundamental right now protecting these areas, social sciences, seeing all types of, you know, research. This is a research institution. Like without research, we wouldn't be here. So this is just to kind of codify that into law to kind of protect that.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions or comments?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve subsection

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Erick Jacobsen: We'll move on to subsection oh to Section 2, subsection A. Before we do, we do have an hour and 20 minutes to work on this, so while we would like to limit the time spent on each section, we still want to give a little bit of time for people to say their piece and ask their questions. Right now we have very experienced people up here and this is the perfect time to ask questions if you want to get clarification. So while it is important to get this approved today, it is also important for us to spend the time that we have allotted to it. We're not gonna do anything else today. We can do it for the whole time. You may summarize it. You have 30 seconds.

Nandana Jaideep: OK, so basically this is just expanding on the work that's already previously been done. So sexual assault prevention and awareness. We just want to make sure that the elements of SB5356 and HB 2242 are just being expanded. So we have confidential resource advisors, notices of survivor rights, trauma infused support and consistent reporting processes across campus.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions or comments?

MJ Mencias: Can I add on that this, this has been long, long, long time working ever since I was an undergrad here. So this is just to add on to those bills that we have already passed to add on more protections. This is just expanding on that.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just wondering what the significance of the first WHEREAS clause was, because it doesn't seem like it pops up again in any of the THAT clauses, like the relevance of it, I guess.

MJ Mencias: So the red zone, it's considered to be one of the most highly incident prone areas. So that's why we mention it. It has been done a lot of research that these this area, specifically the red zone, it's where more accidents happen to women late at night. So that's why we mention it. It's to kind of just give it that recognition that, hey, this is actually a place that this has been multiple accidents happening in and when we go down to Olympia, they recognize it. So that's why we put it in there.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah and this is specifically for college campuses as well. Any questions?

Husna Chepkemboi: My question is, does this work together with campus security and does it go all the way to West Campus? Because like West Campus is literally on the of where we find homeless people and everything and while it's not part of the campus. It's still part of the campus, so I know how it will help protect people there.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, definitely. So these details are going to be worked out once we have like more information. And this bill specifically is just to make sure that the state recognizes this issue and is working with us to give us funding and resources to tackle all these different issues, but working with students and campus safety officers and Husky Health and all of that comes in the execution part of this project, the implementation part. So yes, definitely like when it comes to like implementing this at UW, that will definitely be considered, and me and Kate and Audrey will be the ones working on that within ASUW.

Abigail Appleyard: This is just a follow-up to my last question, but are you seeking resources for that specific time period or just recognition that it's a problem?

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, I think the reason we bring that up is because this bill is specifically centered for sexual assault survivors on college campuses. So we just wanted to highlight that these incidents happen, but they mostly happen during this specific period. But the amount at which it happens during that specific period is enough for us to have these important resources all year round.

Joseph Riggio: I don't want you guys to be demoralized too, if you bring up a specific issue that doesn't end up getting put in the legislative agenda. In fact, it could potentially be a really good resolution idea too, but just keep that in mind as we're going through this. While we do want to keep this broad and keep it vague at the same time, like if you think there's something specific that UW could do about a certain issue that is in the legislative agenda, take note of that and we encourage you to draft a resolution on that for Senate because we can do something about that on campus.

Kavi Pasupathi: I just had a question. Subsection A is titled Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness. Would it be better if it was titled Sexual Assault Support and Awareness? Because none of the subclauses

MJ Mencias: Actually, no, because this is a continuation on that same bill. That's why we're having it like that. Because again, these, these, like I said, This is why I stressed it when I first started and I said that this has been an ongoing battle, right. It's because we wanted to be added to that same exact bill that we've passed with different numbers but is the same exact bill. We're just expanding on that law. Thank you.

Adam Ford moves to approve subsection

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Nandana Jaideep: I'm going to say something really fast. I just want to echo what Joseph said. When we tackle things at the state level, they look at things that are so much broader than just UW. So that's why we want to keep this so generic, and we don't want to mention specific things that relate to UW like Husky Health or West Campus. But I absolutely agree with you, and we did pass a Senate resolution earlier specifically about sexual assault and how we want more resources at Husky Health specifically. So advocacy just doesn't end here. This is just expanding state resources. But if you want to work at UW to improve campus resources, that's something that we do throughout the year. And this is just support and codifying this at the state level.

MJ Mencias: So this, sorry, just that I got a little bit whiplash, but before I continue to this one, I wanted to say that we do at the state level, which means that when we do things at a state level, it doesn't only impact this campus, it impacts all college campuses. So when we're saying that we need language to be broad, it's because it doesn't only apply to the University of Washington. It applies to every single college in the state of Washington. That said, I will be moving on to expanding access to students experiencing homelessness, right, as you all know, there's many, I don't know if you guys were around for COVID-19. There was a lot of students that were homeless. During that time, we were able to give small grants to students that were experiencing homelessness in order to get them house. This is exactly the same thing. It's just expanding on those basic needs, ensuring that students that are homeless can receive the food benefits that they need, the money that they need, the housing that they need.

Wesley Andrus: I would just like you to clarify what the first that clause means when you say to allow all institutions to apply, not just one per campus.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, as far as I know, this is what Brandon told me when we were working on this together, but basically I think right now there's like a one campus per institution limit to this. So like if there's Bothell, Tacoma and Seattle, only one of us gets to do it. So this would get rid of that and all campuses would be able to participate.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments?

Ava Wahl moves to approve subsection

Liam Knochen seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Elizabeth McAleer: is there any way to lengthen debate to like 8 minutes or something just because we're getting through this a lot more quickly than I think we thought.

Elizabeth McAleer moves to lengthen debate to 8 minutes per subsection.

Isac Pasco seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

MJ Mencias: OK, so post undergrad unemployment. This is something that was brought to us by students and PhD's and students that are going for their PhD that they're wanting to seek

unemployment, especially when they're hired by their schools. This is something new we haven't quite explored it too much. I'll be very 110% honest. I have gotten a lot of calls about this. I've gotten a lot of people that are interested in it, but because I don't know much on it, I'm leaving it as is broad because I want more people that are more well experienced than I am to help me with it.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions or comments?

Abigail Appleyard: So is this for people who just graduated and haven't yet found a job or people who are current graduate students?

MJ Mencias: Students that are currently and then for whatever reason you get unemployed, right? They they fire you or you we're trying to get you guys unemployment. So let's say that you're working for Doctor Erick, right? And Doctor Erick decides that he no longer wants to, you know, continue to hire you. And you all of a sudden now you have no funding and you have no way of paying for your education and you're stuck, right? We're trying to get you unemployment. Because this is new, we've never thought about getting students unemployment, right? We're still navigating a lot of this because this is unemployment law. This has so much faster, you know, information out there. So like I said, This is why we left it that way because there's been a lot of phone calls back and forth. A lot of people that want to explore this and to see what are the possibilities.

Naomi Law: When you say you want to get us unemployment, do you mean unemployment status or unemployment benefits?

MJ Mencias: Unemployment benefits. That means if you lose your job you get a check.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions, comments, or motions?

Liam Knochen: This is a very important subsection. It appears that certain departments are either getting integrated with others and with that there's going to be staff cuts. This matters is what I'm saying.

MJ Mencias: This was brought again by students for students. This agenda, it comes directly from university students. So yes.

Husna Chepkemboi: My question is what is this for students who are only undergrad like postgraduate, post undergraduate students? Or is it for students who want gap years? Can you? I know you you say you won't specify, but can you specify a little more?

MJ Mencias: So when you get into a PhD program, right, you get accepted into your PhD program. That's why it's called post undergrad postgrad. You get accepted with an amount of funding and that amount of funding; it depends on the program whether it's running. So right now we're just trying to see if grad students can get it right or undergrad students can get it either or we're happy with whoever. We're just trying to open a door, you know, because once we get our pinky in, maybe we can get our hand in.

Erick Jacobsen: I can add to that. Unemployment benefits, specifically in the state of Washington. It applies if you've had work in the past four, if you had had work in the past in four out of the past five quarters. So it would after a certain amount of time being unemployed. If you did not receive unemployment benefits, you would no longer be eligible by my reading. Are there any other questions, comments or motions?

James Yu: I want to ask if there is some sort of like how is it determined like how much money is in the check that is being given to the students?

MJ Mencias: That is up to the unemployment department. It's not up to us, but it's definitely some as far as I know I think like 50% of what you originally get, right? So again, that's up to unemployment. We what we're trying to do is at least get something because right now you get fired, you get fired, you get nothing. You're out, you have no benefits, you have no nothing.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah. And as far as I understand it, the RCW 544040 is what we're trying to make people eligible for. So whatever that states is what we're trying to get students to be able to access.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, that specific clause says that the past work that you've done is ineligible if you worked for the same institution in which you are enrolled.

Collin Saywers moves to approve subsection

Adam Ford seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

MJ Mencias: So this is supporting students with dependents. As you all know, I am one of those students with dependents. We need childcare. We need other benefits in order to be here. Sometimes we got to make sacrifices, and it would be nice that our institution of education would support us with childcare. I would love if there would be a child care center right here, right? Because then that means I would have everything I need on campus. So that's simply what this is, providing more services for students like myself.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah. And we also worked on this last year, trying to get priority registration for students with dependents so that people who have, like people to take care of have access to classes because they have a lot more things they need to juggle. So we're just bringing it back.

Abigail Appleyard: I don't know much about this, but are there not daycare centers on campus already or is this unrelated to?

MJ Mencias: It's unrelated. I was making an example out of that. What we mean is that we need more support for students like myself and the University of Washington does have it, but the waiting list is about a year, so by the time my daughter was eligible, she no longer needed it. We just need more.

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

Adam Ford moves to approve subsection

Liam Knochen seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

MJ Mencias: As you know, we are experiencing a very tough time, especially for international students and students who are undocumented. This line simply would codify that they should be protected, especially when it comes to being on campus, right? I mean, I don't know about you, but I wouldn't like none of my classmates or my peers to be picked up on campus.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve subsection

Detlef Gerbing seconds

Wesley Andrus objects

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I mean, I saw no comments during that period, so I move to approve and I think this is an important section.

Wesley Andrus: I would just like to know, given how important this section is, why there are no whereas clauses explaining the reasoning.

Erick Jacobsen: I can briefly explain that there the initial document was in paragraph form and then we converted it into a bill form to be more familiar. So the initial paragraph was all about what ASUW wants and some of the sentences like this one on lines 228 to 232 are a bit of both saying like, OK, so Governor Ferguson made the immigration sub count it, but because it's also saying we commend him for that, it's a that clause. So made a couple of determinations like that. There is still some reasoning in there, but it was reformatted from the initial document which was paragraph form. With that, we are in a period of open debate. And if you'd like to add anything, you may.

Dylan Bianchi moves to previous question

Gavin Cruz seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Joseph Riggio: Point of information, Expanding on what Erick was saying earlier, if you go to the appendices section at the very bottom of the bill, you can find the original draft legislative agenda that's in paragraph format. So in case you're confused about the whereas and that clauses and whatnot and why we made the decisions we made, you can refer to that. That's in paragraph format.

MJ Mencias: Also in that same agenda, you'll find links to articles that support the evidence of this agenda.

Erick Jacobsen: Also, just to clarify, we do have an hour left in the meeting, so if there are any comments, I'd encourage you all or any questions, I'll encourage you all to make them all we can because we are still good for time for now. If that changes, I'll let you all know. You may summarize this subsection whenever you're ready.

Ashwin Anand: Hi guys. I can briefly just summarize this 30 seconds. As a part of the bill that I introduced last year in Senate, financial literacy and personal finance concerns have been growing. I just want to make sure that lobbying efforts continue in order to increase the amount of education that people have regarding their finances. It's already been a Senate bill that's been passed at the Washington state level. So I just want to encourage that legislatures do more in order to support this type of education. I'll leave it at that.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you Ashwin, are there any questions or comments?

Wesley Andrus moves to approve subsection

Gavin Cruz seconds

Husna Chepkemboi objects

Wesley Andrus yields

Husna Chepkemboi: My question is about like educating about finances. Are we being educated about like everything in finances like how to buy things like?

Adam Ford moves to previous question

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Ashwin Anand: To answer your question, personal finance is very broad. So not only will we be like will education be covering savings that people can be making. Yeah, best practices for how you can allocate your budgets, et cetera. It's very broad term. Again, everything in this Legislative agenda is very broad for us to move to interpretation, but they'll phrase it the way that they want.

Erick Jacobsen: And if you'd like to access that resolution we can get that to you.

Ashwin Anand: And if you have any other questions please talk to me.

Nandan Jaideep: OK, Section 4, subsection A, we have campus decarbonization. This one's pretty specific, so I'm just going to read off the 'THAT' clauses. It says we're supporting policies that help fund the UW's energy renewal plan. So we want to decarbonize by 2040 or sooner, which is really soon, including allocation from the Climate Commitment Act. So we're just asking that the state allocate money towards this and help us decarbonize.

MJ Mencias: This is a bill that was last year an RSO went last year to the legislation and advocated for it and a senator said, hey, why don't you bring it in a bill form back through, you know, the Associated Students of the University of Washington. So due to the fact that he asked for it to be in a bill form, we're putting it in a bill form and we're taking it back to see if hopefully this year they will fund it.

Erick Jacobsen: And we did have a resolution in the past that supports this as well, also sponsored by the same RSO. Are there any questions or comments?

Ava Wahl: I have a question. So it says in here on line 294, the Climate Commitment Act, we don't want to reappropriate funding away from emissions reduction. Are there other projects that would also go towards, you know, fostering sustainability that wouldn't be emissions reduction? Like, for instance, right now it's saying that, you know, the Climate Commitment Act, it's being appropriated towards emission reduction. But what happens if there are other projects that aren't about emissions reduction that also work to help support the climate?

Erick Jacobsen: I think it was in relation to other than simple emissions reduction. Is there any other climate sustainability focused things that this could go towards? Like instead of reduction it could be like mitigation or adaptation.

MJ Mencias: I think we're focused specifically on emissions reductions because this is a something that the University of Washington has already committed to. And there's a date already stamped on it. So it's not that we came up with, you know, that date, that date has already been because again, it's been codified into law. So we're just trying to get there at that time frame because if we don't continue, we're not going to make it. Does that make sense?

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments? And again, if there's anything outside the scope of the Legislative agenda that you'd like to propose as a legislative directive or resolution, you may.

Parker Holmes moves to strike lines 289-291 “that ASUW supports allocating \$47.5 million from the capital budget towards electric boilers and the conversion of steam to hot water loop system.”

Wesley Andrus seconds

Aiden Reeder objects

Parker Holmes: I don't believe that this conversion is the most environmentally friendly on a large scale, and I believe it's too specific to work with the legislature.

Aiden Reeder: I mostly just wanted an explanation of which you started to give, but I am interested in hearing if there is more research that does support why we do have that currently, why that is the specific wording that we have.

Erick Jacobsen: We're now in a period of open debate. MJ, correct me if I'm wrong. This is, is this the only capital budget request that UW is making this year?

Nandana Jaideep: Believe so. And I believe that UW is also lobbying for the same thing, like the Administrative lobbyists along with us.

MJ Mencias: This is a bill that we're doing along the University of Washington. It's not specifically ASUW bill.

Ishaan Verma: I am from the aforementioned RSO. I represent them here at Senate. I just want to say that this has been something we've been fighting for for a really long time. I don't know how many people know this, but currently we have a power plant that burns natural gas and that's like a huge portion of our emissions here on campus. And so last year we went to go lobby for this and we were recommended to write this up as part of a bill. Also, this is something that's been going on for a while. It says 2040 in this document, but previously it was 2035 and that date has been pushed back. In terms of the actual objection that was made with it not being, you know, maybe the best thing, the natural gas power plant is one of, if not the biggest polluting things in our campus. And this conversion, this decarbonization has been recommended for literally years. So there's been protests, there's been rallies. We've been fighting for this for a really long time, and I think you guys can rest assured that we've done our due diligence in making sure that this plan is both the most sustainable and the best for UW.

Ishaan Verma moves to previous question

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

motion to strike lines 289-291 fails

Ishaan Verma moves to approve subsection

Collin Saywers seconds

Isac Pasco objects

Ishaan Verma: Yeah, like I said before, we've put a lot of work into this and not just our RSO, it's been like all of ASUW, OGR has been locked in on this and then obviously like the official more like higher ups government has been doing the same thing. So yeah we should pass this.

Isac Pasco: I'm interested in particular. I wanted to ask about what meaningful action toward decarbonization across Washington meant. Like if there was any sort of like way we could be like, well, you guys said you were gonna do this and we didn't because I think this is an enormously important issue and I think it would be like if we just said like, well, I think that the University of Washington is like the I went, I want them to do something. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: I believe the question is for the last that clause. Oh, I'm so sorry. For the last that clause, what is? Could the ask be more specific or what is the intent there?

MJ Mencias: To be able to negotiate that in Olympia, continuously say this because this is not our bill alone. We are working in collaboration with other groups, right? We have to be able to leave it open-ended like this to be able to negotiate it more in Olympia.

Erick Jacobsen: With that we are in a period of open debate.

Dylan Bianchi moves to previous question

Gavin Cruz seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Subsection approved by raised by hand vote

Nandana Jaideep: OK, so this is like Brandon's baby. This is something we haven't done before, but I think it's super relevant to our time. We basically want to make sure the legislature updates this specific RCW to state that we include AI generated images, deep fakes and digital impersonation has protected elements of a person's likeness. So this would make sure that people don't like abuse AI and use it to like impersonate students. And especially because students are the ones that frequently use digital platforms, I think, yeah, K through 12 and higher education. So it, this affects students from kindergarten up to college. So we want to make sure that ASUW is protecting them.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions?

Kavi Pasupathi: I just had a question on line 331. You only specified third party companies for FERPA protected information. Is there a reason why it's only third party or?

Erick Jacobsen: I believe that means other than the individual and the university. Are there any other questions?

James Yu: moves to approve subsection

Gavin Cruz seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand

Erick Jacobsen: We'll move on to Section 5, subsection A. These ones will be a lot shorter and I believe there's five of them. Reminder, we do have 45 minutes left in our meeting.

MJ Mencias: So every year we go back to the legislation and we ask for funding for native students. As you know, they are like 1% of the attendees come to the University of Washington, not only in

Washington but across the state. So every year we ask that they get funding a full tuition waiver since you know we are standing on their land.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions?

Elizabeth McAleer: So I know that it's intentionally vague, but it says just native student. Is there a way to ensure that as many people that are like identify as native? Because that can mean so many different things for somebody's identity. I know that it can't be specific, but can you make guesses as to how that will be specified?

MJ Mencias: Because we do work with tribes. That's why we just put just native. Because once we go down there, I don't know if you know many of the representative, but Liz Lovelett is one of those senators that work with native tribes. We just we put native, right? Because if we start mentioning specifics, then it makes it harder for other tribes to be able to get in.

Kira McKey: I just had a question about the difference between tuition waiving and like the increased scholarship opportunities and why those would be separate rather than one group.

MJ Mencias: It's separate because. when you get your tuition waived, the school takes the hit, right? But when you get a scholarship, somebody's giving you this money. Some the money's coming from where in the school does not take the hit.

Madeline Steppe: I was wondering, is the intention of this bill to support Washington Native students or all Native students?

MJ Mencias: Washington. This is only for we only lobby the agenda that we pull. It's only for the state of Washington.

Husna Chepkemboi moves to approve subsection

Collin Saywers seconds

Isac Pasco object

Husna Chepkemboi rescinds motion

Isac Pasco: I'm interested in why it would only be native people from Washington state and not like the rest of the country. It seems like it might be sort of. It seems like it seems like it would be like a thing that would be good in general. Thank you.

Nandana Jaideep: I believe it's Native people from school in Washington. Yeah, yeah, it's just Native students who go to school in Washington.

MJ Mencias: Just the ones that come to in Washington. In other words, to become to become a resident of Washington, you only have to be living in the state of Washington for about a year, 12 months. Right. So that is the bare minimum. That's what qualifies you for the Washington Collie Grant and qualifies you for financial aid. We just want to make sure that they get this benefit if they've been here for 12 months and more all native. They live in Washington.

Zain Asif: Believe what it's trying to say is any native tribe from anywhere in the United States that is a Washington resident would qualify. Is that correct?

MJ Mencias: Yes sir.

Abigail Appleyard: So just to clarify, this is not like a student could come from like the East Coast who is a Native American and get tuition here because if you're a student, you're not really a resident of the state, even if you are having, even if you do live there full-time, right?

MJ Mencias: So to become a resident of the state, you have to be here for 12 months, right? To be receive financial aid, you have to be here 12 months prior to you applying for financial aid.

James Yu: Just clarification, does this bill, is this bill trying to say that for in order to qualify as a native student you have to be in a tribe or like I'm just trying to clarify the wording here.

MJ Mencias: So native is said because that's the language that again when we work with tribes that's the, what they want to hear. Because if we put tribe, then we have to put, you know, things get a little bit more specific. So we're trying to eliminate that specific. We're trying to leave it broad.

Erick Jacobsen: So currently because the word tribe is not used, it wouldn't necessarily limit that it is currently position statements. Would you like to explain what position statements are? OK, so position statements are more vague than the state priorities, which is why you'll see these are shorter and more broad. State priorities have associated bills with them, and the position statements are more about if a bill arises, OGR wants to be able to pivot to support this bill. And student support to it. So those are the intentions of the two different sections. Just I hope that helps

Adam Ford moves to approve subsection

Collin Saywers seconds

Shreyan Mitra objects

Adam Ford yields

Shreyan Mitra: I object because I have a question.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of open debate.

Gavin Cruz moves to previous question

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Nandana Jaideep: OK, this one's also pretty straightforward. It's just a position statement on public transportation, since that's a concern for a lot of students. We have a lot of commuters, so we want to make sure that our policies are accessible and sustainable for students that access and rely on public transportation.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve subsection

Detlef Gerbing seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Nandana Jaideep: OK, this one is also a position statement. It just says that UW libraries contracts with certain companies that are known to share data with like the Department of Homeland Security or ICE. And so we're just want to call for greater protection so that law enforcement can get access

to such sensitive information. So give students control over the information and make sure universities don't share them.

Isac Pasco moves to expand debate time to 15 minutes

James Yu seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Isac Pasco: I think seeing as we don't have a lot of time constraints at the moment, it's probably fine.

Joseph Riggio: You are absolutely correct, but I recommend we just remove the restriction completely at this point.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of open debate.

Isac Pasco rescinds motion

Isac Pasco moves to remove debate time limit

James Yu Seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Adam Ford moves to approve subsection

Maddy Pittis seconds

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Nandana Jaideep: OK, so this one's also pretty straightforward. We do not, we're not going to advocate for a bill, but it just says that we remove any barriers to academics that makes a success. So make sure there's accommodations for students who might need asynchronous like lectures available. Opportunities to make sure they can stay on track for their classes.

Mohammad Motadel moves to approve subsection

Wesley Andrus seconds

Maddy Pittis objects

Mohammad Motadel: Because the subsection is pretty straightforward and it is very helpful for what the subsection is trying to provide to students and academics, so there is nothing that we have to be worried about.

Mady Pittis: I'm just confused is this not already provided by most professors?

MJ Mencias: At the state level, No.

Wesley Andrus moves to previous question

Isac Pasco seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Nandana Jaideep: Shared governance and civic engagement. So this one's an interesting one. So basically RCW 28B.10.281 use really vague like language that made it kind of weird. OK, so basically, Long story short, it said that if you were a student that was engaging in like some sort of protest activity on campus. The university was able to maybe put a hold on your financial aid or let that impact your tuition, like grants or any of that sort. So we just want to make sure that we get rid of that RCW or maybe even try to amend it. But yeah, that's basically it.

Husna Chepkemboi: my question is, does this also protect the people who protest for ICE, for the people who protest against transgender people, for people who protect protest against us?

MJ Mencias: Everything. That's the whole point. We don't want them to use your First Amendment against you and take away your financial aid. That's the whole point of this

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add that currently the RCW is worded in such a way that you don't necessarily need to be protesting or violent. It's just it's just being really in the area of a protest that could theoretically be construed as to disrupt operations. It's very vague, like the wording says. Are there any other questions?

James Yu moves to approve subsection

Adam Ford seconds

Julia Tanner objects

James Yu: I am a very firm believer in free speech. I think everyone should speak their mind, and no matter what their mind is, I think everyone's voice deserves to be heard.

Julia Tanner: I'm totally in favor of this. I just want to say it is interesting when multiple people raise their hands and then someone moves to approve. It just doesn't allow there to be more conversation, especially because we still have a certain amount of time in the meeting. So my objection is just to allow people who still have questions about this to ask their questions.

Erick Jacobsen: We do have 30 more minutes in the meeting. With that, we are now in a period of open debate

Kavi Pasupathi: Is this only for those on like in terms of financial aid or is it also applied to international students?

MJ Mencias: So I think that we had just made it on just financial aid. We want to make sure that your financial aid is protected. A lot of the students that have gone out, even international students have gone out to protest for whatever reason or are in the vicinity they get their financial aid taken away or frozen. And that's something that we want to make sure that all students are protected from.

Erick Jacobsen: To clarify, we are currently in a debate about whether to approve this section or to have more time.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to previous question

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Subsection approved by raised hand vote

Erick Jacobsen: With that, the motion passes. Our last subsection is approved. But wait, there's more. Now we will have the full legislative agenda. We will have a form vote for it as a whole. And if there's any questions you didn't get to and you want to use the remaining 30 minutes to ask MJ and Nandana, you can.

Isac Pasco: I really think there should be something about international students here. I think that having that's all.

Erick Jacobsen: There is. It does mention international students in the undocumented students section. If we want to pull that up, we can get specifics.

Joseph Riggio: I know that we clarified this before the meeting too, but we're still accepting amendments too. People can still move to make amendments, even though we did tentative votes on each subsection. Now is the time, especially if you've had the time to process this and you're gonna draft amendment. You think there's something missing in this document, like expanding a bit more on international student circumstances or something that wasn't captured in this. Please teams or e-mail me that amendment and we can try and get that added. You will still have to move to make the amendment. Sorry, Erick.

Ishaan Verma: I was just wondering, can we have a like a period of open conversation for some of the things that we kinda like moved to approve, moved the previous question like speed ran through.

Maddy Pittis: The very last subsection where financial aid can be paused or it was vague in financial aid can be paused if you're protesting. Has there been an example of that?

MJ Mencias: Actually yes, in Cambridge that happened. So because of that example is that we're making it, hey, we want to make sure that we protect the state of Washington. So because it has happened in other states, that's why we're like, hey, we want to make sure that they don't mimic that here.

Avery Kirscht: Section 2, subsection A. Has there been or would there be any consideration of expanding the statute of limitations beyond the current three years?

MJ Mencias: Like I said, this has been policy that we've been working on for years and we're just trying to build on it. So maybe not this year, maybe next year we'll continue to build on it. This is not like I tell people, this is just the foundations. Each year we get to chip at it each year we get to add at it. Each year we get to put more protections for women there. So maybe not this year, maybe next year. We don't know. We'll figure it out once we go down to Olympia and negotiate this.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add that you can write a legislative directive sometime later and that can prove as like a sort of proving ground where we can build on it in the future if you'd like as well. That's an option to everyone.

Em Coleman: You previously said that this is for statewide, so are other universities going through this process as well?

Nandana Jaideep: OK, yeah. So this is something we're advocating for for students across Washington state. So if another campus has this on their legislative agenda and is advocating for this, sure, like we'll all testify and lobby for it together. But if this does pass, it would apply to all higher ed institutions across the state.

Elizabeth McAleer: The very last subsection. Does that protect protest just on campus or could that be anywhere?

Erick Jacobsen: I believe the current wording was just on campus.

Nandana Jaideep: Because the university doesn't really have jurisdiction outside of campus, so wouldn't really be relevant.

James Yu: I just have a question. I think this was mentioned like once or twice before, but just want to clarify so. I feel like every time that we go into like a period debate, someone moves to the previous question and then people who are concerned about the the current topic just gets ignored. So I just want to clarify like what happens to those questions.

Erick Jacobsen: So someone can ask any questions that they miss now, but when it comes to objections to motions in the period of open debate, people talk about the motion. They don't talk about the bill. So for example, with the if someone moves to approve a certain section, the period of open debate is not about. It's not time to ask the sponsors questions. It's time to talk to the between the Senate on whether or not we are going to move forward. And the way to end that without going into the vote would be if the motion maker rescinds their motion. And if it does go to a vote, the Senate could vote to not approve it at that time and then make another motion later. When it comes to the period of open debate, that is to discuss the motion that has been made and not the bill or legislation itself.

MJ Mencias: But I would like to say that if you have questions, we have emails, you know, feel free ASUW, OGR, feel free to e-mail us. You know we will be happy to answer your questions. If you feel that you didn't have enough time here, you feel that you need more clarification, feel free to e-mail us. We're happy to oblige.

Zain Asif: Going back to the last section, I know that the actual language is to disrupt the normal educational process, but I was wondering if that student that financial aid also applied to student loans

MJ Mencias: So if it goes through financial then yes.

Tyler Kunz: Hi. So I just have a quick question about the subsection D asynchronous work opportunities. So I guess does this subsection advocate to direct faculty how they ought to act and during the removal of barriers academically?

MJ Mencias: Yes, and it is, it is intended to do statewide. Currently it's only afforded to people with special needs. But let's say you get sick or whatever. You want to take the class synchrony. It's supposed to be accessible to everybody. You know, at least that's my view on it. I can always be wrong.

Kavi Pasupathi moves to amend line 381 to include “for all students”

Jesse Luu seconds

Amendment adopted

Ishaan Verma: I was just wondering because the last subsection mentions like peaceful protest and civic action. But in the past, especially recently, we've had like a couple actions that have been kind of on the line. Who determines what like protests are peaceful versus not, and therefore who gets that kind of protection?

MJ Mencias: Obviously we don't, right. That's up to the law. It's up to people that make those laws, right. So again, we don't determine that we are abiding to like the rules and the language that they like to hear. So when we're saying peaceful protests. We're exactly meaning that peaceful protest, right? There's been protests on campus that is not so peaceful, but we also want people to be protected. But specifically, if you're being peacefully protesting, we don't want people to get hurt. We don't want students to get hurt. And we want to make sure to protect them, whether that is, you know, through your financial aid or through whatever it means.

Isac Pasco moves to strike peaceful from line 381

Liam Knochen seconds

Kavi Pasupathi objects

Isac Pasco: I do not think that we should rely on like external definitions of what or what not is a peaceful protest, especially given the current administration. I yeah, I think we should just, I think we should just be protest.

Kavi Pasupathi: I would agree with that. Just there needs to be something in there if you take away peaceful to go like breaking destruction of property or something that would, yeah, so that there will be repercussions for something that should not have been done during that time.

Naomi Law: This is not a motion, though. I propose to Senate that we consider the word lawful instead, though I do recognize that that opens another can of worms.

MJ Mencias: Regardless of the matter, we're going to open a can of worms because right now we're in a state where even your, you know, your First Amendment, which is, you know, your right to speak. It's being criminalized. So, I mean, no matter which way you see it.

Avery Kirscht: I recognize the intention right, especially with the politicalization going on at the federal level right now. But it should be noted constitutional amendment, constitutional rights, especially those in the amendments, are not absolute and non peaceful protests are not protected on the 1st Amendment. If the goal of this truly is to protect First Amendment rights, it should in no way include protests that are not peaceful. That dilutes the purpose. Thank you.

Tessa Raith: I want to echo that sentiment and also say that I fear that that's this agenda item simply wouldn't be engaged with at all by legislators if there isn't some stipulation of either lawful protests or the word peaceful. Otherwise, I don't think legislators would take it seriously, given the current political climate and the presence of violent protests at the UW.

Ishaan Verma: I think that's a super valid point. I will also add that it might be worth considering whether or not it's the UW's responsibility to administer that kind of law in like withholding student aid, people who participate in quote UN quote criminal protests are already punished by the law. So it's worth asking whether or not we give the university authority to punish students in addition to the law.

Julia Tanner: I'm just going to say, Zain, what you put in the chat. So this is from Zain. He would like to amend or suggest the wording non-destructive before protest rather than peaceful.

Aiden Reeder: So in this idea of peaceful protest, there is a House Bill House House Bill 1343 that does define what would make an individual ineligible for aid? It does include discriminatory conduct, harassing conduct, threats, physical harm, destruction, property, all the things that we understand

would be in line of the lawful, the lawful conduct. And so I would second, maybe not going from peaceful, but to lawful like Naomi has said, because there are bills out that we can then push forward on that keeps in mind that while still understanding that there is wiggle room for what they can define and then discriminate on us for. But that is for the legislatures to decide and us to lobby for.

Kavi Pasupathi: I agree with Aiden, but there is like other wording we could use as well in case we didn't want to open that can of worms as they put it. You could also go for nonviolent and non discriminatory or also since this is for on campus we could go in terms of UW regulations. So both of those types of specifications would work, I believe.

Dylan Bianchi: I'd like to agree with what Aiden Naomi said. I think we should really move with the lawful standard because that's clear, right? There are specific laws about what is and is not criminal behavior during a protest. The problem with peaceful in my eyes is that there is no established legal definition though. Aiden, to your point, their established legal definition may be coming. And often, law enforcement authorities will incite or essentially create a violent situation in order to act with more impunity in a situation. This is a pattern of behavior that's noted among Seattle PD. Most recently, I think it was a May protest in Cal Anderson. Several incidents of SBD acting such a way, so I think the lawful standard is much clearer and will protect students better.

Naomi Law: To build upon that point, lawful is not within UW's area to interpret and peaceful is, so it's more clear. Peaceful is also open to any sort of interpretation by any party involved, so lawful makes it much more clear.

James Yu: I heard someone say that it should not be the University of Washington's inside the University of Washington's jurisdiction to punish people who it's like up to the law to punish people who break the law. But I have to disagree with that, because that's like saying as long as you're comfortable with taking the punishment from the wall, you can do whatever it is that you want to do. That is a way of encouraging violent behaviors that I really do not think, oh, we should be doing and so yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add that we only have 12 minutes left until the adjournment vote kicks off.

Tanya Bhandari: Thank you, Erick. I'll try to keep this a little short. I do want to say though, I am in support of peaceful protest, but I very much disagree with the notion of making it using a terminology lawful protest because I don't think we should push for. Legislation that relies on other pieces of legislation that are again outside of our control. And I understand that you can make arguments that protesters, protests are generally seen peaceful or lawful in a certain way, constitutionally protected, whatever. But I think again, if the concern is how the administration. Is dealing with that and what they're doing. I don't think we should, we should use language that again relies on other interpretation, especially possibly hostile interpretation. Secondly, although I do like the terminology, thank you, non-destructive protests, I think the fewer qualifiers we use legally and in this legislation that we are. Pushing the better so they can't be over specific, so people can't skirt around them. But I'll leave it at that. I think peaceful protest is generally not too contentious.

Joseph Riggio: So I'm going to try and remain as neutral as I can in this because this is really up to you guys to decide on the language. But just from a socio-legal perspective, I would caution against using the word lawful as lawful not only implies local laws, it implies state laws, it implies federal. Yeah. And I guess also that would like, I guess technically international law, but that's getting widely ignored. But so, but the crux of that is it includes federal law and federal law as we've been seeing has been rapidly changing to be a bit disfavorable towards student protesting, or at least that's what's

been going on nationwide. So I would caution against using the word lawful for that reason. I think peaceful is an OK alternative, but again, it's up to you, the Senate body.

Aiden Reeder: Looking at the Hospital 1343 that I was saying earlier, one of the ineligible criteria on is threats of physical harm. Which taking a look at and reorienting how we view this and how like what we are boxing in OGR to actually lobby for, that's for physical harm can be easily construed and even swearing at the police could be considered, oh, you were threatening to harm them. And so I think on that matter. Peaceful is the maximum that we could box our backs RJR into, but on that maybe just removing that because this going back to who was the original person. To remove it because of the fact that this removes that box and allows them to lobby into our interest in the idea that a good faith argument, basically a good faith argument of what protest is.

Abigail Appleyard moves to previous question

Collin Saywers seconds

Approved

Motion to strike peaceful from line 381 fails

Collin Saywers moves to approve the Legislative Agenda

Tanya Bhandari seconds

Nandana Jaideep: I just want to say thank you so much guys for engaging. Like the whole point of us bringing it to Senate is for your valuable input. So thank you for like respectful, productive discourse. We really, really appreciate it. And throughout the year, if you ever want to advocate for anything, I work for you. Like as president, I have access to almost every part of campus. So if you want to work on something. Specifically to UW because I heard a lot of great ideas as we were discussing like come talk to me and we can work on it together because even in house administrative advocacy slash lobbying goes a long way because not everything has to go through the state like we can do a lot even on our own campus. So I appreciate all of y'all.

Approved 83-0-7

ADJOURNMENT

Gavin Cruz moves to adjourn

Collin Saywers seconds

Approved

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar

Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
