



Associated Students of the University of Washington
Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

11/24/2025

HUB 307

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 4-0-1

Recess 4:04 pm

Reconvened 4:06 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.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: I have created an internal spreadsheet of all the people planning legislation and currently it is like over 15. And I'm also working through our resolution revolutions people who submitted ideas and getting back to them and encouraging them to work on legislation as well. So hopefully we'll see a big influx in legislation next quarter, but hopefully it is still also manageable. I think that's probably about it for me, so we'll move on to the vice speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hello, everyone. I just sent attendance updates. Please apologize on my behalf to your committee members. I wasn't able to get to attendance until later due to some family stuff that came up. So I was able to do it today, though. Have people check their emails, see if they got an attendance notice, we're doing pretty good on attendance so far. Roughly 35 to 40 people have accrued one or more unexcused absences. We have a total of 142 active senators, maybe more. So good job, just generally. Just remind them that one way that they can prove that they're in attendance is if you can confirm that they were there when they participate in committee meetings, that is a way for them to prove that they were here. Or like you have a Teams message or a recording or something like that. It's also going to be pretty pivotal if you can help try and see if you can arrange proxies, like within committees. I've instructed senators to reach out in their committee teams chats to try and find proxies and empower them to do it. So I'd appreciate your help facilitating that because we need to hit quorum tomorrow, and I already know from the many emails I've gotten that a lot of people are taking break. So for the sake of tomorrow's meeting, please advertise your committees to try and find proxies if possible. And then for me, the GAVEL internship closes tomorrow at 11:59 p.m. Just remind your committee members for me. that would be great. I already sent a reminder, email yesterday, and I included it in today's attendance email just as a little blurb. So I'd appreciate y'all if you can promote that for me. Other than that, though, I don't have anything else on mine end.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: So, I don't have a lot this week. We're trying to do another steering bonding event. So, I included next week and Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday of finals week I think, in the when to meet. If there is a time that not everyone can meet, like if one person isn't able to cover or whatever, I'm just not going to do another one and we'll just try to get everyone on board for next quarter, but it's, the bonding is linked in the agenda for today and then also in the steering teams chat. So, if you could fill that out right now or within the meeting, but just before next Monday would be great and then we'll figure out what to do for the bonding event later in this discussion.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Your word of this week was something else until today. It is now coloristic relating to the skillful use or harmony of colors. But you all are doing a great job.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Recess 4:11 pm

Reconvened 4:16

Recess 4:16

Reconvened 4:20

Erick Jacobsen: Do I hear any motions

Pierce Wallbaum move to approve both minutes

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 3-0-2

PROPOSALS

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the floor agenda. All right. So we have the SLS forum, and apparently, they've requested 30 minutes

Julia Tanner: Can we spell out what SLS actually is.

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. Student Legal Services. Do we want to say who's giving the forum as well? Amanda Reynoso-Palley. What's her title? Interim Director. And do we have slides?

Joseph Riggio: They will yes.

Erick Jacobsen: And Joseph said they requested 30 minutes. What do y'all think?

Dylan Bianchi: Is there a reason why not

Erick Jacobsen: We have three elections, three bills, and one bill in committee.

Joseph Riggio: I kind of want to finally get to the OA.

Erick Jacobsen: Well the OA's top of the list.

Joseph Riggio: I know but still.

Erick Jacobsen: I think we might be good. Particularly if we limit committee meetings. Because, what's the status, how close to passing out is R-32-1?

Joseph Riggio: Very close. It's just people needed time to formulate thoughts about some of the amendments so we should be able to breeze through it.

Erick Jacobsen: So we can cut down on committee meetings time, and then we can probably get to two or three bills today, tomorrow. I think we'll be good with that. Even if we do a 30 minute forum. Cause even if we look at the three elections, realistically, UW Rec might be acclamation, but even if it isn't, JCC might not even get a nominee still

Julia Tanner: With that if no one nominates themselves, I'll be nominating myself for JCC.

Joseph Riggio moves to remove 5:15 timestamp and replace with 5:30 timestamp.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll just say 30 minutes. Because it probably won't start at 5:00 exactly, it'll probably start at like 5:10.

Joseph Riggio rescinds motion

Joseph Riggio moves to add 30-minute timestamp on forums.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: We have questions for all of our elections which is great. I do have information on meetings for the Conduct Review Board. I believe we discussed this last week. But I'll

specify. So the meetings are just very ad hoc. Although this person also has the opportunity to sit on a forming task force on AI policy that Kate is leading. Right now, it's very informal, but she will be submitting a board bill soon, I believe, to formalize it. And that's something where if that doesn't work for that person, we can elect a different person to serve on it, but would likely be working to run that person's schedule as well. Do we have an eight questions or comments on the agenda? Do we have any motions?

Commented [AS1]: this looks wrong but idk what it should be

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve agenda

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-01

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to discussion, our first item is for future liaison selections. So basically, we don't want this to happen again where we come into a year and we have 20 elections we need to do, and we have to spread them out across the quarter and people are being elected late, information, gaps are making things more difficult, and we are taking time away from legislation. So, Joseph and Brendan and I discussed ways that we can basically streamline the process. And first of all, the first suggestion is that all paid positions in the legislative steering committee are elected at the end of each year rather than the beginning of each year. This used to be the case. We decided not to do it for most of these positions because we wanted to give new senators an option to participate, but we underestimated the administrative burden that it would cause, and then we can also do the same for all constitutional positions, Finance and Budget, Joint Commissions Committee, Personnel Committee, and Judicial Committee, and then Judicial Committees also paid, so at some points. But then when it comes to the remaining positions, we could do, we can elect them within certain committees. The problem with that would be making sure that everyone who'd like to participate can participate and with managing how that election looks, but it could streamline it because we could have multiple elections at once. If we do that, then aforementioned constitutional committees could be elected on the floor because there would be more time for them. But I wanted to hear more thoughts on it. And then there's also a case of if things arise throughout the year, we can do something like appointments through committee orders from steering or, and that could involve basically selecting someone from steering who's best suited for, say, a task force that for an ASUW of task force, or it could be something along the lines of what we did with the conduct review board, which was some sort of process whereby, a more suitable candidate or a suitable candidate is chosen through other ASUW mechanisms and then approved by steering. But the ideas with all of these proposals that we streamline the process and prevent it from being a headache while ensuring that there is a fair degree of access for everyone, so I want to hear from all of you.

Joseph Riggio: I just want to also mention that one idea that came up when brainstorming ways that interested candidates from a different committee could participate temporarily in another committee for the respective election, that they're interested in, and we can change the bylaws in the upcoming organic act to account for this temporary shift in attendance for interested candidates to join temporarily join a committee in which an election that they're interested in is happening in. So that's one way to go about that. There are trade-offs of course, like, depending on the committee, there's gonna be, you know, the same roughly the same people in each committee throughout the year, and, you know, I guess you can make the argument that if you were to do an election and one committee, the outcome may have been different had the election been held in a different committee, even if it was the same candidates who ran. So, and especially this is more, I guess, could play favorites into, if somebody from their committee is running and people know that person already, they're likely to be implicit bias in favoring them over a candidate that's not from their committee. So that is something to consider to that I just thought of, but I'm interested to hear where you guys have to think about.

Abigail Appleyard: Just with what Joseph was saying. I definitely, I would kind of worry about bias being a problem, but another thought I had is that maybe like when boards are asking for liaisons, if you had them just like fill out a form with all the information that you need from them, because it seems like an issue recently, at least, has been not knowing when board meetings board meetings are or getting the wrong times. Like, I think that has kind of slowed us down a lot, too, and it might be easier if you just make someone from the board submit that information to you and then you just copy and paste it into the agenda. And then maybe your emails wouldn't get so clogged up as well, but it just feels like however, it's being done now is a little bit disoriented. But I don't have a lot of background on that, so I don't know.

Erick Jacobsen: That's fair and I can add that in transition documents that the next speaker do that. Because when I was meeting people, members of ASUW board for their own committees and councils, I basically said, how many people do you need for each committee, and when do you need them by? And I should have also asked when the meetings are. And for a question. Although I do enjoy steering making questions, so that's not as important, but I agree that meeting times are more important and also another problem was that over the summer the plan was to have certain committees meet in the fall, and then in the fall, those plans changed, and I was not made aware of those plans changing. And so we've elected for two committees that aren't going to meet until winter anyway, which has been also a difficulty because it's taking time away from things that should be elected right now. But I don't know how I would deal with that other than maybe like double checking with everyone with chairs before, but that'd only be really possible with ASUW people because other people may be a bit slower in responding to emails and especially from someone outside their organization. But, yeah, all fair points. Are there any other thoughts?

Dylan Bianchi: This might be kind of heretical, but I think it's worth questioning whether having all of these liaisons is, like, actually useful, maybe. Or going, like thinking like within each

committee, how much is our senate liaison, like, actually been able to do with this committee? I think when we are appointing like 20 liaisons, they're kind of logistical clusters is inevitable. Like, I really, I think it's possible there just isn't a way to do this, that isn't like, really time consuming to elect people and also being like, effective. I like the committee idea, but I think maybe it's worth looking at, like, okay, obviously I don't mean to like demean the work Abigail did last year, but like, is it essential, for instance, that we have a Recreation Student Advisory Board Liaison? What is that person doing for Senate? What is that person doing on the rec dislike student advisory board? What did that person like at the year's end? What did that person think of their time on the student advisory board? And if they don't feel like it was actually useful or if they don't feel like they learned all that much, or if they weren't really able to bring anything interesting back in the reports to Senate, do we maybe just not send a liaison next year and save the time?

Erick Jacobsen: I'm going to go to Julia in a second, but to that point specifically, UW Rec is an interesting example because Senate asked for that seat because of decisions that were being made by UW Rec that Senate disagreed with, and there being no student representation on it. But I'll say for the sake of context, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine positions. There are nine ASUW committee positions that are well, eight if we don't care. Okay, eight, basically that's Senate has to elect, that are just ASUW committees. The Constitution says every ASUW committee, task force etc. must have a Senate representative. The things that aren't ASUW, there are three that are like fee committees, and then there's Husky Health, HUB Board of Representatives, UW Rec, and First Year Student Experience Council, as well as the conduct review board, which is a new thing. When it comes to those, some of them could be like ASUW at large positions, additional ASUW at large positions if you want to make changes to certain governing documents, but the idea behind having a Senate representative and everything is just for accountability purposes and we can talk about how we would go about removing certain positions from Senate's authority, like, for example, Husky Union Building, Board of Representatives, there are ASUW at large positions and the Senate representative. So if we wanted to get rid of the Senate Representative, there would have to be amendments that would basically add to the number of ASUW at large positions, and then we'd also have to check, make sure that that's allowed as well.

Julia Tanner: I just want to kind of push back on that a little bit, because I do think representation is really important. I definitely think I could totally be misremembering, but last year I feel like there was a conversation and steering about not electing liaisons in before summer happened, and so pushing those elections to this quarter. And so I feel like if we distributed more of the liaisons to be elected during spring, even if some of those people drop, that still takes off some pressure for this quarter. But I do think that Senate representation is not only important for what the liaisons are doing in those committees, but also when we have liaison reports, all of the students in Senate are seeing all of this information about different committees on campus, which just increases the knowledge that senators have, which increases

the knowledge that students have, and I think that's really important. So I don't think that we should be cutting out any liaisons.

Joseph Riggio: First, I just want to confirm Abigail. You had your hand raised, but then you lowered it was what you said or asked wanted to ask covered already? Yes. Okay, great. Well, with that, I'll kind of bounce off of the history that Erick gave for some of the rationale, just because a committee might be really boring one year, doesn't mean it's not important because sometimes very randomly, it seems, some committees can become wildly important, some years and really boring other years. And some Liaisons experience might be, yeah, this committee was really boring. I barely have any notes to report on. I don't know how this relates to Senate. And then all of a sudden, maybe recreation decides, let's charge everybody an entry fee, even though everyone already pays SAF like, for instance, right? Hopefully they'll never do that. But, like, that would be a case where the UW Rec committee, like, having a voice on that would be impactful even though maybe it might seem now, it's like, well, why are we sending somebody if if nothing's happening on this committee? So it's definitely contextually variable in terms of how much is done in a committee and the importance of different liaisons tends to increase or decrease depending on the year. So it's really hard to gauge which ones are truly quote unquote importance.

Erick Jacobsen: And its hard to anticipate that as well.

Dylan Bianchi: Right, point taken on that one. What do you think it's possible to maybe bundle certain liaisons? So if we have, you know, these positions that are like you meet once a quarter or twice a quarter, you take a couple related ones, you say, we have one liaison for these two or three related positions, not too many committees for any one position. And just have that person consistently go to all those, we reduce the number of elections.

Erick Jacobsen: That's not a bad idea. I would say the only difficulty would be figuring out what bundles with what because like for example there's only one really health related one, although I guess health and safety could be combined, maybe but like, it'd be difficult to figure out what we can bundle in terms of like, properly advertising it and getting interested people.

Julia Tanner: I actually really like this idea. And have you guys ever played Codenames? I feel like if you could come up with just like a general title to describe two or three, like, quarterly liaison positions, I feel like that would be fine. It doesn't have to necessarily be super related as long as, like, if you bundle a few that only have one per quarter or whatever, then that's, that would be good.

Erick Jacobsen: Dylan, just to clarify, do you mean electing one person or, like, an intern process?

Dylan Bianchi: I mean, like, we would elect one person, or we could appoint them, I'm focused mainly on the idea of bundling them. I know, we wouldn't need to bundle I don't think, every single position would just be like, focusing on positions that they don't meet super often, because

I think it would be more troublesome and feel like, let's bundle JCC judicial. You know, which I'm pretty sure meet at the same time? So that's obviously a problem. Yeah, I don't know. throw them up there. Is it, like, how urgent of a decision is this?

Erick Jacobsen: I mean, we've already got through most of the elections, so this is something that we can spend the whole year talking about it if we need to. But the question is, if we want to include it in Joseph's OA, the deadline would probably be to make a decision by today. But we don't necessarily have to. We can do it in a new OA. Would you all want to wait so that we can talk it through a little more, think it through a little more? I'm getting a nod from Pierce and Dylan. I'm getting a nod from Julia.

Joseph Riggio yields

Pierce Wallbaum: I was just gonna say, yeah, I do really like the idea of bundling, and I think if we're going to try to combine some of these, then I think it's important that we take time with it and make sure we're not overloading any specific senator or, you know, maybe putting two that don't go that well together. So, yeah, I think we should probably wait.

Joseph Riggio: I wanted to let Pierce go because mine is still related, but it's more contextual instead of adding another point. So I do have a draft of an amendment I'm going to make on the floor that addresses the issue that kind of catalyzed all of this conversation, which is the speaker, technically in our bylaws, is the sole, deferred representative, if the liaisons aren't filled. So he is all of our committee under our bylaws, he is the sole substitute for any committee that is not filled. Which is kind of ridiculous. So there isn't a moment in here and I'll just read what it is currently. ignoring the jargon, is in article nine section 1D. Essentially where we talk about liaisonships in Senate. After, in the case a liaison is unable to attend meetings required by their office, or should the physician become vacant and amend it to read the speakers authorized to attend and participate on their behalf, and instead amending that to read. The speaker is authorized to temporarily appoint themselves or a member of the steering committee to attend, participate on their behalf. There was talk too, about adding additional subsections, a steering main member who was temporarily appointed to fill liaison position must resign once an election for their position concludes, and then also adding a subsection that states, a lion election for a physician filled via vice speaker appointment must occur within 10 weeks of the academic course instruction, except spring quarter when the appointed liaison fill the position. So that's to protect like an appointed person cannot then take the position away, even if somebody's elected, election would nullify the current appointee. So that's what's sort of some background into why we're figuring out how to move forward with liaisons because it's clear that, you know, the information was a lot out of our control in terms of trying to get information from people. I know Erick's been trying really hard to get information from different committees, but it's been really difficult for some chairs to get back to us. So there's only so much we can do about that and hopefully we can figure out a way to mitigate that, whether it be this a way or a different OA. I don't think we fully decided.

Erick Jacobsen: I think it sounds like its best to save this for a future OA.

Joseph Riggio: How many elections do we have left?

Erick Jacobsen: We have 3. Are there any other questions or comments on the liaison conversation? Seeing none we will move on to the steering bonding conversation.

Julia Tanner: So just a reminder, if you haven't yet filled out the one to meet during this time that we have. but I wanted to discuss some ideas for just like a lowkey bonding event before autumn quarter. So I had the idea of going out for Boba or coffee. We could also meet somewhere to play like team games so like charades. If you guys have heard of psychiatrists, it's like a, I don't know. It's a fun game. I've played it at early Thanksgiving. But yeah, I just wanted to kind of get what you guys would want to do if we do have another bonus one.

Pierce Wallbaum: If it's lowkey I really like the idea of just grabbing coffee or boba or something. I think that the previous string bonding was really fun, but I don't know if I'd like call that lowkey.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other thoughts? I won't be available in the December 8th-10th part so you guys don't need to fill that in if you don't want to, because Julia has said that, uh, without me, Senate is lost, and therefore we will not be hosting a bonding without me again.

Julia Tanner: So if any one person can't meet, like if there's a time that can't work for all of us, then it's not happening. But yeah, stay with the teams. I'll make sure that everyone filled it out before setting a message, just about like, if it's happening when it'll be. And then I'll just make an executive decision of if we do Boba or coffee where that's going to take place, I'll be keeping in mind like space with a bunch of people. But just to make things simpler, I'll just make it the executive decision about where it'll be but yeah, that's all I have.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there last thoughts or words? Sentences?

Joseph Riggio: I have some sentences. Julia, it's okay to ignore me. I did attend last time, and I have a final that ends, it seems like when most people are available, so I would be late. So you can do what you need to do and find a date and time. I can make it work in my schedule. That's fine.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty we'll move on to announcements and public comment. I will announce two things. I will announce that I would love to have a one on one with each and every one of you, as is mandated by the bylaws of the Associated Students of the University of Washington Student Senate to just check in how the quarter has gone. And we don't I'm pretty flexible we can do it. next week. You can drop by whenever I'm in the office tomorrow or if you

want to schedule a meeting over break, it'll be virtual, but I can do that. Just whenever is most convenient for you. And if we need to wait until winter we can. But I just want to check in with y'all, how steering's been going, how committees have been going, how Senate's has been going, and give you all a chance to give me some one on one feedback on everything and maybe some ideas for things going forward' be okay, but just what's on your radar? Please reach out if you have a specifications on scheduling. Forgot the second thing that I was gonna announce, so are there any other announcements?

Dylan Bianchi: There's a Huskies for Housing Clothing donation bin, I think I've already told you guys about this and mentioned it to Senate, but please. If you have any clothes ... So far... two shirts in there, that's all that's what we're working with. I contributed both shirts. I'm desperate.

Joseph Riggio: Student Health Fee survey please we need to really push undergraduate outreach. It's a tough time to outreach to undergraduates just because midterms, and dead weeks approaching and people just want to get on out of here. So I greatly appreciate it. Totally on your own volition if you want to help out and ask like your faculty, like your professors and whatnot, if you can like talk about the health fee for like maybe two to five minutes and just have people in the course fill it out. Really, that's the only way we're gonna hit a lot of people. with this with the survey. Just educating them on just filling them out and just going through like, this matters because this could potentially shape how funding happens for these three health services, Husky Health, UW Counseling Center, LiveWell. It's a really important survey. If y'all haven't done it already, you should do it. And if you know your friends haven't yet encouraged your friends too. But yeah, we are 25 for context. We're at 95% of the threshold needed for graduate students, which is fantastic, and then only 25% of the way for undergraduates. So if you can, please let people know that this is happening.

Pierce Wallbaum: Have you posted it on the UW snapchat and or Instagram?

Joseph Riggio: We're working on an Instagram thing. Not snapchat.

Julia Tanner: Can you send me information that I can send out to senators?

Erick Jacobsen: I had a question just a quick question. Are you like, is there, like, some policy that says you can't like the time limit on when the survey is it like, can you Okay, so you could extend it

Joseph Riggio: The only reason we would extend it is to get to the threshold of 10% and 10%. which we we were talking and that's possible. We don't want to tell people that because then they won't take the survey. So for now, think no. December 13th is when it closes. Could it, is it possible for it to reopen? Yes. There is no policy against it. Is it bad survey practice? Yeah, but I would argue for this, it might be a little bit different, because we we just need 10% of the undergrad and 10% of the graduate population to fill it out to even do anything with the data.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements? Are there any motions?

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-2-0

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar

Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
