



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

Date: Wednesday November 25, 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 agenda.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds.

Approved by raised hand vote.

LEADERSHIP REPORTS | [Erick Jacobsen](#), [Joseph Riggio](#), [Julia Tanner](#)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erick Jacobsen: All right, with that, we will move on to our announcements and public comment period. Anyone has any announcement or any member of the public would like to speak. Now is your time. Just line up at the microphone. This can be RSOs, personal initiatives, ASUW events, whatever.

Joseph Riggio: Hello everyone So the Student Health fee survey is still going. Please, if you haven't taken the survey, we want your feedback. This is a very important survey because this is going to determine a student government fee that ASUW, GPSS has been working on with UW Counseling Center, Husky Health and Livewell. We wanna know your opinion about it. We wanna know your opinion about the structure. We wanna know your opinion about the proposed fee amount that health units have proposed, which is \$125.00 per quarter per student. We wanna know that if you think that it should be a lower rate, we want you to have, we want you to be able to input your

feedback into that survey, so please fill that out, super important. And also if you can tell your friends about it or your classes or quiz sections or whatnot, no expectation or pressure for you to do that, but it would really help a lot. We're only 25% of the way there with our undergraduate thresholds for getting a representative sample. So we really need to push the outreach on this. So thank you so much. I appreciate it. Please take the survey.

Abigail Appleyard: This is just a reminder that Off Campus bonding is tonight right after Senate.

Dylan Bianchi: Something I've said before, but Huskies for Housing has a clothing donation bin in the front of the ASUW office. So if you have clothing, hygienic products or menstrual products you'd like to donate, you can put them here and they will be given to our local homeless community. Thank you.

Wesley Andrus: I just started a new new RSO for watching Japanese grand sumo, so if anyone is interested in watching sumo wrestling with other people, please approach me. I will give you the Discord link and you can get further information.

Jenna Miller: OK, on next Friday, December 5th, the ASUW Queer Student Commission is hosting their very first Queer Book Club at the Q Center from 3:30 to 4:30 PM. We will be able to pass out some books and you get to meet some really cool people. So if you're interested, you can reach out to me or Erick or any of the leadership can connect you to me.

Anabel Blankenship: I'm just here to speak about the Inclusive Events Fund form we have, which I'm hoping I can maybe send in the chat as well. But I just wanted to let people know if anyone runs an RSO and they have any sort of accessibility needs that they've noticed in their events or their meetings, for example, if you have a deaf attendant come come to your RSO meeting and you're looking for an ASL interpreter, I can help fund that and you can request funding through me for any sort of accessibility needs you have. So please take a look at the form if you are currently running an RSO. That's all I want to say.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements?

FORUMS

Erick Jacobsen: Then we will move on to our public forum for today which is from Student Legal Services.

Pierce Wallbaum: Hi everyone, my name is Pierce Wallbaum, I'm your General Affairs committee chair and I'm also the Outreach Intern for Student Legal Services.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Hi everyone, my name is Amanda Reynoso Palley, I'm the Director and one of our attorneys at Student Legal Services.

Pierce Wallbaum: OK, so since our founding in 1969, Student Legal Services has proudly represented and worked alongside UW students in a wide variety of legal issues. And in just these last few years, we've actually become a tri-campus service provider, meaning any UW student, whether you're from Seattle, Tacoma or Bothell, is eligible to use our services. And so one of the ways that we support UW students is beyond just offering free 40-minute legal consultations is by doing educational workshops and presentations such as today where we aim to improve students understanding of the legal rights and the resources that are available to them. And so if you would

like to access our staff and services, you must first complete the intake form that can be found either by going to our website or by scanning the QR code on the screen. And if you're experiencing an emergency, it's really important that you still fill out the intake form as we are not able to meet with you until you do so and then you can go ahead and call our offices afterwards. And if you do need ongoing assistance after you do your free initial consultation, you can request to hire services at low cost ongoing fees. And then finally, we do also want to recognize the Services and Activities Fee, whose funding allows us to provide our services to all UW students. So thank you so much.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Thanks, Pierce, and thank you, everyone. I hope most of you knew about us before. We're located right here, but every day I meet with students who don't know about us. So I really appreciate this opportunity to come and speak to you all. And we do this kind of presentation. We'll also give presentations on other legal issues, so feel free to reach out if there's something that you would like to be presented to to someone else in your community. So today we're going to be talking about what to do when and if you happen to observe or experience an ICE interaction, or if you are stopped by ICE agents. A lot of this is similar to your rights if you were stopped by any law enforcement agent, but there are some key differences and today's is really going to focus on ICE and kind of what we're seeing in current events right now at this time. I always have to give a legal disclaimer because I am a lawyer, sorry, but essentially this information. That I'm going to give you to give to you today is not legal advice, it's legal information. I'll also say like I'm going to have time to have all of you ask me questions if you want me to answer those questions, but please do not ask me anything that is specific, that is a legal question for yourself or for someone else. For those, please feel free to submit a consultation as long as. It's for you. We'd be happy to meet with you on a one-on-one setting. But if you were to ask me questions here, there's no attorney-client privilege. There's no confidentiality. I can't share where someone else is going to share that. And so the same thing goes if, like, if you want to talk about someone else's information, like you have a close family member who might be undocumented, I would just say just be aware. Don't share anything public about them. Feel free to ask hypothetical questions, couch it in those terms instead. And yes, and just again this is not legal advice, it's legal information. And I will say the immigration world, kind of what we're seeing on the ground in terms of what's happening with ICE. Everything is changing every single day. And so some of what I say today, yeah, I mean, your baseline rights should always apply, but they are sometimes trampled. And so just take a lot of what I'm going to say today with like a huge asterisk of things change quickly, and what we're actually seeing on the ground doesn't always align with what the law says should be happening. Roadmap. OK, So what we're gonna go over today, kind of takeaways that I want you to have once we're done with this kind of brief presentation is just knowing your rights when you're encountering ICE. Also because all of you are students on campus, I want you to understand what the UW protocols are and for those of you who are employees on campus, I also want you to understand what your role would be if ICE ever came to a private space and wanted to enter that space. And then also bystander rights. So if you are just witnessing an ICE interaction, what are you allowed to do? What should you not do? How to protect yourself and how to protect those in your community and those around you? And so let's start with rights when encountering ICE. So it, like every lawyer's favorite thing to say is it depends, right? And so it really does depend. And the main reason why it depends when you're encountering ICE is where it's happening. So if ICE, and I should really quickly say when I say ICE, I'm talking about Immigration and Customs Enforcement and oftentimes we will now also see Customs and Border Patrol also be working in tandem with ICE. So I will sometimes use acronyms. I apologize. Feel free to be like what are you talking about? But ICE is Immigration and Customs Enforcement, CBP, Customs and Border Patrol. When if ICE wants to stop someone on the street, they can do so without any kind warrant. So if they are in a public place,

if you are in a public place or if someone else is in a public place and ICE suspects them of not having immigration status, they can stop them on the street. That is not the case if they are in a private space. So if you're in a private space, ICE needs an actual warrant to enter that space and we'll get into details about what that warrant requires. No matter what, everyone always has Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination and also Fourth Amendment rights, which we'll go over against unlawful searches and seizures. And then we're also just going to talk about what actually is obstruction of justice, because that has been thrown around a lot by ICE. That when there are bystanders trying to assist people or let people know their rights, they're often accused of obstructing justice, even though that is not really what's happening a lot of the times. So I often get questions like what is a public space versus what is a private space? Public spaces would be, when we're talking about campus, like if you're just walking around campus, campus is a public space. Technically, the hub is a public space, right? During normal, normal hours, the hub is open to anyone. Anyone can be in this building. But what is a private space would be like SLS within the HUB. We actually have a locked door. People cannot just enter our space. People need to have an appointment to enter. We've gone the extra distance. We've put up a flyer on our door that says this is a private space. We want to make it very, very clear that no one can just enter our space. And the reason why we do that is not because we don't want students coming in. It's because we don't. We do not want ICE entering our building and we do not want them entering our private space where we have confidential information about a lot of clients. And so there's many steps that we can take to make places private places, make places that are kind of pseudo private, private. So I think on the next slide I talk about this a little bit like semi like semipublic places would be Suzzallo Library, but there are study rooms within Suzzallo Library and. If you are renting one of those study rooms, that is technically a private place, especially if you've closed the door. You could also put a sign on the door that just says like this room is in use, it's private, it's booked. That would make it a private space and that would mean that ICE would need a warrant to enter that space. Same thing. Obviously dorm rooms, dorms in general, like the entire dorm building is a private space. Classrooms are private spaces while class is in session as long as the door is closed. Office hours like those can be private spaces. If the door is wide open, that could make it easier for ICE to just walk on in. But you know, if anyone goes to their professor's office and shuts the door, that's technically now a private space. Lots more examples. I think I've included an entire list in the presentation if you want to look over it. So if ICE wants to enter a private space, they have to have an actual judicial warrant. And this is probably a little bit hard to see up on this screen, but I want to talk about what that is. This is a sample. They won't all look exactly like this, but they will often be issued by a United States District Court. That's usually who ICE is appealing to for these warrants, it should be signed by an actual judge. And very importantly, if they are coming somewhere, especially to someone's private home, this warrant needs to have the correct address for where they are appearing and also the correct name for the person that they are searching for. So if someone were to come to your house with a warrant. And it's all correct, but the person's name on there does not live in that home, you can say this is not a valid warrant. This person doesn't live here. Or conversely, if everything is correct and they come to a home and let's say it's you that's inside that home and your name is on that warrant, but the address is incorrect, that's not a valid warrant. If it's for some other address, that's not a valid warrant, and that means they can't just barge in if they do have a valid warrant. Unfortunately, there's not really much that you can do from preventing them inside. So just knowing that and we want to make sure that you know how to identify what is a valid. Warrant. I'm sure many of you have seen in the news. ICE uses a lot of tactics that are very alarming and very, in my opinion, not legal, like wearing masks and not always identifying who they are and not sharing their badge numbers. One of the other things that they will often do is they will try to trick people by using these administrative warrants. So this is kind of an example of what that looks

like. An administrative warrant would be fine for a street if if they were searching someone. If they were searching for someone in a public place, that would be fine to have an administrative warrant, but it does not grant them authority to enter a private space and an administrative warrant will often be signed by either like ICE Director or by an immigration judge. Immigration judges are not. They're not federal judges. They are not actually technically judges. They are administrative judges, so they do not have the authority to issue a warrant. So these are some examples. I don't expect you to memorize them but just wanted to make sure you have access to those. So in terms of your rights and everyone's rights, everyone has these rights regardless of their immigration status. Everyone who is present in the United States has the rights that every person has under the Bill of Rights, so including their 4th and 5th Amendment rights. 4th Amendment right against unlawful searches and seizures and 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination. And so this is showing up so tiny, but there are these wonderful red cards and I believe in this presentation we might have a link to them at the bottom, but there are through the Immigration Legal Resource Center, ILRC. And these are for people who maybe English is not their first language, or they're concerned about messing up or anyone who just doesn't feel that they can remember their rights. You can use these, you can download these cards. You can actually purchase these cards. I think we may have some in our office. And I think there may be some down at the front desk and you could give these to an ICE agent, especially if they were to come to your door and you could just slip it under the door. And this is exercising all of your rights. It's saying, "I do not wish to speak with you or answer questions or sign or hand any over any legal documents based on my 5th Amendment right under the United States Constitution, I do not give you permission to enter my home based on my 4th Amendment right under the United States Constitution, unless you have a warrant to enter signed by a judge, I do not give you permission to search any of my belongings based on my 4th Amendment right. I choose to exercise my constitutional rights." And then you can, I think at the bottom it says these cards are available for citizens and non-citizens alike. So it's also updating ICE agents about what they can and cannot do because also they've been hiring a lot of new ICE agents with the like \$90 billion that they were just awarded. And I don't think a lot of them are always educated about what people's rights are and are not. And so an important take away is just knowing that you have those rights. You do. You always have the right anytime you're shot by law enforcement to remain silent. But you do have to voice that, which I know is a little bit, sometimes confusing to people. So you can't just be like, oh, I remember attorney Amanda said just keep my mouth shut. Like you have to actually say I am exercising my right to remain silent. Or you could probably show this card like look at look at part one. I'm exercising my right to remain silent. But the best is to physically speak and state you're exercising your right to remain silent. After that you do not have to answer any additional questions, especially with ICE agents. It's really important for people who are not citizens. I mean, there's a lot of considerations about what someone may or may not want to say, but if someone is undocumented, it is best not to say anything at all. And just exercise their rights to remain silent and to speak to an attorney. An important distinction that some of you probably know, but just in case anyone's not aware, immigration court, deportation defense, removal defense, it is all considered administrative and civil. It's not considered criminal, which means that actually you do not have the right to a free attorney in immigration court, despite sometimes the outcomes of those courts being just as much of a punishment as a criminal court would be. So what that means is while someone does have the right to speak to an attorney, they do not have the right to one for free. So oftentimes it can be a huge barrier to people who do not have the funds to hire an attorney. So it's just something I would love to see change in the future. But that is where we are at right now. It's just remaining silent and I think we now have a quiz, a little fun one and feel free to kind of call out what you believe is the right answer. So an officer asks you where you were born. You respond A, I was born at. Hogwarts and have a wizard visa. B, I'd rather not answer that. I'm exercising my right

to remain silent. C, Hold on, I need to Google what to say. Or D, you first. Of all of these, what do we think would be the best answer to give to an officer? I'm seeing a lot of B's. Perfect. OK, you're being questioned by ICE and you feel nervous. You A, break into a musical number about the Constitution. B, silently hand them a business card that says I remain silent professionally. C, say I'm exercising my right to remain silent. Or D, offer them a snack to buy time. A would be the most fun, absolutely. But yeah, C here would be the ideal answer. And then the final one, an officer asks, ask for your roommate's immigration status. You A, respond with ask me no questions. I'll tell you no lies. B, say I don't know and start naming a fake spy story or narrating a fake spy story. Sorry. C say nothing and ask am I free to leave? Or D tell them everything because you once binge watched Law and Order. And this one I realize OK, I'm seeing a lot of the correct answer, which is C, though I realize I didn't go over it. So that is probably an important one for me to add that anytime you're stopped by a law enforcement, you can always ask first, you know, you can ask them, am I free to leave or am I being detained? And if they say you're free to leave, you get to just leave. If they say you're being detained, that's when you would want to say, OK, now I'm exercising my right to remain silent. OK, so UW's policy if ICE tries to enter private spaces. So this I've truly just pulled from the the UW website. But essentially if you are a UW employee, so like let's say ICE came to the hub and someone was working at the front desk and ICE is saying like, oh, I need to get authorization to go up to SLS that hub employee, what they need to do is they need to inform that ICE agent that they are not authorized to allow them to enter the space. They're not authorized to review warrants and so they would basically need to say I need to call my supervisor and they are going to follow UW protocol and come and review this and then what should happen? Is that a trained officer or campus safety employee is going to respond and take over engagement with the agent and determine if the visit requires the response of the Attorney General's office.

Isaac Pasco: Do you have to actually call a supervisor or could you just stall forever?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: I would love that. I think you probably should actually call your supervisor, but I agree that I I love the idea of stalling. I think eventually it could lead to further unlawful actions by ICE potentially.

Aiden Reeder: If the supervisor just never answers, could it follow from that? Because you are actively trying so like could then that be contested I guess?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: I will say this is so this is UW's policy right? This is not necessarily, In my SLS capacity, here's what I would say as someone who is an employee of UW, what UW would like you to do if your supervisor doesn't respond is call 911, which is, people will have their own thoughts about how that's going to work out and to what extent the police are going to make the situation better, but technically ...

Brief interruption of technical difficulties.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: OK. The really quick summary was that as UW employees, if a supervisor is not responding, we are then supposed to call campus safety or 911, which would route to UW police officers. But yeah, that is the UW policy, which is separate from what you should do if you are in a private situation at a private home and ICE were to appear, or if you are not in your capacity as a UW employee but still on campus and happen to see ICE. And I guess so I'm going to move on from the UW policy one. So what is obstruction of justice? Like what can you do and what can you not do if you happen to witness an ICE interaction or an ICE altercation and you want to know what you can do? So what would be considered interfering would be like actually physically putting your body in between ICE and the person that they're trying to detain or grabbing an ICE

agent. Definitely don't do that. Or potentially, if you are filming them too closely, but you do have the right to film ICE officers, you have the right to film law enforcement in general, you should just probably try to do so a little bit of a ways back. We generally say at least 10 feet away to remain safe. You know, they may try to claim they will very often scream and say like, stop filming me. Or they may try to claim that that's interfering with their official duties. That truly is not interfering with their official duties, but it's going to be really a very personal decision for each person about how they feel in that moment, how they feel about their own safety, what levels further that they want to participate in that if they feel too threatened because, you know, we have seen ICE agents get quite violent. So it's it's a very personal decision at that time how you would like to continue. But I do want you to know that it is not obstruction of justice to film an ICE, an ICE interaction from a safe distance. And some other things, really, really helpful things. If you don't feel safe filming you, the most important thing that we can do as bystanders is just document everything we're seeing. So if you don't feel safe filming or recording, you can also write everything down. Try to get the officer's information, like try to get badge number. If there is a car anywhere, try to get like a license plate. Just write down as much details about the ICE officers as possible. I always say you want to be hesitant about trying to collect information about the person they're trying to detain because you do not want to be asking that person to reveal any personal information that ICE can then use against them. So you don't. Want to scream out like, hey, what's your name and phone number so I can find your family? I get that that's really well-intentioned and well-meaning, but it actually might be giving ICE information that they could use against that person. If they volunteer that information, if they're screaming like help me, help me, this is my name. I'm scared of being disappeared, but please do write it down, but don't ask them for it. You can also similarly, like you can verbalize to people like, hey, you have rights, you have the right to remain silent, but you have to tell them that you're remaining silent. You can say all of that. That is not interfering with ICE. That's not obstructing justice. But again, that's all going to depend on your level of safety and security and how much you want to get. Involved and that again is a very personal decision and so I think that that is, you know. I think that's a kind of a good overview. I would say if ICE comes to you and they're trying to ask you questions about like a roommate or a friend, you also have the right to remain silent and you do not have to share any information with them. So just being aware of that as well. I think we have one more. Yes, one more scenario. So these are true or false scenarios. So scenario one, you're filming an ICE agent from 10 feet away and you calmly say to whoever they're trying to detain, you have the right to remain silent. Is that obstruction?

Senators: No.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Scenario 2 ICE comes to your friend's apartment without a judicial warrant, without a judicial warrant. You tell them you need a judicial warrant to enter. Is that obstruction?

Senators: No.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Scenario 3 an ICE officer arrives without a judicial warrant and you physically block the door. This one maybe we need more information about, but what are we thinking?

Senators: Yes.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Yes, but it depends. Exactly. And I think it's if there's a door that you're blocking, I guess the question is, is it a private space or are you like blocking a public front door? If it's a public space, then that could potentially be considered obstruction. But if it's a private space,

then it is not. An ICE agent questions you about your undocumented roommate and you choose to remain silent. That one is also not obstruction. This is kind of the majority of my presentation. I want to leave some time for Q&A and I actually don't know how long I took.

Erick Jacobsen: We have 5 minutes.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: 5 minutes for Q&A.

Abigail Appleyard: Some of the buildings, you know, you have to like tap into and stuff, but a lot of times someone will like follow in behind you because it's so inconvenient for the builder to shut. Most of the time it's just students, so it doesn't seem like that big of a deal. But if someone were to enter that way. Is that still like a private space that they're breaking into because they're not supposed to be in there or is it like the public?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: That's such a great question and and I think these get really complicated, but I could imagine ICE trying to do that, like especially with the residential halls. I learned through our last presentation at the residential halls that that there's not someone that kind of checks IDs at the doors. And so given that it would be possible for ICE to come in, but they're still, they would still need a warrant to enter anyone's actual dorm. Once they're in the space, I think it would be questionable about whether or not someone has let them in. But if someone did let them in, then they, that, I should have said this and I apologize, I didn't say this earlier. ICE needs either a warrant or they need the authorization of someone in the space to be allowed to enter that space. So if someone does just let them into the space, then they've technically potentially been given that authorization. So I think it's really important that we kind of inform our community, like, please don't let, you know, they're not often just one person. It is very often like an entire group. And I would hope that a student would be like, whoa, whoa, I'm not going to let in these like 10 masked men behind me. Into this building, but it is possible. And so I think that's where it's really important that we spread the word about this. Great question.

Ava Wahl: Let's say we do encounter ICE from a distance and we're able to gather information either because the person being detained offered it to us willingly or because we were able to gather information about the ICE officer or officers in question. What would our next step be if we wanted to, like, publicize the information and use it to the benefit of the person that was detained? Like, who would we go to?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: That's a wonderful question. I would recommend following up with the Washington Immigration Solidarity Network, WISN. They have an entire app system that they use to notify the community when ICE is around. You can, if you do get someone's actual information, which again, I don't, would never want you to ask for, but if you've been given it, you could try to locate their family members with that, share it with them. There is also an app called Notifica, the Notifica app, and that is an app that's being used. Just it will spread the word like, hey, ICE is in this area, ICE was reported here. And so a lot of like what we can do to be good bystanders and good members of our community is actually just spreading the word if we do see ICE agents so that people who are not safe in those situations will have have a heads up.

Spencer Grubbs: So my question is, are ICE agents allowed to lie or are there like no repercussions for lying and providing false information to try and gain entry into a a a location?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: That's a great question. I mean that, they are definitely allowed to fudge the truth. I think that it, like most things, it does depend on the extent of what the lie is going to be. But again, like we will see them all the time try to use these fake warrants. And I mean, it's helpful to

know if they did and if they are violating someone's 4th or 5th Amendment rights, it is really important to document it because that may give that person an opportunity to sue them in Federal District Court and to potentially have some avenue to maybe be able to better fight an immigration removal, deportation proceedings, or just to potentially bring about some change about how ICE agents are operating. But I will say that ICE agents in general have been given a huge amount of leeway under this administration and under this current Supreme Court. Most recently, they were just basically told that they're allowed to racially profile. So everything that I thought that I knew about the 14th Amendment and our right to due process and to be free from racial profiling kind of went out the window with that decision. So it's hard to say, there's a huge it depends because everything is changing every day. And so what I would have thought would not be legal. I could see this current Supreme Court upholding.

Abigail Appleyard: Sorry I have another one. If they have a warrant for your dorm, are they allowed to search your portion of the dorm even if the warrant's not for you?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: So if it's like a warrant for a triple?

Abigail Appleyard: If it's like a roommate are they allowed to search your portion as well?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: It would very much depend on the language written into that warrant itself. So if it's a shared room, then yes. If it is like and I think this also really depends on how the apart, like how the dorm room is laid out, but if it's like you don't have an individual locked door or a number on your door and the warrant is just for your general number, they they could potentially search those rooms.

Erick Jacobsen: I believe we have time for one last question.

Charisse Vales: It's just that like the HUB is like a public space. I think particular to like the Ethnic Cultural Center, since a lot of like undocumented students meet there, it is like a similar process where you have to like tap to enter. Would that, would it also be like a semi, or semipublic space or it a private space?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: So the ECC is a private space. Because you do need to tap in, so you have to be a student to enter that that building. But the HUB, like you don't actually have to be a student. If you are here after hours, sometimes you have to be, you have to have permissions to enter and you do have to tap in. But during normal hours, anyone's allowed in this space.

Julia Tanner: Ananya asked can ICE target a green card holder?

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Yes, it is possible. Basically ICE, I mean, we are seeing ICE target U.S. citizens, I would say. So I don't mean to fear monger or anything like that, but basically ICE was just told that anyone who looks like they could be undocumented, especially, I will say like the language of the Supreme Court ruling was basically like that they can take into consideration someone's English capabilities. So if they're speaking with an accent, if someone is in an area where low-income workers usually are. If someone looks like they might be undocumented, which to me is like that is very clearly racial profiling. So I think it is very possible that it could be an accidental targeting of a lawful permanent resident or a U.S. citizen. But I will say and also until someone is a U.S. citizen, it is possible for them to be subjected to removal proceedings, especially for green card holders if they commit specific types of crimes that can subject them to removal proceedings. So it is possible to become to be investigated by ICE for those purposes.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you for your presentation and Q&A Amanda.

Amanda Reynoso-Palley: Thank you so much for having us. I think, I think just these QR codes really quickly. There's like a know your rights on immigration handbook and then our flyer if you want to access our services and get a free consultation. Thank you again.

Julia Tanner moves to recess for 3 minutes to set up cart captioning.

Dylan Bianchi seconds.

Approved by raised hand vote.

Recess 5:48

Reconvened 5:51

Recess 5:51

Reconvened 5:52

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Erick Jacobsen: OK, we will move on to nominations and elections, and our first election is for the Joint Commissions Committee. The JCC brings together ASUW's 9 diversity commissions and four advocacy programs. Our question is what does diversity, equity, inclusion and belonging mean to you, and how would you utilize your experiences to facilitate communication between the Senate and the JCC?

Dylan Bianchi nominates **Santiago Quesada**

Santiago Quesada accepts.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any nominations? JCC is a great way to get involved in diversity programming and advocacy on campus. It meets pretty frequently, so it's a good, a great way to get in to further ASUW positions as well. Our last Senate liaison to the JCC was then hired as a JCC employee for this year. I will ask three more times. Are there any nominations?

Santiago Quesada elected JCC Liaison via acclamations.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the UW Recreation Advisory Board, the question is how would you coordinate with recreation affiliated clubs to ensure students are centered in all of UW Rec's initiatives and projects?

Naomi Law nominates Cecillia Hellman.

Cecilia Hellman ineligible due to absence.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other nominations? if you're concerned about this meeting too frequently, I promise you it doesn't. Are there any other nominations?

Russel Ross elected UW Rec Advisory Board Liaison via acclamations.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the Conduct Review Board, the question is what experiences have you had using AI in assignments and how would you use those experiences to inform fair judgments on AI related cases of academic dishonesty? And just to clarify for meetings, these are very flexible. You basically, if you are elected to this position, then you and all the other reviewing officers will be

sent times and dates for hearings and then you join if you can attend. So it's not even a standing meeting, so you don't have to do any scheduling around it and it's pretty easy and if you are a Conduct Review Board officer, you will also, if you'd like, have a seat on the upcoming ASUW AI Policy Task Force. If you do not want to claim that seat due to meeting times or any other factor, we will elect a separate representative, but the conduct review officer gets first come, first serve because they are working directly on issues that are mostly AI related. Are there any nominations?

Ava Wahl rescinds nomination.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other nominations.

Jayden Kim nominates himself.

Erick Jacobsen: With that, the nominations period has closed and if our candidates would like to please come up to the front of the room, please. As a reminder, our candidates will have 15 seconds for introductions. They will have 30 seconds to answer the question and 15 seconds for a conclusion. They will go in order as they appear on the agenda.

Kavi Pasupathi: My name is Kavi. I'm an engineering major and I'm also your vice chair for off campus committee and a GAVEL member. Thank you.

Jude Belland: Fellow senators, thank you for your time today. My name is Jude Belland, and I believe I'm uniquely qualified for the Conduct Review Board thanks to my intimate experience navigating the strict disciplinary action school administrators have levied in response to the widespread utilization of artificial intelligence in our school assignments.

Zain Asif: Hello, I'm Zain. I have a lot of experience working with a I and talking to professors about how to use it beneficially instead of in a way that harms students' education. Thank you

Jayden Kim: Hi everyone, I'm Jayden. I'm a first year here at the university and I have had the opportunity to serve as a research director for a nonprofit called MedSearch and I have attended many AI related events most recently, the public health event. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: You can stay up here. You will have 30 seconds to answer the question. Would you like me to restate it? All right. Our question is, what experiences have you had in using AI on assignments and how will you use those experience to inform fair judgments on AI related cases of academic dishonesty? Whenever you're ready.

Jayden Kim: As part of my role in MedSearch, I'm responsible for proofreading and identifying AI generated work. I believe that AI can be useful to, a useful tool in studying, proofreading, and even navigating libraries. I've done so since 5th grade. However, I firmly believe that all work should be one's own work. Because we came here to learn and learning how to, while learning how to use AI is important, we shouldn't need it to do our work. This is a belief I'll be using to inform fair judgments. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: All right. And then we're going in reverse order now. So Zain, whenever you're ready, you can unmute and speak. Would you like me to repeat the question?

Zain Asif: No, thank you. I've had a ton of experience talking. First of all, I've used AI to help me write outlines for my papers and stuff like that. I think that's an appropriate use of AI, especially after talking to my English professors and they agreed. But I have a lot of. Yeah, I'm. I cede my time

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you. Moving on to Jude, you have 30 seconds. Would you like me to repeat the question? Whenever you're ready.

Jude Belland: I'm my friend. Whenever you're ready. In my senior year of high school, I was flagged for the use of AI on the final essay for my mandatory philosophy class. I was subject to an academic investigation and faced the threat of suspension and the possible revocation of my own diploma. Throughout this entire process, I received no help from my school administration or my own teachers who I'd spent years developing relationships with. I felt disenfranchised and it is that experience that I seek to change. I want to understand individuals' personal narratives to help humanize them in the eyes of the review board.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on, would you like me to repeat the question? Our question is what experiences have you had using AI in assignments and how would you use those experiences to inform fair judgments in AI related cases of academic dishonesty? 30 seconds whenever you're ready.

Kavi Pasupathi: I personally use AI to automate more of my work in terms of, you know, writing outlines or like going through big pieces of text that I just do not have the time to read. And there is a fine line between using AI to do your work for you and learning from it. So I think that's what needs to be defined clearly within universities and schools, and that's also what I would bring to the review board.

Erick Jacobsen: And you can stay up here. You'll have 15 seconds for your closing remarks whenever you're ready.

Kavi Pasupathi: Oh, I also think it's just a good idea to mention that AI is growing and it's growing rapidly. So it's not a matter of if people are gonna use it, it's just when are they gonna use it at different stages in their life. So drawing a clear line earlier on will help define how it's used.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Kavi. Moving on to Jude, do you have 15 seconds for a closing remark. Whenever you're ready.

Jude Belland: I believe all above all else, the students are entitled to due process and the intrinsic respect we pay to those who have worked to be where they are today. And I promise that if you should elect me, I will stand uphold those values. Thank you for your time.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to Zain, you have 15 seconds for closing remarks. Feel free to unmute whenever you're ready.

Zain Asif: I have previously gotten flagged for writing papers for plagiarism, and I definitely did not plagiarize anything on them. It was purely due to my writing style being similar to AI, so I have experience dealing with this.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Zain. And lastly, Jayden, you have 15 seconds whenever you're ready.

Jayden Kim: OK, well, thank you everyone for listening. I would also, I hope you vote for me, but I would also like to thank all my fellow nominees for nominating themselves and as he mentioned, AI is a growing field and we should try to distinguish lines

Erick Jacobsen: Round of applause for our candidates please.

Drumroll commences.

Jude Belland elected Conduct Review Board Liaison.

NEW BUSINESS

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

On campus affairs

- Semi-informal discussion regarding legislation
 - Writing legislation for upcoming winter quarter

Off campus affairs

- Attendance
- Bonding

General affairs

- Pierce presenting bill to AAA, Julia stepped in as Chair
- Julia takes attendance
- Our bill has passed out; icebreakers instead
- Played Rose/Bud/Thorn

Academic and administrative affairs

Agenda:

- R-32-1: A Resolution to Increase Academic Transparency During Registration

Discussion:

- Shuchita asks for a summary
 - Pierce provides it
- Mohammad asks who will be writing the course descriptions
 - Pierce answers that the professors will
- Jayden asks for a

Action Items:

- Kira moves to approve the bill
 - Issac seconds
- Voting on the bill:
 - Favorable: 15

- Neutral: 0
- Unfavorably: 0
- Abstain: 2

OLD BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: We are back and we're going into old business. We're starting with OA-32-1 Which is an organic act to updating the Senate bylaws and rules. Joseph Riggio, Senate Vice Speaker, is the primary sponsor. Joseph, would you like to come up here, please?

Joseph Riggio reads [OA-32-1 An Organic Act Updating the Senate Bylaws and Rules](#)

Erick Jacobsen: You had so much fun, didn't you? OK, in all seriousness, it's very important to make sure our governing documents are structured in such a way as to enable our advocacy work, even if it's not as flashy. With that, Joseph, would you like to, yeah, explain more about why you made this bill?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, I'm really, again, please, I cannot reiterate enough, open the Senate bylaws and the Senate rules if you haven't already, because this is gonna make absolutely no sense otherwise. This is a very like parliamentarian thing to do of having this. This bill is basically instructions to the parliamentarian to change things in the bylaws. So if you want to ever propose an organic act yourself, it'll probably look something like this. It's very, very instructional and so I'll go over the bill summary once again. Pretty much almost every single rule and article was amended, not because it was changed, but because either the formatting was weird or we decided to reorder, like committee chair compensation, for instance, was split in three different articles, so we just combined it into one article because it makes sense. Some are pretty significant changes though, like I'll particularly point out the supermajority changes, so there are some, let me find it again. There are some clauses where yeah, so Article 8, Section 2D after "the Senate allows it amend by a simple majority vote" to read "by 2/3 with super majority." So the reason for this for vote of no confidence, in Robert's Rules, it is a 2/3 supermajority, and the argument for that is the Senate should be pretty confident when they do a vote of no confidence. For right now, our bylaws say it's a simple majority, which if, typically a super majority is required for that, so I'm basing it off of Robert's Rules, which is precedent. It's also true in Sturgis rules, which is the standard parliamentary procedure. I believe it's also true for Reed's Rules, so I'm surprised this change wasn't made sooner. So yeah, there's a lot of technical stuff like that, but even the really small technical stuff is super duper important. This is where I can put my nerd hat on and say like, this matters. Also, sorry, I keep breathing into the mic. I'm sorry Teams people. Any questions?

Erick Jacobsen: As if you weren't already already wearing your nerd hat.

Joseph Riggio: I do have a fun amendment too, so you can see me make that amendment in a bit.

Erick Jacobsen: Any questions, comments, or motions?

Julia Tanner: moves to amend in lines 125-129 to read "favorable, unfavorable, or neutral"

Naomi Law seconds

Approved

Abigail Appleyard: This isn't exactly an amendment, but it's more like a pre amendment with regards to the committee chair compensation. I think there should be something in there about if a vice chair is filling in for a committee chair for the whole quarter that they be compensated because it's kind of crazy to think that, you know, I would ask my vice chair to do a job for free that I get paid about, over \$100 to do, and it doesn't really make any sense not to give them the money if it's just going to go back into the general fund. So it's not like costing Senate anything because they just wouldn't be paying me. And they'll pay someone else.

Jayden Kim: This is more of a point of inquiry. On, for section 2 like the title and the 'THAT' clause following it, it says ASUW Senate ASUW Senate rules. Whereas in the actual document, the running head states ASUW Student Senate Standing Rules, is there?

Joseph Riggio: functionally there's no difference. It's the same document. Hold on one second. Let me just make sure. Yeah, no. There's no, there's no functional difference between that.

Joseph Riggio: Firstly, I would appreciate an amendment made from someone. There was a mention in lines 143 that the joint resolution submitted. The Oversight Committee chair would be involved in that process and Vice Speaker, the ASUW Committee Vice Chair. So we retired the ASUW GAVEL Committee Vice Chair positions. They would now be the interns. So this is just more of a, it's not entirely grammatical because technically there is a separate position than the interns, but I would recommend changing it from vice chair to interns. I'm gonna do that first and then I'll make an amendment later.

Kavi Pasupathi moves to strike vice chair and read interns

Spencer Grubbs seconds

Approved by raised hand vote.

Erick Jacobsen: It's been a long day y'all.

Joseph Riggio: And it's about to get longer because I have a pretty lengthy amendment. I'm going to speak on the amendment 1st and then I'll make the amendment. So our lovely speaker over here, according to our bylaws, all the committee positions, liaison positions we've been electing this past quarter, when they meet and when there's no Senate liaison, this guy fills in for them. According to our bylaws, all of the like 17 was committees, there's 20 committees. He is actually the sole person responsible for proxying all of those committees that are vacant. So we need to change that. So I'm going to propose this amendment and then I'll kind of explain the rationale. This amendment was talked about in the steering committee. It essentially-- TLDR is we're going to make it so that steering committee members can also take the responsibility off of the speaker and so we can appoint like via committee order a temporary appointment to that.

Joseph Riggio moves to add clause after line 106 to read: "In Article IX, Section (1)(D), after "In the case a liaison is unable to attend the meetings required by their office or should the position become vacant," amend "the Speaker is authorized to attend and participate on their behalf." to read "the Speaker is authorized to temporarily appoint themselves or a member of the Steering Committee to attend and participate on their behalf"

and insert subsection (i) under Section (D) which reads: “A Steering Committee member who is temporarily appointed to fill a liaison position must resign once an election for their position concludes.”

and then insert subsection (ii) under Section (D) which reads: “A liaison election for a position filled via a Speaker appointment must occur by within 10 weeks of UW academic course instruction, except Spring quarter, when the appointed liaison filled the position.”

Erick Jacobsen: That is now reflected on screen. Joseph has made a motion to make this amendment. I'll give you all a few seconds to read it before I ask for seconds. Don't want anyone supporting anything if they don't know what it is. Are there any seconds?

Adam Ford seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Aiden Reeder: This is kind of on Abigail's comments. The vice chair, vice chair payment was a discussion last year when this was being built. I don't or I guess when the original like restructuring was being built. I don't entirely remember the conversation on that though. So is someone else that was also present able to speak on that?

Erick Jacobsen: Hi. I changed the compensation structure when I was the Membership Coordinator. I believe the only discussion we had about vice chairs was whether or not to like pay them flat. It was briefly mentioned if it would be possible for them to be paid in the case that they were proxying. There wasn't necessarily a conclusion to that discussion, but one thing that was brought up was that it's not always the vice chair who's doing that. But I think ultimately there was no necessarily big conversation about it or a profound conclusion. Those are just some things that were discussed.

Abigail Appleyard moves to amend “compensation for standing committee chair shall be at a rate of \$500 per quarter or a percentage of that sum proportional to the number of regular meetings attended personally by each member holding the title of committee chair distributed at the end of the quarter” to “Should a vice chair fill in for their committee chair for the duration of the quarter, the vice chair shall be compensated at a rate of \$500 per quarter per chair or a percentage of that sum proportional to the number of regular meetings attended.”

Abigail Appleyard: I guess basically my thought is that like, you know, if a vice chair had to come in one time for a meeting, I don't know that that necessarily needs to be compensated, but it's a big commitment to ask someone to do a job that you're getting paid for, for free, and I wouldn't feel comfortable asking my vice chair to do that. Because I just think that that would be wrong because I get paid a decent amount to go to those meetings and it's just not fair to ask someone to and I also wouldn't want to have to not be chair just because I have a class commitment that overlaps with the steering meeting because I still love to be here in Senate. So it just kind of helps cover both of those bases. It's not like you know if the chair had to come in one time, I think that's kind of a different scenario, but a whole quarter long commitment I think should be compensated.

Adam Ford Seconds seconds

Aiden Reeder objects

Abigail Appleyard yields

Aiden Reeder: I like the idea of this because I do want them to be paid. I think it would be better to specify if it weren't just filling in for like steering and whatnot. It would have to be all of the duties of the chair, such as in bonding, heading the committee and whatnot doing all that other stuff that a chair would be. That's what the intent is that they're paid for, even if they aren't doing those. If a vice chair is indeed doing all of those, then they get paid at the same rate.

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

Abigail Appleyard: I guess my thought there is just that like if a chair can't make Senate, then you shouldn't be chair. But because our steering meeting like it's just difficult because I think like we kind of set it at the start of the year and then you have to go and make your classes, and I can't choose to just not take a class because steering is at a certain time. But I also don't want to not be a part of Senate in the capacity that I am. And I think if I had a class that overlapped with Senate, yeah, I shouldn't be chair anymore and someone else should do that. So I guess my thought was just that. This would be specific for taking over steering commitments, but I guess maybe that should be specified in my amendment, which I didn't do so.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, for the record, this is I'm going to Dylan and then I'll go to Julia. This is \$500 for all of the duties of the committee chair. So if someone would like to make that amendment, we can do a friendly amendment or Abigail can withdraw her motion for a new one or we can go forward with a vote. So we have options.

Dylan Bianchi: What I'm gonna propose is that instead of having it as like an entire quarter thing, because to Aiden's point, it's so complicated because there's two different meetings that they're going to have it be something where it's like if the vice chair is substituting at 5 or more meetings, which could be either Senate or steering then they're entitled to a proportional compensation. So if you fill in at one meeting, you're not entitled to the like 20 bucks or whatever. But if you, you know, past a certain threshold, if you've put in \$100 worth of work, you you would get that compensation.

Dylan Bianchi moves to amend the duration of a quarter to read 5 or more meetings

Abigail Appleyard accepts as friendly amendment

Erick Jacobsen: How I currently understand this and you have some, we are in a period of open debate for the record is that, would the, under this wording, the chair still be compensated for the meetings that they attend?

Joseph Riggio: Erick, I actually don't know this about the budget or whatnot, but how is the stipend currently allocated in terms of does it pay for just the whole position and all their responsibilities or is it by meeting or? So that \$500, like what can we work with here in terms of like this amendment or you get my question?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, budgetarily, it's just a lump sum, uh, \$500 per quarter. Uh, so uh, 1500 per committee chair times 4, which is? 2000 that number. So apparently it's just that number that allocated to Senate for one item of committee chair compensation. Um, so within our bylaws we can redirect that, but the way it was intended to be structured was. Um, because it is uh proportional to the meetings attended, it is based on that with the assumption that it is also compensating to work outside of meetings. Uh. The problem was that we were trying to balance Uh was that um a there's work outside of Uh meetings. So doing it at an hourly rate would be misleading because it would be saying, oh, you're working 3 hours and you're not. So that's why it's a flat sum with a proportionality assigned to it. But the other thing to balance was that committee chairs should be attending all the

meetings. Because if they are not, then they're not doing their job and we want to account for that and balance those two, um, considerations. So does that answer your question,

Aiden Reeder: I know we try quite hard to get Vice chair positions filled in, but there I believe are still possibilities for general proxies that do not hold the role of vice chair to fill in. Would we want to, I guess expand the reporting of this to include any proxy, any single proxy that meets that threshold is eligible for that compensation, just in terms of the spirit of trying to compensate them for work done?

Joseph Riggio: So to address Erick's point, so the following subsection is the speaker shall be responsible for the calculation and allocation of these funds. So there is a bit of discretion there in terms of, if we're not fully confident on the wording of this first subsection, the 2nd subsection would clarify or give Erick the power at least to make sure that it is being proportionate however we as a Senate decide to interpret that. And I, the parliamentarian, would enforce that interpretation if we are unclear on the wording right now. I think it's OK. I do like Aiden's idea but I'll let someone else make a friendly amendment.

Isac Pasco: I think sort of to Aiden's point, it might not be all that practical possible to like calculate the total amount of like hourly like paid for the work and it might be too much overhead. I think that it might be better if we go to. I'm so sorry. I think it might be better if we should rely on the speaker doing the right thing, but I'm not entirely sure.

Adam Ford: I was just gonna say in the spirit of our discussion that I would like to propose a friendly amendment changing every mention of or amending every mention of Vice chair in this proposed amendment to just simply say proxy.

Abigail Appleyard accepts as friendly

Dylan Bianchi moves to previous question

Naomi Law seconds

Approved

Amendment approved

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Matt Freire seconds

Abigail Appleyard objects

Dylan Bianchi: It's Tuesday before Thanksgiving break. I amongst other people have to like go like home home, and I think we do unfortunately have to push this bill to next week

Abigail Appleyard rescinds objection

Adjourned 7:02 PM

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar

Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
