



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

12/1/2025

HUB 307

4:09 pm

ATTENDANCE

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

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve the agenda

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Approved 5-0-0

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Erick Jacobsen reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose

land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the speakers report, I have little to report. We did not have board last week because it was on Thanksgiving. And other than that, everything that I want to talk about is already a discussion item, except for, again, I'd love to do one-on-ones with all of you. Jothsna and Julia, you're fine, because we talk to each other a lot. If you want to do one-on-one, that's great too, but I'm not going to force you. I will force you 3. I'd love to meet with you either this week or over break on Zoom/Teams or in the early days of winter quarter. So if any particular time works for you, feel free to reach out.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the Vice Speaker's report, Joseph isn't here right now, but you can see on the agenda, I believe the GAVEL report. You cannot. OK, we'll get to that. But he's been putting together the GAVEL report and the Oversight report. We'll talk about that later with the approval of the agenda.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Hi. I also don't have much. Unfortunately, there wasn't a time that works for all of us, so there will not be a steering bottom bonding, steering bonding part to don't even. OK unfortunately. So my goal for next quarter is to start out at the beginning of the quarter, getting everyone's availability for bonding and then that way we can just like keep going through the weeks until there's a time that we can all meet. So stay tuned for that. It would be nice if we did something like a paint and sip with nonalcoholic beverages or something like that.

Pierce Wallbaum sighs loudly.

Erick Jacobsen: Can you put that in the minutes?

Julia Tanner: So yeah, that's basically all I have, I'm going through intern applications right now and interviews and then we're gonna do Senator of the month, which is a discussion item. Very excited for that. And that's that's all. So yeah, hopefully you guys have a good time with finals. Have so much fun. And hopefully your breaks go well too.

Erick Jacobsen: Julia, who who gets a certificate and prize for the 25 constituent challenge or 20 constituent challenge?

Julia Tanner: right now. Oh, it's not. It's not closed yet. Wednesday.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, so they get the prize start of next quarter?

Julia Tanner: Yeah, first, first week of winter quarter, there will be a prize for those people.

Dylan Bianchi: Has anyone met the standard already?

Julia Tanner: one person, another person's working on it.

Abigail Appleyard: is it 20 new constituents or 20 total?

Julia Tanner: 20 total. So if you guys could say that in your like committee.

Erick Jacobsen: You guys are also eligible if you'd love to get a certificate.

Julia Tanner: Besides Dylan right?

Abigail Appleyard: I don't think I'm eligible.

Julia Tanner: You're a designated seat as well. Pierce is eligible!

Erick Jacobsen: Pierce you can get 20 constituents, we'll give you a prize and a certificate.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: I was unsure what I wanted to do for the work of the day or week of the day. It's also the final one of the quarter, of the year, actually. But I landed on Humdinger, which is remarkable or outstanding person or thing of its kind. So y'all doing great. Fantastic job. Great. Quarter. I hope you enjoy your break. Come back nice and refreshed.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Recess 4:14 pm

Reconvened 4:19 pm

Recess 4:19 pm

Reconvened 4:21 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Y'all I think that Academic and Administrative Affairs minutes are the best of any committee, so if y'all want to talk to your Vice Chairs about doing it more in that style, I think that would be best. Because it's just nice to have more information. We don't require it to be verbatim

but it doesn't have to be verbatim to be thorough. I'd like to see more there. Do we feel like we need more time? I'm getting head nods – shakes.

Julia Tanner moves to approve both minutes.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to proposals, looks like we have none. That is unfortunate, but hopefully next quarter we will have more.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: So I guess we'll get right into the Senate floor agenda. And the first thing I'll say is that we need to add the Oversight and GAVEL reports to the forum section. So I'll pull those links and get that ready in the meantime does anyone have any thoughts or comments or questions on the agenda for tomorrow?

Maitri Karia: I have one for the people who join online, if they're joining using their mobile, it's very difficult to get into breakout rooms. So the instructions for that, if they can be made clear, but when I transfer it to my laptop, it's right there what you all mentioned. The double square. It's like very easy to see. Yeah, for mobile, if you want to add some small instructions.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, Joseph can move people into breakout rooms, so we might just do that. I'll write that down.

Erick Jacobsen: And feel free to send a message saying, hey, I need to be put into a breakout room, but I'll also talk to Joseph about figuring out what instructions we need to give to mobile users.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, because mobile, I felt the same thing when I was a committee chair last year. It's difficult. So people can just or Joseph can just manually put everyone into breakout rooms.

Maitri Karia: There was one more update that I shared with Joseph, but I still want to get more details, accurate details. So there was, since there was a KYC, a KYR session in the last Senate, there was an ICE incident at the School of Dentistry. I think end of October. I did mention it to Joseph, but I'm yet to get accurate specific details. I'll share it with you all once I have because the person who told us is a liaison for GPSS. But there was an ICE incident.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm going to add the oversight and GAVEL reports.

Dylan Bianchi: It's all just Joseph doing that now right?

Erick Jacobsen: Good question. Joseph will be doing all of the oversight report, but the GAVEL report will have GAVEL liaisons come up with him. I'm trying to limit the GAVEL report to hopefully 5 minutes. It might take a little bit longer, but I guess it's your call if y'all want to put a timestamp or not on these forums. We can put a timestamp on the forums together, put a timestamp on each individual forum, put a timestamp on one but not the other. There's options. So if you want to do anything, let me know

Abigail Appleyard: I don't really see a reason to like just based on the way our agenda looks right now. I don't feel like it'll take that long and it doesn't seem like we have anything that's super pressing.

Julia Tanner: I will add also in the notion of like transparency and communication, I think not putting a timestamp would be the most effective way to get the things that want to be portrayed by. Joseph and members of Gavel the best communicated without a timestamp.

Abigail Appleyard: I just also since this is like the first time we're doing it this way, it would be good to get like a real accurate sense of how long it will take and then maybe if we need to adjust next quarter, that's different, but like there should be one run of it where we don't put a limit on it.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other thoughts?

Julia Tanner moves to approve agenda.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Erick Jacobsen: One last thing I'll say we did. It has quarter debrief on there for the committee meetings. That's a suggestion. We will have, and I'll discuss this later, a survey that I'll give out in my leadership report, but in committee meetings, it'd be great if y'all took the time to remind people to fill it out. It's pretty short. And then you can have like informal conversations about how the quarter went and then whatever ice breakers or other discussion items you'd like. But I think focusing mainly on that would be great.

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to discussion items, our first is an executive session. For those of you who do not know what an executive session is, it's basically a private part of the meeting. We will pause the recording. No minutes will be taken for this section and no one who is not a member of this committee will be allowed in the room. I don't believe we have a sign for the door, Brendan. OK, we don't need a sign for the door, but I guess we'll close it and. Yeah, so it'll be a 10 minute

executive session to evaluate the qualifications of an applicant for public employee employment or to review the performance of public employee.

Reconvened 4:38

Erick Jacobsen: OK, we have technically we reached the end of our executive session. We can vote to extend it but sounds like we're good. So we'll move on. Our next discussion is proxy compensation. This is something that was a big conversation on the floor and we figured that it's probably the people in this room that are most interested in that and have the most insight on that. So I wanted to give you all a space to talk about it. In a smaller group setting, just cause we don't want to take up too much time on one amendment to the OA. So if anyone has any thoughts on proxy compensation that they wanted to share or that they didn't get a chance to share in Senate, now is the time.

Dylan Bianchi: I'm gonna stick by my stance on this on the floor, which is that we can set like a floor above which you as a proxy earn compensations, whether that's three meetings, five meetings, whatever for a couple reasons like one, I think like if one of us chairs is like sick and we miss one steering meeting is it worth docking pay right? Whereas versus like missing a quarters worth of steering meetings? That's different. Similarly, like is it worth getting you know, a proxy fully worked into the UW payment system just to pay them like 12 bucks for one steering meeting. Yeah, that's my thoughts.

Abigail Appleyard: I agree with that. But like with this system, we would still be docked for every time we miss a meeting. It's just that they wouldn't be paid unless they hit five, right? OK yeah it would just go back into the general fund if there was less than five?

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other thoughts?

Julia Tanner: I think 3 meetings should be the criteria. So if like you're getting proxied for three meetings, and that doesn't necessarily have to be in a row, but I feel like that's more. I don't know.

Dylan Bianchi: Is that more than three meetings or three or more meetings?

Julia Tanner: More than three meetings.

Erick Jacobsen: That is the number that STF uses. STF is who I modeled the Committee Chair compensation off of, and we'd have to explicitly word it because currently if you are sick for a day. You do miss out on that money. So we would have to amend that in explicitly as well. But I also think because there was a lot of back and forth on the floor, the way the amendment was worded is a little unclear as well. So if one of you, I know Abigail, you were the first to propose it, wants to take the initiative in refining the language, incorporating whatever we've discussed and making an amendment. If it's grammatical, we can just make it. But if it's adding substance, which it sounds like we will. Then you can make an amendment on the floor, but just so that we have it all like figured out.

Joseph Riggio enters.

Erick Jacobsen: Hello. Hello. A great man stopped by. We had to turn him away for our executive session. We are currently talking about proxy compensation. Are there any other thoughts? Does Joseph have thoughts?

Joseph Riggio: No because I don't know what was discussed prior.

Julia Tanner: I wanted to kind of bring up the discussion of how much would proxies be paid if they did three or like four meetings plus how would we divvy that out? Because the whole point was with the stipend was that it's not necessarily hourly. It's more of like just a stipend for all the work done as a committee chair. So how would we divvy that out from meetings missed?

Erick Jacobsen: Currently, although the idea is that it's tied to all of the work that you do, the distribution of the payment is tied to the amount of meetings you attend. So it's like percentage. So we can change that if we have a more elegant way of doing that. But it's difficult to account for everything in a way that doesn't like consider meetings attended.

Abigail Appleyard: Just in terms of like I guess, is it organized by the number of meetings or is it also considered like the length of the meetings? Like would you if you miss Senate, do you lose more than if you had missed a steering meeting or is it just like the numbers because I don't know. It's hard because like the stipend works out to less than minimum wage. So I don't know if you're even allowed to base it on hours without that like affecting like because if it's based on hours and you're paying us less, then that's not.

Erick Jacobsen: It is currently based on hours, yes. So we can base it off of meetings, especially because one of the main ideas with basing it off of hours was steering was only like an hour, but now it's more like an hour and a half and. The effect is less prominent of the difference, so we can base it off of the meetings and we can also. It's difficult to to account for, it was very difficult coming up with a way to make it work so I'm glad we're having this discussion, but I think before I go to Joseph, I'll say if we are doing proportional compensation for chairs and we want to compensate proxies for their work, we would have to explicitly say that. The money proportionately goes to the people who attended the the meetings on their behalf. That'd be something to figure out in terms of does proxying for you in Senate make you money then, which doesn't seem right. So that's another conversation we can have.

Joseph Riggio: An idea is so OK, we still need to figure out the difference because we need to clearly define what meetings are because there's steering meetings, which is the obvious one, but then there's Senate committee meetings, which can vary in length they are typically 30 minutes we could say ballpark. But an idea, I don't know how feasible it is, but an idea is so it's \$500 right now. We take now because it's based on hourly, maybe this idea is absolutely bogus, but we take \$400, we divvy a portion of that, let's just say 400 for the sake of argument and say this is meeting based compensation. The under 100 is responsibilities, so the chair would then be guaranteed \$100 stipend as long as they execute their responsibilities and then that could be deemed by Senate leadership in whatever capacity or the speaker if it's under supervision. And then the other \$400.00 is or however much we set that to is proportionate to the number of meetings attended. So there's a mixture of

both does complicate it fiscally a little bit, but at least in my head the breakdown. Could be justifiable. But yeah, I'd like to hear thoughts on that.

Abigail Appleyard: Well, the nice thing about that would be like dividing 400 by, say, ten Senate meetings and ten steering meetings works out to 20 per whatever meeting. And I just think that you can't consider time at all without it being like, it's just weird to be like it's a stipend, but it's also based on your hours. Like if it's based on meetings, I think that's different. I don't know. It's just it's a weird way to word it.

Brendan Chang: So to help put it into context, it's based off of "hours" because that's how it has to be programmed into the budget and that's also how it has to be filed. That's just how the system works. There really isn't a way to like, it's just a huge Workday limitation, which is actually, it's like a whole thing right now. That's why it's hourly, that's just the way it has to be put on a piece of paper. But whether you want to actually say it's for your hours or if there's a stipend is really up to you as a body and Senate kind of manages that within itself. And for legality purposes, stipends can be less than minimum wage because it's just technically it's considered a financial support flat payment rather than just like that for legality things. But I hope that puts a bit more into context.

Erick Jacobsen: I am technically working less than minimum wage for the Washington Student Association.

Abigail Appleyard: Is it a flat payment if it's proportional? I guess I just don't understand how that works, but that's just like a technical thing.

Erick Jacobsen: I think it's about distribution versus calculation. It's distributed as a flat payment but it's like calculated sort of hourly or like the other way around. I don't know.

Joseph Riggio: This is a question for you, Erick, because you oversee the Senate budget for these stipends, are these like line items that are specific for? Like this money is reserved for this committee chair or do we have a bit of leeway in terms of like we just have one over. Oh, I see. I think you understand my question.

Erick Jacobsen: So currently the way it's allocated in the budget is committee chair stipends times four is the line item that it is and \$6000 is appropriated to that. So. It makes it OK. It does sort of make sense for us to say that someone chairing, like performing the duties of the committee chair, which includes chairing the meeting, the committee meeting, or coming here would be able to receive that. So I think in terms of budgetary policy, we're probably in the clear. But that is how it's allocated. And then I spoke with Khushi and Owen at the beginning of the year and they know that it'll be distributed at the end of the quarter and I will talk to them about the specific numbers for each of you once I sit down and make the calculations, but that's generally the process and the way it's allocated.

Abigail Appleyard: is it just a check or is it direct deposit that goes through Workday?

Erick Jacobsen: It's direct deposit.

Brendan Chang: it's actually what you opt in during onboarding.

Abigail Appleyard: probably direct deposit.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other thoughts on this? We can also have more in depth conversations one-on-one or in future steering meetings and after this OA we can always change it again. Or if we want to take this question out entirely and then rework payment in a more substantial way with more time, that's also an option. But I just wanted to give you all the chance to talk about it here and to basically clarify the wording that's currently in the amendment. Are there any final thoughts on this topic?

Abigail Appleyard: should I go through with writing an updated amendment or should I?

Erick Jacobsen: Sure, if you feel comfortable with that. moving on to liaison management discussion. This is pretty similar. It's like operational. We wanted to loop you in, but basically Joseph and I in our meeting with Brendan started going back and forth and we're like, maybe we should dedicate time to this instead of taking up Brendan's, but basically the idea is currently the Vice Speaker is in charge of overseeing liaisons, which is a change that I made in the OA because I wanted to appropriately account for the lost time of no longer being on board, but now it's kind of a lot. So we were having a discussion on whether that should stay with the Vice Speaker, go back to the Speaker or go up to the Speaker I guess, or whether we wanted to create an oversight chair again. Maybe not that title, maybe no committee attached, but a position, paid or unpaid, an internship, whatever that handles that specifically. And I wanted to hear your thoughts on that.

Joseph Riggio: Before thoughts, I'll give a couple since the positioning question is my position essentially for some context of what the day in the life looks like for the Senate Vice Speaker. So this wouldn't be a problem if I wasn't the chair of GAVEL simultaneously and with GAVEL being as structured as it is now, fortunately we are getting interns for GAVEL, so the work is going to be a bit lighter, but with attendance policy being the parliamentarian, helping legislation efforts as well as GAVEL. I just don't have, I only have 15 hours guys that I get paid for and I work overtime most weeks. So in an effort to try and delineate the work a little bit and delegate it to someone or something else, liaisons. The potential that liaisons have to create a meaningful impact in Senate is huge and very untapped into. And for me personally, like something that I plan on doing in winter quarter is having a Teams chat with all the liaisons and try and have like at least a virtual committee of sorts to pass ideas to each other because there's not a lot of communication between committees right now. And that's an effort that I want to start next quarter. But I'm going to be honest with my efforts being focused on GAVEL this quarter or trying to set that up, the liaison management for me has been put on the back burner. I still got through, I got reports back, the monthly reports. As you saw of the liaison report is ready to go. A lot of committees didn't meet this quarter, so it's pretty light. But winter quarter, when all these committees are finally meeting, it's going to be a lot of work. Which again, I am mentally sane somehow, so I don't really mind if I have to take it on, but I think we should definitely have a conversation as to maybe having a position dedicated for this because we can do a lot more with our liaisons than we're currently doing.

Abigail Appleyard: I guess kind of the thought that I had would be to have someone like within GAVEL, but not like a GAVEL member kind of managing that like again, some sort of intern type position. I feel like you would probably want it to be someone who's a little bit more experienced in ASUW in Senate, you know, someone who was a liaison in the past. But that could be like, a position is good rather than just delegating it to like somebody else who's like already has that responsibilities or you or I don't know having the committee chairs do it.

Erick Jacobsen: I will say I have the capacity to do it. In terms of hours, I can make it work. So just don't consider that too much. But I, yeah, I get where you're coming from. That makes sense.

Pierce Wallbaum: Is it just like really tricky to split up the liaison like management between the two of you? If there's some more room for you and that would help with the liaison burden for you? Or is it just like too much? I guess.

Erick Jacobsen: That's what we're currently talking about in order to like past the time when we find out a more permanent solution. But it's not ideal because it requires like constant like communication between each other and very specific delineation of oh well, who's reaching out about committee times? Who's reaching out to the chair about it? Here's your new member who's reaching out to the members about their responsibilities and it's not ideal to have to, with everything you do on that, coordinate with someone else.

Joseph Riggio: I imagine if we were to create a position. So I'll layout my argument for this. We don't have to go with it, but I think ideally an elected position that would be a similar authority as a chair in terms of I would love for this to be a paid position and have similar to like GAVEL chair, like the liaison person, whatever we title that would have regular meetings with liaisons and whatnot. That currently doesn't happen. I don't have one-on-ones with liaisons right now. I wish I did. Also like GAVEL meets like one hour, the same hour every single week, Thursdays 3:30 to 4:30. If we can do that with liaisons too, I think that could be really beneficial for cross communication about different like legislation workshops that could be had. Or just knowing about different issues across and I think it would empower people to continue attending their committees too, if they feel like they can rely on each other a little bit more for help. But yeah, I kind of I'll briefly layout the tasks that this liaison person would probably manage that I currently do. So one of the huge things that you probably noticed this year was we had a lot of trouble getting in touch with chairs from different committees and councils and what not about when and where meetings were, which is pretty detrimental to us when electing because we've all, I mean JCC is a good example. We had a resignation immediately after we had STF and budget. Finance and budget committee we had to work around to because they couldn't make meetings this quarter and that was because we didn't know when they were meeting and they didn't know either. So that person would follow up with those chairs. They would probably have to develop a decent understanding of the bylaws of the different committees too and just double check and make sure that the liaisons know the responsibilities and rights in each committee. That would be pretty important. Two, meeting or three technically, meeting with liaison members, whether it be one-on-one or in a group setting. If we do like a Teams channel, you know managing that as well. So there's a pretty substantial amount

of hours that that do go into this role that I would argue should get paid. But again, we can be doing so much more with liaisons or this position.

Maitri Karia: I was saying I do exactly the work that you're mentioning right now with Ryan. So we have a liaison committee because it was so spread out and we're not able to leverage the people who are interested in student governments in the first place and just getting them together and information sharing purposes. So we did get it streamlined although and it is actually working in our favor. People are, we got to know about the ICE incident through a liaison. So that is when we had a meeting every month we meet. There's a proper management system that we've brought into place, but again I think Ryan manages the chair communication and I manage the liaison communication and the other, you know, providing them with their primary point of contacts or helping them collaborate, scheduling the meetings every month, managing the documents, helping them understand what GPSS is doing, not only asking them for updates but giving our updates as well and it does help. I don't know payment wise of course mine is a paid position but if looking at it from a non payment point of view but having such a system in place is benefiting us, GPSS as a body.

Abigail Appleyard: Is it feasible, like is there, do we have enough money that this could be paid or is that kind of like a, you know, down the road pipe dream?

Erick Jacobsen: It's a tough question. We have a lot of money in the general fund, but we're in a deficit year to year for ASUW. Senate, we cut down on our costs, including the lowered prices for maintaining committee chairs. We lowered a lot of costs. We removed cart captioning. It's shifted to OID, which has funding for cart captioning for everyone. We lowered our programming budget. We made a lot of cuts to our budget in order to account for the deficit. We are still in a deficit ASUW wide. Cuts have been made in other places as well. I wouldn't be surprised if more cuts were made. So we're in, we have a lot of money that can be used once and not a lot of recurring money right now. So I think if it's a question of would BOD give us that money, I think the answer would be yes. But the question should be more along the lines of is that a responsible, sustainable use of funds which we can discuss.

Abigail Appleyard: Is it possible you could pitch it as like, you know, we're test running this and we'll see if we find it beneficial over winter quarter and then if not, you know, we'll reevaluate for spring?

Erick Jacobsen: I think if we ask for the money they'll say yes.

Abigail Appleyard: You just mean like for a year over year is probably like if there's different?

Erick Jacobsen: I think they'd say yes to that too. I think the question is should we not is it able to happen? It's more is that the right decision given the deficit and all those other factors.

Julia Tanner: I would argue that it is responsible as compared to other decisions that ASUW is making with money, we as leadership like it's been, we are all, all of us are very driven individuals with a lot on our plates. And as Joseph just laid out, he only has 15 hours. I only have 15 hours. Eric has 18. Those have been lowered in the past and it is really difficult to get like all our tasks done. So

if it would be available to hire someone else and pay them for this job, that would take burdens off of Joseph and would allow us to not have that burden fall on us and I think it would be responsible because like you said, there's a lot of potential there to tap into as far as communication between ASUW and committees go. There's a theme like within ASUW of trying to get more representation, communication and community this year. So that is like another opportunity we as Senate could do that. So I think the answer to is it responsible? Yeah, I would say it is.

Abigail Appleyard: I think my thought then would be someone working within GAVEL not like a GAVEL member earning a stipend do this position.

Erick Jacobsen: Why within GAVEL

Abigail Appleyard: I just think it would be if he's the one who's doing it right now, it might be nice, especially initially to have that kind of oversight and to be able to.

Joseph Riggio: So context to the GAVEL chair and the Oversight. I am now GAVEL and the Oversight Chair. That was not the case last year. The Vice Speaker had none, I mean, they, I know Jacob would check in on Aiden and whatnot to see how liaisons and whatnot were going. Same with Andal. But it wasn't in their official responsibilities. From a parliamentary standpoint, we might, if we were to go that route of assigning a GAVEL member, we would have to expand in the standing committee in the clauses where GAVEL is, we have to do an OA to expand that because it's clear in the bylaws that GAVEL is for implementation of follow up of policies. So we would then have to read in a way to expand GAVEL to encompass liaisons, I would argue that and just from my experience doing both GAVEL work and liaison work, they're very different. The policy and resolution follow up, while there is some overlap in terms of overseeing members and members' work and whatnot there's similarities there. The nature of the work is very different. A liaison is more focused on taking being present at committee meetings on a regular outside of ASUW, sometimes internal with ASUW, but non relational to Senate and GAVEL does have meetings and stuff like that, but it's more relational and the forbidden word that I cannot say but follow up and implementation and student advocacy anyway. I don't think it's a bad idea to do a test run though. I think we could make an argument, maybe not for like winter quarter, but we would have to do it this fiscal year and then and maybe even in the next year and we can just in our transition documents or somewhere or even in the like in the OA we can even say codify it in the, and be like a sunset clause or something for that's also possible.

Erick Jacobsen: I will say that when it comes to creating a paid position, that's not something we can do the middle of the year. The only way right now we can do it for this year to temporarily relieve Joseph of his suffering is to do an unpaid internship, which we are not bound by the volunteer and intern policy anymore. So we can do that, but I can also take it on for the rest of this year and. We won't have to create that internship and then next year we do a new position, but we would have to create the new position from the bylaws and then definitely account for it in the budget. I think I'm sold on the idea of a new position for this. I was not at the start of this conversation. But I've been convinced and I like the idea of also having like a standing committee in quotation marks of all the liaisons cause they were very successful meetings that Andal coordinated

last year with all the liaisons present. And that being a a more regular thing to give frequent reports and stuff would be great. And it would function sort of like moving the GAVEL committee outside of Senate. It'd be a little less formal, a little less duties, but whatever or whatever. But it can happen and that could be also a good justification for paying a position and for electing that position

Abigail Appleyard: What if we just, I mean, it would be the same thing that we have to wait until next year or whatever, but if we made, took oversight out of Joseph's role and just made this person the oversight chair, just called it that?

Erick Jacobsen: I advise against that nomenclature because it'd be a bit confusing. Um, but we can say like liaison manager or chief liaison or, we have infinite possibilities for titles.

Maitri Karia: Yeah, along with the liaison management, they can contribute to maybe assisting you in the value, something of that sort because being the liaison management in the management, you need more exposure to what internally ASUW is also doing so that there's a two way communication. We can get information sharing and not just them because they require a lot of support from you as to what should they speak in the committee, what should be their input. So that person needs to have a lot of internal knowledge as well.

Erick Jacobsen: We can also justify putting them on steering.

Joseph Riggio: Yeah that's a possibility for steering, but I think that if we were to have a standing committee for liaisons, I do agree with Maitri in that GAVEL and liaisons could be like we can have a GAVEL member show up to the liaison standing committee meeting or whatnot and like kind of maybe have that two way communicate. Like again, there's so much potential that we're not tapping like we can be so creative with this. It's just a limitation of how many hours I have in my life.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah I'm certainly convinced now.

Jothsna Sundar: Just a thought about like the amount of experience we would want someone to have in this position. I don't know what our rules are, but would we want to maybe limit it to like not freshmen or require something about like experience cause like in theory I could possibly like take up some of this work, but I don't think I have the ASUW knowledge or experience to like do it well. That's just my thought.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah. If we do it as an elected position and structure it the way we structure committee chair elections, they would have had to be a senator the previous year. So I'll ask for final thoughts. We can also have this on our agenda in winter. This is a very much continuous conversation and the next two items aren't. But does anyone have any final pressing thoughts that can't wait? Great. Moving on to winter steering times. This time is best for a lot of reasons, but if it doesn't work for a lot of people then we can move it around. I would say please Monday. So if anyone has their schedules sort of decided and for some reason 4:00 to 5:30 is the worst possible thing and you can do another time on Monday, we can talk about that, but keep in mind that it is scheduled with OPMA and with the HUB. We'd have to change both of those and with OPMA, probably have to be a special meeting, which means that we're very limited on what we can do. We

have to set the agenda like 3 days beforehand. We can't amend it. We can't add things. Since then, the way we got around that was adding proposal one, proposal two and then filling it in if we had proposals. But it's kind of a headache and not very fun. And also the reason we chose Monday from 4:00 to 5:30 is because it's right before Senate. We have the most amount of time for people to submit their legislation for that to be incorporated into the agenda and then we can send out all the information for Senate right before Senate, and it's accurate and we have less people going up in the middle of the Senate meeting and adding things to the agenda because we gave them all the time they could possibly need, but. Before I get into holiday stuff, were there thoughts on that or feedback?

Abigail Appleyard: I think it's hard for me because being in public health, there are so many people who are premed, but they all take their science requirements during the normal part of the day and then they push our public health classes towards the evening. I can do like it literally my class is right during that block, but I could do any time after that if I don't know like if I can't go, I can't go. But if it like also was inconvenient for other people, then I would advocate to maybe switch it around a bit, but I don't want to, things shouldn't change just because my major is weird.

Erick Jacobsen: I do know that Tanya has a class that ends at 4:30 next quarter but also that's what the conversation around the proxies is for and working out those proxies. We can find a way to make it work, I'd say probably not move it later in the day on Monday because it already like the HUB closes at 5:00 first of all or those doors close at 5 I guess it's dark. We don't want to be out too late. I don't want to be out too late.

Joseph Riggio: Take this with a grain of salt because I am perfectly willing to do tedious extra work if we vote to change the meeting times and but we did submit to the public records office already when our meeting times are that was submitted over. Actually, I think literally today was their submission time. So the government knows there's one more meeting. Yeah, so it would. I can do it. It would be tedious and I would have to go back and forth with the records office because they literally just submitted it because there are a couple holiday things I had to shift around that I was not mentally awake while doing. So I had to resend them a request and that's when I learned, oh, Thanksgiving break was literally the the last possible moment I could have done this, which worked out for me but then I learned, oh, it's gonna be really hard to change anything. Again, grain of salt. I can do it, but again.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll also add the reason I think it's better to say a time and then if it doesn't work for someone, it doesn't work. We figure it out with proxies and stuff because two years ago they tried to change steering every quarter and work around everyone's schedule and it was a logistical nightmare. And then also it ended up with things like steering at 10:00 AM on a Thursday and that's I don't think any of you want that. It's better to work your schedule around an existing commitment than to work an existing commitment around a schedule that might be evolving. So I'm in favor of just keeping it.

Abigail Appleyard: just to be clear though that totally works so much better for people in like Poli Sci and like, yeah, not STEM classes. Yeah, just like to be, you know what we're talking about. I

don't want to say privilege because like, it's not whatever. Yeah, it's scheduled in a way that like supports the poli side people who are already very well represented in Senate. And there are other people who want, I don't know, whatever. It's not like gonna shift the whole thing, but like something to be cognizant of is like, yeah, other majors have classes at different times.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, no, that's a that's an excellent point to make. I will also say that this meeting on the one hand this time has worked out perfectly so that I'm able to post the floor agenda every day, um, but one with the coming quarter, there is a chance that we're going to get a lot more proposals and that'll make my job super stressful to like post the floor agenda in time. So I'm already anticipating a challenge with that, so. If we move the meeting further into the day, that would cause a problem. I do think that this is a good point that Tanya's also in some classes and other classes that are later in the day, and I do think that it's benefiting poli sci majors. I would like to offer the idea that maybe if we're not able to do it like this next quarter or spring quarter, but to switch it to like a Thursday or a Friday at a time that works for more people. That way the agenda can be posted way in advance. Without stress and that would suit more majors.

Erick Jacobsen: what time are you thinking?

Julia Tanner: That would have to be a discussion.

Erick Jacobsen: Because it's difficult to account for everyone in the future. We can account for everyone currently on steering and maybe find something and maybe it is 10:00 AM and maybe that works for a lot of sponsors, maybe it doesn't, but. When it comes to setting a set time, typically we set it for next year as well. We send in the OPR like bookings and stuff so that they know enough in advance that this is a regular meeting and not a special meeting. Because if it was a special meeting, it would greatly limit our ability to perform business. I'll say that's fair, it definitely benefits people with more flexible majors, which is bad. And if there's times that work for more majors like on average, then we can discuss that. I think it's difficult to account for people without thinking of it as like who is the most people that could be committee chair that it would work for versus who's the most people that work for now. And I'll add that my classes aren't necessarily a problem, but when I'm scheduling standing meetings with ASUW, with my second job, with all my clubs, I have to fill out so many When2Meets usually it's quarter to quarter and it's difficult for me to say. I don't know when my schedule is gonna be because this has to be decided, this has to be decided, this has to be decided. And it's like all of those are decided with like when2meet and all of it is like building around my schedule, which is is great, but it also means that sometimes what works for the most people in two different things is the same time and then I have to go back and say. Actually, I can't make that time and I have to pick. And it was something when I was scheduling my meetings with Brendan for this quarter, I kept saying, oh, I don't know when my things are. And it's frustrating and difficult if you don't know when your things are.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I would say I do prefer that we keep it at the time we got it just through this year because I also like I have to build my work schedule, my class schedule. I had to change one of the classes I was in because I realized I had doubled it with steering. And so I think it is, it just makes life easier to have something that we can plan on quarter to quarter to quarter and that allows

like me personally at least to then make time for steering and also like my job and avoid conflicts there.

Abigail Appleyard: I just think it's like, no, I agree with keeping it. It's just because like, I have to change my class because it didn't fit with steering like I have to take this class to graduate. And so it's a little different, but that's So that's not like, I apologize because I didn't actually mean to have my hand up and then I had my hand up. So just a thought, especially because like last year Tejasvini was also like a public health major. Clearly off campus loves their public health majors. And I, you know, we still got some in there right now. So it's just and if Tanya is also, yeah, not super social sciences related, like just moving forward, I've already planned that I'm not going to be able to make steering. So like I'm not, you know, broken up about it or whatever, but. Just like in the discussion of being equitable and you know, wanting to have Senate be more diverse, like basically making it so that if you aren't on a very flexible like earlier in the day focused schedule, you just can't be in Senate leadership isn't a good idea.

Erick Jacobsen: Before we go to Pierce and Joseph, with Tanya's schedule, her computer science classes are more focused in the morning, and it is her Poly Sci meeting that is currently conflicting. But. That just goes to show you that STEM is I'm sure STEM for her is rigid as well, but it's rigid in a different way and it also makes it difficult to account for because if we wanted to do a time that worked for more people and we chose, say, a morning time, then it would not work for her specifically anymore, but that's just something to consider as well as different requirements.

Pierce Wallbaum: I was just going to say I feel like the time that we currently have it at is very efficient. I think it's the day before Senate. So we can really plan for the next day. We don't have to remember like, oh, what we talked about last week and. You know, it makes it very seamless in planning for Senate. Also, I really get trying to plan around like other majors, but I mean poli sci, poli sci, poli sci, poli sci, like I know, but I'm just saying like if we want to, if we want to plan for what works for people who are attending Senate. And I think all of us but one do have more flexible schedules. Like I get it and that means that we should be more flexible with Senate also. But I think it does work for the vast majority of us and so I just really like today at this time also. And yeah, pushing it later would I don't. That wouldn't even work with having to post the agenda. Maybe earlier could also be an option like 3 to 4:30 if that works better for some people. Maybe it's not as dark later or. It's not as dark when it's earlier, but yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: And I'll add that when it comes to Senate time specifically, I've had someone come up to me and say you don't have many theater majors in Senate, do you? And I'm like, no, now that you mention it. And they're like, Oh yeah, because this, this and this happens at on Tuesdays between 5:00 and 7:00. And so. Scheduling we're not gonna be able to cast an all inclusive net. We can try and cast a more inclusive net if we can, but we'd have to be talking about it in very concrete terms.

Joseph Riggio: I'll address Pierce's point first. I think it would be extremely hypocritical of us if we are to expand our departmental representation and not be cognizant of the fact that you brought up, which is many of us are poli sci majors or social science majors, and instead of trying to adapt to

find a more adaptive and innovative compromise approach that we just gear it to whatever has worked before, but what's worked before is has worked because that it's mainly been social science majors. So we're never going to be able to expand to other departments if we keep the same system. I'm going to shatter the the box that we're in currently, and maybe it's a stupid idea or maybe it's a brilliant idea. I don't know. I want to hear your thoughts if we have time, but we could expand the options for steering. What I mean by that is we have Monday meetings, OK? Every other week we have Friday meetings or we have Thursday meetings. Now, while this would complicate my job, I don't care. I'm the one proposing this idea and we'd have to, you know, put in our Oh no, we have to put two different meeting times in the schedule and make sure they're consistent and lined up. And sure, it might confuse some legislators and whatnot to try and figure out when Senate or steering is mean because it's inconsistent. But if we were to switch every other week, we do Mondays, one day and Fridays like Monday's one week the following week we do Friday and then we switch every other day and one of them. We can try and make it work for as many different departmental majors as possible. And if we need to keep the Monday structure, this is a temporary solution for this year by the way. We need to figure out something more concrete for the future, but. We could do alternating Meetings at different times. That's an idea.

Erick Jacobsen: Not necessarily speaking to that but speaking to Friday as an option, I think Friday is a very good day to have meetings generally, I think people have the least amount of obligations, but there is always a lot of pushback when I suggest Friday meetings. And last year I or maybe the year before. No, it was last year. Last year I suggested it in steering at one point and there were some committee chairs who shot that idea down. But this is your job. So I will ask that if we decide that Friday fits the most schedules that. We accommodate for that because we are being paid real money to do this. That's something that frustrated me last year.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I really don't think we should do multiple meeting times because like your class schedule is going to be weekly repeating. My work schedule, and I'm pretty sure most people's work schedule is weekly repeating. So if you set two different meeting times, for us that have to be here every week, we're now having to carve two separate portions, like two. Yeah, I think there is a genuine cost of making things more complicated. I don't think we should look past that. I think we should be more careful. Frankly, I think ASUW as a whole we need to be more careful about creating new committees and creating new positions and creating more complicated schedules and all of that stuff. Because it does make things harder for people to follow, especially if we're trying to be more accessible. So I just, I don't think it's a workable solution. And I do think I also don't necessarily think that moving this meeting earlier in the day is actually going to make it more accessible. I think the closer you get to like noon to afternoon type area, the more classes there just are happening on campus. Frankly, I get that there are some majors that have relatively more classes in the evening than like Poli Sci has classes in the evening, but I think most majors still have the bulk of their classes between like 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM. This is anecdotal. I don't have evidence of this really. So I think trying to move steering because clearly we at least on Mondays we can't really move it later in the day. I don't think moving steering early today is going to make it particularly easier to

make for anyone. I know that I personally in both my poli sci and like non poly sci like gen ed classes I've had like the bulk of them be from roughly 10:00 to 3:00.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll also add that later in the day is not ideal for a lot of people. If it's like if the end time starts to be past like 7:30, then that becomes really difficult. And I've had BOD Meetings like that, which they suck. It's it sucks to go that long. It sucks to be in a meeting until 9:00 or 10:00 PM. And it sucks to even be in a meeting until 8:00 PM. I have a meeting at 6:30 after this. It'll go until at least 8:30, probably 9:00, 9:30. That's going to be hell.

Abigail Appleyard: I would support like I would totally be in favor of doing like Friday afternoon. I think that people's schedules are generally later on Friday. And I do agree with your point that like if you're being paid to do something like you should be carving out time to do it and not be like it's Friday; I want to go to the beach.

Joseph Riggio: I obviously I think we need to spend more time on this conversation I would be in favor of moving it to Friday too. And that's simply because it seems, again, being in social sciences, I'm in my own echo chamber but I do have a lot of friends in STEM majors, public health majors, CS majors especially, where it seems like universally Friday is a quiz section day or more of a section day which is again what Erick was pointing to a little bit lighter and so I would also agree with Abigail that if we're trying to be more inclusive to different departments, perhaps a Friday time could be better, and maybe we could schedule it in a way that can happen, so instead of it happening during where a section time would be, because most sections or labs or whatnot happen at set blocks of times we can maybe have it be where if you need to miss half of the steering meeting you can come for the latter like 45 minutes like that's still possible. So I think there just needs to be a bit more thinking and innovation with how we approach scheduling steering going forward but its not easy I'll admit that.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm going to move on to the second part of this discussion because we are running out of time and we can talk about this more later, it sounds like we're not going to change the winter steering time so we can have a more concrete discussion about the steering times going forward, potentially even including spring quarter if we get the chance to change our regular booking with OPR. But I will say there are two Monday holidays next quarter and Huskies on the Hill is on a Tuesday, and Huskies on the Hill has never been on a Tuesday for as long as I've been aware. But it is on a Tuesday so we'll probably have to cancel Senate, and we'll probably have to reschedule our meetings for the ones that are scheduled for MLK and Presidents Day, so those two speaking to Fridays, what are your availabilities on Fridays for a special steering meeting?

Abigail Appleyard: Everything but 10:00-11:30.

Erick Jacobsen: Great, I'll ask more specifically, how does 1:00-2:30 sound? No, I'm getting vigorous shaking of the head from Jothisna, what's your availability?

Jothisna Sundar: It's not so much my availability as like I'm gonna be so real, I am not the most essential person to have this meeting run, just record it, I can do the minutes later. So if 1:00-2:30

really works for people that's fine, my schedule can be like somewhat disregarded for this particular thing.

Erick Jacobsen: It'll only be two meetings this won't be a standing thing, we can talk about standing meetings in the future. But is there a time on Friday that's an hour and a half that would work for you?

Jothsna Sundar: Oh wait I'm totally lying I moved my quiz section so 1:00-2:30, my sincerest apologies, 1:00-2:30 does actually work for me.

Erick Jacobsen: Great! Does 1:00-2:30, Dylan tell me, give me a one and a half hour block that you're available on Fridays.

Dylan Bianchi: After 3:30.

Erick Jacobsen: How does 3:30-5:00 sound? Are we good?

Pierce Wallbaum: It's really hard to say because we don't get our work schedules until during break so I don't know when I'll be working on Fridays.

Erick Jacobsen: I guess we have time for this. We do have to move on very quickly, but we will be canceling Senate on February 10th I imagine. Is everyone OK with that? I'm not happy about it. But I mean its worth it.

Joseph Riggio: if anyone's planning not to go to Huskies on the Hill I guess we could have a sacrificial lamb to do a legislative workshop.

Erick Jacobsen: But still we'd have to account for quorum, we want to encourage senators to go to Huskies on the Hill.

Joseph Riggio: it doesn't need to be an official meeting.

Erick Jacobsen: Well then we're canceling. We're canceling the meeting. We will move on, we only have 10 minutes in this room. Quarter debrief rose, bud, thorn. One to two sentences please for the love of god.

Julia Tanner: I'll say rose we've gotten the meetings to run really smoothly, bud, I'm excited for all the senators to join after we put up posters next quarter. And thorn, oh the website being down and then it was randomly back up, but we don't have any control over it.

Erick Jacobsen: Bud? What you're looking forward to.

Julia Tanner: New senators when we put up posters.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm looking forward to Erick Jacobsen doing his job.

Dylan Bianchi: Rose my committee passed a bill. Bud, they're getting slowly more enthusiastic as time goes on. Thorn, they're getting slowly more enthusiastic as time goes on.

Maitri Karia: This is really good. I enjoy, I don't know I mean this like talking to y'all and listening to y'all, it's a lot of ideas, I guess that would be a good part of this. Bud is no thorns or bud, I know schedules are tough, Fridays, if y'all want my availability, I don't have anything I just have Tuesdays and Thursdays and GPSS gets done on Wednesdays but I am really interested in taking my work forward in liaison management so if anyone wants to discuss further, you can, just feel free to connect with me any time.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, I'm going to skip over Francisco because he hasn't been to as many meetings as Jacob has and then I'll go to Abigail.

Abigail Appleyard: I would say my rose was our committee bonding because I feel like we had pretty good attendance. Bud I need to work on speaking in public because I cannot read those bills and thorn me speaking in public.

Pierce Wallbaum: My rose is just that committee members have been reaching out to me a lot more like actually asking me things and I'm like oh yeah I forgot I am your committee chair, you can reach out to me so its still new I'm adjusting to it but its always nice when they reach out to me and ask me for like help on legislation or anything. Bud, is that, I would say just honestly working with everybody, I hope that some people might have more ideas for legislation because a lot of times its just parliamentary questions, but I hope that they get more comfortable putting themselves out there and then thorn is just I have not been able personally to be in my committee for like the last four or five meetings because either we didn't have committee meetings or I was in AAA for my own bill so I wish I got more time with them.

Jothsna Sundar: I'll try and be fast, rose, I don't know Senate is fun, I like being involved here, and I like working with you all. Bud, I am excited to over break like try and make my job easier for myself so I have more time to like do more interesting things with senate because not gonna lie, the minutes are kind of boring. Thorn, yeah general tech difficulties has been interesting which I can't really complain that much about.

Joseph Riggio: My rose is other than GAVEL because I praise GAVEL like all the time, they're doing fantastic, I'll save that for my rosebud. GAVEL, yeah, so my rosebud is probably, unlike Abigail like, well, it is a learned skill but reading the legislative agenda during that steering meeting man I was proud of myself for that one that was a long ass legislative agenda, anyway, thorn, I need to clarify the proxy policy more man, I get some wild requests sometimes for proxies or proof of attendance too, its always a joy but its still a thorn nonetheless. Rosebud, I'm so stoked for what GAVEL can do this year, they have proved a lot of great potential and I'm so excited to see what they'll do in the coming quarters. Promote GAVEL.

Erick Jacobsen: My rose is definitely GAVEL. I think GAVEL is doing so amazing and I'm so impressed everyday with them. My bud is the list of 18 pieces of legislation being worked on. I can't wait for all 18 of them to be submitted at the same time on the same day. But I love to see all the ideas for legislation, and I'd love more to see them happen. My thorn I don't know everything is great y'all, I'm so happy and everything is so amazing. The website sucks, I can't wait for it to work

finally. Any final feedback, what's something we should keep in mind going in to next quarter you can also tell me later. Are we doing great? Can I be a better chair how can I be a better chair?

Julia Tanner: Posters.

Erick Jacobsen: put that in the minutes please. How else can I be a better chair?

Pierce Wallbaum: to do like a one on one should we just like reach out to you and say like I can meet this time.

Erick Jacobsen: yeah that works. Sounds like I'm the best chair in the world? That's what I'm hearing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erick Jacobsen: Announcements and public comment, does anyone have any announcements or would any member of the public like to speak?

Francisco Dojenia: I move to adjourn.

Erick Jacobsen: You can't. Any announcements?

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

3-2-0

5:40 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
