



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

1/5/2026

HUB 307

4:00 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

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

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

TBD On-Campus Committee Chair | E

Kavi Pasupathi (he/him), Off-Campus Committee Vice 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

Alan Galvez (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

Julia Tanner seconds

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've been doing a little work over break. Mostly just some like administrative stuff preparing for this quarter. A lot of it was like reviewing our survey which we're gonna get into as a discussion item later and then just various things. I met with all of our committee chairs for your quarterly check-in and that was great. But yeah, that's pretty much all I have to report start of the new quarter. So I'll move on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: So I'm just going to summarize what I've been doing over break. I do choose to work over break. Yay. But I made a lot of progress on a lot of GAVEL resources and materials. I've been working on trying to strengthen the committee's resources. Some of that includes something that will benefit all of us is a UW people contact list that I'm surprised was never made before. It's a comprehensive list of contacts from Student Life, from UW executive branches to the Provost and President's office. It has all the deans and associate deans, their assistants. Very comprehensive list. It also has Bothell and Tacoma campuses on it too, so I'll be sharing that out shortly and I'm just finalizing a couple things with it so everyone can benefit from it. I've also been we hired 2 interns for the GAVEL committee. Congratulations to Teddy and Colin, they are going to help me with leadership efforts for GAVEL and just doing a lot of the administrative back end work and making sure that we're successful. GAVEL applications will be open or they already are open. They will close on January 13th. I plan on making an announcement tomorrow, so if you have senators that are interested in GAVEL's activities, you can refer them to that application or me for questions if you want. In terms of my other Vice Speaker duties, I've been well, as you'll see, there's an OA that I'm introducing later today. I'll talk about that then, but I've also been working on just making sure our meetings are all good for this year, especially what we have a couple meetings due to holidays that are gonna be on Friday instead, including the meeting that substitutes, we're gonna meet on the 16th instead of 19th cause the 19th is a holiday. Same for the holiday in February too. So keep a lookout for emails from me about any changes to the locations, dates, times of our meetings. They will still be the same time three or sorry 4:00 to 5:30 in here, it'll just be a different day. And that is all for me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Awesome. Welcome back everyone. So first off, if you have anything you'd like me to promote for this week's pre meeting brief, send it to me ASAP and I'll include it in the e-mail. And then tomorrow I'll be announcing the senators who got 20 plus constituents. We had a grand total of two. Two senators got 20 plus constituents. Hopefully we'll get more people to do it this quarter. I'm gonna try to like a few tactics to kinda do that, but we really wanna get representation, so we'll keep trying. For bonding for steering and the rest leadership and floor, I'm still working on that, so stay tuned for that over the next couple of weeks. And then for committee chairs specifically, I updated the committee sheet, so it should like reflect who is actually in your committee. I just removed all the deactivated senators. And I want to try to be more up to date with this over this quarter. So I'm sorry about that for last quarter, but hopefully it'll be better. But let me know if you have any questions with that. And then I haven't decided on an intern yet. I'll decide this week and so that'll be exciting. That's all I have

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Alan Galvez: No updates from Brendan so nothing to report.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the minutes, we have Senate steering from December 1st and Senate floor from December 2nd.

Recess 4:05 pm

Reconvened 4:15 pm

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 4-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to proposals, we have one proposal an Organic Act OA-32-2, an Organic Act to establish a Select Committee tasked with reviewing constitutional amendments, and this is sponsored by Joseph, but before I give it off to him, please keep in mind that because this is an organic act, this is basically our committee meeting for it. So it doesn't go through committees in Senate. So we have the ability to make amendments directly to this organic act in addition to

approving it towards the floor agenda. So with that disclaimer out of the way, Joseph, would you like to read your bill?

Joseph Riggio reads [OA-32-02 An Organic Act to Establish a Select Committee Tasked with Reviewing Constitutional Amendments](#)

Erick Jacobsen: I will say I think technically we may need amendment for that, even though your intent was bills. Technically the meaning would still change.

Joseph Riggio: We can also change that to constitutional question or something or ballots.

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like to explain a little bit more?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, so context, it's a little bit in the bill summary, but. I have been contacted by a few senators who have been collectively working on an effort to promote constitutional amendments or draft constitutional amendments to address some of the long-standing issues in ASUW, especially over the last three years. And so there, we are anticipating multiple pieces of legislation to come in to the Student Senate regarding that this committee is going, so one of the reasons why I'm a proponent of creating a select committee last year we had to sacrifice, many of you who here last year remember we had to basically sacrifice what was a General Affairs to the JCC condemnation bill for an undetermined amount of time and then when it was recommitted we had to again sacrifice the committee. So this is to prevent that from happening because we are anticipating not just these constitutional amendments and Senate bills that are to come in, but also as I mentioned, in a whereas Clause Erick is anticipating, hopefully many sponsors are going to propose their own resolutions. And we're going to have hopefully an influx of legislation this quarter and possibly next quarter. Yeah, crossing fingers there. So this is an effort to really and I really tried to take time to look and see if this is legally viable. It is. I combed through Roberts rules. I tried to find anything that was like an exception or um, something that we can't do. The only thing that I found I addressed in the bill, which was that we can't create select committees that serve the exact function and the responsibilities of a standing committee, but since we don't delegate any we don't delegate Senate bills or constitutional amendments, we used to. The Oversight Committee was responsible for doing that, but that's dissolved. That's no more. And so this would be an effort to try and offshore some of the workload from that, these constitutional amendments are produced because I imagine these conversations about the constitutional amendments and Senate bills are going to last a month, maybe more, likely more. So yeah, I'm happy to answer any questions that you guys have. I know this might kind of seem a little bit out of nowhere, but this is just in anticipation of things that I've become aware of in the last few weeks

Erick Jacobsen: Before I take hands, the bill summary is technically not a part of the actual bill, so I changed that in terms of the timeline and the use of the word Senate order. But in the bill itself, Senate order is not, that's not the way constitutional amendments are. So that would need to be changed to Senate bill. And as Joseph said, and as you can all see on the agenda, there was no constitutional amendment submitted today, so that would need to be amended as well to be a little more accurate.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, so starting off “the Select Committee comprised of GAVEL members and Senate liaisons.” I'm not on the list right now. For the structure, is there an intention behind that or was I just missed?

Joseph Riggio: So this does not include Senate officers. Oh, you mean like as a liaison to I if you'd like to be added on, sure. I just based it on conflict of interest. Just because we are Senate officers, I just automatically admitted or omitted us. But if you want to be part of this, then great. Yeah. By the way, this goes for if you think that somebody should be a part of this or you think that somebody shouldn't be part of this, we do have to clearly state the membership. We can say groups of people, although this membership would be good for attendance records, just having a consistent attendance just to name the actual person. But if you would like to recommend somebody, you can make an amendment to the Organic Act to change structure. So yes, personally, I would be open to an amendment adding you on there.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I go to back to Dylan, I just noticed that Kate is on here as a voting member, but she's not a voting senator as a member of the Board of Directors. So that's also something that might need to be changed for accuracy. She can still be on as a nonvoting member.

Dylan Bianchi: Could you speak to the content of these incoming amendments?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah. So I'm not best to talk about it because I this isn't my effort. I've been asked to provide consultation and legal advice for them essentially. And I've been working with Erick to essentially. So I alluded to it earlier. What I can say is the last three years of a ASUW have been rocky in terms of relations with ASUW Senate and the Board of Directors again has been up and down and up and down over the years. A good example of this is personally, I went through some issues with the intern and volunteer policy. There was a lot of early miscommunications with board directors that could have easily been prevented had we had clearer language in the bylaws. Or a different system in our constitution to prevent these sort of things from happening. But like when I was trying to recruit GAVEL people the first time, lobbying is a forbidden word in my vocabulary now I can't say it because I'm scarred. But the, essentially I learned over the course of many months that, I was actually. The emails that I got saying why the GAVEL posts were in violation of the intern and volunteer policy and the personnel policy was I didn't. It was my mistake. I did not look at the personnel policy when reading their emails. I just read their e-mail providing their criticism and what to change and whatnot, but I didn't verify the bylaws because I trusted them. And upon further inspection about a month or two ago, I realized that there was some misunderstanding about who needs to approve what in in the ASUW bylaws it can be the, to approve intern and volunteer applications, it says either or the Vice President, President, Director of Communications and the Personnel Policy Director. It does not say and it also does not require that the President has to be the one to certify things. That is something that I was told by e-mail. So this is a case study of thing experiences that are more common than personally I initially thought. I was, a group of people came to me with a lot of issues that they've also experienced similarly with miscommunications and interpretations of the bylaws and and policy and governing documents that wasn't necessarily, I wouldn't say legally acceptable. And so I'm being careful with my words, by the way. That's why I'm taking my time. I know I'm not providing a great answer for you, and I apologize for that because I can't speak to those, but all I can say is that we're trying to restructure ASUW in a way that can benefit students more that we can properly allocate. Our budget to services, we can get moving on a lot of advocate, We can focus more on advocacy and external efforts over constantly trying to have to rehash on internal issues that have been going on for the last couple years.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add to that, as far as I've been consulted as Speaker, I've not seen a bill yet, but I've been informed that some of the reforms include more power for Judicial Committee and the overall ASUW budget going through Senate. And I know there's more. I've not been told specifically

anything more than that. But I think that it will be based at least partially in the constitution proposed by Francisco's task force from two years ago. I don't know how much of that may be changed from then. It's all completely up to sponsors. I do know that it's not gonna be a one for one revival of that.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, maybe I just misunderstood a little bit, but the membership consists of GAVEL, current GAVEL members right?

Joseph Riggio: Some. So the exception, I should have mentioned that the exception to that is vice chairs because they need to serve functions still in their committees.

Pierce Wallbaum: I guess I'm just wondering how this won't interfere with their like duties to GAVEL already. Because I know you just talked about a lot how GAVEL has some like they need to meet outside of Senate because their workload like I just will this not interfere with that at all.

Joseph Riggio: The hope is that these committee meetings are taking place during when we have committee meetings during our Senate meetings. The committee chair does have the in as the current OA reads the committee chair would have the authority to have special meetings outside of Senate if chose if absolutely needed. But the hope is that this the current. I mean they have to be senators for to be voting members on this and so like the the current GAVEL members out are on here either will be or are already are voting senators. So and I tried to incorp. I tried to make it less of an outside burden as possible. In fact, I would argue that the only real outside of Senate meeting work that needs to be done is the committee chair responsibilities and just organizing things outside to prepare for these meetings. But if we have consistent committee meetings and I'll probably advocate for on the agenda, hopefully we get legislation and so then we'll have committee meetings regardless, but I'll. We advocate for committee meeting time anyway, so long as we have this committee active.

Erick Jacobsen: And there is a limit on certain interns and volunteers on how many hours they can do. But it's sort of like if we're considering it as a different role, like this is within their capacity as a senator, not within their capacity as the GAVEL member, GAVEL member is just why they were chosen, then that doesn't run afoul of any policies there.

Julia Tanner: Yeah. So I was wondering the intention behind instead of going to Judicial straight off the bat with all of this instead forming a committee to kind of review it and like kind of sorting that out, because I feel like a lot of the goals of this committee kind of run parallel to what Judicial has been doing and they're not getting any power basically.

Joseph Riggio: So the constitutional amendment has to go through judicial no matter what. It will go through their process and they will have a chance to create reviews. The part that this is sort of mimicking ish is well, the the function of this is to make sure that a legislative, a standing committee. Existing standing committees aren't sacrificed for this because regardless, the Senate bill is going to be introduced to Senate, and it's likely going to take a long time, regardless of what judicial reviews are or aren't. We're going to have to as officers, we're going to have to explain or hopefully judicial can come and explain themselves. But explain their review, amendments and or their recommendations. And so they still have the same authority through this process. My interpretation of this is more just to preserve the functionality of Senate while this is happening so that we can conduct regular business like our resolutions and joint resolutions and other things. So that way we

can get things moving with the Senate bills in parallel to it the point, the intent and point was not to circumvent judicial or try and take power away. I, this judicial process has to happen regardless anyway, so. They'll still have the opportunity.

Erick Jacobsen: any other questions or comments? Or any motions on this? I remind everyone that the amendments with regards to Senate order versus Senate bill, the timeline and Kate's membership have not been made yet.

Joseph Riggio: I will also add I would be greatly appreciative of an amendment because this Organic Act doesn't really do anything if the first that clause. This is such a, I can't believe I did this. This is a break me thing. The line 55 and 56 reads a select committee named the committee on ASUW restructuring and then it ends. It needs to say shall be formed, shall be formed, shall be established, shall be formed. So please.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to amend line 56 to add "shall be formed"

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 3-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: And the committee shall be formed. We still have not made the other amendments for the record, but anyone, if anyone has any questions, comments or motions, now is the time.

Joseph Riggio: Friendly reminder, I can't make amendments to my own bill. I can recommend things. You can also frame your potential amendment, say the occurrence. Any occurrence of order shall be restated as Senate bill. That also works where applicable.

Dylan Bianchi: It's a comment. I think it would be great if amendments were recommended again so we can motion for them. Joseph, could you repeat the amendments?

Joseph Riggio: There's two amendments that need, well, three that need to happen. The first is so Senate order, there was some internal confusion of whether it was called a Senate order, Senate bill. Senate orders don't exist. That was something that the last Organic Act addressed because Senate order was used in language even though in our rules, our bylaws said bill, it's Senate bill. So any instance of order, Senate order referring to the constitutional amendment needs to be changed to Senate bill.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to amend line 138 to say senate bills instead of senate orders

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Julia Tanner object

Pierce Wallbaum yields

Julia Tanner: I'm just gonna suggest that you say any occurrence. So just like editing your motion

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

Dylan Bianchi moves the previous question.

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 3-1-1

Motion to change “senate order” to “senate bill” in line 138 fails due to a lack of quorum.

Julia Tanner: I was just gonna suggest that you amend your motion to include every instance that it says orders.

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

Dylan Bianchi moves to amend every use of the phrase “senate order” to “senate bill”

Kavi Pasupathi seconds.

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: For the record it still says one of them was introduced which is not true.

Pierce Wallbaum: I don't know if you guys fixed it and it's just not updating on here, but on line 44 it there's a parenthesis missing, so I think it's just grammatical, but it says article 7B1. But it's just missing the other parenthesis

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, that's grammatical. Again, we have not amended lines 19 to 22 regarding constitutional amendment being submitted which is not true.

Julia Tanner: Can I question the sponsor? What would you prefer? Do you want this? Whereas clause to be struck or changed in a specific way?

Joseph Riggio: Just say in January.

Julia Tanner moves to amend line 19-23 to say “in January a constitutional amendment will be introduced”

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

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

Joseph Riggio: I argue this is grammatical lines 21 to 22. I know we just made the amendment but and “will be expected to be approved by the Senate steering”

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, that is definitely grammatical. No more motions on that.

Dylan Bianchi: Sorry, just to be clear, is it expected to pass like has judicial discussed this?

Joseph Riggio: I guess if we want to be very clear, the intent was to say to be voted on for approval, not necessarily that it would be approved. I mean judicial can't approve or they can provide recommendations and revisions, but this is mainly for like Senate steering committee for us to put it on the agenda. It'll go to us and we will approve it to be on the agenda. That's what this is saying.

Erick Jacobsen: I will say if it is to be changed,

Dylan Bianchi: I'm so sorry. Yeah, I thought and it's totally my bad, I thought the phrasing was like it's expected to be approved by judicial.

Joseph Riggio: Another reminder that we need to resolve Kate Lawson not being a voting member or an active voting member of Senate. So if we want to keep Kate on this committee, we would need to add a clause about nonvoting members and then have her be there. We could also, I guess you could put like a comma and just say without vote.

Pierce Wallbaum: Could you just say the voting and non or just the membership even instead of adding a new clause?

Erick Jacobsen: we would need to specify who is voting or not voting.

Julia Tanner moves to strike voting and add without a vote for Kate Lawson.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Dylan Bianchi moves to specify all members as voting

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: any questions comments or motions?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve OA

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 3-0-2

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: We will now move on to the approval of the senate floor agenda, which I will add the Organic Act to the bottom of old business. All right, now we do have nominations for the On Campus Affairs Committee Chair because like I said, Tanya did resign due to conflicts in her schedule. And we also have a new committee that we need to elect a liaison to the Undergraduate Transfer Student Advocacy Committee. And the question and information was provided by Jess

Phan, who is the Director of Community Relations and the Chair of this committee. Apart from that, I don't think there's anything unusual about this agenda. Oh, right. Joseph, you can take this away.

Joseph Riggio: so while I'm getting the link for my amendment, I apologize. I formally apologize. It was very chaotic because I forgot I was gonna take chairship when Erick's bills were under consideration, and it is in our rules that joint resolutions need to be read in full. We just read the THAT clauses so the vote is invalid now normally I mean, since this is a rules issue it could have gone through had it not been brought up. But Erick and I talked and we decided that it is in our best interest to have a revote for this bill. Not only it's a blessing in disguise because I know that some senators were concerned about not having enough time to really talk about the implications of this bill. And just for reference, this is joint resolution 32-1 is the joint resolution regarding the Undergraduate, for a graduate and undergraduate student regents. So it is a pretty notable joint resolution. And since we didn't read the bill in full or the sponsor didn't read the bill in full, the vote that we took was invalid. So we're going to have to do a revote on it so that way it can go to Board.

Joseph Riggio moves to add JR-32-1 to the top of Old Business

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Kavi Pasupathi: I was just gonna ask if the Organic Act would come under new business. Since it's new, wouldn't it come under new business?

Erick Jacobsen: Technically it's just the way we describe things for some reason as new business and old business, but new business is first readings and old business is second readings. So per our bylaws and rules, it now enters second readings because we are seeing it as a committee. But yes, that is a confusing name for it.

Joseph Riggio: To add on a bit of clarity to that, it's kind of like, summary of new business, typically I mean will steering will 99% of the time review all the legislation that's coming through and we put it on the agenda and organic acts are special because they, you know, they're internal to us and because they don't go to board, we have the authority to approve them internally. So that means the the process that we have in our own bylaws for organic acts makes it so that way first readings happened just now in steering and that would be new business technically, which is what Erick was saying. And then we are the committee that made committee edits. So it wouldn't go to on campus, off campus, AAA or General Affairs. It just goes right to old business in the chronological order of things.

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

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve Senate Floor Agenda

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to discussion our first discussion is a survey breakdown. Now I will be showing a bunch of information in my leadership report tomorrow on the Senate floor, I wanted us to discuss it a little bit. We got 66 responses, which is amazing. And in terms of scoring on procedural knowledge, comfort, speaking, sponsorship, interest and ...

Julia Tanner: Is there a chance we can see this information or is it part of a greater presentation?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, I mean, you can all see it on the leadership reports, which is linked on the floor agenda. I guess if we wanna go through that, we can. It might be a little bit more late. OK. Thank you. And I'll link that onto the discussion item as well. OK. But yeah, basically 66 responses. I'm just gonna very briefly go over each of these slides cause I'll be going through them in more depth on the floor and then our main discussion will be around the suggestions that were made. 3.76 average rating on a scale of one to five on comfortable and familiar with Senate rules and parli pro. That's pretty high. No one said level one, which is pretty good. It means at least with everyone we've given some sense of how it works and with most people they're pretty comfortable with it. Moving on, a lot of people are comfortable speaking 4.15 average rating out of one to five. And again, no one chose level 1. 3.35 likelihood of sponsorship. This is lower. It's still pretty high. I'm happy with this mostly because sponsorship interest isn't just about how comfortable you are, but it's also about what ideas you have. And if people just don't want to write legislation, they just don't want to write legislation. And I don't want us to, like, force them to. So OK I think this is doing pretty good here too. Next, virtual experience 3.76, almost a four-star rating. Again, no level ones. That's pretty good overall. I kind of fear that it might be lower just because it's difficult being online. But if you go to the next one, 4.5 average rating in person. That's really good that so many people feel so engaged and feel like their experience in person is great. Yeah, so a couple people mentioned their reasons for what motivated them attending online or in person. Most people attending in person cared about they felt they could focus more, give their attention more, and talk to people and interact with people more. Most people online just couldn't make it for a variety of reasons outside of their control, three of which mentioned health and safety concerns. Someone said in winter quarter they're gonna attend online just because they don't feel safe walking around in the dark on campus which is fair. And other people mentioned they were sick and so they attend online. So and then just four people said, oh, if I'm not on campus, I'm not going. So it doesn't seem to be that there's like a problem with attending in person. Most of these things are things sort of outside of our control. But moving on, we did ask them to list what their top priorities were as senators. Now, a couple people mentioned a couple things, but I categorized them mostly. Most people mentioned affordability in some form or another, either Housing and Food services, college affordability or something along those lines, followed by safety and then DEI&B and accessibility were tied. Top issues in diversity were queer and undocumented issues, but a couple people mentioned gender equity and international student issues. Well, one person, two people, I think actually mentioned just inclusion in general. Seven people mentioned health. Three of them just said health generally, four said mental health and one said sexual health. And then five for housing, sustainability and transparency. Two for student rights and representation and two people were concerned with federal affairs. And then apart from those, these were also mentioned. Some of them like support for the social sciences I don't necessarily understand in depth, but others were just specific things that are small but important to them and definitely things that are relevant to Senate. So the final question we asked, which was optional, was if people had any suggestions for how we can make Senate more inclusive, welcoming, accessible and engaging. And so the next slide shows all of their responses and there's a

lot here. I want to highlight that last year the vast majority of people in our survey were concerning themselves with the snacks. They said they were here for snacks and they said they wanted more snacks. This time we actually have recommendations on how we can make it better that are not snack related, which I'm grateful for because ultimately I don't think we can necessarily just throw snacks at a problem until it goes away. Some of these we still can't do anything about. Someone said bring back the third row of tables or more tables. Those were removed to give more people access to the room because we were so crowded and we couldn't fit more chairs. And ultimately the only way we'd bring that back is if suddenly our attendance dropped significantly or if we started doing a second room. And streaming to that room, which would not be fun for anyone, I think. Or if we encourage people to go online, which I don't think we should. I like that people are so happy and eager to attend in person. Some of these are pretty small. Let's see, we will have a refresher on parli pro and Joseph's worked on a parli pro pamphlet. A lot of people mentioned more bondings, committee or otherwise, which is interesting because I think more people said they wanted more bondings than people who attended bondings. But I'm glad that those four like the bondings, and I think that's something we can work with as well. I don't you guys hear my voice enough. I'll give you like a minute to read over that. And then if you have any questions, comments or ideas on how we can support these requests, please let me know.

Dylan Bianchi: This may be kind of a dumb question, why do we take committee attendance aside from meeting quorum?

Erick Jacobsen: Mostly just quorum, actually, but it also helps Joseph with attendance records. If someone forgets to vote in the attendance vote, then it's easier on them if they were marked present in committees. That way they don't have to go through the trouble of like accessing voting records in order to prove that they were there. But quorum's the main reason. It's also just a public record I think that we have to maintain in terms of conducting business.

Dylan Bianchi: We're required to do it?

Joseph Riggio: We are. So all, if it's applied to ASUW to Board of Directors as an entity and it supplies the ASUW Student Senate as an entity, given like the definitions of like state agency, OPMA, OPR, uh, it does apply to us in the same sort of way. So like, not only like for instance like the board directors, right? They're subject to OPMA, OPR, but so are the committees that are delineate and the task force set forces that they made are also subject to that, especially if they take minutes, attendance, agendas and whatnot. So anything that a public member of the public could attend or should know about because we are an institution of public service, we are required to record that which standing committees function the same way we have steering, we have officers and the chairs and whatnot, and then our standing committees are just an extension of us essentially as an entity, so we have to record it.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions, comments, or suggestions related to this?

Jothisna Sundar: Sort of a follow up, are we going through with adding like an icebreaker type question to like the beginning of the meeting?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. Yeah, I forgot about that, but yeah. And that's one thing we're gonna do. Someone said we should move our meetings before sunset. I wish. I so wish, but it's just not gonna work for people. Oh, one thing that I would like to mention, a couple people said that they had

anxiety speaking or that they didn't know when or how to speak up or that they felt uncomfortable. And one way that we're gonna try and work on that is we're gonna have people submit messages on teams to Joseph or to any of us on leadership, and then we'll read those out if they don't feel comfortable saying it themselves. Yeah, just to give another option. Does anyone have any other comments or suggestions?

Kavi Pasupathi: For chairs engaging with teams, is it just them not joining the teams call or?

Erick Jacobsen: That was I believe a complaint regarding a very specific committee, but I have spoken, I spoke with that chair and just in general I think it was regarding like whenever they talk to the committee, make sure you check teams as well. So those of you committee chairs here, just whenever you say you ask people what they think about something or you ask or you conduct a vote, make sure you remember to check teams. I know sometimes it's easy to forget, but just we want to make everyone feel included.

Julia Tanner: I have a friend on one of a very specific committee as well and she said that exact thing. They just weren't talking to the people on Teams.

Erick Jacobsen: I believe that was from that friend. Any other questions, comments or concerns?

Pierce Wallbaum: Are we going to do another legislation revolution thingy?

Erick Jacobsen: Resolution revolutions? Yeah, sure. Probably not this week, but maybe in the future. Currently one of my main things that I need to do now that I'm back is reach out to everyone who said they were gonna sponsor a bill and check in on their progress with that. But yeah, definitely. And we might, we can talk about this in leadership and then maybe in steering as well in the future, but we may make it like subject specific or do something like, oh, within your committee you come up with an idea that relates to the committee's topic or something. OK. Yes, soon. Any other questions, comments, suggestions, anything hopes, dreams, fears? Alright, with that we'll move on. Now with that we will move on to financial projects. Basically what my intent was with this discussion item is ASUW has a lot of money in its general fund and we've been advised by SAF to bring down our reserves, we've been told that it's like at like an unhealthy high level, which is funny to hear you have too much money, but basically we have an issue in ASUW as a whole where we spend more each year than we get, but we also have a bunch of reserves that those reserves aren't gonna last forever, even if we don't get our full staff allocation. But that is money that student fees that should be used to support and help students. So I'm going to be meeting with Khushi. I think this week soonish with ideas for things that ASUW can fund. And I know I talked to some of you during our check in, but if any of you had ideas for things that ASUW can fund, I'll bring that to Khushi as well. I think it'd be really cool if Senate was leading innovation on this. Because we have such a diverse group of people with so many varied backgrounds and we have access to a lot of students' opinions. So does anyone have any ideas? If you had \$1.8 million?

Joseph Riggio: This idea is not my own, so I'm representing other people, but if the Student Health Fee were to be passed, there's talks that maybe we can use some of this funding to subsidize certain like groups of people's fees. So like instead of being forced to like have an opt in or opt out program, we still apply the fee universally, but ASUW would promise to subsidize a certain amount for a period of time as students would ease into the student health fee if that is passed. So that's a good idea for the health fee.

Erick Jacobsen: that brings me to an interesting point of discussion which is I'm looking into the legality of that. As a public state agency, there's limited things that we can do, limited things we can fund. But I found a paper written by the Solicitor General, Noah Purcell, former ASUW Board of Control member, which it's called the The Gift of Public Funds Boogeyman and it talks about various legal cases in in the past few years or the past 50 years that basically established that the prohibition on the gift of public funds is sort of like over interpreted by a lot of agencies to shut down ideas, but that legally speaking, almost any program can fit under an exception put forth by one of the exceptions that have been established by the Washington Supreme Court. So, for example, if anything relates to a fundamental goal of government or something like that, then you can put money towards that and that involves higher education, waste management and a lot of different things across different cases that have been established to be that. And even what if it's not a fundamental purpose of government, then the Supreme Court has ruled that like if the state agency gets something out of it that's even vaguely defensible, it'll be fine. And also the burden of proof for proving that something was money was illegally spent under this provision is on the challenger. So it's assumed by the Washington Supreme Court in any case and by any state court that a program is legal until proven otherwise in court. So I plan to bring that up because I think in ASUW we've had a lot of discussions about oh is this gift of public funds, and I'm gonna bring that up. I'm gonna bring it up to Brendan and Alan now has this information. I do recommend the article if any of you are interested. It's fascinating. That's how I spent my Christmas. But yeah, and then there are other rules anyway. I'm checking with SAF guidelines, I'm checking with whether or not we can like give money to another department, which is what that Health Fee subsidization how that would work. But yeah, so there's various like procedures to deal with, but I've been looking into them and it doesn't hurt to propose a project and then I just check with Khushi, check with Brendan and everyone else. And if it doesn't work out, that's sad, but it very well might Noah Percell thinks it will.

Maitri Karia: Do y'all have funds to send undergrads to conferences?

Erick Jacobsen: Not currently. I think there's another student government that I looked into that did something like that. A grant for attending.

Maitri Karia: We do like GPSS does.

Erick Jacobsen: Oh you do? I'll write that down I'll bring that up as well. That's a great idea thank you.

Jothsna Sundar: I was just gonna say maybe go over the ideas that you are going to bring up in the meeting.

Erick Jacobsen: Sure I have a lot. So I was thinking we already give money to the food pantry, maybe I should have to make a donation to the career closet because that helps a lot of people. What else? I thought about maybe if we can donate to different like departments or units, maybe donating to student legal services to like subsidize costs for students gaining representation. They already do a really good job of that, but I believe 50% of fees are waived. But maybe ASUW can make it that 100% for a year or two. A couple people, I think someone this year and also when I was in Hall Caucus mentioned like UW doing something with similar to U Village with having umbrellas everywhere and you can take an umbrella if you don't have one and use it and ASUW can probably just pay for that to happen maybe and implement that. I was also thinking, apparently this is something also that the Young Democratic Socialists of America here at UW are looking into but

like, I was thinking like we make one of those little free libraries, but like, make it like you can take and leave one and take one with textbooks. I think YDSA has a more comprehensive plan for that so I do plan to reach out, connect them with Khushi and everything. But where did I put my document with all of these ideas? Because I wrote them out in more detail somewhere. Promise there's a lot.

Pierce Wallbaum: Do you have like a ballpark estimate like how much money's in the reserves that we need to spend or is it just?

Erick Jacobsen: Last I checked it was uh like 1.6 million or 1.8 million.

Pierce Wallbaum: and what are we trying to get it to?

Erick Jacobsen: That's a good question. I don't know. OK that's something next ask staff, but I found my document. Oh, Jothisna suggested upgrading the HFS vacuums. And then my professor is the advisor for, or my professor last quarter was the advisor or is the advisor for Purple Group and they're planning to do this whole thing where they have little like kits with like information and whistles for if ICE is on campus to alert people and my professor mentioned, I was like oh we can provide that in ASUW office. And she was like, oh, we'll see how much money we have to get them. And I was like, actually we have money too. So that's something that I've already spoken with Khushi and Nandana about and Valeria. But yeah, and then this would be a very high cost project and UW Admin would have to be very involved, but UW Admin has been refusing to like install new blue light emergency poles just cause of the immense cost and effort with like the wiring, getting them in the ground, all of that. And I looked into it and apparently it's like \$50,000 to install a pole like that. So ASUW can like maybe fund one or two of those. Or five for \$250,000. So a lot of these are pretty ambitious. A lot of them will probably be like, at least the higher ticket items might be like slimmed down as we consider other information and policies, that sort of thing. But I was really excited to come up with all these ideas and to hear everyone else's. So you guys have ideas too. Definitely let me know now or later. I don't care. Just we can do a lot again.

Maitri Karia: You know about the UW Food Pantry, maybe we can have like divert some funds there because I think a lot of people volunteer, and to manage the pantry, so maybe get supplies or incentivize or help the volunteers in some way, because right now today itself, I thought they were running out in and out because of heavy rains and managing the pantry and fire drill and everything. So maybe support volunteers and donate some money to the pantry.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, at the beginning of the year we donated \$10,000 to the food pantry. I do think we could donate more and I do think they really need it. But I also had the idea when SNAP benefits were cut that we would like provide free food through Bean Basket. Couple legal issues there, but what we came to, was the idea that we would donate money to the food pantry to buy things and then they would give those things to Bean Basket and Bean Basket can distribute that as like a chapter of the food pantry. So we're looking into that as well, but yes, that's very much on the top of our minds. Are there any more questions, comments or suggestions regarding these? I don't want to spend too much time because it's technically outside of Senate scope, but I do want to make sure that there's a lot of communication with Khushi about this, you know, maybe bring some ideas to fruition. Alright, well, moving on, spring and future steering times. So this is something that's probably gonna be a discussion over a couple weeks, but we were talking last quarter for those of you who are here and might remember about what the most ideal time for steering would be.

Monday evenings aren't great for public health majors and quite a few STEM majors, but there's also STEM majors that meet more that have required classes more in the morning. That's something to consider. So what we wanted to do was identify what the most ideal day and time was for steering, while also considering the fact that we need to approve things before Tuesday and we don't want. Two years ago we had it on Thursdays. We had steering on Thursdays right before Board. And then there were a lot of instances where people submitted their resolutions on Friday and they didn't want to wait another two weeks for it to reach the floor. So they suspended the rules and introduced it on the spot without going through steering. And that's something that we've really wanted to prevent because steering is just a great check and step in the process. So it'd probably have to be like a Friday or a Monday and in terms of like times, I think if you guys can share your experiences on when you're typically free, that'd be helpful.

Dylan Bianchi: I kind of think steering's at a good time right now. I think unfortunately, like you can't put steering at any point in the week without it being bad for a person or frankly like a major or a group of majors because there's a lot of majors and there's a lot of different programs and like right now we have a time that usually works for most of us, and I kinda think that's about as good as we're gonna get it. I also think it's key that it's like Monday's good because it allows us to catch resolutions to your point and it's before like the 5:00 PM deadline.

Joseph Riggio: Another option too is, I mean currently we do require like prime sponsors of bills to be present whenever we're discussing their bill. And typically if they had to miss, we require them to have a Co-sponsor that can be here to talk about their legislation. And that's a big stressing point. We can amend that. We can provide some exceptions. Like if the reason they can't make it to steering is because of an academic conflict. Like we can provide an exception and have maybe like a Senate officer be a liaison or OK, yeah, or someone from steering be a liaison just temporarily to make it more equitable. I don't necessarily know, like for the committee chair conversation, because I know that was a big one before we went for break. Like I know Abigail's situation and Tanya when she was chair, was that their majors made it far more difficult for them to attend steering regularly, so I'm not sure, but it is possible, at least for like senators, for for like Erick's argument of why we're trying to have steering at the time that we have it in terms of introducing legislation and whatnot, I think we can make some rules that are a bit more flexible, but I don't know how to solve the committee chair problem.

Julia Tanner: , I was just going to add to Dylan that I think this is a pretty good time as it stands and it has been for the majority of committee chairs and officers for the past two years. So I'm fine keeping it as it is.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I think generally the best move is to set a time that's consistent so people can build their schedules around it. And of course you're gonna get unfortunate situations where like for Abigail, she just can't build around it like she's got classes she needs to take at this time. And that's where we run into the thing of like any time you set is gonna conflict with a major or you know, like a time, but people need to take classes.

Joseph Riggio: I will say that I mean there is a disparity between like it's no accident that a lot of majors that are represented in Senate are social science majors or their equivalent. And a lot of it is STEM. I don't know if you've ever taken a look at departmental requirements for STEM courses, they're not, they're very, very restrictive. They require you to take courses that are only offered in certain quarters and if you don't take it, you might not graduate. And I believe that is partially.

Abigail's it's it's a course that if she, like in the Poli Sci department, it's really easy for us to move around our schedule and just choose a different course because the department allows us to just choose a course that meets a very general criteria. So it's very friendly, but like. If, like a chemistry major needs a certain chem course with a lab that is specific to their departmental requirements and it's only offered one quarter, there is a disparity there and I think we should think about that. I do agree with Dylan and Julia that yeah, this time has worked before. And I would argue, at least for now, keeping it the same is probably wise. But that doesn't mean we should table this conversation indefinitely. Because this is a real problem, we do need to find a creative solution for it. I just don't think it's going to happen today.

Erick Jacobsen: I think I'll keep this on the agenda for future meetings as well. And maybe some weeks it's like we spent a minute on it saying hey, we don't have ideas. But maybe on a day that's like less busy we go into more detail, maybe have a day where we have a few recesses to look up some information about when majority of UW classes are. Also something interesting that Initiative Tacoma is trying to advocate for is like a free period where no classes are held. like the administration doesn't schedule any classes for a specific hour of of a week, and then that way clubs and people can have meeting times there. That's something that we can try to implement here too, and that might help solve our problems, but that also might create a situation where if someone's involved in four clubs, suddenly they're all meeting in that one hour and it's still not ideal. So there's ways we can approach this and I would like to keep it on future agendas until we feel like it's resolved, but. I don't feel like it's necessarily resolved quite yet. So with that though, we do only have 3 minutes left. I'll move on to the final discussion item, which is Provost forum questions. Joseph, take it away again.

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, so we don't have a lot of time on this, unfortunately. I might request an extension then. Or actually no, I don't need to request an extension for this. We have some time to think about it actually. I just need to get the briefing materials and everything done by January 8th, which is done and I can send it to you guys. Sorry. The point of this is much like we had the Presidential forum questions, we got the Provost to come on the 27th, so that is confirmed. And I'm submitting materials to them. And in doing so, we're repeating what we did last year or not last. Well, actually, yes, last year, technically, technically. No. When we did the presidential forum, we submitted questions then we, Erick, Julia and I presented it to you guys so you can give feedback and we can workshop questions. Essentially, I don't think we're gonna have time now, but just think about some of the questions that you wanna ask the the provost, like think about general ones that are over encompassing. We want to, so this time we're going to heavily limit the amount of questions we submit. I recommend only submitting like three to five questions, Max 5, but preferably 3 because the feedback that we got last time was there wasn't enough time for Senator questions, which I agree with and so to to limit that I would think about maybe 3 to 5 broad, encompassing question related to the Provost's office. Think about it, workshop it. We can talk about it next week and then I'll create another Word document. I'll also draft some questions up so we have something to talk about next week. But yeah, submit that next week through the follow up

Pierce Wallbaum: this is Tricia Serio right?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. OK. Any questions, comments, any questions? I will say there is the Provost Advisory Committee for students, which is ASUW's direct line of the Provost. I think monthly or biweekly or something like that. But in terms of the provost or is the president, the provost is probably easier to contact outside of Senate meetings. And if there are questions, we can save them

for PACS and transmit it to our PACS representative who is Nandana, Kate. And then I think there's open selection for a couple seats. But. She has already answered questions about the engineering student fee. And what was the other thing I asked her? Oh, the Arts and Sciences budget proposal. So we're probably not gonna do a question on that. We also want to, I believe, limit the amount of time she has to answer each question. Because a lot of people felt like President Jones went on and on about with certain questions and didn't give a lot of time for others. Are there any anything? Is there any anything?

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: All right, with that, we'll move on to announcements and public comment. I have an announcement. The Husky 100 applications are open and I think you all are exceptional individuals and should all apply. Any other announcements? Any motions?

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-2-0

Adjourned

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar

Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
