



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

1/16/2026

HUB 307

Call to Order

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

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

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

Blair Yeh (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair | P

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

Kylie Jones (she/her), Proxy for GPSS Director of University Affairs | P

Nandana Jaideep (she/her), ASUW President | P

Ashwin Anand (he/him), Director of Internal Policy | P

Kate Lawson (she/her), Director of University Affairs | A

Jothsna Sundar (she/her), Senate Clerk | P

Marshall Traverse (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Joseph Riggio: I think it's in all our best interest if we can swap the proposals Jr. 32-3 with SB-32-1 to get it out of the way first.

Joseph Riggio moves to reorder the proposals.

Abigail Appleyard seconds.

Approved 3-0-2

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve the agenda.

Abigail Appleyard seconds.

Approved 4-0-1

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 speaker's report, not much to report. I have like 3 or 4 people who have met with me the past week for legislation and like at least one or two more that will be meeting me. Honestly, that's pretty much it, I think. Moving on to the Vice speakers report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: GAVEL member applications closed so I'll be looking at those. Expect by next week I'll have made decisions and whatnot. And then we'll have new people in. That'll be exciting. And then for just a reminder, attendance records, committee members reach out to you and be like, Oh my God, what did I do? I didn't submit a vote in time or whatnot. Just a reminder that committee attendance also works for that too, so you can refer them there. And then let's see. I didn't. Tonight I'm gonna make the liaison committee on teams just so we have that group. I know I said I was gonna make it on Wednesday, but I had graduate applications due on January 15. Yay. So it did not work out that way. That's all I have.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Yeah, I just have a reminder for people in steering to please fill out the When2Meet so we can plan bonding. Thank you so much. And I will be sending another reminder later today. And have a great weekend.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Marshall Traverse: No.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: moving on to the approval of the minutes.

Recess 4:05 pm

Reconvened 4:08 pm

Recess 4:08 pm

Reconvened 4:10 pm

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to proposals, we will begin with JR-32-3 a Joint Resolution of tri-campus support for increased tri-campus collaboration. JR-32-2 was withdrawn and this was the resubmitted bill. I know there are some changes so Joseph, if you would like to read the bill in full.

Joseph Riggio reads [JR-32-3 A Joint Resolution with Tri-Campus Support for Increased Tri-Campus Collaboration](#)

Erick Jacobsen: All right, I'll go to Nandana in a second. But I did want to comment briefly. I spoke with Brendan, our SAO advisor, on specifically the clause that Dylan raised issue with last meeting around the allegations of embezzlement. What Brendan had to say about it was that because the funds that were, lack of a more delicate term, in play were belonging to the WSA RSO as an entity, it was completely outside of a ASUW's legal purview. So that means two things. It means we're probably not gonna be opening ourselves up to a lawsuit if we say anything about it, but it also means that we're not doing anything by saying anything about it. So it's completely outside of our legal and administrative purview from my understanding. I just wanted to make that clear because I know we had that conversation

Nandana Jaideep: Thank you, Joseph, for writing this bill. I just want to address several mischaracterizations that underlie this resolution. First, the claim that ASUW Seattle has been unresponsive or disengaged in tri-campus efforts is simply false. At no point were these concerns raised directly with my office or my board prior to this being evaluated externally. When disagreements are taken outside internal governance channels rather than addressed through direct communication, it undermines trust and weakens our collective advocacy, which I'm sure is why we're all here. Additionally, I have extended multiple offers to meet with ASUW Tacoma and GPSS presidents on different matters, which they never replied to. Second, the board did attempt to

address these misrepresentations. We reached out to correct the record and requested a reconciliation meeting to resolve concerns constructively. That Outreach did not receive a response that using legislation in place of direct engagement is not collaboration. Third, my office and the Office of Government Relations have been proactive and available. All tri-campus communities were included in Huskies on the Hill planning and participation. We conducted joint meetings, coordinated lobbying efforts, and held individual conversations with ASUWB and GPSS leadership. These efforts are documented and verifiable, so if you would like to see them, please reach out to me. Fourth, it is unprofessional to bypass internal discussion on one's own campus and bring unresolved internal grievances to this body without prior debate or authorization. That approach contradicts the collaborative values this resolution claims to advance. There's also a serious issue of representation and legal exposure that cannot be ignored. The ASUWT Senate meeting scheduled last week was canceled due to OPMA concerns for reasons that have not been publicly clarified. Despite this, ASUWT is referred in this resolution previously as an honorable mention, which last week was evidence of formal discussion and debate or authorization of that body which constitutes another form of misrepresentation. Additionally, there's an active Superior Court injunction involving ASUWT currently pending in Pierce County. So I'll put that out there. Finally, I want to address the comments regarding transparency and OPMA. My position has been consistent. I value transparency. I want all parties informed. I do not conduct tri-campus business on non OPMA compliant platforms. That statement was not an accusation of illegal conduct. It was a reaffirmation of how this board has unanimously chosen to operate. And I can say my board and I and OGR and whoever else named, I remain committed to genuine tri-campus collaboration that requires accuracy, direct communication and good faith engagement and I believe this resolution as written does not meet that standard. And finally, I want to address the board bill about the representations by the Vice President who is acting President. The reason I chose to, chose that wording was because within ASUW Tacoma's internal operations, there is no current Vice President. There has been no like formalized or public ascension of like line of succession after the removal of the President. So I went by whatever they go by. There is no current Vice President. The Director of Internal Affairs has not been appointed as VP. The Senate Speaker has not taken over for the Director of Internal Affairs, so. I don't see how that's a tangible claim. And in terms of that bill being hindering tri-campus relationships, that bill was aimed at just addressing misrepresentations of our work and our efforts at a Board of Regents meeting which I believed was not the platform or the avenue to grieve out personal grievances. So that was just an effort to put out an olive branch and say that the board is here to talk about it. We do not appreciate it, but we want to fix things. Yeah, that's all I got.

Julia Tanner: Oh I was just going to clarify what you said about embezzlement. So just to clarify, this clause wouldn't hinder the bill nor add to the bill. Like, can you just clarify what you were saying with that?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, it has neutral value in the passing of any judgment or officialization of anything like it, it won't affect anything in a direct way.

Joseph Riggio: So first to address that point, and Nandana don't worry I'll get to you I appreciate you being here. The embezzlement was mentioned to provide context to why ASUW, why we in OGR for a little bit here I can give a witness testimony. I was a state legislative intern last year during winter quarter. I was in, I worked in the legislative building and I worked for Senator Claire Wilson, proud Senator of the 30th Legislative District. Baked us cookies every Monday. Awesome of her. But at that point I was in close communication with Sean just because he was at that time the acting GAVEL chair and I was a GAVEL member, pretty proactive GAVEL member. And so I would run into him all the time at the state legislature. And then suddenly he fell off the face of the

world. I think it was either late February or early March. It was towards the end of my legislative efforts. I just stopped seeing him appear at things. I tried to communicate with him and reach out. I just. I have no idea. I know I've had many conversations with OGR since then of like just, you know, venting about the whole situation and whatnot. It's a rough situation. I commend Brandon for what he had to do during that point and what he's doing now. But yeah, the reason why the embezzlement is mentioned is to provide context that Sean mysteriously disappeared from our firm. Mm-hmm. Mysteriously disappeared from the face of the world. And that doesn't, you know, that's not a legal argument to say that embezzlement incurred or whatnot, but it is to provide the sources that I have, have commented on that and so that is why it's in the bill. Just to provide context, I'm open to amendments on that. And the second thing, I just want to provide just a statement real quick. I do not have infinite time in the world. I started out on this bill as a co-sponsor, the original version, sort of advising this effort. I was approached. And I was happy to provide advice as a student working on this. Initially I was not very involved with the writing of this legislation initially, but as the legislation has evolved over the weeks, I have been more involved in that process. I will just make a statement and say that if we do move to approve this bill and it fails, I am respecting that decision 100%. I will not, and I'm saying this on public record, I will not suspend the rules. I will not call for a motion to suspend the rules. It is done. Same with the joint resolution, same with the Senate bill. I have worked. No we have worked on the Student Health fee and I do greatly apologize that I have not reached out directly to the Board of Directors before writing this. However, I was approached by several members of different organizations, and before I'm a politician, I'm going into human rights law. I'm a human rights activist. People feel scared right now and they, this is really a platform and a chance for them to explain what's going on and the content of this bill. Work needs to be done. I have the parts that I have written in here and explicitly changed from the different version is that ASUW Tacoma and ASUW Bothell are at fault too for the collaboration and miscommunication. I want to make that clear in the bill. Now it is clear in the bill. When we say that collaboration hasn't been the best, we say ASUW Tacoma, ASUW Bothell. When it comes to the faculty council positions too, ASUW Tacoma and ASUW Bothell are admittedly worse at appointing people. And I know it's, you know, apathy. Voter apathy and student participation is really hard nowadays, and I do recognize that and I'm willing to, and I think we all, we're not blind. We're smart people. We understand that there's more to it than just procedural shit, so I just wanted to put that out there that the contents of this bill do matter and they matter greatly. But you know, I think senators should still have the chance to review some of this and make a decision on their own. And also I'm happy to let Ella speak on the GPSS and 4121 stuff that we get there too.

Ashwin Anand: Thank you Joseph, I mean I'll just discuss a couple of the Board's grievances with this bill. In addition to what I mentioned, just starting off with a lot of the DOLA stuff that was presented. You know with embezzlement, as stated in the bill, the former DOLS's actions of embezzlement were clear, leading to the removal from the position. The ASUW alongside the SAO office took ample time through a thorough process after the removal to discuss options to pursue criminal charges or not to pursue criminal charges through proper legal channels, which obviously again takes time independently. None of the people in leadership last year had any control of the WSA RSO funding, which again was the primary source of the embezzlement, which was determined again after a true thorough process. So yes, we acknowledge that there was a three-month delay, but things need to take time. The bill even goes on to acknowledge that the current OGR team is trying to fill the gaps from last year and they are. They're doing a great job. We understand that there was a delay but it was an unprecedented event so we had to take the time to understand our options and carry forward. And we had a proper plan and we hope that it benefited all students and organizations. I'll go on to say that beyond this, not ASUWT or ASUWB had

assisted in that process of transitioning issue, which did lead to ASUW having to handle a lot of the ongoing lobbying efforts and fix the issues within our own OGR team. And so I guess there was a gap in lobbying efforts, but we would have hoped for someone else to step in to try and, you know, push forward a better lobbying process while we were absent throughout that time. That didn't happen. And there's also, again, limited communication from GPSS in that same issue. I'll move on to the Director of Internal Policy stuff. It's pretty much relevant to me. I had a scheduling conflict from fall quarter and winter quarter that led to me not being able to attend GPSS meetings. There was obviously a lack of communication for my part so I'll take full ownership from that and I hope that soon or at least undergraduate representation will be in GPSS further. Now moving on to the Director of University Affairs, the DUA understands their position and job description, very specifically job description, which includes the appointments to certain committees. Not only did the DUA meet with the sponsor of this bill in order to discuss appointments to these committees right before this JR was submitted into Student Senate, but like they're currently going through the process to do the appointments being named in this bill and just on the appointments themselves, the DUA has again within their own right is doing the appointments quarterly simply due to just scheduling conflicts because people's schedules change and so you have to do the appointments on a rotating schedule. It's determined by the DUA because they're the one doing the appointments. So again, Kate's been doing a fantastic job giving announcements in Student Senate, encouraging people to apply to these appointments. All the right stuff is being done. The fact that we're in week two and these appointments aren't done isn't a statement about Kate's, you know, lack of action, but rather that again, it takes time for these things to be done. So that's just like 3 main things that I want to cover you know, again, we agree. We acknowledge that there are a lot of mistakes that have been made, but I don't think that it should have resulted in this. I think a lot of internal discussion should have been done. Again, it was kind of placed on our lap and ready to be discussed. But I'll stop there

Joseph Riggio: I'll address it point by point. Yes, self-explanatory for the DOLA and I appreciate that additional context and again I'm open to amending. GPSS, you mentioned autumn quarter there's a scheduling conflict I have here in the sources at source 13 for all of y'all. It's linked in here. It isn't just October 1st, October 15th, October 29th and November 12th that Ashwin has missed for Executive Board. He does have a vote with Executive Board as mentioned in this bill. It was also and Zoey, the former Director of Internal Policy, did attend the June 4th, 2025 meetings. So I would imagine that maybe in the transition documents, or there is clearly precedent that it is known that the Director of Internal Policy does attend GPSS. June 25th, July 30th, August 27th, September 4th, 24th were also not attended. So I would also like to know what scheduling conflicts and also why. And maybe I'm just unaware of, you know, the complete proxy system and whatnot, but there was no, and it's not just the Director of Internal Policy didn't attend these meetings; No one from ASUW attended those meetings. And then lastly to point to so it is true. Kate Lawson, I reached out to Kate Lawson asking about the faculty councils. I have record of that. And I reached out to her because senators and students were curious about faculty councils. I myself served on the Faculty Council of Teaching and Learning last year. I started my position in November. So yes, I'm aware sort of what the timeline should be for that. I don't know what's going on in Kate's life and I'm happy to have these conversations. I plan on emailing everyone tonight to schedule meetings for that. What I do want to ask though is. So Kate is the, so the five committees that Kate is on, I do have e-mail record. I did ask the faculty council chairs for the Faculty Council of Student Affairs, David Smith, the chair. I have public record saying that Kate has not attended these meetings. I'm happy to share that with y'all. I also have record for the ones that she has been attending. She did attend the Faculty Council of Research meeting for October and November, but December and I

know she was sick in early January, so. But still we have a proxy system. And also I would just like to hear the I haven't gotten academic standards yet, so I'm not sure about that but the faculty council applications, you know, for following the process and procedures, that does take some time and I'm not sure I will have to double check with the bylaws and consult Kate. But we might also miss the February meetings as well, which is pretty devastating. That means October, November, December, January and February meetings are being missed. That's a lot of meetings. And so, yes, well, I recognize we all have lives and I've worked 60 hour weeks and God, sometimes I make mistakes and things don't work out that way. I mean, God, I feel bad for Jothsna because I forgot to set up the recording properly and now we have to do minutes by hand. Like mistakes happen. We're freaking students. But I would like to hear a bit more information obviously, as to why.

Ashwin Anand: To address the at least the missing the GPSS meetings. Not only in the summer was I traveling abroad, but I did not have a judicial committee or interns in order to proxy for these and also Board was again during limited hours not able to attend these meeting because again, summer hours. But again, fall quarter I had class which directly interfered with every single one of the GPSS meetings. Again, lack of communication to go to these meetings and I understand that none of board was able to go. But I had a class and most likely everybody else had some type of scheduling conflict. We do understand what the issue is, but again, I take accountability for it and we'll fix it moving forward.

Nandana Jaideep: I just want to respond to the in depth search on Kate. FCAS. She does go to them. You can back check that and reports to the Board of Directors on the workings of FCAS almost every other week. The board's hours were reduced last year in proportion to everybody else in this organization. So if you look at the bylaws, Kate serves on a lot of faculty councils in addition to the other work that she has to do in addition to meetings, so 18 hours is not possible for her to be in every single place at once and the open selection process. I served as Director of University Affairs two years ago, so I know how hard it is to find interest and appoint on these councils simply because you're asking students to volunteer their unpaid time to take meetings for you. That's essentially what it is. So it's really hard to find qualified students who like actively take an interest in these things to apply because the open selection process works in a very simple way. You need at least three applicants in order to be able to close the application and then appoint somebody. It's really hard to get like three students interested in going to a meeting about libraries for you every single quarter, especially when there's like more than 10 things that you need to appoint to. Simply put, from my personal experience, from Kate's experience, these things take time and just like a lot of other things, and we're doing our best and I hope you guys can see that. If there's other grievances, please come talk to us directly.

Julia Tanner: I just wanted to actually speak in favor of this bill and specifically the changes that were made. I reread it this morning with the old draft and then I read it again with the new changes and it is significantly better. I will agree with Joseph on that, there does need to be changes in the whereas clauses, especially with this like as we've brought up multiple times like airing of grievances vibe that isn't productive in my opinion. I think that we should be going directly towards the people that are doing the wrongs or making the mistakes as we are students. But I do want to talk about those changes, and I also want to kind of redirect focus because we are talking a lot about the whereas clauses and the information in there and it is valid like to have all perspectives heard for sure. But as steering members on steering we also want to focus on the that clauses and the changes. There was a lot of debate last steering meeting about the that clauses and the changes that have been implemented are I think very solid. I also think that the message that the that clauses bring are really important to kind of formalize connections tri-campus wide. I know in my time being here at UW

I've seen very little like tri-campus communication as a student, as a senator, as a chair and now as part of leadership. And so I think that these that clauses are really important to kind of collaborate. And I want to say like again, the whereas clauses kind of take up the focus away from that, which is unfortunate because these things, this collaboration is extremely important. So I just wanted to set out that kind of idea and reminder that the that clauses, the things that are actually being done in response to this, this resolution is really important and we should focus on this like collaboration, trying to form community and that kind of thing rather than getting stuck in the weeds of the whereas causes and prevent using that to prevent this and the good changes that come of this from occurring

Dylan Bianchi: I'd like to respectfully disagree because. I think this resolution is deeply disingenuous. I think I first of all, I'd like to acknowledge the elephant in the room, which is what happened on Tuesday in Senate. I know that ASUWT and ASUW Bothell students have been heavily involved in the drafting of this bill and when these students came to our Senate, they didn't address us in terms of like, hey, we've all made mistakes, but here are some like systems we can have to make things better. It was insulting. It was condescending. They were giving misleading information to our senators who had no context and they were not following process. We didn't like kill this bill. We tabled it for a week because we have a clause in this bill that without citation accuses someone of a felony. That's not acceptable. I want to first of all, I do want to revisit that. I know that the allegedly there is doing nothing to work to keep us from getting sued. But again, we have a clause in this bill that accuses Sean Beal allegedly of a felony with no citation. If I say Pierce allegedly hit my dog with a car. When I say allegedly, that's still not a fun thing to put in a bill. I don't think Pierce would like that. It'd be offensive to him, right? It's the same thing, right? We're not respecting process and neither did UWT in coming up here and trying to without adequate context like get this bill on our docket, presented to our senators, right? And I and I because of the way it was presented by these UWT senators, it really seems to me that the whereas bill clauses are kind of the point that these salacious clauses where we are pointing fingers pretty much exclusively at ASUW Seattle people, often without citation, is the point here. This ends up being the point and that clauses amount to creating a committee. Again, I really view these that clauses as kind of a non solution because instead of promoting an actual direct solution to this to the supposed problems we're saying we're going to form a committee and then they'll find the solution in a bill where the most recurring issue is that clearly board members have difficulty making it to all the different committee meetings they're supposed to go to. I just look, I think this bill is below the standards of Senate. I think it is not formulated from place of wanting to be genuinely helpful. I think Board continues to be ignored in the attempt to help and you know frankly Joseph, we had board members come in try to explain themselves and then your first response to that complaint was to say. Which was essentially ignore it. Like Ashwin explained why he wasn't at these meetings and you just walked right past that. And I think that's reflective of how this resolution.

Joseph Riggio: Point of information. What exactly did I ignore?

Dylan Bianchi: Ashwin cited that he had conflicts for these meetings and then you listed off months where he'd already explained what the conflict was. He explained that. The whole process of this bill has been more oriented on pointing fingers and, you know, making people's personal frustrations with ASUW known than providing a meaningful solution because I don't think forming another committee represents a meaningful solution. That's all I got.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah my point is sort of similar in the sense of thank you, Julia. I understand what you're saying in terms of like, let's move on with what we actually want, but I wouldn't be

comfortable like supporting the sort of legislation where the whereas clauses contain like defamatory mischaracterizing and inaccurate representation of certain members of my organization, my board, and in fact myself too. So even if the that clauses, which I don't think are effective, were effective, this bill wouldn't be something that I would be proud to pass as an organization. Additionally, the collaboration claims in a lot of these could have been addressed just an interpersonal communication, direct communication, which I offered multiple avenues for through e-mail through teams. I have like receipts if you guys would like to look at that. I think like Dylan said, another committee to address the issue that board members are allegedly not making certain committees doesn't seem like the most productive solution to me and I feel like if you guys are worried about tri-campus relationships or like performance of Board of Directors or to certain things in the bylaws, we have our Director of Internal Policy. We're both in the office a lot. We're really accessible like if you guys would come talk to us about anything, we'd be happy to address these issues and if you guys have suggestions on like what to improve or anything like that, we'd be happy to, you know, we're working on our governing documents right now. So we're always trying to update them so that they best reflect our abilities and our performance. And lastly, I want to say that we're all here like with a mission of trying to improve lives of students. We're all on paid time trying to improve the lives of students. A bill pointing fingers at each other kind of like takes us away from that goal and this time could be used for like legislative efforts or like initiatives that directly impact the student body when interpersonal issues can be resolved through better communication, more receptive communication. And finally I want to yield to Erick. If you would be comfortable doing so, could you give like your like thoughts and experience with like tri-campus efforts on your like, you work directly with Senate and the Board of Directors. So let us know like because I've worked with Erick all year and none of these qualms have come up before so.

Erick Jacobsen: I mean I reached out to first GPSS you know because they're right here and then to Tacoma and Bothell about Senate cooperation in early fall quarter. This was an extension of Jacob Gannon's efforts as Vice Speaker last year in conjunction with the Bothell Director of Senate. They were working together to follow up on the Seattle divestment bill in the other campuses because it not being passed by other campuses was something that the Board of Regents cited, and we didn't want to give them that excuse to not listen to student opinion anymore. So I continued those talks in order to figure out some formalized way of doing things. I created a document that I shared with GPSS and I think Bothell, I'm not sure either Bothell or Tacoma. I didn't share with everyone yet because I wanted to get to a meeting first, but that had different models of cooperation including the tri-campus committee like the one mentioned in this bill that just on general advocacy including a Tri campus resolution process. And including informal standing meetings. I received some initial feedback with the caveat that we would continue in meetings and then ASUW Tacoma made a group chat on teams to talk about it further. We felt we all filled out the lettuce meat I think it was. It was one of the other things that isn't When2Meet. We all filled it out and a meeting didn't happen. So over the break I sent another I sent a When2Meet. And I've had struggles getting everyone in the group chat to fill it out. So that's where we're at on the Senate side. I also spoke with Brandon in fall quarter and he did mention that he planned to work on some sort of memorandum of understanding for tri-campus lobbying, especially in light of there's a lot of difficulties with WSA right now. Some of you may know, but a lot of tension between WSA and members, between members in WSA and between WSA staff even. So Brandon indicated to me that he did want to create a memorandum of understanding for tri-campus joint lobbying. Not necessarily a committee, but some sort of formal document saying that no matter what happens in WSA things continue between the campuses. And with regards to Board Bill 6.01, there was an e-mail sent following the

passage of that board bill to Tacoma leadership. And as far as I'm aware, there's been no response. So those are my personal experiences with Tri campus relations.

Ashwin Anand: Thank you Erick, I think you covered a decent, very good portion of what Senate's tri-campus communications were. I kinda just want to go back to what Julia was saying with the that clauses. You know, I think most of the discussion here should center around the whereas clauses because frankly, being frankly put, the whereas clauses take up a majority of this bill just purely by line numbers. And they are the most defamatory towards ASUW. But focusing on that clauses, almost every single one of these that clauses aside from the repeal of 6.01 can be done with increased communication. We can do, you know, a Tri campus committee for like, you know, monthly meetings on campus events. We could do that through just communication with various tri-campus, right? For a special meeting spring 2026 to discuss the governing documents we're already performing the government governing documents and there's already plans to involve a holistic student input, something that can be done without this board bill. Again, the only thing that really requires this bill to be passed is the repealing of 6.01, which is the entire issue that ASUWT had brought up during Senate, which blindsided all of us. Right. Understandably, yes, in response to what they did, right. And so if you take away all the that clauses that don't need this portal, the only one is the repealing of 6.01, which is the intention of this bill, right? So if we're trying to understand the actual implementation of what happens after this bill is being passed, it is the repealing of 6.01 which is purely again a grievance thing and a pointing fingers thing rather than something that actually promotes student engagement. Tri-campus collaboration. We are all for tri-campus collaboration and increased talking. We hope for it, we encourage it, but there has been a lack of that simply because people aren't reaching out to us, we all have open office hours. We're all very accessible to the public. And because the tri-campus haven't reached out to us, it there's no mutual consensus going on, right? So understand the intentions behind the that clauses, but understand the intentions behind the whereas clauses. That's what I urge everybody to do here. It just again, seems like we're airing out grievances and that there's a very clear that clause that is being gunned at.

Ella Spurlock: Hello, everyone. For those of you who don't know me, my name is Ella. I'm a fourth year PhD candidate in the Department of Chemistry and a senator in GPSS, and I have been for all of my four years here. I will say I also sit on the Executive Committee. I've been elected twice to that position, so I've been in the Executive Committee of GPSS since fall of 2022. So to briefly, I've had a few points build up, but the first one addressing the point of the Director of Internal Policy attending the executive meetings. I will say that is something that has always happened in the past from previous Directors of Internal Policy. As I mentioned, I have been on the Executive Committee for 3 1/2 years now. And there were times when the Director of Internal Policy wasn't able to make it, and they did appoint a proxy or at least communicated with the GPSS Executive Committee that they were not available. I will say we are all students here. Going to classes, getting our degree is and should always be our first priority. That said, when we hold roles like this, there are responsibilities that we take on and finding a proxy is something that's precedent and we really, really look forward to having that undergraduate voice and views within GPSS and that's something that we've been lacking this year. So really looking forward to that. The next point about the Director of University Affairs appointing folks to these liaison positions. I believe it's mentioned in this bill, but GPSS was able to accomplish our appointments fairly quickly, but that did come with a fair amount of work. You didn't mention that, like that's a ton of work, finding all these people and feel free to disregard me if I misunderstood, but it sounds like so far you're only asking your senators directly to hold those liaison positions. Have you sent like all student emails? Have you talked to GPSS because we had many applicants for our positions, so perhaps having Ryan send an

e-mail to reach out to those people who applied but were not appointed to GPSS, like there are there are options and I just some recommendations I might have to try to find those. And then also on the content of this bill, I agree that the that clauses are the most important part. I disagree that forming a committee does nothing and that this can be accomplished simply by good communication, because we've seen that good communication without accountability oftentimes doesn't happen. Forming a committee and having it be, having the Senate hold the Board responsible for this collaboration that the Senate wants and that the students want is going to be a wonderful way to make sure that all students are represented. I believe that there should be some form of legislation to codify these committees and all of the options that are represented. It's honestly surprising to me that this doesn't already happen. So I think getting this motion through an official avenue should be very important for ASUW.

Joseph Riggio: Well, as Dylan addressed the elephant in the room here, the embezzlement clause, to address your point about the specific language in the bill, the words that you cited were in a different draft of the legislation or was in a different bill 32-2 which was the one we read last week. This is and even though it is in this bill, it was not in the last bill. So I'm not sure why and that led to your decision making, but I could be be misremembering.

Dylan Bianchi: Point of information. Actually that's immature, I'm sorry.

Joseph Riggio: So I just wanna put something. I'm on the Planning Committee Chair for the Student Health Fee Committee. Part of the process is if we get student support, we need to create a joint resolution to create a memorandum of understanding, which would then create a committee that we would discuss the Student Health Fee and the provision in the memorandum of understanding and it would be in that joint resolution. This is a joint resolution. While it isn't explicitly in here that a memorandum of understanding, I am welcome to, I'm open to amending language into that clauses so that it's very specific, but it is implied here that the formation is of this committee. The reason why this is not a Senate bill is because we can't alter the bylaws of other organizations. We could do for our own internally, but that's not this is acting as a memorandum of understanding, something that is going to be precedent as we talk about this Student Health Fee if that moves forward. So there already is and that's just that's legally the process in the university policy were required that the Senate's passed that legislation to work on that memorandum of understanding. So this is in effect what this joint resolution will do only for tri-campus collaboration. There is a lot of parallel to that and there's a lot of legal basis for that. So I also respectfully disagree in that. Could the whereas clauses use a little work? Am I open open to striking a few that seem redundant in this? I'm happy to have those conversations. I think we need to because the last thing I want to do is shoot ourselves in the foot. So I'm totally open to removing the embezzlement clause. I am totally open to remove anything that we get public record for that provides evidence in the contrary to any of these clauses. But I do argue still that ultimately senators should be the ones making the decisions here. I do think that this should go through the legislative process so that, as Erick mentioned, with tri-campus collaboration and the lack thereof and us trying to reach out for a year or like basically a year now since Jacob Gannon and then into him and we've been struggling on our end too and I'm OK. I have records of that because I have access to the Jacob's old emails and everything. I saw the lack of communication too, and it seems like we all agree that there's a lack of communication, which means that there and that's mentioned in the whereas clauses here. There's a direct connection to those whereas clauses and the need for this tri-campus support. So I guess I'm just confused as to you know the what the dissonance is between the whereas clauses and the that clauses, because to me it seems like there's a clear connection. We all agree that tri-campus collaboration is lacking miscommunication and lack of communication across the board. I don't

know to what varying degrees I'm open to seeing that public record and informing the people working on this legislation about that too. Again, I was approached with this information. I do not know everything. I have scheduled a meeting with OGR. I'm reaching out with them after this meeting to confirm that either Wednesday or Thursday at 5:00 PM, we're going to be meeting to discuss this joint resolution. I'm open to those conversations. Ever since this, I recognize that had I been given more time and wasn't approached during break, I would have tried to make as much effort as humanly possible to meet with people. But and people that are working on this legislation are scared to come out there and that's and that was a weird way of saying it so let the minutes reflect that. But it's true. There's a reason why I was approached. Again, I am not a politician, I'm a human rights activist and so and people know my background. I would never sponsor something that I would believe that the people working behind it are acting in bad faith. I wouldn't do that. I would have withdrawn this legislation. Aiden Reeder was the former prime sponsor of this, he withdrew. So I and I was asked to take it over and I agreed to take it over just so that way the people working on this could have a say. I was aware that there would be testimonies at the last Senate meeting. I did not know that they were going to do it at that Senate meeting. I did not know that. I don't know if y'all can tell from my reaction, but I also wasn't the most happiest person during that moment either. The bill was recognizably unfinished at that state, as you can see in some embarrassing clauses and placeholders. It is a complete version now. That's why we introduced it as a new bill. This has a new bill code and that is what I want to say on that front

Ashwin Anand: Just to kind of quote you Joseph, I think we are shooting ourselves in the foot only because when over 150 lines of the whereas clauses are almost directly just again, defamatory statements,

Joseph Riggio: Point of Information can you point to the specific whereas clauses that you find inflammatory so I have knowledge of them?

Ashwin Anand: You can look towards Tri campus collaboration, whereas clause number one. Having attempted to fully direct such events, including Huskies on the Hill, you can look towards, so you want me to go through all of them, but sure, I was speaking more of a general context. OK, OK, I mean, I'll go through all of them. Let's see here. On whereas clauses with Tri campus representation on UAW 4121. Yeah, I with the whereas clauses on tri-campus cooperation you know, have been lacking. Whereas clause 3 ASUWT and ASUWB lack of communication when we've again put in our efforts to try to communicate. I'll yield my time to Nandana.

Nandana Jaideep: There's multiple instances of defamatory clauses. If you like, want to come back to me, I can like pick up the quotes and the lines and source them. But I just want to say that simply saying that I was trying to mischaracterize the VP who's the acting president by doing that is inflammatory because now you are accusing somebody of allegedly doing something when they were following the procedure.

Joseph Riggio: Point of information. My question is you say that, and correct me if I'm wrong, but do you mean in this bill there's language in here that mischaracterizes the bill. I would like to you to point to that language.

Dylan Bianchi: I just want to make a quick point. We can say over you know over again that we're all students. We all make mistakes, except that most of these whereas clauses are dedicated to specifically naming members of ASUW Board or ASUW Seattle and accusing them of wrongdoing. And I'd like to yield my time to Pierce to give Pierce a time to have a chance to speak. Do you have anything to say, Pierce? I yield my time to whoever's next on the list.

Julia Tanner: So kind of echoing what Joseph was saying about the Whereas clauses. Again, like I also had issues reading the whereas clauses. They can be amended on the floor. I think it's important that again, everything is like it's as factual as as possible. So if Nandana has like receipts for like exactly how these things are wrong, most of them aren't cited either, which is already an issue so that's important. I also agree that like a lack of direct communication before the drafting of this bill was bad. That was like my biggest issue reading this is like where was the direct communication, especially if this lack of direct communication in this resolution where there are potentially inflammatory things in the whereas clauses impedes actual collaboration between tri-campuses. That's important but I wanted to talk about like whether the things in where the that clauses can be done without a bill. As Erick said, it has been really difficult to do informally, you can say, oh, it's because it's just Student Senate not the board, but he has been doing a lot to try to foster collaboration between all three campuses and it clearly is not going well and hasn't been going well. And so I do want to push back a little bit about that clause about forming the committee because I again, it's a formalized way of getting the three campuses and GPSS together and it's not about the committee finding the solution as it lays out forming a committee in order to do just doing that would enhance communication, but planning Huskies on the Hill, city lobbying efforts, cross campus events, which I haven't seen personally and other issues as the committee sees fit. That's not saying this committee will be formed to find the solution, it is outlining specific reasons for the committee to be formed in the first place. And again I think that is important.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, before I continue on to Abigail and then go call for hands again, I will say it has been established precedent and tradition that if we feel like whereas clauses or that clauses need work, we have in the past recommended that sponsors draft potential edits and then wait to see those before we approve so that we know that when it goes into committee edits what we want to be addressed will be addressed. And so that is fully an option for all of you to keep in mind. I just want to make that clear and then something I forgot to mention where the the word events sparked. Top Dawg Voter Contest is another tri-campus thing that's been happening. That's. I don't know if that can really be termed an event, but it's sort of like for voter engagement like things where like it's a competition and it like has generated at least some interest. So I forgot to mention that, but I'll go to Abigail and then I'll call for hands again.

Abigail Appleyard: I have a couple of quick points but the first is just supporting the idea of having a committee. I've sat on many committees before, as I'm sure all of you guys have, but nothing beats being in a room with people discussing an issue. It is just 100 times more efficient than any e-mail phone call will ever be. At the same time, I recognize that like, it can be difficult to get all those people in a room. And so maybe it's possible that we could set a date on when we would need to set committee meetings by. And then, you know, if people aren't around, it doesn't work out that way maybe we commit to trying a new approach after that, but I think like starting with committee meetings because that's a system that we're used to. It's a system that we know works when people are there. I think that's definitely the first place that I would think to start and I think it's written in this bill. The second thing is just that I was also not aware about all this stuff with you know, all this whole situation when we were in Senate the other day. But if people want to come into a public meeting and say things, that's their prerogative. And I don't think that should be a reflection of Joseph or the work that's gone into this bill. And the third thing is just a quick note. I think it's incredibly unprofessional to be walking around and whispering to each other when the prime sponsor is speaking because you are clearly not listening to them and are not putting effort into what they are saying.

Ashwin Anand: Thank you, Abigail, for speaking. Just to quickly talk about a couple points. To your point about a committee and Julia as well. I agree. Committees are great. You're getting everybody into a room similar to what we're doing right now and having open discourse, but I completely understand that, right? I do have a personal opinion that a committee could be formed outside of the boundaries of Senate. I think that's again my personal opinion. There definitely is a better process in order to form this committee. The problem where again, a lot of Board and we've brought up issues, right, is that most of the substance of this bill does not reflect what would be actually done in this committee. We can have an entirely new bill that is way less attacking certain people on Board and establishing a committee on the right borders, right? It can be an entirely different bill with even just one clause that establishes this committee with specifications. Again, there's no specifications on how many people are in this committee, where this committee takes place, just like you mentioned when meetings need to be established by just a lot of things within this committee point that can be established in an entirely different bill that is not addressed in this bill. It's just a point that I want it to be right. Second thing, this is a joint resolution and I again taking into account joint right there not only in this. Build and a majority of the whereas clauses are only addressing ASUW. There have been mistakes, again a lack of communication across all fronts, ASUWT, ASUWB and GPSS. There are four organizations in play in this joint resolution and only ASUW is being named. That's our entire agreement, right? The bill's content is pointing fingers at certain people, not pointing fingers at other people, and entirely again in its message wrong. When you read the whereas clauses, the 200 whereas clauses, and then you get to one clause that I appreciate, I agree with it. And then you get to another clause which again, yes people have the ability to openly have public comment and speak their mind. But when the intention of this bill, when it's been co-authored by people at that organization in order to get that, what's it 6.01 removed is the nature of it, right? That's the intent. Their intent is, I can't speak for their intent. At least the way that I read it in my personal opinion is that their intent is to not foster open communication, but rather get that 6.01 removed. There's a much entirely better way to establish this committee that does not involve finger pointing. And if it does involve finger pointing, point everybody out, right? That's, I'll leave it at that.

Nandana Jaideep: I have the certain whereas clauses. I only picked some of them out because I don't want to be here forever. But if you would like me to go through the rest of them I can do that. Let's go to line 36. It says whereas ASUW has case criticism based on testimonials to be read, while the ASUW Student Senate considers this JR for its handling of tri-campus events, having attempted to fully direct such events, including Huskies on the Hill, with minimal input from other student governments in ways that burden other campus campuses and strain the intercampus relationships. That is extremely defamatory. Simply put, there's a Huskies on the Hill meeting going on right now as we speak involving all the campuses, which I wish we could be at to help improve our Huskies on the Hill experience as well, which I believe might have been more productive.

Joseph Riggio: Point of information for the Huskies on the Hill committee I've just heard from various different sources. I know Douglas is an intern of OGR. Is it true that they have been leading and writing the majority of? The planning document for the Huskies on the Hill.

Dylan Bianchi: Douglas is taking the lead because amongst us OGR interns, Douglas was selected for this. Douglas has faced challenges with other campuses not doing things they were asked to help with and instead going in and deleting the work Douglas took on, which has led to Douglas having to do more and more as certain things were left undone. I will also say that Douglas is not the only OGR person working on this. To be clear, Douglas is it's actually not here in the meeting due to

some sort of conflict, so MJ Mencius is there. I believe Brandon is there and they have also regularly been in those meetings. So just to be clear from those points.

Nandana Jaideep: I do believe that is extremely defamatory to all of the wonderful work our Office of Government Relations has been doing. Moving on, we can go to line 58. Which says that whereas, according to verbal testimony submitted for this JR current and past ASUW BOD members have acted in a way to hamper tri-campus collaboration and governing transparency. I believe this is extremely defamatory and this is the testimony cited as a claim for this clause is also a serious issue of representation and legal exposure that cannot be ignored because ASUWT's reference and work in this legislation without evidence of formal discussion, debate or authorization of their Senate constitutes another form of misrepresentation. So I'll just put that out there one more time, moving on to clause 64, the entire Institute of Director of Legislative Affairs again, we can all allegedly that person has done something wrong. I cannot talk unless there's like a legal. I'm not implicated to speak on that. I'm just saying that putting things on here without any sort of proof or evidence can give the other person a grounds for defamation, if that makes sense. So us like quoting someone else's like actions without any sort of source or evidence is essentially defaming them. Moving on to line 128, the entire failure to represent the student government proceedings. That is simply untrue. Again, like if you guys would like to see all of my tri-campus communication efforts, I'd be happy to provide that to you. This is why I believe that before going on the public record and making inaccurate claims, it is very important to talk to all parties involved so that you have like a holistic view of every situation and that we proceed in a professional manner within our organization. We represent the entire student body and we are doing the students injustice by acting in a way that hinders our productivity and our interpersonal skills that in fact are the very things that help us do this incredible work. But yeah, that's all I have to say. If you guys want me to list out the rest of the defamatory clauses, let me know.

Peyton Sax: I've been really trying to sit here intentionally and listen to everybody in the room, because I really appreciate all of you spending the time to be here because all of you really do put in really hard work. And Joseph, I appreciate you trying to advocate for people like I know that that's your intention with this bill is to advocate for the voices that go unheard. I will say that like having Nandana have to go through every single bit that feels defamatory and it's this is this to me is it that's not a productive use of our time collectively. It's not a productive use of y'all's time. It's not a productive use of her time or anybody's. I truly think that, like this could be solved by communicating and yeah, establishing another bill with a committee to work on this relationship. Right now though, this this conversation, it has been an hour and a half and I just want to put that in the record that it has almost been an hour and a half of talking about what could have been said, what wasn't said, what was cited and what isn't cited. And I don't think that's productive for y'all. Time or anybody's time. And I appreciate all the hard work that you do in taking the time, but I want your time to be used productively along with the rest of ours. So that's all I'm gonna say. Again, I appreciate you being here. I that's that's really all I have though.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I go for hands again on that note, I will remind everyone that we have this room until 5:45. So we have 20 minutes and we need to approve the floor agenda before then because it needs to go out 24 hours before our meeting. So by Monday at 5:00 PM, Monday's the Holiday and Saturday, Sunday weekends. So we do need to approve the floor agenda before 5:45 today so I would hope that we all keep that in mind. And if anyone wants to table this for further conversation, that's always an option. I already see hands, I guess, so if you'd like to speak, I'll go to Ashwin, Joseph and then Dylan.

Ashwin Anand: Echoing off of Peyton's point, and just really specifically what I mentioned already, a large portion of this bill, in my personal opinion, does not need to be there. Establishing committee we all support. Everybody supports increasing communication. There can be an entirely different drafted bill to have that one that clause that says, that has all the specifications of a proper true committee to foster tri-campus collaboration. We are all in support of that. I will personally sit on that committee myself and I will see through. I understand and I appreciate the need for it. But when we look at specific that clauses that indicate ASUWTs, maybe in my personal opinion, their personal grievances towards the ASUW Board for approving 6.01 and when you look at a multitude of whereas clauses that take and point fingers at certain ASUW members and not the entirety of all four organizations, I don't see the effective purpose of this bill and to Peyton's point committing this to the floor of Senate and taking up senators times with a bill that only points fingers rather than establishes and truly does something for senators. Even previously, Erick mentioned that senators hadn't written that that many legislations this quarter. There could have been more efforts in order to pursue further legislation in a variety of ways to better the student experience, like Nandana mentioned, this bill in its entirety 300 lines. There's maybe, in my personal opinion, 30 to 40 to 50 lines that are truly reflective and that are truly productive for Senate and for ASUW.

Joseph Riggio: Well I will have to, let me address the criticism that this bill points fingers to ASUW Seattle, that is that this bill points fingers largely ASUW Seattle Board members, right? So I just want to point to the clauses and I'll try to be quick. I have them here, but the problem is I need to Scroll down for it. One second. Apologies. So line 101, whereas clause this criticism isn't fully aimed at the current OGR team who is dealing with the aftermath and actions of the former DOLA is to highlight the damage that has been done, emphasize the lack of efforts by BOD etcetera. And then I'll move to 186. Oh, OK, can I read off of yours then to get the line numbers? And then also oh yes, 186 because ASUW and ASUWT and ASUWB for this matter in reference to faculty councils have no active representation on either more. And then also. There is another clause. I'll just read it out loud. Yeah, we recognize that that we aren't just pointing fingers at ASUW Seattle when we make that clear in this bill. I just wanted to point that out and I've already I'll, say it for the record twice now, totally open and I can prepare amendments and whatnot for consideration and I can present a report even to senators and what not about any clauses that we work together and collaborate on in terms of anything that would concern defamation. Also that I've already said that the embezzlement clause can be amended and changed as well. I think that's beating on a dead horse. The last thing that I'll say is I just want to say I appreciate y'all coming out and providing much needed context. Your wisdom is very appreciated and. I do recognize that. I think we could work together and collaborate more, a lot more than we're currently doing. We would love to have you in steering. I know like Senate leadership, we'd love to have you guys. You guys are on our agenda so we'd love to have you guys here. Nandana, you are a voting member, so you're always welcome here to provide insight and whatnot and correct the record when things are necessary. And with that, I encourage, just for time sakes, either a motion to approve or a motion to table. And that's all I will say,

Dylan Bianchi moves to table JR-32-3 and SB-32-1 until January 26th

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the floor agenda, I want to highlight elections. I'm gonna hand the floor to Dylan is in a second, but I think Joseph also has been in communication with Unit of Transportation about the University Transportation Committee. So I'll start with Dylan. Do you want to explain the case?

Dylan Bianchi: Does everybody remember the bill we passed like two months ago now regarding these sort of residential housing boards? One is camp centric, one's not OK. We were initially gonna go the open selection route, then Nandana pointed out that we would get a representative on these committees way faster just by appointing a Senate liaison. So if we had the Board, yes, the Board go through yesterday to change that wording in like one of the that clauses. Yeah, the one thing, could we change this to have it specified? This is my bad that these would be two year terms. Sure. And then Joseph, I checked this by Erick, just wanna confirm, we can appoint liaisons for two year terms, right?

Joseph Riggio: Not necessarily. So it depends a lot on their bylaws, because we appoint liaisons based on the needs of what other committees are. So I don't have to verify that. So I can't provide a concrete answer right now.

Dylan Bianchi: In communication, it was specifically requested that we send someone for longer term.

Erick Jacobsen: And considering that we have in the past appointed liaisons from senators from a current year to serve as liaisons for the next year, that's precedent enough, I think so. OK. So we have those two on the agenda. Dylan, do you know meeting times for any of them or is that to be determined? OK. And then Joseph, did you have the university transportation committee or are we holding off for a week or what?

Joseph Riggio: The university transportation committee should be good to go, I thought. Are we electing a Senate liaison? Did you send me? I'm so sorry. I thought Matt went by acclamation, right? That was transfer students. Oh, transfer students. No, I have not received anything about that.

Erick Jacobsen: Alright, well, we don't have to do that now then. So with those two elections. And then the WUE bill and Nandana has a forum. Nandana, how long do you think you'll need?

Nandana Jaideep: Not longer than 20 minutes for sure. If we're doing questions.

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like it should say Meetings are TBD and not NA, because that implies that there aren't.

Dylan Bianchi: One of them meets 4 times a year and the other meets 6 times a year and I can't remember, but I will bring that.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions, comments or motions? Oh, I will say, this does exclude committee meetings. Do we want to have committee meetings,

Pierce Wallbaum: I was just gonna ask what was going on with that since they're not on the agenda.

Dylan Bianchi: I think the same thing from last week applies where I think we should have at least one meeting where we address the legislation before we have another meeting that's just like check in, how are you doing? OK, so yeah, unless we get to like a month of no committee meetings

Blair Yeh: We need a committee meeting for On Campus Affairs to sure and a Vice chair, right?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, you're so right. OK. Oh, also we apologies, we forgot. Technically we need to do Committee Chair Elections for the new Select Committee, right?

Joseph Riggio: I can briefly prepare a description and questions. Yes. And if we don't get around to it, we can approve the agenda for Julia's sake and I can just.

Erick Jacobsen: We don't need to post it today. We just need to approve it before we get kicked out. Do we want to have committee meetings after the resolution? Because it might take the whole meeting, but I don't think it's gonna take the whole meeting.

Pierce Wallbaum: What is presidential form? Can you explain that?

Erick Jacobsen: That's Nandana's forum. Yeah we're not having Dr. Jones again.

Joseph Riggio: We can also change it on the floor too before we approve the agenda if we're not feeling it.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 5-0-2

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: We have no discussion items

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any announcements or public comments? I will announce. You can announce that too. But I will announce OGR has sent us two bills for signing in pro. We will be announcing it in Senate as well. But SB 5906, the SAFE Act, submitted by Senator Drew Hanson, prevents ICE from entering college campuses without a court order and mandates institutions warn students of ICE presence on campus and SB 5963 automatically qualifies members of the Passports to Career program with LASAC for the Washington College grant as well, which deals with foster youth and unaccompanied homeless youth as well.

Julia Tanner: In case you haven't seen on Instagram, this isn't verified as of before this meeting. I don't know if Nandana has a verification. But there is, yeah, there are whispers that ICE might be around campus this weekend and on Tuesday. So whether or not it's confirmed or not, just keep yourself safe. Know your rights. Inform others of their rights. Like, look out for each other. That's it.

Erick Jacobsen: Nandana have you heard back from Sally?

Nandana Jaideep: No, I haven't reached out yet. I also want to know if until I have accurate information, I also don't want to like send out any inaccurate information or fear monger. Anyway, so I will try to get that information to you guys as soon as I can.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements or would any member of the public?

Henry: I'd encourage signing in pro for Senate Joint Memorial 8114, which is an investigation to the killing of Aisha Moore. It's the second time that Kara Washington and her family are attempting to get more pressure to have a formal investigation from the US as well as the country that murdered her into just the circumstances and social justice.

Blair Yeh: this is like a question for the committees. Are there like teams chats?

Erick Jacobsen: There's a channel in our, in the Senate teams, like the team, not the chat. So they do exist and we do tend to prefer if committee chairs can send out like a brief pre meeting message before Tuesday.

Blair Yeh: know that myself and like over half of the people on the On Campus Affairs committee is not in any kind of Teams.

ADJOURNMENT

Abigail Appleyard moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-2-0

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
