



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

1/26/2026

HUB 307

4:04 pm

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

Kavi 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 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

Brendan Chang (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: With that, we'll move on to the approval of the agenda. There are suggested edits on there, including minutes from Friday's steering. Do I hear any motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve suggested edit.

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and reorder proposals

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-0-3

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda.

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

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: All right, so moving on to the speakers report. I've been working with Nandana and the Bean Basket and with the Food Pantry. We're gonna schedule a meeting for hopefully sometime this week to figure out all of that stuff with the setting up the Food Pantry chapter. There's quite a few logistics to handle. I'm going to close the When2Meet that I sent out to all the Senate officials from Tri Campus groups and try and schedule a first meeting of potentially more to discuss my memorandum of understanding draft that I've had since the start of the year. Also, I've been working with Valeria and we're going to loop in Pav from GPSS on ironing out and following up on a issue of ICE policy and I'm also in communication with Avery, a senator who's working on a bill pertaining to that subject as well. We're going to have GAVEL appoint a liaison and then that liaison's gonna work with me, Kate, Nandana, Valeria and Pav to figure out how we are going to follow up on ICE presence and prepare for a potential ICE presence. And then finally Nandana and I met with Denzil Suite and Lincoln Johnson about the engineering RSO student fee on Wednesday. And Denzil Suite's going to reach out to the department of engineering or mechanical engineering. So things are making progress slowly but surely and I am really enjoying a lot of the progress that I'm seeing.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Alright so congratulations to the new GAVEL members. We have four new, technically five new GAVEL members because we had a vice chair election and vice chairs are part of GAVEL automatically so congrats to those five people. I've been onboarding and whatnot and trying to get them situated in GAVEL, I'm excited to pick up the work and whatnot on Thursday. Also, attendance has been looking pretty good so far. I'm honestly super astounded by the fact that we have a regular attendance of around 90 for so we're well above quorum and that's really good for winter quarter. A lot of organizations experience seasonal depression and that hits us too so I don't wanna jinx it. I think next meeting there'll be high attendance too because, good segue to my next announcement, Provost Forum happening tomorrow. It's the 27th. I created a form already for submitting questions. The provost has received the two prepared questions, those are the ones I posted in steering so if you want to expand on those questions or anything, I highly recommend that

you submit questions on the Microsoft forum so that way I can ask follow up questions and Senate leadership and moderator, I will probably be the one delegate moderator again. Been working with Erick to try and get a GAVEL member for the immigration policy, we're gonna talk about that tomorrow. And then, yeah, oh, liaison committee, right. So I'm going to try in in my report form for tomorrow, I'm gonna request that liaisons, if they can, can stay behind for like a few minutes they can join well, bonding's next the following week, right? OK, well, I'm gonna ask them to stay behind a little bit so that we can, I can just brief them on both the liaison report form, which if you have liaisons in your committees, remind them to fill out the liaison report form. It's due on February 2nd, so. Please help them do that. But I'm gonna have them stay behind and so we can work out monthly meetings for that committee. That's all I have.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Super quick, I'm going to send out another when2meet for planning bonding because the past one wasn't, It's hard to like plan two weeks out, so I appreciate you guys tried. But yeah, I'm going to send it out again and I'll reconvene and give you guys the results next week. That's all I have.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Hello, the word of the day today made me laugh. So its going to be the word of the week now. It is oaf, which is used to refer to someone as big, slovenly, and slow. And y'all are doing a great job.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the minutes we do have 3 sets of minutes today.

Recess 4:12 pm

Reconvened 4:20 pm

Julia Tanner moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 6-0-0

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: we are moving on to proposals JR-32-4, this was resubmitted, JR-32-3 was withdrawn and Joseph would you like to just talk about what was changed.

Joseph Riggio: Yes, I can. So I met with OGR today around 2:00 PM and it was a very productive discussion. Nandana was also there too, so she can verify what I'm saying in case I'm saying anything that wasn't, but I did take notes in the meeting, so I hope I can characterize it best. But essentially pretty much everything that had to do with OGR and characterizing what happened last year and some of the recent events we cleaned up the timeline and the history of it and I got their perspective and I went ahead with deciding to just strike that from the bill. I agree with the point even in steering I acknowledged I agree with the points that there were sources that were, there weren't adequate enough sources in the bill that substantiate those claims and statements and testimonies are never guaranteed so it was it was a leap in logic so that part was removed. You'll notice that the pretty much the director clauses were removed. The board bill 6.01 is still in there although it's condensed just so stating that it happened and that this is what the regent's position was. Pretty much I removed everything that didn't have a very clear source is essentially what happened. And if you look at the the source links or whatnot, there's a direct reference. I also went through the THAT clauses and made sure that all the WHEREAS clauses had meaning to the THAT clauses in the bill. So if you go through it, it's all in subsequent order or sequential order. So I'm talking about what happened with OGR last year and everything and I'm trying to form that MOU and I'd love to you know if we do bring this to Senate we can talk about Erick's effort too. Brandon also mentioned wanting to try and do something in the form of an MOU, something formal to formalize efforts tri-campus so we can decide. Senators can decide whatever they think is best. The other thing in here is that THAT clauses there are specific ones to 4121 now that directly link to the WHEREAS clause there. There's a whereas clause talking about GPSS attendance and whatnot has a THAT clause that's directly linked to that as well. So overall the bill is just much more directly tied to the sources, WHEREAS clauses and THAT clauses are much clearer. I argue this is a more this amended version of the bill, in my opinion, satisfies a lot of what the arguments are, but I would like to hear what everyone else has to say about it and open for questions.

Nandana Jaideep: Yes, I wanted to start off by saying thank you, Joseph, for your work on this bill and for meeting with me, Brandon and MJ earlier today. I think that kind of gave us like a little more clarity on like some of the context leading up to this bill, but I still wanna say that there's the THAT clause that we're zoomed in on the screen right now. I think if our goal is to facilitate healthy tri-campus relationships, I think the board bill of 6.01 was an attempt at that exactly simply because ASUW's name was kind of shown in like an inaccurate and like an ideal light in a state such as the Board of Regents, and if ASUW is talked about in a defamatory way, which includes Board, Senate, our entire organization, I think it is our responsibility to correct that and let them know that this is not the place or time to address personal grievances and this was just an attempt at reaching out to them and being like, let's talk to each other directly. So I'd say this board bill in fact facilitates tri-campus relationships and does exactly what it's saying it doesn't. Simply because I sent this board bill to Tacoma, I extended that offer to meet, which was returned with silence. So I don't think repealing this is gonna exactly facilitate a healthy tri-campus relationship. It's just gonna take away from our autonomy and like take away from me standing up for the name and honor of our organization.

Ashwin Anand: I'm gonna second what Nandana said. I think that, you know, to your point, I think a lot of the amendments that have been made or the reintroduction of this joint resolution, there are parts of the WHEREAS clauses that I do agree they've been cut out in an effective way

that definitely add value to the joint resolution. And again on a personal note with line 65 to 72 that or lines 61 to 68 that referenced me like again completely understood that I've been absent from the GPSS meetings. There has been a class that I attend both fall and winter quarter that conflict with those times like I understand that this is pointing it out right. To note this point again repealing 6.01, at least to my understanding, when there have been efforts made to create and foster collaboration between Tacoma and Seattle like repealing 6.01 doesn't do anything when again, we were calling out an injustice that was made that hampered our tri-campus collaboration. And so we don't wanna create a back and forth where we had introduced the bill, it's been passed, we sent out that statement and it should have been the end, right? Repealing it only contributes back to that cycle of like now we're going back and forth on how inequities are addressed, et cetera. I'll leave it at that but like my main point of contention is with 6.01 just because like I think the rest of the THAT causes address most of the stuff at least.

Pierce Wallbaum: Point of information, I want to look at this board bill but its not, the link says it's been removed.

Joseph Riggio: This is the same argument I'm going to make for the Senate bill too, so. I think we could all agree that our governing documents, it's a headache to read to go through all the different positions, all the different ways that we structure our government is very convoluted. That's, yeah. And so trying to figure out and how to plan everything that pertains to your role is going to be difficult. And I recognize that my God, I like even with Vice Speaker, like I'll be working 18.9 hours weekly, which is 3.9 hours over what I'm supposed to be working and it's, I understand Ashwin, this bill and the Senate bill is not pointed at personal, the the positions. This is a result of an institutional issue more than anything of we need to try and look at our bylaws and look at our Constitution and look at our governing documents and go, OK, clearly this hasn't been entirely working. Some of it has some of there have been great initiatives and great efforts and great things put out by the Board of Directors. And I mean like my work. I've worked closely with Audriana too, like the Student Health Fee and like I know he she's super big on the public health side of things and it's been great to work with her there. And like I, Ashwin, I see you in the office. I'm like, I know you're doing judicial stuff and whatnot. I appreciate that work and that work that you do too but things have and historically have been missed and these are kind of ways that we can sit down and have a conversation about, OK, well, you know, should these responsibilities fall under these positions? Should what is our proxy system look like? Do we need to be more clear about that? How can we reform our institution to better serve students which, you know, I would argue that to address the 6.01 concerns, I think that's, you mentioned the cycle of we don't want to have this back and forth and I think my curiosity and my question just kind of is, well, the cycle needs to start and this joint resolution I guarantee you would not have really existed if it wasn't for that board bill. I can tell you that right now it wouldn't have. So it's just interesting to me that the same argument is being used against this effort to have a public conversation about what we're trying to do tri-campus. And I think we should have an educated and informed conversation about it, which is what I tried to do with meeting with OGR, what I've tried to do reaching out to y'all, I understand that the beginning of this was very rocky and I apologize on behalf of them for that and myself, just as somebody who has met with y'all prior and likes to mediate before throwing myself in the shark tank. But you know there's a reason this effort exists and there's a reason why they won't budge on this THAT clause and I think if senators want to repeal that that THAT clause, I think they should be able to do that and if there's a convincing argument for that, I think that should happen on the floor.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I move down the queue and then accept new hands with regards to constitution and bylaws like complexity, I did want everyone to be aware we talked about in board

this last Thursday like a sort of workshop which would act as a special board meeting. It would run 9:00 to 5:00 on a Saturday. I know 9-5 on a Saturday. That sucks. But we're the only people who have to be there and all of you are invited to come if you want. It's still being scheduled, so we don't have anything confirmed yet, but there'll basically be a time that, there will be catering, where we go through the constitution and the bylaws and we identify issues and potential solutions. And so that is something that the board has been talking about implementing. Owen's been taking the lead on scheduling and all that stuff, but you are all welcome to attend once that's like locked down and you're welcome to reach out to Owen and Nandana For more information.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, so I just wanted to clarify my position on this cause last meeting was a little bit foggy. I want to reiterate that I'm for tri-campus collaboration and working with the tri-campuses. But in terms of routes to actually do that collaboration, I feel like there's been a few routes taken. There's this JR, there's what Erick introduced at the board meeting and there's also just informal kind of communication. And so as far as the best route, I just want to say my position that the, especially with the history and the drama with this JR it feels like it's a lot of energy being taken in the wrong way like that energy could have been put somewhere else. And so I'm gonna say that I'm not fully in support of this JR but I am in support of the general like the face value of having collaboration and tri-campus collaboration.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, one thing I want to mention is that I broadly agree with Joseph's point that in terms of like policy stuff that this bill does, that's something that should be up to Senate to decide. My concern was not, the things I would rather not put in front of Senate have to maybe do with interpersonal issues, right? I think last year we lost winter quarter to the JCC bill because it was so wrapped up in interpersonal stuff. And once you start trying to litigate that in a space like Senate, it's an unwinnable argument. It just spirals. My concern with discussion of Board Bill 6.01 right is that right now UWT is dealing with a pretty significant internal conflict and it's it is ongoing, right? Like Elias is still litigating this. I think it would be best that as Senate, we decided we were not going to touch this with a 10 foot pole until it's been settled, until it's been shaken out. I think broadly speaking, we should let UWT figure out their stuff and we should not get involved or reference or like further kind of poke the bear by tweaking the past approach to this issue, especially because like I said, I think if you take a pretty personally charged issue like this and you put it in front of Senate in any capacity, that's just not a helpful space to deal with that stuff. And I think people are gonna kind of fixate on the interpersonal stuff and then one side is going to want to speak, the other side is going to want to speak. They're going to have conflicting narratives. I think it's going to be problematic. And for that reason, I don't think we should. I think we should remove clauses relating to 6.01 before we put this on the floor.

Ashwin Anand: Thank you everybody for your your inputs and to kind of just go from the top down starting with the bylaws and constitution. As to Erick's point, we're in an ongoing process to improve them and you know Board and Senate themselves like we've all come to the consensus that both the governing documents are not in alignment, that there's a lot of problems with it. And so we're taking active steps in order to take like, you know, a big leap towards making sure that both of those documents are the best that they they can possibly be. I encourage everybody to go to, when the meeting is scheduled so that you can provide your inputs on the bylaws and constitution, it'll be really great. Second thing to your point, Julia, like I'm for tracking this collaboration and that's precisely what Board's started from scratch, right? We wanted a bill where we wanted to start from the ground up to make the intentions of the bill clear like even though intentions aren't specifically like stated in the bill, they definitely carry their own weight. And so Board we've decided to pursue a very ground up approach, positive approach of tri-campus collaboration to pursue memorandums

of understanding and lock in and solidify tri-campus collaboration amongst the organizations, right? And I think to the point, to your point, the JR's connotation, even though maybe now because of some of the changes is slightly more positive, it still has that negative connotation with some of the WHEREAS clauses and so in my personal opinion, I think it should be tabled indefinitely so that Board can start from scratch and so that input can be provided from everybody else. To your point, personal grievances on the Senate floor are not very productive at all. ASUWT is going through their own stuff and the Board Bill specifically calls out what was addressed towards ASUW and not towards what is happening at ASUWT. And so again, I wanted we wanted the Board Bill to be an end all to where we call out what was wrong about what they did at the Board of Regents and for that to stop there, right. And so reiterating again, I think it should be tabled indefinitely so that Board can figure out what is the approach for Tri campus collaboration and also we encourage ASUWT, ASUWB and GPSS to be there when we start solidifying how we approach this in the future.

Erick Jacobsen: And adding on to the like planned workshop, it's scheduled for 9:00 to 5:00. If you want to drop in, you don't have to be there nine to five, you can just be there as long as it takes for you to provide your input and for us to hear you out.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, I'll touch on a little bit about the Board Bill that Ashwin mentioned. So I think our vision for that is just keeping all the productive aspects of this JR and moving towards like a more cohesive, respectful and collaborative approach to it. So when we talk about memorandums of understanding, the reason we didn't pass anything last meeting is again, we don't want to have this whole thing of stepping on people's toes. We wanted to talk to OGR, get their input because a large part of tri-campus relationships have to do with the work that our Office of Government Relations does. So we want to take like a slow, steady and like cohesive approach to this, which is why we wanted to take it, build it from scratch. And obviously this is not going to be like a board bill that we pass and never look at again. Our intention with this is to get Board to come to an agreement and obviously Senate will be the body that passes this memorandum of understanding and we'll hope that the Senate of the others as well as GPSS will also want to pass something of that sort. Moving on to Joseph's comment about how like this bill would not exist if not for Board Bill 6.01, I feel like the reason 6.01 exists is because certain members of ASUW Tacoma chose to air out personal grievances at a stage, such as the Board of Regents. This was our response to that, saying that that's not OK and let's have a more professional meeting to discuss anything of such sort. That request was ignored and this came out of that, which is again airing up personal grievances on a public state such as the Senate. And if you think about that logically, that makes me think that the bill that we passed has even more grounds now because they just invalidated everything that we asked them for and went on to do the exact same thing of airing out personal grievances on a public setting again, if that makes sense, which is why I wouldn't become, I'm uncomfortable repealing this bill because instead of coming to us and facilitating healthy tri-campus relationships, we keep going in circles and this bill is our intentional effort to let them know that we're here to fix this in like a professional manner.

Ella Spurlock: Yes, on the topic of Board Bill 6.01, my understanding from what I've heard speaking to people doing research for this bill and also this resolution and also from just our WHEREAS clauses is that one of the largest complaints is that the current ASUW Tacoma president is referred to repeatedly as the Vice President, which is actually incorrect. And so this is a matter of respect and at the least submitting a correction to update that to respectfully refer to the President as the President and not the Vice President would be a very easy step to take to begin to start to heal these tri-campus relationships that are looking a little rough.

Joseph Riggio: You know, I've only been here for a year and a half now, so I don't know the history. Actually, Erick probably knows more history than I do. He's ancient at this point. Sorry. And Nandana, you as well. You've also been here last three years, right? University Affairs Director, Vice President and then President. And so it's, and for the last three years, I'm aware of many internal efforts. In fact, the constitutional amendment that's being proposed in judicial at 5:30 is based on a task force that was done in 2024 to reform the Constitution. There's a lot of amendments so a lot of amendments made to the Constitution to try and improve the institution internally reform because issues like this have happened in the past. This is history repeating itself. This is not new history. If you go back to the archives, you can talk to Francisco if you want. He's the expert when it comes to ASUW or he knows actual ancient history of of ASUW. It's crazy. He digs up archives from the libraries and shit on ASUW constitutions and previous efforts of that so he's very knowledgeable. But regardless, this is, this has been happening for a while and so you know, we're already in the cycle. It's not about preventing any cycle. It's not, we're already in it. And the the problem is what ends up from my observations, what keeps on happening is and the Senate tries to internally work with the Board of Directors to have institutional reform, it goes somewhere. There's progress, there's promises made, and there might be a constitutional amendment put in the ballot and that constitutional amendment goes through. There might be bylaws, reforms and a task force that gets formed and then boom, we have reforms. And then the following year, it's all undone or it's completely changed. It doesn't look the same way again. So there's a history that sort of makes me a little uneasy to go along with the arguments that are being presented today about internal reform is I'm very worried history will repeat itself and this, this and the SB for that matter, is a way to find some sort of way to involve the student body more. Students should be able to read the what should be publicly available, but is not for some reason. Board Bill 6.01, which we've had to screenshot and put as an appendix on here because we don't have access to bill. I asked the board coordinator who that's that's their job. And then I had to reach out to Erick for that board bill because I know he's on board. So eventually I did get the board bill. But it's still not publicly available and we've been talking about this for like 3 weeks now. So that's a problem and it's been, the source has been linked here for a while and on top of that like and to quote MJ because I love this quote, senators can read. Like they can read the bill, they can read the the Board Bill, they can agree with Board, they can disagree with Board. But it should be senators at the end of the day, we should not kill this bill in steering. That is my argument that I've been running with for the past few weeks and it's the argument I'll continue to run with, you know? This is not official student opinion. This is workshopping something together with the Senate to try. All this is already public. All this is already answered. If anything, us working together, collaborating is going to look a lot better to students and a lot better to the public to build confidence and respect to our institution again, where I have friends that keep telling me like, I don't even know what the ASUW does anymore. We got to fix it. Something has to happen. And I firmly believe that these efforts, though imperfect, are a step in the right direction.

Erick Jacobsen: It is now 4:45, which is our timestamp for the approval of the Senate floor agenda and these bills are automatically tabled for a week.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: So moving on to the approval of the senate floor agenda, we have the Provost forum and I was thinking of doing a resolution revolutions workshop as well because we have no

new bills. And then we have our elections and committee meetings will still happen if we get to that. Especially because we have no old business or anything, but we're gonna front load the workshop, the Provost forum and the elections. And we have questions, three questions from us, two questions from us and then a long period of senator submitted questions. And we've implemented new rules on like length of speaking and that sort of thing in order to address concerns that were raised from the President Jones forum. So all of that has been communicated to the Provost. And if any of you have questions, I encourage you to prepare them. Does anyone have any questions, comments or motions on this agenda?

Brendan Chang: Do you think it might be good potentially like you do the Provost forum and then nominations, elections and then resolution revolutions workshop.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I was gonna suggest the same thing specifically. I think if we just move resolution resolutions into committee meetings, and that way we have, we just you know how much time we can spend on it once we get through elections. Because I think we should prioritize elections particularly for like my darlings to UDBIA and CUCAC, which have been sitting in bureaucratic hell for nine months.

Pierce Wallbaum: I second that.

Erick Jacobsen: I've moved it down to committee meetings and that actually works pretty well for like the sort of structure that this is intending, which I know we've discussed this before, but like instead of like generating altogether lists of those and choosing floor. We'll have each committee generate an idea that like relates to their committee. So that's great for that. So we can do that. Are there any other comments or questions on this agenda?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda.

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to discussion items, Jothsna did you get a chance to find the mathematical solution to our steering timing problem?

Jothsna Sundar: OK, so I just wanted to provide a brief update because I said I would have something by this meeting. And funny story, I don't. So I started compiling the like data of classes and when they are happening, but it was very tedious and very annoying. So I was like, let me at least try and e-mail the registrar to see if they will send me information. They have not gotten back to me yet and they said four business days last Tuesday, which would be today. So I'm gonna go back to compiling the information. I'm gonna give myself like two weeks again approximately, but that's just my brief update on finding a better steering times?

Julia Tanner: I need to leave, Erick can you share your screen on the Teams?

Recess 4:50

Reconvened 4:52 pm

Brendan Chang: I think this topic might have been when I was either out or sick or both.

Erick Jacobsen: So this is sort of flowing from Abigail being unable to be here this quarter and we're basically discussing what would the like mathematically ideal steering time be to allow the most people to participate while also like having it within a time frame where we're approving the agenda in time and we're not having too many like suspension of the rule amendments. So basically we're talking about either Monday or Friday and what times work for then and so Jothisna's volunteered to look at like course schedules and like figure out if there was any, like indication of an ideal time on Fridays, I think or Mondays as well. So that's what the topic is.

Brendan Chang: I don't know if when it comes to the course schedules, but a lot of times because what happens is it's usually someone within a department is that like person who like builds all the classes and like gets all the scheduling and stuff done and there's a lot of, it's kind of unclear who like when. I think some departments get it done really early or they plan it for the whole year as a last minute. I think it just depends. So when the actual huge course catalog is released, it's probably like at the last possible. So it might be potentially more you might be, you might have better luck reaching out to the individual departments of everyone on steering to see if the departments will be willing to share that ahead of time, if that's possible, or it might even be published on their own website or online or shared within the major within itself is potentially possible. I don't know that in in various departments there's no regulation. I think the regulation is you must have a you must have a finished by this deadline. I think that's it.

Jothisna Sundar: Yeah, that's definitely a good idea. The way I've been going about it right now is going through the old time schedule. So like winter quarter's class offerings and using that as sort of like the baseline of, this is approximately when classes are usually scheduled. So yeah, that is also kind of going department by department, because you can't ever look at like all of the classes being offered at once. You have to go in each individual college and then each individual like, yeah, even under the College of Arts and Sciences and then like under the history major, there's like five different course codes with different time schedules. So yes, that is similar to how it's going. I did reach out to to the registrar to see if I can get it all in like one or fewer files, but that's a good thought that we could implement in the future, possibly.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other thoughts or commentary on this?

Kavi Pasupathi: And it will also depend on what classes they would have to take and what they get. So even if you get a course schedule from like each department, the specific class they need to take or want to take if it lands on that day, it lands on that day.

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and take JR-32-4 off the table and add proposals II under discussion on the steering agenda.

PROPOSALS

Joseph Riggio: Explaining a little bit, we've talked about this bill extensively. I genuinely don't think there's going to be any more amendments made to it. I think I would encourage a motion to approve or table indefinitely.

Erick Jacobsen: with that said. We have already approved the agenda for Tuesday, so even if we like approve, go ahead, Brendan.

Brendan Chang: Alternatively you can just move to reopen discussion but it's the same thing.

Joseph Riggio rescinds motion

Joseph Riggio moves to reopen discussion

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Ashwin Anand: Since its been reintroduced for discussion I'll reiterate the points that have been made. You know, one Board's already working on a more comprehensive bill in order to attack what is truly in discussion here, which is tri-campus collaboration. We have, we're starting from the ground up. We're creating a more more set standard implementable process for improving tri-campus collaboration and that's an ongoing effort with Senate collaboration that's being done. The second thing, the board bill itself that was proposed in its entirety, the board bill addresses something that was directly targeted towards ASUW from ASUWT. It was a personal grievance that was aired at a Board of Regents meetings when it shouldn't have and the board, the bill itself was directed towards improving and starting to facilitate discussions between ASUWT on the matter and those discussions. That happened because ASUWT didn't reach back out to us and we wanted to address what was directed towards ASUW and let ASUWT handle their own internal discussions. If and Nandana will speak to what changes can be made about the board bill to kind of resolve the situation but to Joseph's point which was mentioned earlier, this entire joint resolution wouldn't have been written or wouldn't be in effect without this board bill being in the joint resolution and so we can take a different approach to start from scratch and better improve relations by stepping aside from this joint resolution and you know, reform practices and to Joseph's point from earlier saying that like, oh, we're just, we've been in a constant cycle of, you know, improving or trying to change like our governing documents and then changing it again and changing it again and changing it again. This joint resolution and the Senate bill, and we'll get to that later, have sparked discussion, heavy discussion from the Board and the entire organization in order to come together to facilitate discussion about our governing documents. And so again, we have taken steps in order to facilitate these discussions and preemptively jumping into this joint resolution into the Senate bill to try and force amendments that haven't been thought about by the entire organization is wrong. And so again, I'm gonna urge to motion to table this indefinitely, but I'll defer back and let people comment.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I just think again, I'd like to highlight the point that this bill wouldn't be here, if not for the board bill. I think we're just kind of trapped in a cycle of mutual recrimination and I think this process shows us that trying to handle interpersonal frustrations through official declarations of Senate or Board of whoever is I don't think it works.

Dylan Bianchi moves to table JR-32-4 indefinitely.

Joseph Riggio: Point of parliamentary inquiry, just correct me if I'm wrong. Tabling indefinitely means we wouldn't be able to discuss this any further unless it was take off the table by a 2/3 super majority if it was ever brought back. But this would essentially end the discussion and not bring it to the Senate if this were to happen.

Erick Jacobsen: Under my understanding yes.

Ashwin Anand seconds

Blair Yeh Objects

Dylan Bianchi yields

Blair Yeh: I do agree with you that it would be like a huge waste of time if everyone there just sharing their opinions on this bill but I also agree with Joseph that students like deserve to know what's been going, but it will like be a huge waste of time. So I don't think we should table it indefinitely but I also think like everything stemming from this 6.01 or Board Bill 6.01 does seem to be like, or to me at least it seems to be like it was written in good faith and the only problem is like incorrectly addressing the president or ASUWT and it is also defamatory. But everyone in ASUW Senate are all students. And even if even though like the WHEREAS clauses are defamatory and it will be like presented to ASUW Senate for changes, they will like understand that we're all students. So I don't think there's a likely to take it like to like a serious like level because we're all students and we do understand that it's really like hard to be present at every single meeting when you just so many meetings and responsibilities. But I just don't think we should table this indefinitely.

Erick Jacobsen: With that we're in a period of debate.

Kavi Pasupathi: I think, I mean, we've been sitting here for three weeks. I think this is like the third version and the first two they have been, they say it was attacking some people. It was like, you know, poking some needles where they didn't need to be. But it has been like revised over and over and I opened this document even like this afternoon, I read through it and I also compared it to what we had before and it sufficiently takes everything down. And as for the board bill 6.01, it's. I mean it was written in good faith like Blair said and there was the issue of not addressing the person, right? Because even if you don't like the person, you still respect the title of the position they hold. It's not it's not personal. I'm just saying it was it was an error made and it needs to be corrected. And again, at the end of the day, I just don't think anyone will take this the wrong way if we take it to Senate. It's a student opinion, you know, just because all of you said that without the board bill, this JR wouldn't have been landed on our desk. So I think we've made all the decisions we can and that's like within our power and it's still within our power to table this bill. But at this point it's just better to let other people take a look as well, let us know what they think because we do represent a whole body and it's been like constrained within like a certain group of people for quite a while.

Joseph Riggio moves the previous question

Nandana Jaideep seconds

Approved 5-1-0

Motion to table indefinitely fails 2-4-1

Ashwin Anand: Going back to everything that was just mentioned within like the debate to table. Completely understood from both your perspectives. Like I get it. More visibility, more insight into the process makes sense and obviously like I'm for Senate entirely right? The key points that I wanna touch on relating to the JR is the first that clause, right? The first that clause references the memorandums of understanding and how you know creating a task force would kind of go about, which is exactly what Board is trying to do right now. We're trying to go through a more comprehensive process to establish what memorandum of what, what best memorandum of understanding could be presented to Senate. Because ultimately Senate is the one that votes through the memorandum of understanding that then the other rest of the tri-campuses were approved as

well, right? And so the board is ongoing in this 'THAT' clause and the next that clause too, right? Going back to board bill 6.01 and Nandana will touch on this as well. All I will say is that a change can be made to the board bill so that the main premise of the board bill can be changed and right and so. If I take that change into mind and in my mind remove that board bill from this entire joint resolution, the premise of the joint resolution itself is already being fixed by a body that is also taking in Senate input as well, right? And so in my mind, when the board bill isn't there. Joint resolution isn't necessary and there's already two better avenues that are combining together to create the most optimal solution. And so again, in my mind, like tabling indefinitely, I think that's the best solution because there's two ongoing efforts that can be done quicker to bring this to the table as immediately as possible. So I'll leave it there and that will end my time and Nandana can speak.

Nandana Jaideep: I have three things to address. First I'll start with addressing your question about like the Vice President. I was merely following Tacoma's internal procedures because as far as I know the tri-campus community did not receive any sort of formal communication, e-mail, nothing of that sort, saying that there has been a removal and they've appointed this new person. So since this person wasn't an elected president, I wasn't going to like give them that title as the ASUW Seattle president because that's not my place like. Their Director of Internal Affairs wasn't appointed to become their VP. There was no like shift in roles, if that makes sense. There was no like formal gestures in their Senate or Board or whatever even so I didn't believe that was in my capacity to do that, which is why I addressed it with VP in the first place because that was their elected title. Moving on to what Ashwin was just talking about, I think this bill started off with bad faith. I will put that out there. Hence, now that we've heavily, heavily amended it and come up with a very diluted version which still doesn't encompass OGR's voice or an actual like drafted MOU, I'd rather just work with OGR directly once we draft the MOU, have those words out, put that in a bill, present Senate something concrete that we can actually put into our governing documents, make binding and actually take action on. I think that is a way more productive use of our time rather than amending a bill that's been amended so many times already. Moving on to the last thing about how this, we wouldn't be having this discussion right now if not for the board bill that the Board of Directors passed unanimously, mind you, including people in this room about addressing mischaracterizations. If the student government of Tacoma has an issue with being addressed as VP or like think that we, this is hindering tri-campus relationships, I would implore you guys to have them speak for themselves. Like I know you guys all care about tri-campus relationships, so like I'm glad you guys want to be the spokespeople for it, but if Tacoma wants to be that person to, like, put that hand out to foster better tri-campus relationships, let them pass formal communication in their Senate. Let them, like, let their leadership reach out to me directly. Let them voice out their own grievances in their own autonomous manner, so we can be more productive and efficient in our discussion rather than having our Senate speak for them and then create this whole internal battle while they're facing their own internal battle. Like, if that makes sense, that's my piece.

Joseph Riggio: I appreciate those comments and I hear you, I truly do. I do want to reiterate ASUW, Tacoma, ASUW, Bothell and GPSS are expected to hear a similar bill about a memorandum memorandum of understanding. In fact, it might be this joint resolution. It might be a resolution of their own. I don't know. I do know for a fact that this is a joint resolution, meaning GPSS is going to read this on the floor this week. So keeping that in mind, the point about it's already been amended so much, so you know there, we shouldn't pursue further amendments. That defeats the legislative process. The whole entire point of the legislative process is that we have these deliberations and that we can amend and we can make things, this is not student opinion. This is not official student opinion. This is us creating the official student opinion. And this is the natural

legislative process. Now do we have a process in our bylaws in our governing documents that says that every sponsor needs to contact people who are part or stakeholders of the bill? No. Is that a good thing to do? Yes. And that's why I've been trying to make amends and reach out and rectify, which is why we had a meeting with OGR today, which I was praised for earlier today, but unfortunately now. It seems like the efforts I went through the bill with OGR and I struck the clauses with them that were the most I've walked through the I shared my screen with with OGR so they could have direct input in this version of the bill. Did they know it would be this joint resolution? No, but but their input directly influenced this version of the bill that is true to and also Ashwin's point about two better efforts to find a better, there are two better efforts right now to find a better solution. I don't think there's a better solution. I think there's a bunch of different options for a solution, and this is one of them. And I think that senators should have the power and authority to choose which option they feel is best. I think we should leave it to the people. I think we should leave it to the students. I think we should leave it to the Senate about how the ASUW that is supposed to be a public servant to the students, how they're going to govern themselves. So that is what I will say. Again, I would encourage a motion to approve.

Kylie Jones: I just wanted to put out there that I agree with Joseph. I think the role of the Senate is to represent the diverse interests of the student body. You have senators from different walks of student life for a reason so like at the end of the day if you really want to put your best foot forward for tri-campus collaboration, sometimes it takes recognizing the challenges that you have faced along the way and taking responsibility for any harm, whether or not at the end of the day, whether or not we can go back and forth and whether or not you think that ASUW has committed any wrongs or whatever, but clearly someone felt harm from the actions of a ASUW like there is, there would be no reason why this has gone back and forth for multiple weeks at this point. At the end of the day, like our jobs as student leaders is to put that best foot forward and at the end of the day sometimes it means putting stuff like this into the Senate and let the senators decide. They're all students, they're all adults. They can look at this critically.

Kylie Jones moves to approve JR-32-4

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Nandana Jaideep objects

Kylie Jones: I just think at the end of the day you have the senate for a reason. This bill's not gonna, there's clearly no one's gonna budge on the amendments. Let the Senate decide on how they feel. If you truly feel that like this resolution should not be struck down, make that case to the Senate. If you feel that it should go through, make that case to the Senate. You have a Senate for a reason. Keeping this bill in limbo in this room only shows the students that you are willing to put any sort of thing that criticizes you and keep it in a lock box. If you truly value transparency and accountability, sometimes it means making the decision that you don't want to make and put it in front of the Senate.

Nandana Jaideep: Thanks for that clarification. I'm not opposed to Senate seeing this bill. I think it'll be super helpful just for them to also have clarity on everything that's going on. All I would say is when we present something to the Student Senate as an honorable organization, I would make sure that we're proud of everything in that bill. So I would only be comfortable moving forward personally if we could strike the 'THAT' clause from the bill which talks about repealing 6.01 to foster tri-campus relationships because that was the purpose of that bill. And repealing that would just not make any sense because the whole point of that was to reach out and offer space to talk to

the student government of UW Tacoma. And I believe if they found an issue with it, we should give them the autonomy to make that decision rather than make it up to UW Seattle. If the issue here is that we're hurting people with our actions let's put the ball in their court and have them make their action and speak for themselves and be their own autonomous governing body.

Erick Jacobsen: With that we're in a period of debate.

Joseph Riggio: So I think I am very happy to hear that you would like senators to see this bill. And I think for that very reason we should, even though there is one 'THAT' clause that we just can't seem to agree on. We're not going to agree on everything and that's OK. I mean, gosh, for the Student Health fee, I've been negotiating with people for the last like a year and a half to try and figure out some sort of compromise to get a joint resolution through if student support through this survey and that can be a headache sometimes, but it's worth it. I just had a very informative meeting with the RSO Trans Collective about the Student Health fee and about their issues with it. And it referenced a Reddit post and whatnot about the student health fee and whatnot. I'm not on Reddit, so I'm super, but there was discussion that was had and it was it was engaging. And even though I disagreed with what they were saying because they were just telling me flat out like that they they had no idea like they didn't know that it would be student governed for students and so having that educational conversation and working with them eventually we got to a point where like, OK, I'm going to send you more information, I'm going to follow up with you and we're going to work together on this and figure out some sort of compromise. And that's what I think needs to happen with this bill is we need to figure out some sort of compromise and it can happen on the floor. That's. Fine. Students and senators should be able to participate in this conversation. I applaud the effort of the eight to five session for internal reform that's being planned on Saturday. I will tell senators all about it, but that conversation, that's the reason the Senate exists, is to have these conversations in a bigger body of students that can provide more input.

Joseph Riggio moves the previous question

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 4-3-0

Motion to approve JR-32-4 fails 1-2-4

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to announcements and public comment, if there are any announcements or if any member of the public would like to speak, now is the time. Anyone, I mean RSO events, ASUW initiatives, projects.

Joseph Riggio: Student health fee! Oh my God, wow. I was just talking about it. That's crazy. Tell five friends about it. Get people to vote or get people to take the survey. It's kind of like a go out to vote campaign. So I mean, tell your friends to take the survey. Thank you.

Nandana Jaideep: This is just putting this out there. If you guys are interested in running for office next year and being in a different position within ASUW and are curious about other things, EAC is hosting like an elections info forum on the 30th, so be sure to check it out.

Dylan Bianchi: Huskies for housing Students of Color for Public Health are hosting a clothing sale fundraiser Wednesday, Thursday and Friday from 10-2. That's what the donation bin in the ASUW office was for. So if you are looking to buy more clothes for a relatively cheap price and have that money go to a good cause, you can do that. Also if you have too many clothes you can still donate to it over the next few days, so I think there's something there for everyone.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other announcements?

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-1-0

Adjourned 5:21 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
