



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

2/2/2026

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 Pasupathi (he/him), Off-Campus Committee Chair | P

Pierce Wallbaum (he/him), General Affairs Committee Chair | P

Dylan Bianchi (he/him), Academic & Administrative Affairs Committee Chair | P

Maitri Karia (she/her), GPSS Director of University Affairs | A

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

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and swap proposal order to read LD-32-3 first.

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 3-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: The agenda has still not been approved. Are there any motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 3-0-2

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: So we are cancelling Senate for February 10th so that we can all go to Huskies on the Hill and I hope to see you all there. So the question of the February 9th meeting is still up because that would be a regular steering meeting. So just like the previous holiday, what we're gonna do is if we don't get any Legislative submissions by Thursday, which is the deadline to cancel, then we will cancel the steering meeting. If we do get submissions, we will still meet on Monday to go over these submissions as well as the following Friday just to manage our like schedule so keep an eye out for that. We may not have to meet on February 9th.

Dylan Bianchi: Just a heads up that I won't be there on February 9th if we do meet.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, thank you. Apart from that, I've been continuing all my projects on. Oh, alongside GAVEL and the Board of Directors. I don't have many updates except that we're meeting the Food Pantry on Thursday and I've heard of many a piece of legislation being in the works. And we've had our first submission in a while so thank you, Spencer. But yeah, that's pretty much the extent of my report. So I'll move on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: I sent out attendance notices apologies for a little bit of a delay. However, Julia will probably wait for deactivation. There's only three people, but we'll give them time to see if they can prove their attendance, which is a good reminder. If people receive attendance notices, it's not the end of the world. It just means that they may have forgotten to submit the attendance vote. In that case, please talk to your committee members and say, hey, there's a lot of different ways that you can prove attendance, like me taking attendance and then giving it to Joseph so he can verify the attendance or they can send, it can be a screenshot of something they said in Teams with a verifiable date and time. Or it can also be something they said in the minutes, like a motion they made, or another vote voting in an election, for instance. So there's a lot of different ways to prove attendance. If people are worried about that, you can also have them reach out to me too and we can try and work something out and see if there's anything that is provable public record that I can use to prove that they were there at that meeting. And then also just very minor GAVEL updates. I know we were talking about having someone on immigration policy and whatnot. The GAVEL committee has assigned A liaison for that. That's Mailinh. So they will be focusing on that for GAVEL's efforts. And also in just like 4 weeks we'll be having like the GAVEL quarterly report, which is crazy to me that winter is going by so fast. Also liaison committee. I'm gonna remind everybody tomorrow to fill out the When2Meet if you're a liaison. So. If you have liaisons in your

committees, please remind them to fill out both the report forms. Those were due yesterday at or actually today at 11:59 PM. So if you know some liaisons in your committee, just hey, make sure they fill out the report form. Also, we're trying to have our monthly meeting so they can fill out the When2Meet too. That'd be great. That is all from me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: So me and my interns finally got to meet we'll be discussing like a reel idea later in this meeting, but we have like three reel ideas coming up within the next two weeks. Some are related to Huskies on the Hill, some are just general fun Senate stuff, so be looking forward to that. It's fun to have solid plans in the works. And then as far as bonding goes, one, not a lot of people filled out the new When2Meet and also I think the next two weeks just don't work for most people anyway, or at least it doesn't work for me. So I'm going to hold off like a week or two before sending out another When2Meet to figure that out. But we do have floor bonding tomorrow after Senate. If you can remind your committee members, that would be amazing. If not, it's OK. I'll have it in the pre-meeting brief and my leadership report. But yeah, that's all for me today.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Hello, your word of the week is austere which means to be plain, serious, and unsentimental in style, manner, or expression.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

Recess 4:12 pm

Reconvened 4:20 pm

Julia Tanner moves to approve all three minutes

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-2

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to proposals, our first proposal today is LD-32-3, a Legislative Directive Supporting Student Voices in Democracy Through Alternative Voting Methods. This is by Spencer. Would you like to read the bill out for us, please?

Spencer Grubbs reads [LD-32-3 A Legislative Directive Supporting Student Voices in Democracy Through Alternative Voting Methods](#)

Erick Jacobsen:

Dylan Bianchi: Did you reach out to Brandon about this?

Spencer Grubbs: I have not. I probably, that is in fact the one stakeholder I probably should have the most.

Ashwin Anand: I just wanted to comment, If you haven't talked to Brandon, potentially changing "is authorized" to something more of like a suggestion that you should do, unless if you talk to him, then for example like authorization.

Erick Jacobsen: Speaking briefly on that it's I think even in the current wording, it's still up to Brandon how he approaches it. It's just that he just physically can't lobby on anything that's not in the bill. Just saying that he can, and then if he decides to do that, that's another conversation between Spencer and Brandon.

Dylan Bianchi: I think we still should probably pass this through because obviously it's at Brandon's discretion what he does with it. So if he feels like his his plate is overburdened, then he can just not bother.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve LD-32-3 into off campus

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to SB-32-1 a Senate bill on Institutional Reform. I believe this is the first time this will be read out in full, so please read it out in full.

Joseph Riggio reads [SB-32-1 A Senate Bill on Institutional Reform](#)

Julia Tanner: point of order, can you guys lower your conversation?

Joseph Riggio continues reading SB-32-1

Joseph Riggio: Point of personal privilege, do you want me to read the clauses that are bylaws clauses?

Erick Jacobsen: you can just summarize the bylaws clauses

Joseph Riggio continues reading SB-32-1 until line 583 clause on Director of Campus Partnerships

Julia Tanner: Sorry is it point of order to go back to the agenda?

Erick Jacobsen: Oh yes, it is 4:50 PM. So this is automatically tabled for a week.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: We are now moving on to the approval of the floor agenda. We have two elections. Our Judicial Committee liaison did resign so we must elect a replacement for her, and then we now need to put Spencer's bill in Off Campus Affairs. So I'll do that. OK. And then do we want to like give some guidance for the other committees to like continue working on the resolution revolution things we started, I'm seeing nods, so I'll put that in. And I did put a note under adjournment to stay for Bingo, which is our bonding that we do have after Senate tomorrow. And we have pizza.

Brendan Chang: Did the person on Judicial from Seante resign?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah from Senate too.

Eick Jacobsen: And then Joseph, you said there are no forms for tomorrow?

Joseph Riggio: UW Impact.

Erick Jacobsen: That is confirmed? Do we have slides yet?

Joseph Riggio: I am getting it from them. I will get them by the end of the day. 10 minutes.

Erick Jacobsen: Great, 10 minutes for the UW Impact forum. Does anyone have any thoughts on the agenda?

Kavi Pasupathi moves to approve

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 5-0-2

Julia Tanner: can I request a two minute recess?

Recess 4:53 pm

Reconvened 4:55 pm

Recess 4:55 pm

Reconvened 4:57 pm

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: We are entering an executive session now at 4:57 PM.

Executive session convened 4:57 pm

Reconvened 5:12 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty we are back on the public record and we are moving on to our next discussion item, which is a constitutional amendment proposal. For context, this has been submitted to judicial, but due to like the time limit on when a constitutional amendment can be submitted to the ballot, the goal is that we in steering at least get a chance to discuss it because if it like takes a while in judicial and then it would take too long to go through steering, then we still want to be able

to discuss it. So this is our opportunity to do so under the understanding that Judicial has not submitted its recommendation yet or any comments and if this conversation remains ongoing in a future discussion item we can also note what has been said in the most recent judicial meetings depending on like timing and whatnot. So Joseph, would you do me a massive favor and just summarize, please, like a list of what's being changed here?

Joseph Riggio: OK, so I'll just do talking points. So we're trying to figure out ways that we can delegate some of the responsibilities of Board to other entities or other things that would be created. So we're proposing like, judicial would be an independent own thing, personnel would be its own thing. We would, I've been collaborating with Francisco Dojenia on the possibility of like an auditing thing, so an accountability board essentially or person and then also you keep legislative branch, us, and executive branch which is the Board of Directors. A lot of the things being struck is just rearranging into articles that we argue makes more sense. Like moving some of the management and control into different sections like the recall policies and some of that. Also getting rid of any job description that is in the Constitution can just be in the bylaws, doesn't have to be in the Constitution. In fact, it makes it really difficult to change job descriptions if any points are laid out in the bylaws. We should keep it very purposeful of what we put in here. So we just struck that and we're recommending that the bylaws takes that over. The most important thing being separated is judicial being its own independent thing, so they would be able to make recommendations that can be challenged by the Board or the Senate, but they would be the final say on their own recommendations and judgments. So and those judgments could then be used by Senate or Board or even the public. So. Students to back their legal claims on different situations that have happened or are happening. Also, you'll probably see Board of Directors has been changed to Board of Executives. Just calling it an Executive Board and Executive branch, that's just something we thought was a good idea. Also, all my organizations and RSOs that I'm a part of refer to it as an executive board. So it's just consistency. That's one of the minor changes there are. So another major change is suspension to the bylaws. We are, right now the Board of Directors is able to suspend their bylaws and make amendments to it, so long as they eventually review the language to judicial, which can provide a recommendation, but then could be overruled by the Board anyway. So we would propose the same system that Senate has, which is we have a bylaws document and a rules document. The bylaws wouldn't be suspendable, but the rules would be. So we would take all the procedural rules that are suspendable and put them in a document that we can all agree this can be suspended. We actually, fun fact, I believe one of the sources are the appendix for the Senate bill on this. Unfortunately it's something, but the rules exist. In 2024, Francisco made a rules document that got approved by board and technically they have a rules document. It's just never brought up or used. It's buried in the OneDrive, but it's there and technically it does have authority, which is interesting. But yeah, that's the TLDR is it's way more. It's a lot more complicated than that. I can go into a bunch of different branches, but. I think it'd be better use of time to just answer questions instead.

Erick Jacobsen: I actually do think it would be really helpful if you explained some of the changes more. Maybe talk about the auditory branch, explain what's being changed in personnel for it to be its own branch.

Joseph Riggio: Article 16. Pierce is there. I see Pierce, or just go to that bar and go to constitutional convention. So this is a brand new section just entirely. We're proposing that every four years we would have a constitutional convention. For those who aren't familiar with that, it's essentially, we would have essentially a meeting to talk about our constitution and proposed reforms. Essentially there's clauses about how it would work in here. We would have, in the judicial branch, we would

have a chief judge at the beginning of the convention present the constitutional appraisal. So essentially it's just a huge convention where people can come together from all different ASUW entities and the different boards that we propose. To come together and talk about bylaws and internal reform in the Constitution and have it kind of be a mandated thing every four years. The process for that I can go into depth a little bit more. But perhaps it might be better to move on to the boards. I can expand. I'll just start in order. So executive branch, not much is being changed except for the fact that we're removing the ability for them to approve everything. So essentially like so personnel, so the Senate and how personnel would work. I'm getting ahead of myself. All of these things are kind of connected, so it's hard to separate them. But essentially what our personnel board would do is they would be the beginning of all personnel hiring and whatnot. They would have authority to appoint certain employees or hire certain employees. But when it comes to like director appointments or leadership or officers and whatnot, we would have a joint approval process with the Senate and the Board. So the Senate would approve a certain number and the board would approve a certain number of applicants and personnel, the personnel board would essentially be responsible for proposing those applicants. They would filter through those applicants and they would propose them to Senate and to the Executive Board so they can vote on it. So it's a very, it's a different way of thinking about personnel in the way we have it. The way it's currently done is we have a personnel committee, they break off into subcommittees and there's different hiring committees and whatnot, and that can still be done. But and then those hiring committees make decisions. Personnel committee votes on Personnel Director oversees that and then Personnel Director takes out to the Board of Directors and then they vote to approve via 2.0 board bill.

Erick Jacobsen: Can you explain when it comes to the difference between director appointments and other appointments, what appointments would the personnel board be able to make without approval?

Joseph Riggio: So if you go to Article 12 that's the personnel branch. So if we go to functions, so ultimately, let me go ahead and. So the the exact personnel policy would be delineated to the personnel policy for what is considered what would be executive approval versus what would be for employment. There is an outline process though for officers. I'm just trying to find it. This is a very long constitutional amendment reform, so apologies.

Julia Tanner: Point of inquiry, is the room done at 5:30?

Joseph Riggio: we could go over.

Joseph Riggio reads SB-32-1 Article 12 Section 5

Joseph Riggio: The system, the executive board would still, for open selection process that the board like the current committees and whatnot that the board is responsible like individual board directors are responsible for, instead of those directors being responsible for those at large appointments, the personnel committee would be. Essentially. Yeah, and it'd be further defined in the ASUW bylaws and personnel policy, which is why as a result from, that is an interesting static.

Pause for static

Joseph Riggio: Yes, we have a new section in this as well. The Senate appointment process shall be a system in which any entity or officer defined by this constitute and nominate Student Senate for their approval appointment. So. The functions of the appointment open selection process for the personnel branch, we'd essentially maintain a lot of the same practices that we're doing. We just, what this essentially does is offload a lot of the open selection process and finding those applicants

to the personnel board instead of directors relying on different directors and leadership to conduct those applications themselves. We would still have authority, senate would still have authority for their own positions. Executive would have authority over the positions they see, so that does not change. But what does change is we defer the actual application process and hiring recommendations fully to the personnel committee.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, so I'm so sorry to clarify the difference in the personnel appointment process, the Senate appointment process and the open selection process is that open selection is like committee members, Senate is like directors and personnel is like every other staff.

Joseph Riggio: Essentially. I think it's, the way that we have it in here is probably a bit ambiguous and I would probably encourage either Judicial or Senate to clarify it. Open selection process. I'm assuming that refers to just general hirings for like the 70 employees that we have. As well as, cause any committees that are the responsibilities delineated to the executive and the Senate are outlined in A and B but they're meant to, so these also too. So the reason these amendments are going to make a lot more sense when we have bylaws that reflect the things constitutions just normally are supposed to be vague and flexible, so that way we are allowed to use our bylaws and other governing documents to clarify the things that don't make sense, we these are aspirations.

Erick Jacobsen: So will there be like a new set of bylaws also alongside this?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, well, that's what the Senate bill hopes to try to accomplish is working on. There would be a transition committee, and that's in the Senate bill for the Constitution amendment itself.

Erick Jacobsen: Can you explain the Auditory committee for everyone really quick?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, so the Director of Internal Policy would be in charge of this branch. They would, and the rationale for that is it's like me being a parliamentarian and doing attendance. I'm the accountability police. This branch is the accountability police essentially. So they evaluate all that it takes, the personnel director and the vice president are currently responsible for evaluations and in our current bylaws as I read on the Senate bill. They are responsible for a ridiculous number of individual one-on-one evaluations, which is insane. So as we grow in scale at the ASUW and recover from our COVID-19 era, we're going to have a lot of performance evaluations and if the personnel committee is going to handle all of the appointments and whatnot and the hirings and take all that responsibility away from Board of Directors so they can do other things then that means they don't have as much time to do the evaluation component. So we break that evaluation component into a different branch that would be independent of everything, and its sole focus is just making sure that all the other branches are doing their jobs. That's what this is. There would be membership from different branches, including at large. We proposed 3 at large members selected through the appointment process. There'd be from the Senate, Administrative Coordinator's assistance of the ASUW and Director of Internal Policy would serve as the chair of this. We would have advisors from Board of Personnel, ASUW, Student Activities Office and we would we want to try and have someone from Office of Public Records office because there are so many conflicting beliefs about public records and it would be great to have someone there just to lay the law of the land. And so essentially their primary function is to audit. They are auditors. They're gonna go through everything, make requests. They they will request for information, kind of like how Senate has a procedure for requesting information. So, I will also need to attend judicial soon. So maybe questions.

Pierce Wallbaum: Two questions, under article 10, judicial branch, why are you removing the liaison from the Senate?

Joseph Riggio: That's just being moved. So we're completely separating, the judicial branch is gonna be completely independent, not just from executive, but from Senate too. They're their own thing. Um, so it doesn't make sense like board. It wouldn't make sense for internal policy to to liate to chair anymore. It wouldn't make sense for Senate to have a voting member, I think in the non voting membership. Um. Let's see. Chief Judge. Never mind, I'm opening open to amendments in the non voting membership if we want to have Senate liaisons and executive liaisons to that. But I mean the whole point of this is that like Senate and executive wouldn't be able to influence judicial decisions especially because Senate would might be the ones requesting. And same with executive would be the ones requesting. Ideally I would like to promote this to the LSJ pre law and law and try and get students in there to be our judicial to legitimize a bit more.

Erick Jacobsen: But I will point out before I go to Julia that the executive and the Senate both have voting representatives to each other.

Pierce Wallbaum: I also noticed that Student Legal Services is to serve as a liaison or and or representative in both judicial branch and the Constitutional Convention. Can I ask why specifically Student Legal Services?

Joseph Riggio: For as an advisor I believe the wording and judicial branch is oh, representative. Maybe a non voting member.

Erick Jacobsen: That is currently how judicial works. They do have a

Julia Tanner: How many of these changes are a reflections of the constitutional amendments that Frisco had proposed like two years ago?

Joseph Riggio: Pretty much almost, some of them are literally word for word. So if you look at the comment section, anything that is, you can actually see the date of different comments. Francisco left a bunch of advisory comments to clarify the decisions too. I probably should have mentioned this earlier because that would have provided great context for people. Essentially some of these comments are as old as time as the 2024/2025 proposal. Some of them are newer. You know if it depends on what profile picture you see Francisco has. There were changes to the judicial branch compared to the 2024 proposal. The constitutional convention was actually an idea that was in the task force, but that wasn't implemented in the final proposal. But to answer your question, Julia, like I would say 70% of this or more is just the 2024 proposal again.

Dylan Bianchi: I'm going to be honest this isn't related to the Constitution. How long are we planning on like spending on this or are we willing to punt this to next week?

Joseph Riggio: We're talking about it now just in case judicial delivers a statement today. After today, because for this to have a chance if we do the timing and the full legislative process of recommitting and veto and override and all that, we're on a pretty strict timeline because March 19th is the cutoff. We have it in our policy that there's a 20 day of any it has to be submitted. Any ballot question has to be submitted 20 days before the election, which gives us till March 19th. We don't have a Senate meeting next week. We might miss this Senate meeting, so we're on a pretty tight timeline if we, I want people to consider this. I know that I've encouraged.

Erick Jacobsen: that'll be 5 meetings for the record

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, and so and it'll be in committee for a little bit because I'm assuming people will have a lot of thoughts on it. So we are on a strict timeline unfortunately and due to unfortunate circumstances, the HUB power being out, everyone forgetting about the holiday and not scheduling special meetings and just running out of time. JCC actually had a meeting that we thought we had longer. We thought we were gonna go until 7:30. We ended up only going till 6:45 because they weren't aware that JCC was meeting at 6:45. So we've been, it's been delay after delay after delay after delay

Erick Jacobsen: So and then do you want to explain what you changed in the executives? Just so we all have a full understanding if it's being changed.

Joseph Riggio: First of all so this, and I'll just go section by section real quick. Purpose essentially it was moved to the anything that is struck from here was just moved to a different section management control article. So we're the executive branch would look a lot more, there's some wording changes in here represent the whole student body. It's in our bylaws that that that is true. We say ASUW members, but. I mean, yes, that's that's also true, but that's I'll go to membership because this does change. So the president acting as chair shall only vote in the case of a tie. More than simple majority. We do that in Senate. It's unclear if board all set the same procedure. So we're embedding in the Constitution. Uh. And then also we would. Seven since. So right now there's six representatives at large in the bylaws. Those are the director positions that have vote. We would propose 7 and we would have one representative selected by Graduate and Professional Student Senate which also just that's one job, but we'd also have, the reason why we propose 7 is because we're proposing a Director of Labor Relations and also the DOLA. This has been something that's been talked about for years, but the the DOLA should have a voting seat on the board. That's been discussed for a long time. So that's the changes in membership with that. Let me go back to the section. Yeah, if internal policy is moving down to non voting and there's Labor Relations.

Erick Jacobsen: Who's the 7th?

Joseph Riggio: This would be. Let me get back to you on that. I don't have a good answer on that right now. I need to look at my notes. Um. But yeah, I the non voting membership. We also include the Health Relations Director. The Health Relations Director is a weird, nebulous position. The Office of Health Relations is fairly new, but we want to solidify it. Nina is the current Student Health Relations Director. And also oh 7th is the represent of. That's unofficial. I think we just put having seven out large appointed members in the by or in case we want to have a director position. I thought that was Director of Legislative Affairs though that that were I'm pretty sure is the Director of Legislative Affairs. Regardless, this would be something that would be in the bylaws, not the Constitution. So conversation about that can still happen. We're just saying 7 instead of 6 in anticipation of.

Erick Jacobsen: Do you want to remove DOLA from non-voting?

Joseph Riggio: Well we can't remove anything from this. Judicial has to. By the way, we can't make any amendments or anything to the current proposal. We'd have to wait until Senate. But yeah, I'm open to that, but we'll we'll figure that out. And then also succession has just been moved to management and control officers, any job description, eligibility, all that got moved to the bylaws. That's why all that struck out. That's more procedural. Things stay the same with that. Same with recall. We move recall to management and control I believe for a different article. So it's just moving stuff around to make things clearer. Functions and powers of the board. This is where we get into a lot of, some of the key differences. So we're proposing that the board would have the power, the

service policy making body of the ASUW with certain powers of oversight. So instead of full oversight, they would be having certain powers and then we define those certain powers and can expand on them in the bylaws. Execute all enacted legislation policy. The association. That's just condensing the wording into something that's readable and not jargon as well. Nominees. Yeah, we did that. Also, if we're gonna have a personnel board, we're delegating the responsibility of appointments to the appointment process of that personnel board. We got rid of the this is crucial in Section 8 A5, exercise final approval of budget expenditures ASUW. So we are proposing that finance and budget committee would have the initial proposal and drafts kind of like they do now, but the Senate and the Board of Directors or Board of Executives would vote on the budget expenditures.

Julia Tanner: I wanted to see if we could move on to the next discussion item since we only have 5 more minutes.

Dylan Bianchi: I want to, can I second that?

Erick Jacobsen: lets move on. I think that's within my discretion. So now that that's all been explained to us in the next meeting, we can discuss it and our thoughts on it. Take it away Julia.

Julia Tanner: Yeah so I'm just going to discuss the one reel we have planned for tomorrow. So I wanted to see if it was chill if I asked for like a 5 minute or like 7 minute recess during the meeting. So anyone who didn't want to be filmed in the reel could leave the room and then we would have less people coming in and out, like if we had recorded it at the beginning of the meeting. So I wanted to see if that is something that would be chill with everyone, like just calling for a recess to film a reel.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah that's fine.

Julia Tanner: So we're doing the mannequin challenge. Have you all heard of that? It's like the 2016, like just frozen and then you like film like the 10 year anniversary. So we had some ideas of what people could be doing. It sounds like some members of leadership don't want to participate and I can't force anyone to participate, but I had some recommendation or we as a group had recommendations. So like Jothsna could be writing emails on the whiteboard and Erick could be holding the GAVEL while Joseph could be like holding the microphone. It'll be like really fast, just like a quick walkthrough with the audio and then everyone else can be like, if they're raising their placards or like on their computer, so like super simple. But yeah, do you want to add anything?

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, I was just thinking because we have to explain to everybody in Senate also what we're doing. So maybe we want just a little more than 7 minutes, maybe like 10, just to give enough time to actually, because we don't have to do it again or extend the recess. Like I think just 10 minutes should make sure it's done and explained and people can leave if they want to. And that's all I have to say.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, if we can't force Senate leadership, we certainly should shame them. And that's it. Yeah, I'll have a little script to make it more concise for people to understand tomorrow as well. Do you guys have any? Thoughts, feelings, opinions. You think it's really dumb or it should be fun?

Dylan Bianchi: Sounds perfectly adequate.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, I think it's a fabulous idea. Cool. That's all I have. No more thoughts.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Dylan Bianchi: Anyone know if there's some kind of like Health Fee Survey?

Erick Jacobsen: I don't think so. I feel like I would have heard of it by now.

ADJOURNMENT

Pierce Wallbaum moves to adjourn

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Adjourned 5:40 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
