



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

2/3/2026

Location: HUB 250

CALL TO ORDER

5:00 pm

APPROVAL OF SENATE AGENDA

Julia Tanner moves to add a 10 minute recess between new business and committee meetings

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Kavi Pasupathi moves to approve suggested edits

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve the agenda

Corbyn Morisette seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

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.

LEADERSHIP REPORTS | [Erick Jacobsen](#), [Joseph Riggio](#), [Julia Tanner](#)

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Teddie Schmitt: Hey guys, I'm Teddie Schmitt and in the interest of getting information out, I encourage you to go into the Senate steering agenda yesterday and read Senate Bill 32-1 a Senate Bill on Institutional Reform. Thank you.

Kaitlyn O'Connor: Hey guys, most of you know me. I'm Kaitlyn, OGR's Community Organizer. Like Erick said, Huskies on the Hill is on February 10th next Tuesday. Looking forward to seeing you all there. On February 9th, the day before we will have our last training. It is a more informal drop in, come get to know your group members, come hang out with me in the main ASUW Suite Hub 121. And then on the board here we have, we're doing an e-mail campaign about opposing cuts to the Washington College grant and supporting financial aid in partnership with the WSA and the Washington Bus. So all you have to do, it's really easy. All you have to do is go and input your personal information and it automatically generates an e-mail that is sent to the governor, as well as some of the senators and representatives that have supported the Washington College grant in the past. There's also some information about what the Washington College Grant is, why you should support it. We have one of the most equitable financial aid packets in the country and we would like to keep that and keep the funding for that so that people can come to college. So if you could scan that QR code, it really supports our efforts and thank you guys. See you at Huskies on the Hill.

Joseph Riggio: Well if you know you know. Behind me there is a lovely QR code. If you scan that and send it not to just five people, but 10 people. No. So I have two minutes up here and I would like to ask that we spend the next minute and 15 seconds, roughly, you pull out your phone or teams one friend. Just one friend. That's all you have to do. One person you know that did not fill out the Student Health Fee Survey. Send them that link and have them fill out the Student Health fee Survey. Cuz guess what? It closes tomorrow at 11:45. PM February 4th. Everyone should fill out the survey. So we need as much student input on this as possible. It is extremely important. This can be a brand new funding mechanism for Husky Health, Live Well and the UW Counseling Center. It can break off these three units from SAF and have it be its own thing, kind of like you pass. So please, if this is something, even if you do, if you don't support it, we still want to hear from you. So please tell your one friend to fill out the survey. Thank you.

Aiden Reeder: Speaking of SAF, I'm again trying to get people interested in attending, at least as a member of the public at SAF. We meet 1-3 in the HUB on Fridays. We don't have anyone that has been a member of the public to visit. We are currently reviewing like we're doing budget discussions with a lot of our units, the Child Care Assistance Program, the Student Technology Loan Program and the Samuel E Kelly Ethnic Cultural Center. We'll be discussing that this Friday. Please come at least to learn how your money is being spent, if not to say anything. It's important, guys, please.

Julia Tanner: Hello again. I have a message from our incredible ASUW Queer Student Commission co-chair Jenna, who is sick at the moment, so wish her well. But she's plugging this Friday from 3:30 to 4:30 in the Q Center there's going to be the Queer Book Club and they will be giving out Last Night at the Telegraph Club, so please attend that. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any announcements? I'll give you all until I walk to the microphone to think of any announcements you might want to make. And while I'm doing that, and if you haven't filled out this QR code or either of them, you still can, especially the one about the Washington College Grant, it's going to be a very difficult fight and OGR needs your support. We need as many people as possible to contact your representatives so that we can save financial aid for people.

Joseph Riggio: I'm just going to do this on behalf of RCSA. Elections, presidential elections are open. They are a thing. So please, if you are a resident, if you're a resident in a resident hall on campus. Please go to the RCSA webpage. You can find the voting link there. Fill out the voting link for the presidential elections. Thank you. Bye.

Erick Jacobsen: Raise your hand if you are an RCSA resident or an HFS resident. Keep your hand up if you have voted in the elections. I saw too many hands lower. The rest of you, please vote. Alrighty, thus concludes our announcement and public comment period.

FORUMS

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Erick Jacobsen: We'll move on to the nominations and elections. Our first item is the Select Committee Chair for the ASUW Restructuring Committee. This is the Select Committee that we approved by an Organic Act a couple months ago. Or a month ago. I don't know. It's been a while. Anyway, this committee chair is responsible for attending weekly Senate steering meetings, chairing the select committee meetings during Senate, holding additional meetings under their discretion, and chairing conversations on bills concerning constitutional amendments. The question is, how would you ensure that productive conversation occurs during committee meetings about constitutional amendments, given the complexity of this topic? Are there any nominations?

Dylan Bianchi nominates **Detlef Gerbing**

Detlef Gerbing accepts

Joseph Riggio nominates **Addison Wooster**

Addison Wooster declines

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other nominations? I'll ask it three more times.

Adam Ford: In a shameless act of self-promotion, I nominate myself.

Adam Ford nominates himself

Erick Jacobsen: With that, the nominations period is closed. Would the nominees please like to come up to the front and I promise I will do my best to run elections correctly this time. We will

start in order of how you are presented here and you will have 30 seconds for an introduction, Radcliffe whenever you're ready.

Radcliffe Cushman: Hello, I'm Radcliffe I'm a first year student, probably going to study urban planning or drama. I joined Senate this year and I'm really excited about restructuring because I've read a lot about the structure and I would be really excited to serve. So that's my introduction.

Diana Abebe: Hello my name is Diana Abebe I'm a first year and I plan on majoring in Law Societies of Justice. And yeah, I just want to be more involved on campus.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on now to Shreyan. Is Shreyan here? Is Shreyan on teams? OK, Shreyan is unfortunately thereby not eligible, so we'll move on to Detlef. You have 30 seconds for an introduction whenever you're ready.

Detlef Gerbing: Hey everyone my name is Detlef Gerbing, my pronouns are he/him. I'm a prospective poli sci and public policy major, on campus you'll see me as the Vice chair of AAA. I'm a GAVEL member, I'm the executive director for Oliver Hall, and I'm also a tour guide, fun fact.

Adam Ford: Hello, Adam Ford, he/him and I'm a junior history major. I've always liked to think of myself as a procedure fiend. So naturally, a position like this was very interesting to me.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Adam, if you'd like to stay up here. You'll have 90 seconds to answer the question. Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is, how would you ensure that productive conversation occurs during committee meetings about constitutional amendments, given the complexity of this topic? Whenever you're ready.

Adam Ford: As has been seen over the quarter you know, it's very important that we understand ASUW's role as an advocacy. So as chair, I'd definitely like to make sure that's on the front of people's minds as we brainstorm how to make sure that such an advocacy that represents so many people has the best structure possible? So I just want to make sure as chair that everyone kind of has that right headspace for all that. Thank you.

Detlef Gerbing: So just to preface, I'm a big believer in just the best way to combat and work on typically complex issues would be to just allow the most amount of opinion. And some ways I've reinforced that philosophy in my like actual development is in AAA for example, I'm Vice chair, so I've been observing our meetings a lot. And I think something that really works for there that I would love to implement in my chairship I guess would be to encourage open discussion and group think, which I think is a great way to allow a variety of opinion again to try to narrow down a very broad topic and flexibilities and nuance. I also run and moderate all of our Hall Council and Executive Council actions and meetings. So I kind of know what it means to like be at the front and pick through certain pieces about, I don't know, like navigate conflict, giving, ensuring that people who are more quiet and people who are a little louder have equal opportunity to speak because again, I think tackling complex issues requires the most amount of student opinion, regardless of how active or how loud they are. And I'm also kind of familiar with Parli Pro being in GAVEL and being in the Senate as well. So I think combining all of these efforts together, I have a pretty good

chance in ensuring that for such a complex and important part of the Senate, like the restructuring, I think I am a pretty good candidate towards making meaningful change.

Diana Abebe: So I would ensure that productive conversation occurs during meetings by preparing like some sort of agenda and ensuring that nobody's like multitasking because I feel like that happens a lot in like other spaces as well that I've seen multitasking and making sure everyone completely understands what is being discussed and that everyone's just paying attention and is present in the moment. I'd also like to, I'm also good at really getting to the point and like staying on topic. And would like to like get to a firm resolution before moving on to the next task. I also want to foster just an inclusive and respectful space for people to speak up when misunderstanding arises, because I wouldn't want to be someone who like made a decision on something without fully understanding it.

Erick Jacobsen: All right. And Radcliffe, you have 90 seconds. Would you like me to repeat the question? Our question is, how would you ensure that productive conversation occurs during committee meetings about constitutional amendments, given the complexity of this topic? You have 90 seconds

Radcliffe Cushman: I think with constitutional amendments it's often like there's a lot of like considerations going cause you have to consider edge cases cause most people when they're thinking about amendments only think about like their intended what they think. So I think with like the sizeable membership of this committee I think is about 20 members. Definitely going to be a lot of balancing about which voices are being heard. And I think my experience as a chair competing and studying parliamentary law in like the past two or three years gained like a lot of experience in reading Roberts, how to interpret laws, how to interpret like parliamentary issue scenarios. So I think as like a chair I could provide some advice to some of the members who might have less experience with parliamentary procedure because even though they might not have the experience, they do have that voice, which can be very important when defining confidential issues. Because if they have a voice but they don't know how to interpret that into legislation, then it's going to be hard for them to express that. So I think a chair should be able to give advice and I think the chair should have that kind of backing of understanding how to interpret and implement voices into constitutional, like as a method, as a genre.

Erick Jacobsen: And now you will have 30 seconds for a conclusion whenever you're ready.

Radcliffe Cushman: Yeah, I think all these people are good candidates. They have the right idea. They want to help people have voice, their voices heard, have equitable access to improving our association, ASUW. Just please pick the candidate you think will represent your voices in that committee the best. Thank you.

Diana Abebe: Thank you for listening to me and please vote for me.

Detlef Gerbing: Yeah. So overall, like in the Senate, I've spent the past few months learning the ropes of what it means to lead discussion and committees through all of my various positions. So

combining that with my devotion to this committee's success and willingness to work with others, I believe I will make a great candidate for this position and hopefully can make some really strong change within the ASUW. I appreciate your consideration and I hope for your vote. Thank you so much.

Adam Ford: I Adam Ford shamelessly ask everyone to vote for me.

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, due to tabulation concerns, we will be getting back to you on the winner of that election after we have elections for the Judicial Committee. So are there any nominations for the Judicial Committee liaisonship? Our former Judicial Committee member Tessa unfortunately resigned. Anyone interested in serving on judicial? This is paid in spring, by the way, if you want money.

Justin Amaral nominates himself

Joseph Riggio nominates **Sora Tolley** on behalf of **Tessa Raith**

Sora Tolley ineligible

Joseph Riggio nominates **Maggie Schoenfeldt** on behalf of **Tessa Raith**

Maggie Schoenfeldt declines

Erick Jacobsen: No one wants to be on the Judicial Committee. This looks great on your resume and you get a little bit of money. Don't you like a little bit of money? Money's great. You can use it to buy things.

Leila De Folo nominates herself

Blair Yeh nominates **Husna Chepkemboi**

Husna Chepkemboi: I'm sorry, I'm not that greedy. I can't. No, I humbly decline.

Husna Chepkemboi declines

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any nominations? I'll ask two more times then. Seeing none, the nominations period is now closed and I believe our two candidates are only on Zoom, so no one teams, so no one has to come up to the front. But we will start with Justin for 30 seconds as an introduction whenever you're ready.

Justin Amaral: Hi everyone my name's Justin Amaral. You might remember me from the last election, but I'm here to tell you that I think I'm the best candidate for this position and I'm happy to run and I'm happy to serve. Thank you.

Leila De Folo: Hello everyone my name is Leila De Folo I'm a junior in my first year at the UW and planning to major in law, societies and justice. Student government is something that I've been interested in and involved in for a long time, and I would love to use this liaison position as an

opportunity to get further involved in the UW community and learn more about how I can serve student needs.

Erick Jacobsen: And we will stick with Leila for 30 seconds, I'm sorry, 90 seconds as an answer to the question. Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is, what motivates you to join the ASUW Judicial Committee, and how would your perspective contribute to maintaining accountability and integrity within the student government? You have 90 seconds whenever you're ready.

Leila De Folo: My motivation to join the judicial committee stems from my experience in student government and commitment to fostering transparency, accountability and integrity in campus leadership. I previously served as a co-student body president at my last college, and my duties included advocacy, event planning, and serving in a total of four different faculty committees. This experience shaped me as a student leader and gave me a perspective grounded in transparency, problem solving, and determination that I can use to contribute to maintaining accountability and integrity within the Judicial Committee. In my previous role, I worked on initiatives to improve student government procedures, campus safety, and class scheduling. Working such significant projects required a great deal of transparency, as student feedback was vital and it was important to me to ensure that the students knew we were using the information they provided us responsibly and accurately. This practice was especially important in cases where I was faced with discussion about student fee increases, as I knew this would affect a lot of students and I believe that clarity and documentation is foundational in gaining institutional accountability and student trust.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Leila. Moving on to Justin, you have 90 seconds. Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is, what motivates you to join the Judicial Committee, and how would your perspective contribute to maintaining accountability and integrity within the student government? You have 90 seconds whenever you're ready.

Justin Amaral: What motivates me to join the ASUW judicial committee is the chance to be able to serve and to be able to hold people accountable and keep the integrity within the student government. And I'll tell you why. OK, I've been. I've been in a lot of places. I've served as student government. I've been a secretary in high school. I was also the president of the Honors Society and within those clubs I've seen a lot of things that were not held, a lot of people that were not held accountable for mistreatment. They're not accountable for breaking the rules and the regulations. I'll tell you, if I'm elected to this position, I will make sure that everyone is held accountable and that this student government is tight knit. The rules are followed. I have no shame. I will call somebody out who needs to be called out. I will make sure that accountability is sustained and that this student government has integrity within itself. That's what I'll say. What was the second part? Yeah, my perspective. I come from a background of it. Oh, I think I'm out of time. Oh, sorry, I heard something. OK. But yes, on top of that, all right, I've I've called out behavior, like I said. Like if you've ever seen those Senate videos in the government where they just honing somebody, that's what I will do because I care about the ASUW. I care about the ASUW government and I

want to make sure that it is run with accountability and integrity as deep as it goes and as far up the ladder as it needs to go.

Erick Jacobsen: All right we will stick with Justin for a 30 second conclusion whenever you're ready.

Justin Amaral: I wouldn't be up here running if I didn't think that I was the best person for this position. And that I believe in justice and integrity and honor in a student government, especially one that's as important as the ASUW Senate. And ASUW in general. So I hope that you guys can understand that. And you know what? Again, just vote for who you want. OK. Thank you guys.

Leila De Folo: Overall, I believe my experience and dedication to justice and inclusivity make me an excellent candidate for this position. I really care about the students on our campus, and I would love to be able to use this position and utilize my skills and knowledge to uphold the standards of integrity and accountability that students deserve. Please vote for me and thank you.

Drumroll commences

Detlef Gerbing elected ASUW Select Restructuring Committee Chair

Drumroll commences

Leila De Folo elected Judicial Committee Liaison

Erick Jacobsen: We're moving on now to the Conduct Review Board. This is, for the record, dealing with academic violations of conduct regarding AI. And if you are elected to this position, you will also serve on ASUW's AI Policy Task Force with Director of University Affairs Kate Lawson. And when it comes to meetings, basically the way the conduct review board works is that you just like get a notice when there's a a meeting and if you can, you can join. So it's pretty flexible, but the AI policy task force might have a more rigid meeting. I haven't been made aware of a specific time, so that's probably still flexible. But yeah, are there any nominations?

Elizabeth McAleer nominates **Cecilia Hellman**

Cecilia Hellman accepts

Kyra Lui nominates herself

Pierce Wallbaum nominates **Malia Marin**

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any nominations? Seeing none, the nominations period is now closed. If the nominees would like to please come up to the front. We'll begin with Cecilia. You have 30 seconds for an introduction whenever you're ready.

Cecilia Hellman: Hello I am Cecillia Hellman and I am a first year majoring in political science.

Kyra Lui: Hello I'm Kyra My pronouns are she they and I am a first year sophomore. I'm 17 and I graduated at 16.

Malia Marin: Hi everyone my name is Malia. Nice to meet all of you. I'm fairly new to Senate, so it's nice to finally be here. Last year I was actually in RCSA, so just finally dove into Senate. But yeah, I'm excited to run for this committee.

Erick Jacobsen: If you'd like to stay up here, you'll have 90 seconds to answer the question. Would you like me to repeat it? Whenever you're ready.

Malia Marin: OK, I think probably like a lot of people, I have used AI for assignments before, obviously within fair judgment, but I think that AI can be a very useful tool. But I also understand the negatives that comes with it. Obviously there's a lot of environmental damage that it can bring. I also understand that we are here to learn, like we're paying for an education you want to do your you should do your work yourself. You want to get something good out of all this money you're paying for school. So I think there's a fine line between using it and using it for bad, and I think that's something I would love to use my own experience in to judge whether or not someone's using it for the right reasons because it can be helpful, but I think there's a lot more to learn about AI and that's something that I would like to also learn about and that would help make better informed decisions of people using AI on assignments. And yeah, at the end of the day I think academic honesty is really important and everyone should be held to that standard. So thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to Kira, you have 90 seconds. Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is what experiences have you had using AI and assignments and how would you use those experiences to inform fair judgments on AI related cases of academic dishonesty. You have 90 seconds whenever you're ready.

Kyra Lui: Obviously, I think most people have used AI, me included. With AI on the rise right now, it is kind of impossible to ignore and impossible to not use or not be kind of included in a society where everyone else is using it. Without using A I, it would be hard to be competitive in the real world, especially at this level. And I think that there are ways that are ethical to be using AI to kind of deepen your own learning and understanding of courses or material, but obviously you shouldn't be using AI to write your assignments for you. Yeah, I think that the first maybe 15 years of my life I haven't touched AI, so it is definitely possible. At the end of the day, with so much of AI being unclear and so much science that we still need to uncover about what I actually means for us and for the environment, maybe biology if it ends up being in our bodies, it is very important to actually understand and be aware of what we are doing and how it may affect us.

Cecilia Hellman: I personally have never been a super big fan of using AI. Not that I haven't. There are many reasons why I'm hesitant. However, I am taking a class this quarter that has had a teacher that has enforced slash, encouraged the use of AI as long as you record what you've been saying and I think this has given me an opportunity to see how you can use AI in different settings and not using it for doing your homework and doing everything for you, but more as a tool on how to help you become better and use like help you to better your assignments and come up with blueprints or ideas or use it for to find sources in other places and I think this has given me an interesting opportunity to see the ways that you can use AI in a good way, but it is also there is clear violations on when it's bad.

Erick Jacobsen: You'll have 30 seconds for a conclusion whenever you're ready.

Cecilia Hellman: If I get nominated, I will try to keep a very open mind on what each individual case is, because they are probably very different for every single person and try to keep my experiences of the class that I'm taking right now and the ways that you can use AI and the research and things on what you can't use AI for.

Kyra Lui: At the end of the day, I think AI is much like using and like working with other people. At the end of the day, we can use each other as tools to help each other learn and to, you know, actually learn from each other. Much like helping other people, you can work together sometimes. Some assignments may let you, some assignments may not, and you cannot have someone else write your homework for you. At the end of the day, I think it. Is quite natural.

Malia Marin: I just want to say thank you for giving me this opportunity to sell myself as to why I would be a good person to be on the Conduct Review Board. I hope you take everything I said into account and just know that if I do win, that I will do my best to hold everyone accountable to this high academic standard that we all worked hard to achieve and be here for. So thank you.

Malia Marin elected Conduct Review Board Liaison

NEW BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: I'll just summarize our one piece of new business. Our new business today is LD-32-3, a legislative directive supporting student voices and democracy through alternative voting methods. And I will read the bill summary.

Erick Jacobsen reads [LD-32-3](#) bill summary

Recess 5:59 pm

Reconvened 6:09 pm for committee meetings.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

On Campus Affairs

- Filled out When-to-Meet
- Resolution Revolution Discussions

Off Campus Affairs

Discussing LD-32-3 A Legislative Directive Supporting Student Voices in Democracy Through Alternative Voting Methods

- Grammatical Edits made

- Maggie Schoenfeldt moves to approve, Sophia Victorino seconds
- Passes: 14-0-2 (6:30)

General Affairs

- Committee Meeting Begins at 6:06pm
- Sarah took attendance for teams, Pierce took in-person attendance
- Pierce read aloud our Resolution revolutions last week
- Isabelle Green brought up a concern about using the breakout rooms; suggests instead speaking with an advisor
- Pierce asks for feedback
- Maddy Pittis suggests having a slideshow instead, says that once you have a slideshow, it always exists and it can be references by students in the future
- Pierce adds this whereas to the document-> navigating different majors
- Pierce suggests-Packet regarding information regarding what you can do when you do not direct admit into the major; can be sent with the admission document
- Em helps with some of the wording on that suggested that clause that Pierce added
- Sarah (myself) suggests adding DARS into this as well for information regarding the degree audit; added
- Pierce suggests adding a whearas clause that connects to this degree audit that clause as well
- Em, Isabelle, Liam, Ava, and Pierce work together to write a that clause about how DARS is the primary platform used for students
- Em suggests a whereas clause about how many students are using DARS and how to use it
- Isabelle suggests adding different A&O teachers to this DARS information
- Liam shares a personal story about the LING major and the difficulties associated with it
- Pierce suggests that our bill adds a call to action
- Isabelle and Em suggest adding a UW commits to consolidation and clarity of information by June 2026 as a policy statement of their ongiong communication
- Ava wants to ensure that “consolidation” is added
- Ava also suggests that it be included that students don’t get the most out of A&O
- Pierce adds a space-holder A&O clause to add a survey (conducted of the students) showing dissatisfaction regarding major choice, application, confidence in applying for a major
- Em thinks that there should be a seperate wheras clause about the confidence that they feel about applying into their major
- Pierce adds this whereas clause
- Pierce reads over the Whereas and That clauses
- Pierce suggests before finalizing the bill talking to relevant people; ie: first year programs, student technology accessibility
- Pierce asks if anyone has any last thoughts

- Isabelle, Ava, and Em all share their agreements
- Meeting ends at 6:41pm

Academic and Administrative Affairs

Elia Zheng was selected as vice chair because she was the only person interested in the role who could make steering meetings. After that we discussed potential resolutions

Select Committee on ASUW Restructuring

PRE MEETING

Time Start: 6:19 pm

Time End: 6:45 pm

AGENDA

- Vice Chair Elections
- Constitutional Changes and Run Through of the Document

DISCUSSION

- Ensured everyone was in the teams chat and had access to the legislation tracker and the proposed constitution draft
- For productivity, the changes were gone through by each article and their amendments

Articles and their proposed amendments:

Preamble - added the diversity and land acknowledgement

I - name, no changes

II - struck this article as it was relocated

III - no changes

IV - no changes

V - Rights and Responsibilities, consolidated all of the bullet points and segments into one paragraph.

V - the bylaws segment, adding in articles of incorporation. There is also a new system proposal

ACTION ITEMS

Vice Chair Elections:

- Adam Ford nominates himself

- Teddie Schmitt nominates themselves

Voting **AF: 1 TS: 9 Abstaining: 7**

POST MEETING

Next Meeting:

N/A

Future Items:

Continuing the conversation around the articles and their proposed amendments.

OLD BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: We're going to come back now at 6:45 pm and we will immediately move into old business. We have one piece of old business, LD-32-3. If Spencer and Abigail would like to come up, Abigail is the committee chair that reviewed this. And then if we can start by having Spencer read out the bill in its entirety. Then we'll go to Abigail to talk about committees.

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

Julia Tanner: Point of personal privilege, can you talk a little closer to the mic?

Spencer Grubbs continues reading LD-32-3

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Spencer. Abigail, would you like to explain what you discussed in committee?

Abigail Appleyard: So this was incredibly controversial legislation. No, it wasn't. It passed favorably 14 to zero to two. We made a couple of edits, but they were all grammatical and they were two of them were adding a T back to Brandon's name. So and a comma. Really invigorating. Yeah, that's all I have.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you Abigail, are there any questions for Spencer about this bill?

Mohammad Motadel moves to approve

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Approved 97-1-5

Applause

ADJOURNMENT

Adam Ford moves to adjourn

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Liam Knochen object

Adam Ford yields

Liam Knochen: it's not quite 7 now is it?

Brennan Sandora moves the previous question

Adam Ford seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Adjourned 6:56 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
