



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

9 February 2026

HUB 307

4:03 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 | A

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

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

Elia Zheng (she/her), proxy for Academic & Administrative Affairs Committee Chair | P

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

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

Detlef Gerbing (he/him) *Select Committee on ASUW Restructuring* Committee Chair | P

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

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Pierce Wallbaum 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: I don't have much to report. We may get one to two pieces of legislation for our agenda on Friday so look forward to that hopefully. But apart from that, preparing for Huskies on the Hill. I hope to see you all there. Moving on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hi everyone. So quick attendance update. I'll be sending, sending out attendance notices hopefully by tonight. We don't have a Senate meeting tomorrow, so we have a little bit more leeway this week and by we I mean me. The GAVEL committee, we appointed a second person for immigration policy so hopefully we'll have two people working with. I know Kate and Erick are gonna be working closely to do that with a bunch of other board members too so that's exciting. And then also for me, the liaison committee, I'm gonna look at the When2Meet and see when in February we're going to meet. It's just going to be a once a month thing, sort of like how GPSS does theirs. In fact, Maitri I might talk to you after to see how to structure that. I'm gonna try and work with Detlef I'll do some more onboarding with you because I know you're kind of thrown into, so we'll set up the OneDrive folder and everything for the ASUW Restructuring Committee and get that all set up for you because you'll be the only committee member without an e-mail account. That's all I have to tell you.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Also quick, we had a successful bonding for the floor last week. It was super fun. Lots of people showed up and then here on out we'll have reels regularly posted. I'm working with my interns and we've had some really exciting ideas and so it's exciting.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Hope you had a great day yesterday watching the Seahawks win the Super Bowl in my home team stadium. That was also fun. Not bitter or anything. But your word of the week is umbra which is a conical shadow excluding all light from a given source. And that sounds like a fun word for today.

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the proposals then we will begin with SB-32-1 a Senate Bill on Institutional Reform. I believe we were at a certain point.

Joseph Riggio reads SB-32-1 from line 538 clause on Director of Campus Partnerships.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I take hands, Joseph, do you want to call out are there any like amendment ideas that you currently have or any edits that you plan to make, if any?

Joseph Riggio: So I'm just going to, when this bill was introduced it was January 12th I recognize that some of these provisions have either been addressed or some of these things have been ongoing. This collection of students approached me with a lot of different concerns, noticing that based on, a lot of these sources are public record sources if you go to these sources or they are the absence of records, which in and of itself can be proof sometimes for the burden of proof would fall on me. So for this legislation, I am completely open to any amendments. If we can find a public record or receive record of things that have been happening that have actually been happening, I am more than willing to strike whatever to correct the record. However, these were the observations made not only by myself, but several other people too. And we did our best to try and answer two questions for the different responsibilities that ended up in this bill. It was the first question was there a violation of the bylaws and is the violation provable by public records? So the only violations that are listed in here are those of public records. I want to just really emphasize the conclusion of that Section 3 article. This is about institutional reform. Board of Directors has a lot of responsibilities and not enough hours to do those responsibilities. That's my main argument and we need to figure out a solution together. So hopefully by proposing this legislation, the Senate and the Board can work together to find such solutions and I do firmly believe that a task force with representation of the Elections Administration Committee, Personnel, Finance and Budget, Executive Board, Senate, JCC, I think collectively we can find a solution together that represents the sort of issues that have been ongoing for the last few years.

Nandana Jaideep: Thank you everyone for being here, the Board of Directors are here today to like help alleviate some of your concerns that you may have regarding the piece of legislation. We're here to like have a conversation with you guys to address these things firsthand because I believe we have had multiple conversations with the sponsor of this bill and I believe you know like what the shortcomings of this bill are and why the avenue, such an avenue problematic. So I just want to start off by saying accountability is great. We need institutional reform. There's mechanisms to do that within our organization, through the Personnel branch, through the Judicial branch. There's avenues for all of these different things. We are very open to changing our governing documents. In fact, we have a meeting coming up where we're gonna spend an entire Saturday working on these before spring quarter, so. It's just something that is an ongoing effort and I believe that this bill is more sort of a defamatory attempt at addressing these issues. And I would start off by reading out a statement from Grace Clarke, my Director of Programming who couldn't be here today and then we can have the rest of Board of Directors speak, but hello Senate steering. I apologize for not being able to attend in person today. Regarding this bill, I want to firstly appreciate its goal of addressing institutional review and reform. Holding exec branches or organization or government accountable is something that we are seeing a lack of in our federal government. So with that in mind, I must recognize that as something that's on all of their minds lately. Checks and balances are a fundamental part of ensuring accountability to the constituents of ASUW. However, this bill unfortunately nuances the importance of this mechanism. I've had a hard time coming up with a way to address certain parts of the bill that focus on the Director Programming position. Because I would ideally have love to have a conversation before it escalated to this point. I'm all for taking

accountability in ways I can improve as an individual and as a public servant. For example, I thank the authors of this bill for highlighting the fact that I haven't hosted town hall. It reminds me of another way I can increase student engagement within state of initiatives beyond the two record high attended RSO Summits and pregnancy test launch party, several other events and four RSO newsletters I have already completed with transparency and engagement in mind. I list these achievements I have made in this position not to be petty, but to show how a conversation could have increased the accuracy of this bill and mutual understanding across the organization. I want to emphasize beyond anything that my door is always open as long as it is mutual, respectful, and serving the students of the UW the best that we can. We are all here because of our constituents, and it's imperative that we not forget about them in times of searching for institutional reform. Human beings are at the center of what we do, and I would love to get to a point where we can get past the rigidity of policy to become teammates and collaborators as human beings looking to better our community. Thank you for your time and to the authors of this bill I will greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the bills further so we can collaborate on improving an organization that has incredible potential to serve students.

Ashwin Anand: Following up on Grace's statement, I will agree with all of it. I think that this bill. I mean, Joseph, to your point, right, it's like we're not looking for violations, we're looking to create institutional reform and all this bill does is point out mistakes. We create a task force in order to create such changes, et cetera, et cetera. But there hasn't been enough dialogue in order to spur that change in a positive direction. I mean, I've been at steering for a month on this bill and the joint resolution. I've heard all the discussions and we as board and we as an organization have come up with a fair solution to it that most people have agreed on. It's just the date of when this happens. And to your point, you say that the bylaws have a lot of responsibilities and that we don't have enough hours. And then this bill goes on and says that when we try to increase our hours in order to accomplish these responsibilities, that that's a mistake, right? Like this bill is very contradictory in its nature and that also again pointing out mistakes when we're trying to work towards the future is like not really productive at all. So like point like just pointing out board and not pointing out other parts of the organization as well is also a big mistake. I again, I've said all these things multiple weeks in a row, so I'll pass it off to the rest of board or whoever wants to speak to speak their mind, but I'll speak in a general sense. That's my complaint with it first.

Joseph Riggio: So I will end with a question but I'll start with the reason why I'm doing this, because why in the world would me acting as a student, but obviously I am the Vice Speaker of the Student Senate, that fact is known and why would I take the time out of a crazy busy schedule to sponsor legislation that I know for a fact that is going to be quite controversial. It is because I've only been here for two years, and last year I was a witness and made a lot of friends who were also witnesses to some issues pertaining to either personnel hirings, elections procedures, suspension of bylaws to circumvent the Judicial Committee in certain decisions, to review certain amendments that were made to either the bylaws or even the Constitution itself. I have watched a Constitution be passed. In fact, the 2024 proposal constitution that this constitutional proposal is based on got totally rewritten. It was the previous administration passed a constitution of their own. That undid the majority of what a task force was supposed to be created to change these bylaws to accommodate for an old constitution that tried to resolve a lot of these issues and so I was around when that was going on. I was actually a student paying attention to it from an outside perspective and we have done a lot of great things. The pregnancy test program, that's a huge, huge thing. And I want to commend Grace too on the RSO Summits because yeah, that is insane and incredible. And y'all should be proud. Audriana, I'm so happy to work with you with the student health fee stuff and

the sustainability credit was so good. Like there's a lot that we should be proud of. But here's the main point I want to make the potential for ASUW to do so much more, the responsibilities that are listed in this bill are either work in progress maybe. I haven't heard of that so far. I'd love to have conversations about that. I have emails of me trying to reach out to schedule meetings, so I apologize if our busy schedules can't really make that happen, but at the same time. For all, it doesn't, the good that we're currently doing doesn't overshadow the potential of what we could be doing more of and the absence of what could be if we had these committees convened, I mean sustainability, our Student Sustainability Council is a good example. I have my own liaisons coming to me and asking me why haven't these committees been formed yet? And we were reached out to as Senate to try and elect positions and I don't know what to tell them. I tell them to reach out to the chairs. I've reached out to some chairs about some things and some of the miscommunications have definitely driven me to be more supportive of the idea of having a more open public Senate Board conversation about the responsibilities cause in prior experience, closed door conversations haven't led to places and I would love to know, and this is where I'm going to end with a question, what reforms and considerations were happening prior to this bill? We talk about winter quarter, we talk about the internal bylaws event that is happening probably within the next three weeks or so, I imagine and what was happening in autumn quarter before the joint resolution before the senate bill to try and address the responsibility issues that are laid out on this bill.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I continue with the queue and take more hands, is that a point of information or is that meant to be?

Joseph Riggio: Open question.

Kate Lawson: Thank you for your time everybody and I'm glad to be speaking next because I think I can talk to that point. I appreciate members of this committee sitting through this, I appreciate Joseph you raising these concerns and I respect the observations you've made from your position. I'm only capable of speaking to the issues raised with my office, but I also want to say that I stand by everything that other board members have said and I really respect their testimony in regards to their position as well on these issues. Ashwin and I have been working all year in order to understand the specific aspects of my role as they relate to the Constitution and the bylaws. One point of concern that I have with this bill is that it states that the lack of a valid board bill appointing representatives to specific councils is indication I've not been doing my job that is nowhere listed in the bylaws or in the Constitution that I am required to get these members approved by board. This is a conversation that we've been having all year and it's one that has caused this process to go slowly, has caused it to stagnate at points because we are really trying to comply and understand this complex set of regulations that we operate under. Now I'm not saying that does not mean that we should not reform that. In fact, me and Ashwin have been working on it since October, which he can testify to about what a potential reform to that clause would look like. But I have appointed liaisons to these committees and they are not required to go through board, which makes this clause lines 507 to 511 completely inaccurate in terms of my job. It also negates 465 through 479 which say that I have not done my job as well and I understand that this is complex and I understand that if you are not in my position trying to understand what exactly my requirements are, that it may not be apparent, but I do understand these requirements and I have done my best to comply with the set of laws that I've been given and also to work with Ashwin to reform what cannot be understood.

Julia Tanner: Point of personal privilege real quick, people on teams say that they can't hear super clearly so just try to speak up when you're talking.

Peyton Sax: I just want to also say thank you to everyone for being here. I know that these have been long and very informative meetings that have taken a lot of time and energy. So I really appreciate you all taking the time. I similarly, I want to just second what Grace and Kate had to say, and that I can only really attest to what I have to say about my own position being mentioned. And so I kind of want to walk through lines 373 through 399. The first whereas clause, both of those, the publications board and the sponsorship activity advisory committees are inactive. So that is something that in the bylaws needs to be amended within the first place firstly, and second off, like the Sponsorship Advisory Committee has not met since what I found of records since like 2013 is what I saw. I also just want to preface that my position along with many other positions on the OCOMM team were stemming from zero transition documents. So I had when I came into this position this year, I had zero transition documents. So I've been really basing off of my position off of what I can do and what I'm learning along the way and my job description. Similarly, I take full accountability. I was not at the autumn orientation, but my Assistant Director gave the autumn orientation Communications presentation. So that was I'll take full accountability for not presenting on the Microsoft platforms, but in respect to marketing, making my team available for who to contact for visual design, content curation, they were all informed on that. Similarly, the clause or line 391 mentioning the Publicity and Programming Committee. As Julia knows who was just there, we've been hosting this weekly since the formation of the committee. Since the beginning of the year on Mondays at 3:30 PM, whether that be on teams or in my office, those have been happening with me, Jessica, Grace. We do have a at large student as well who comes to those and Lali from JCC. So there's also JCC representation there. And then as for 395, it kind of is similar to 391 that committee has been going forward. So I'm not I'm completely agree with institutional reform, and I also want to take a moment to acknowledge that our organization also went through a website migration last year. We lost tons of data on the actual website. It finally finished. n like mid-September slash late September and we were still working on it and we've been trying to fix all the things that were lost on it since then. My web developer and tech administrators are also working off of limited transition documentation knowledge. That has been lost of trying to recover. So I just kind of want to acknowledge that me and my team have been kind of going through that along with the rest of the organization. I know that that's a huge institutional gap. So I'm really looking forward to collaborating on institutional reform, but I just wanted to outline the gaps of where my stuff is mentioned. Thank you

Kushi Loomba: I just want to second what all of the Board members are saying. Like, thank you so much. I think it takes a lot of work to make a bill with such detail and it takes a lot of time. And so I feel like it was a really great way of not only having accountability, but also hopefully a space for us to all collaborate together. I will say I would have appreciated again having conversations prior to this bill coming out as a kind of the first thing because I think it's really important to engage with stakeholders and get stakeholder kind of feedback as an informatics major that's like one of the main things of like when you're collaborating with people is to understand both perspectives and then create something from there. And so I'm just going to talk a little bit about my section and I have a few just kind of information that I'd like to provide. I know one thing that was mentioned was that there wasn't enough Senate representation with just the budget in general. And so we actually have two senate seats on F&B, we have Kira and then we also have Josue. I know something that we want to address from last year was ensuring that we have JCC representation. So after discussing with Erick and also working last year, we were able to kind of see that one JCC member also would be part of that Senate seat to have that representation and to ensure that people are able to get their voice heard. So that's kind of one thing I wanted to talk about. Also, I work pretty closely with Erick like I said, as he's the liaison on Board. So I think there is that Senate representation and I'm

consistently engaging with those stakeholders. And then I know there was something else also mentioned regarding our general fund and also how we've been using it for certain expenditures and we are actually advised to spend money on one-time costs which are like capital expenditures, which is why office renovations, office supplies, those type of things are we're advised to use it on our general fund being so high because we're not supposed to budget from our general fund. Once General fund is depleted. Then if other people are relying on us in a budgetary kind of standpoint, then they won't have like access to those resources, which is why we don't budget from it. So on these like one time costs, whether it be office supplies or a renovation and I know like we really are ensuring to have 131 and 121 be as connected as they can be, which is where the conversation even came for us to have a door or just some sort of pathway to have even more engagement. And that was like a kind of like a need and a here that we had heard from JCC last year, which is why we were exploring these options as well. So we're also just trying to do our best to ensure that things from last year are just in the past. We are working towards that. So I know that was one part I wanted to address. And then also we have, I had around 40 open office hours when the budget came out in the beginning of winter quarter and I also had workshops outside of my like regularly scheduled office hours. So trying to make myself as accessible as I can to the entire organization. I had so many open slots I the only thing I was kind of holding that whole week was just ensuring that could meet with people, entity directors, employees and that's out of my job description, that's out of my whatever is there. But that's just my way of giving any availability I have. And I will take accountability for the fact that it was some of the information was delayed sending out at the end of fall quarter. It was a mental health I was not at capacity and I had a lot of personal stuff going on, so I understand how that could be an issue, but and I take accountability for that. But I also just had a lot going on in my personal life. And then on top of that, for minutes and agendas and just records, I 100% agree and understand how important it is that we have accessibility to that kind of to what Peyton said. We not only did we lose a lot of documentation, but I have all that stuff available in our like SharePoint kind of folder that we have for public records. We're working through it, getting posted and everything, but I have record of all of my minutes, my agendas, ensuring that they're OPMA compliant, sending in my agendas as well. Three business days early did that last year and I'm doing that this year as well. And then for stuff that was mentioned regarding the interim finance and budget committee over the summer, one, we didn't really have any expenditures this summer at all that were kind of met with which was why there was no 3.xx bills made. But also I as the FNB director have authority to approve things up to \$1000 as I work very closely with SAO and they do the actual purchasing. I don't do any purchasing at all. So they're actually the ones that I work very consistently with. And you know, I've worked with Brendan in the past, Coop in general, just all of SAO to actually do that stuff. And there's record of that in my emails as well. And then as for SAF I know SAF was mentioned a lot as well and the deadlines that were given were not the ones that just came up to be in my term from last year and this year. SAF has always had a deadline that they grant ASUW because we don't work the same way that full time employees work like the HUB for example. So not only are we not working 40 hours, but we're not working for four quarters like other full time employees do, which is why we can't function in the same deadlines that SAF gives. SAF funds really big entities like you guys know, whether that be the IMA, Husky Health, they have that full time capacity that ASUW does not have so there's no way for me to be able to submit a working budget without getting any voice from our employees or anything in the timeline, which is why those extensions are granted on a year to year legacy basis. And it's not out of me not doing my job and so that's one thing that I'd also like to clarify. And then I also did give a financial report. I worked very closely with Francisco last year. He was actually our Senate liaison last year like or he was on the F&B committee so I did give a financial report and like I said earlier regarding the agendas, minutes, I 100% understand could be made more accessible and I'm really working on that

right now. But I have access and records of all this stuff happening and I've been really working with SAF last year and this year as well to really ensure we bring back ASUW's credibility. We were able to get our full SAF allocation last year and that's through all of the work that we've been doing on the budget and that we're continuing to do this year to ensure that student dollars are not just sitting in our general fund, that they're actively being given back to the students. And so that's kind of the whole thing that we've been working on to help partner and to help repair relationship with SAF. But I just wanted to give a little bit of context and I'm always happy to further discuss.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, I'll keep it very short. First, Joseph, I'll answer your question secondly, I'll just speak to the general, you know, you talk about like fall quarter and what we did to try and reform the governing document again, me and Kate at least on her issue, were able to sit down and discuss an option, coordinating with Nandana and Sonal about the liaison appointment scenario. But even past that, Judicial Committee spent two to three Meetings of fall quarter, specifically on just reviewing the bylaws and constitution, making our comments and you know, leaving our suggestions we spent basically 1/3 of the quarter just reviewing our governing documents and so we could present suggestions at its updates during when board would meet in order to review the constitutional and bylaws and to review it. And so at least on,

Joseph Riggio: Ashwin, is that not already a responsibility that Judicial Committee has to do anyway? So were there other external Efforts past what was required of judicial?

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, well, I was just answering your question about what was happening fall quarter. It does fall within Judicial's purview and so I was just saying that we spent a third of the quarter working on that dialogue view. After we reviewed the Elections policy, the procedures, keep taking those comments and then you know, even Erick can speak to this. I discussed with Erick on taking his input and now you know, working with suggestions in order to review the comments. But it was another external conversation if you want to, Joseph, write that down that we had. Board also was notified of all the suggestions that were being made or all the, you know, proposed amendments that we would be bringing up and so there has been ongoing work, right? Referencing everybody's comments like everybody will speak to their own kind of personal part of this bill, but the fact, the mere fact that like people on board have to speak to their individual like problems and sections rather than working together to come up and see like if this bill will actually do good or not is like a big problem for me. We should be working again towards the future. This bill heavily lingers on the past and so like again we in Board have spent we spent over a month discussing what we can do to help. We found that solution through, again, an open meeting where everybody can discuss changes, right? We're spinning our circles again and again. This bill, it creates a task force. We're saying that we can basically do what a task force wants to do in like a more efficient way. If we want to look at the 'THAT' clauses and see like what is the implementation here, we've found a better solution, right? And and it's a solution that is accepted across the organization. And so like again, I respect all the time and effort that's been put into the Senate bill, the joint resolution and even the constitutional amendments, right. Constitutional amendment, it's going through judicial right now. We'll figure out what's happening but with this Senate bill specifically again, it just lingers so heavily on the past. I think similar to the JR the WHEREAS clauses detract heavily from the implementation when we can spend the one hour and 30 minutes that we have in steering discussing how we can directly approach uh a joint organizational meeting. But I'll leave it up to you also.

Joseph Riggio: So I appreciate that and well there's something that's quite startling to me and that is the prioritization of internal mechanisms. and that is the prioritization of internal mechanisms over the mechanisms of a democratic participatory process for including our students. Including

senators, including Board members, all together collaborating on a piece of legislation. This is not official student opinion. This is work in progress opinion. This is work in progress reforms. And this is the place to have these conversations because it forces everyone here. Which is thank you for all coming, by the way. It forces these conversations because I personally had trouble trying to meet. I know I have a meeting with Sonal and so thank you.

Sonal Virk: After the fact.

Joseph Riggio: And I'm happy to meet. Sonal that was disrespectful.

Sonal Virk: But this isn't disrespectful?

Erick Jacobsen: Please, can we continue?

Joseph Riggio: Yes. I yield my time to Autumn. Oh, I thought you had a statement. Did you not? No, I don't. OK.

Jess Phan: I was going to mention a little disrespect as well. I believe that the content of this bill is inherently very personal. I think that going through the lines of the you know, what the board is not doing is very personal. To act as though this bill is not very personal to us as human beings, as students, as board members, is unrealistic, is a completely unrealistic way to approach this bill. We need to recognize that people are involved. This is not just a we need institutional reform. No, this is calling each and every one of us out. And yeah, I'm offended like it is unrealistic to expect us not to defend ourselves or expect us to not be offended. It's like, you know, this bill, this bill says the BOD has demonstrated, you know, no interest in institutional reform or fixing things or anything like that. And however you want us to do our jobs, you said yourself, we don't have enough hours to do our jobs by itself right. That that we I like, like Peyton, I had no transition documents. The bylaws like literally zero the last time that there was a valid transition document in my SharePoint was 2023. In my section it says, you know, I hadn't started the Undergraduate Transfer Student Advocacy Committee. There were no at large members. The last time that the committee was started was 2023 on the exact same date, winter quarter 2023. That is the last time someone in this role has provided their successor with enough documents and documentation for them to successfully fulfill this role. And if we had so much concern about institutional reform, conversations needed to be had. You know, you mentioned that last year you were just a student kind of looking in on this process. You had concerns, you had all of these sorts of things and we've been working on it since last year. I don't understand why the rational approach wasn't to approach BOD immediately right off the bat winter, fall quarter, autumn quarter, have these conversations. We are people. The whole point is for us to have conversations and address these concerns, for these concerns to be displayed in a bill that would go out to yes, members of the school who care about these things is so wildly inappropriate to me. And like, I'll say here now, like, I'm not running again. Why? Because I know exactly how hard this job is. I want to focus on myself and I want to focus on what I want to do because this job is so difficult sometimes. It's so much work. But I stepped into this world because I was so passionate about it. If this bill goes out, students are going to look at that and say, God, like maybe I don't want to run and that completely undermines the entire point of the ASUW. And that's how I feel about this bill.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, I just want to start off by saying what patents have really resonated with me about just conversations. The fact that the committees listed on that bill hasn't been active since 2013, that could have been solved with a simple conversation that I'm going to be very honest going

forward that the sponsor of this bill did not have so that could have easily been eliminated. This misinformation need not have been spread. Moving on a lot of this stuff here is accusatory and it's misinformation and it's defamatory. And when we bring it to a platform like this, this is not what you think it is. This is not creating open, honest conversation. This is bringing out like flaws and accusations and putting it on the members of the BOD to carry that burden of proof to prove themselves innocent. That is not what due process is like and if you have questions, look up what due process is. And what has happened in the fall, that's a great question that you ask. Why don't you just ask me instead of before you like write this entire piece of legislation. We would have happily given you all of the things that we've been working on, all of the projects Audriana spent her entire summer sorry, for the vaccine clinics, something that has never been done before. I'm sorry, there were so many things that we were juggling at the same time to make sure that when we open school up in September that we were just going on and on and on more than like we have seen in previous years and again we have grievances with last year's constitution and you said that the conversation, the governing documents two years ago that passed would have fixed all these institutional issues. I strongly disagree. The governing documents do not fix institutional issues, they just like they help guide people in those positions, fix them. But it's open conversations and teamwork that fixes issues. So I just wanna point out that this isn't an honest attempt at creating a conversation. This is spreading misinformation, an attempt at bad PR for the Board of Directors and these things have implications. I don't think you understand that I'm taking away time from a project I could be doing to help the student body to be here to waste student dollars on this conversation. And then this is just also really disheartening that alumni who are not even involved are like helping sponsor pieces of legislation and grieving out last year's problems that weren't addressed directly to the people who were in power last year. So we're better than that is what I want to say. Erick and I have worked hard to maintain Board and Senate relationships this year and we've talked about this, had conversations about this multiple times and this continued accusatory language just makes it seem like it's targeted and my problem is not institutional reform. Me and Sonal worked on that greatly last year with task forces with all these other things and working on it this year as well. And we want to include you but icing us out from that conversation and pursue, doing a route purely shows that you guys treat women and women of color so much different than you treat other people. And minorities don't run again because we bully them out of these positions. So if there were grievances about the Constitution that was passed last year, why didn't you take it up with the person who sponsored it at the time? Yet we're here having this conversation today. That's all I have to say.

Owen Rivera: First I would just like to remind everyone to please stay courteous. I know this is not a very easy to talk topic to talk about, but respect is one of the pillars that we build our organization on, so I would just like to make that clear. That being said, I would like to touch upon the information that is in this bill. Joseph, you yourself kind of mentioned that this is framed as being, you know, institutional reform but before that you mentioned that a lot of this information is coming from last year, you know issues that we're seeing that you saw personally last year. So to me there's a disconnect between the quote unquote intention of what this bill was supposed to do and the actual information that's inside. So we have, you know, of course you said before there was somebody who wanted to get constitution passed, everything was changed and this individual was a main contributor to the information in this bill. So I see a conflict of interest in this, first of all, and with the fact that they themselves are trying to basically give themselves an alumni spot on whatever task force is supposed to be created. Along with that, a big goal of this bill is supposed to address parts of the Constitution bylaws that are quote unquote overly bureaucratic and the solution is to make a two year long task force that is going to be extremely slow bureaucratic. I just, there is a very

big disconnect on what the stated intention of this bill is versus the actual content. The content is a slander piece to the Board of Directors that basically you know shows the the worst of you know whether it's true or not basically just trying to make everyone look bad. And I find an issue in that because as ASUW, we should never be trying to put each other down regardless of what position we're in. I just don't think, look, there's a way to do something like this and this was 100% not it. You know, we have struggled with, you know, students knowing who we are, what we do and how we help them and this being something that would hit the students and being what a lot of students their first time hearing about ASUW is not helpful to us in any way and I am just struggling to really see like where this disconnect is coming from and I would like you to if you have an answer for the question, things that I raised, I would, I would like to hear.

Erick Jacobsen: Just to clarify are you phrasing that as a point of information in which Joseph will immediately respond or more of just like an open question where when we get to Joseph later he can answer?

Owen Rivera: just two things specifically I would like you to touch on the conflict of interest for the contributors to this bill and I would like you to touch on the kind of stated intention versus the actual kind of contents of the bill along with the task force being you know the solution to over bureaucratization in our organization.

Joseph Riggio: First of all the conflict of interest, there is no conflict of interest and the reason why is because I'm a student sponsoring a bill that is subject to a lot of amendments and changes, and I won't even be voting on my own bill. I won't even, I'll be abstaining from all the votes related to my own bill. So that in and of itself, to me at least, is not a conflict of interest. The stated intention behind this bill is to layout some concerns that students have come to me about and like I said before too, there were two things that went into this bill, two questions. Was there a bylaws violation in the currently written bylaws before this bill was introduced January 12th? And if that answer was yes, then are there public records proving that? You will notice that a lot of these clauses have sources linked to them. If you click those sources, you can read themselves with the minutes. There's minutes in here. There's conversations that have happened. There's agendas that are proposing different Board bills and situations. You can read the legislation yourself. I encourage everyone in this room, if you haven't already, to take a look at the records folder that was put together and made public that goes through all of these things. We were very careful to state things that aren't happening and not associate necessarily a reason other than an institutional failure, which I think we all agree that the task force regardless of whether it's a task force or not, we need to find a solution to this. We've had a lot of people say, actually, yeah, you know, the public records issue, we need to solve that. Actually, yeah, you know, taking accountability for some of the things not happening. Yeah. People's, I know I've been in a weird mental state the last few months too. Khushi, I sympathize with you and we need to figure out something. We need to figure out outs for people. We need to figure out our proxy system a little bit more. We need to figure out our appointment system a little bit more to give Kate some ease. But that conversation at least from what I've heard from people who've been working on this for the last three years is that it's been back and forth like the cycle you've been mentioning. We're in this cycle again and again and again. So this is an effort to bring us all to the table, whether we like it or not, and try and have this conversation. And to directly answer your question, the task force is going to address every single whereas clause in this bill. It's going to address the budget issues. It's going to address like how we allocate our spending and cost and whatnot. There's a constitutional amendment that's paired with this that tries to go over and see how can we restructure our organization to better allocate these responsibilities and delegate them out to other branches and bodies so that way the executive board

isn't swamped with all these responsibilities. So that way we can try and find a solution. I really, really am looking forward in three weeks to having that internal policy conversation. I'm a complete parliamentarian nerd when it comes to that, so I'm stoked for that and I'm really happy that that's happening, but that should have happened a while ago.

Erick Jacobsen: As a reminder we have two minutes left until we will immediately go to an adjournment vote. And if anyone wants to continue until 5:30 or 5:45, however long we have the room then that has to be a motion, but in the meantime, I will go to Sonal.

Sonal Virk: Yeah I have a few questions of my own. So you mentioned you said something earlier in the meeting, Joseph you said “make you guys meet here” to have the conversation here, bring you guys here. I want a little bit more like what, what do you exactly mean by that? If BOD has made themselves available, there's a BOD meeting happens every Thursday. There's open comment, public forum. You can come in, you can address your concerns. Or if you were wanting to do it in private, we all have public facing office hours that you can come in and talk to us and that's our hours and months and months of time that you could have addressed this with us and you did not. So I want you to answer why did you not and why did you spend more time writing a bill when he could have came in during at least 40 hours of public facing office hours? And you thought this was a better route to go through. So that's my first question. And also you mentioned a lot of students have come up to you. You mentioned a lot of anecdotes, you mentioned testimonies. What was your process in collecting this information and do you think if they are a sort of employees that you went behind the Personnel Director's back and ran personnel operations without him knowing. Those are my first two questions.

Joseph Riggio: OK, so I'm gonna try and answer as quickly.

Erick Jacobsen: Unfortunately it is 5:00 pm we will have to immediately go into an adjournment vote. Brendan, since the motion just automatically happens, I just go into like all those in favor and all opposed and stuff?

Brendan Chang: You technically made a motion and someone still has to second it

Obliged by the agenda, **Erick Jacobsen** moves to adjourn

Motion fails due to no seconds.

Joseph Riggio: So to answer your first point, bring everyone here. I apologize if “make everyone here” was the word I used. I think the minutes will clarify whether or not I said that but that was not the intention. The intention was more as a consequence of something like this it does bring everyone together, kind of a like it or not situation to address, the people that have have been working on this and have been helping with this. It's mostly been led by me, not helping.

Sonal Virk: The student testimonies that you are collecting, that is what I want. The process. So clarify that please.

Joseph Riggio: The process was the people that approached me, I reached back out to them and asked if they'd be willing to testify. I asked if they wanted to be public or be anonymous. So far most of them have chosen to be anonymous.

Sonal Virk: Were they ASUW employees?

Joseph Riggio: I'm not going to disclose that and I don't have to disclose that.

Sonal Virk: That's where the Personnel Director comes in. If it is an ASUW employee and one is so that is that is one thing that I can clarify really quick. One of them was and they talked to me about it personally because I oversee personnel. So that's something that everyone should know went behind the Personnel Director's back, chief of HR.

Joseph Riggio: This is not a personnel complaint

Sonal Virk: It doesn't have to be a complaint. But when you're saying that they're anonymous, they stay confidential you don't handle that. The Personnel Director does.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, Joseph, do you have any concluding comments in response to those questions?

Joseph Riggio: My concluding comment is as a student sponsoring this bill, I can reveal the information necessary to provide context for this bill. We have had case studies before where like the suspended students wanted to remain anonymous. People who sponsored the sexual assault allegations and the Allen School wanted to stay anonymous. This is something that has been done before for people who want to speak, propose legislation or have someone propose legislation on their behalf because they're uncomfortable coming to the people that they are writing this legislation for.

Kushi Loomba: Awesome I have a few things I want to talk about. I have been called aggressive and unapproachable from Senate members in the past, which I think and it's on public record and that is unacceptable. It's very inappropriate. I am also a woman of color, and that also is not an environment where I feel very safe having a conversation. And I'm not the only brown woman that that's happened to the same thing. I kind of echo what everyone was mentioning. I heard budget issues, like what budget issues? You working through that you're not collaborating with the Finance and Budget director and committee with and then same thing. Where's the data for what students are saying? Like fine, we want to ensure that their identity is anonymous. I 100% understand that, but there has to be merit in a claim being made. And so data is still data. We don't have to disclose who said the data. But there has to be some sort of data to back up the claims that are being made. Also, you mentioned that like it or not situation, we all should be sitting in this room. That is very hostile of an environment. I also think it is far less productive. I think all of the board members are so willing to work together with you all. And we are willing to take accountability. We are willing to show up. We are willing to do what it takes to ensure that we all are on the same page. So I don't even. And you know what? It would make a lot more sense if we all were like, no, Joseph, we don't want to meet with you. We don't want to talk to you. We don't want to work with the Senate. And then you go ahead and introduce this bill. Makes a lot of sense to me logically. But there was no prior conversation or an ask or any sort of like working together and this was like the first thing. So of course we're going to get in a lot more defensive, a lot more offended. It's going to be a lot more hostile. We're not going to be as productive. So I'm a little bit confused because if you want so much institutional reform, if you really care about the students so deeply, we are wasting time on unproductive conversations that are hurting internal ASUW members. Our livelihood of the organization is the people. I think Senate does amazing things. I think the Board does amazing things. We all, if we just worked together and it wasn't in a way where we're defending ourselves it could be a lot more productive. And so I think the same expectations that are held of Board members should be held to the rest of the environment and the rest of the organization as well. And so to me, if you're not willing to talk to us and this is like your way of communication, I don't think being forced to sit in a room is going to get what you want.

Joseph Riggio: I have to be careful with my words. Its an open public meeting.

Erick Jacobsen: would you like time to think?

Joseph Riggio: No, I think I'm OK. I will come out with an apology right now. I apologize that this bill has made Board of Directors uncomfortable in any way. I apologize if it seems like I, a straight white male with that entitled privilege, has come off in a way as to invoke feelings that perhaps this was a targeted effort, and I'm sorry for that. I'm sorry that the intentions for the joint resolution and the Senate bill. Have seemed to do a lot of work against the aims that it tried to instill, which was we just want to serve students at the end of the day. I mean, god, I've spent the last 3-6 months on GAVEL trying to work with people, trying to work with administrators, trying to work to get stuff done. And so, yeah, I really do wish that these students came to me sooner. And the reason why is it would have allowed time for me to schedule appointments with people to have conversations before this happened. But the problem is we have very strict timeline because of last year's amendment of a 20 day calendar timeline for a constitutional amendment that anything just automatically dies if we don't meet that. In addition to that effort, this supplemental bill is meant to reveal that many responsibilities, some are happening now and that's great, but a lot still aren't and we need to figure that out and that is of the utmost importance and that can't wait around for trying to accommodate a bazillion different schedules when we can all just meet here, meet in Senate, talk to senators and the public directly. Hell, if I look like a complete fool because some of these clauses and a lot, if everything in this bill proves to be false, I'm OK with that because I will publicly admit OK, I'm a complete embarrassment to myself and that this bill is ill researched and I will withdraw it on the Senate floor if the Senators and if Board members during that Senate meeting say, hey, this is a bunch of bogus. But here in steering, as I said with the JR I firmly believe that this should be a conversation for students about their student government that they pay a Services and Activities Fee for. That student dollars are being used in paying for salaries of both ourselves and Senate and Board of Directors. I think students should have a say in this conversation too. And that is what I will leave it at.

Sonal Virk: Yeah you just mentioned you want to meet with students, you want to meet with staff, you want to meet with employees, yet you still didn't meet with the board. Which goes back to my first question, which you did not answer. Why didn't you go through our public office hours? Why didn't you approach us? Why didn't you come to board? Why didn't you have a private conference or conversations? You still didn't answer my question, so I would like that answered please. And also you mentioned that you had around 20 days, which still gives you a lot of time to have open conversations with all of us, if not just the president at least and so, yeah, can you just respond to that

Joseph Riggio: For the office hours it was unfortunate that the timing of these was over break. and so that the two weeks that these bills were being drafted, especially the Senate bill I couldn't even try to meet if I wanted to and to the point of this bill has been introduced steering since January 12th. I do have e-mail record of trying to meet. I have a When2Meet that admittedly I need to check to see if people have filled out. It's unfortunate that I personally cannot accommodate to everyone's office hours because I'm a student. But I will try my best.

Sonal Virk: And so are we.

Joseph Riggio: I will try my best. And why didn't I go to office hours? It was a strict timeline and I that's why I kept saying I really. Wish that I was approached about this sooner. It would have made

my life a lot easier selfishly, because that way a lot of this can be diffused. So I recognize that. And then the other question, could you repeat your second question, Sonal, so I can answer it correctly?

Sonal Virk: You answered both.

Ashwin Anand: Where do I even start. Oh yeah, OK, so content of things in the whereas clauses. Two things. First, I do want to point out, yes, Erick, again, you've done great work. I will point out that you are not mentioned in this Senate bill, which you know, again, understandable. But if you want to make institutional reform, Senate is a part of that. And so we have to own up to all mistakes, which is moving on to my second point. We're not sure we can sit here discussing whether or not we did things, whether we not we didn't do things. Let's just say in the hypothetical sense, we we agree to everything, right? The the point of this bill, again, is creating a task force. In order to analyze what per se are the mistakes that we made? Sure, I'm gonna repeat again we've already come to a consensus that, OK, maybe these mistakes have been made, maybe some of the mistakes haven't been made, but the only action that's being taken as a part of this bill is to create a task force that would further delay what changes we can make to reverse the mistakes that we might have made or to improve on the mistakes, right? The bill and and you know, I'll be blunt, is very pointless in its nature when all of us as an organization have come to a better understanding and have had better communication than the sponsor of this bill with the people that are being included in this bill. Sure, it's over break. A lot of us maybe still had teams notifications open, so we could have responded to something at the very least, even though we don't work over break. Again, to point out Khushi like Khushi had open office hours expanding or like beyond the hours that she already works. We all definitely. At least sent out some type of e-mail during break in order to set up meetings for the start of winter quarter at that first week. A lack of communication cannot be just a it was spontaneous in the moment because I know that this bill again, I commended the first time this was read. I commended the amount of memory and the amount of work that's been put into this bill because again, it points out almost every single mistake of a mistake that we might have made or mistakes that have been corrected. This bill was not drafted in a night. There could have been open communication and beyond one night we as Board, we as an organization have come up with a better solution. So. Again, let's move past like pointing out or pointing figures at who made a mistake, who didn't make a mistake, and let's see if the bill actually works. My personal opinion, it doesn't work when we have a better, faster solution in just talking about it in a very public meeting, not just with Senate people, but with people you know outside of the organization, outside of Senate, outside of steering but yeah, I know you have a point of information.

Joseph Riggio: I would like to know the internal reform that board is proposing, could you walk me through? Exactly what that entails?

Ashwin Anand: I will read it off. institutional reform planning session. It's going to be a 7 to 9 hour retreat on an upcoming Saturday to review and update our governing documents, including the bylaws and policies. It will cover institutional reform, the inclusion of various voices around ASUW, a shared direction as to what the organization will look like and also the clarity of how the governing document structure will look and also how we can improve on the responsibilities of Board and other members. All in all ASUW employees are extremely welcome and encouraged to attend this and it will be hosted in the HUB which is a very publicly accessible event. It will give people adequate amounts of information and you know, notice that this will happen. I encourage everybody to come. But when again, a bill is being, I wouldn't even say dropped on our on our laps, it's being thrown at our face. We've discussed it for a a month and again everybody can voice their personal concerns, but at the end of the day, this bill is not going to get the same amount of things done as us

coming together as an organization to discuss it. If this bill goes to the Senate floor, which you mentioned, if it does go to the Senate floor and maybe it does. No discussion is going to be had that would be productive because most of the time it's going to be focused on the whereas clauses and saying when did this happen? Why did this happen? Instead of what is that task force going to do at the end of the day, if this goes to the Senate floor, again, this is a public meeting. People already have access to this bill or the contents of this bill. People can see this and already have discussion. We've had our internal discussions. It's not pointing out anything else. We've had our discussions internally as steering, which is what steering's responsibility is to discuss whether or not it goes to the Senate floor.

Erick Jacobsen: before I continue and then for the record, it will be Owen last in the queue and then Peyton and then Khushi. I will add that all of the items mentioned in this bill in terms of like appointment and proxy process, required duties of the board and events, all that sort of thing like those were just I discussed with board, I submitted another bill which would like attempt to directly reform those and we as a board decided to pursue all of those as conversations within the special meeting. So all of these items will be discussed just for the record. So I'll go to Owen now.

Own Rivera: First, I wanted to touch on what Ashwin said. The date of when we're gonna have this meeting is gonna be revealed at our all staff meeting along with all the information that you all just said or heard. So you know all employees will know when and where this meeting is going to happen. I also wanted to touch on like the first question I asked you. So I wasn't talking about you as in the conflict of interest. It was the individual who was an alumni who is mentioned as like an honorable mention. I believe that there is a conflict of interest there as you know, they were the one that proposed, you know, the constitution that got blocked and changed that you mentioned before and then they directly contribute to this, and I'm assuming that they are gonna be wanting to make themselves the alumni advisor to this task force. That's what I meant by conflict of interest. Next so you directly said you just want to, you know, help students. Every meeting that this bill is talked about, whether it's here, whether it's in, you know, actual Senate meetings, whether it's in Board, is an absolute waste of time. I just want to be completely blunt. I believe it does not do anything to increase the service that we give to students and that is where like my overall biggest issue is this is not going to help students at all. This is a great conversation. You know, you're saying a lot that I really like to hear and that is extremely important and that's why we came up with the decision to have this special meeting to really combat it at, you know, where it matters because anytime we're talking about this, it's just disagreements and we are getting personal and we're breaking down relations that we don't really need to do. So that is just my kind of two cents that it doesn't really make sense that you know when you say you want to just do as much you can to help specifically help the students, but then are taking all this time basically just to be wasted on, like I said, conversations that are good to have, but good conversation, wrong way to bring it up. And then I also wanted to just like ask you guys, Julia, if you're comfortable, I would like you to answer. If not, completely OK. I just wanted to add and if if not then just I'd like to hear what you think. So if this bill was passed right now exactly how it was, what do you and say for example with sense of the daily they post about it. What do you think that the impact of the Board of Directors as well as ASUW?

Julia Tanner: I think it would be a net negative. like it would be for sure especially because there isn't the context of this conversation happening. There isn't Board members individually defending themselves on it. You will read it, read the story about it and be like, Oh my gosh, ASUW is like a joke, et cetera. It wouldn't be productive and it wouldn't ultimately lead to internal restructuring or reform. So thank you.

Peyton Sax: I also wanted to recognize the governing documents and public records. Me. I know Kate, Owen and Sonal, Ashwin and Alan Galvez are all working on a specific place to hold our governing documents in the future. So that has been act in active motion since the beginning of this quarter and this conversation and also on individual levels has been happening since fall quarter. And I just wanted to make everybody aware of that, like that is an active not only just conversation, but that is an active like trial error process that we're figuring out how to properly present our public documents so they're promoting user accessibility. Just SharePoint right now is not fully accessible outside of our organization, so trying to find ways for user student accessibility and readability. So yeah, I just wanted to preface that for public sharing documents that is something that is an active motion for reform.

Kushi Loomba: Yeah I wanted to touch on something that Ashwin said that I really thought was important to kind of address was that if this does go to all of Senate, there is, and to what kind of what Julia was saying as well, not only is there no context, but also just the way that it works, not everyone would even be able to interject or give any sort of additional information regarding the bill and then that's another thing with our operational budget. I understand obviously that we all are on student dollars and that is why I'm so passionate about ensuring that it goes right back into students. But if we go and present this to the student body, not only does it not directly impact them when it comes to our wages and our salaries and all that information, there is so many nuances to the budget that it takes a while to understand. I had to learn it. I work so closely with the rest of the organization to try to help understand the budget, but just to introduce something as complex as the budget in one meeting, not being able to talk about. It. It creates a story that's not even true and it creates something that is very difficult and it's not accessible for the average person to understand because it takes time. So I think that's a whole other thing is that through all the work that we do, it's so individualized, it's niche and we're trying to make it as accessible as we can to the rest of the organization and to the rest of the employees, but only once when there is that collaboration can then can it go to students in a way that is understandable, is accessible and then we can show the impact and ensure that's going right back to students.

Kavi Pasupathi: Alright just to start off I've been here for the last couple weeks since the beginning. There's been a lot of back and forth, right? We've been sitting through this and I will agree with Julia that this is a net negative, right. Overall, this, there's not much context. It does come out bad and that's not good. However, there is the only thing that I really took away from this bill is that there's no system for accountability, right? That is something that severely needs to be addressed, not in the way that this bill is approaching it. However, it does need to be addressed, whether it's a Senate bill or a reform by the end, right? And you know, we've, I feel like every other conversation that we're going to have in like the next 7 to 10 minutes is just going to be a repeat of what we've been saying over and over. And I think everyone has heard a lot, everyone needs like some time away. We need time to look on this bill. We need time for anything. And with that, I make a motion to adjourn.

Kavi Pasupathi moves to adjourn

Ashwin Anand seconds

Nandana Jaideep objects

Kavi Pasupathi yields

Nandana Jaideep: I think there's just some things that need to be said before we adjourn, especially with all of the claims that have been put out there that are pretty harmful. So I just want to make sure that we leave on like an actual productive note, because I really do not want to come back here next week to have the same conversation here.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of debate. As a reminder, period of debate can be ended with either the motion maker withdrawing their motion, the objector withdrawing their objection, or a motion to the previous question.

Joseph Riggio: So I get the net negative perspective. Believe me, I thought about it too. I'm like, man, do I really want to shoot ourselves in the foot here? Here's why I'm sort of convinced it'll actually work the other way around and be a net, a net positive. What's the PR for constantly fighting against each other and constantly in this cycle and if you know the Daily or they dig and whatnot and pull up all these records that that I've also looked through and whatnot, that's that that will be a net PR negative. But what about the story of collaboration? What about the story of us trying to work together to figure this out? What about that story? What about the story of actually, guys, we do recognize and we can take accountability amid our faults, and we're going to work to improve our institution together to improve student lives. That is the story that this will tell. Is the task force a perfect idea in and of itself? No. But the reason why it's proposed is because it's working on the confounds of our current bylaws and governing documents. I do wish there was a more streamlined way. But the task force is the formalized mechanism for trying to get huge bylaws, structural reforms, the long, nitty gritty conversations that need to happen. And guess what? It's formalized, which means we don't have to rely on informality. We don't have to rely on maybe this conversation will happen. Maybe this meeting will happen. It'll be a meeting regularly, every that's reliable, that we all sit down, whoever the representatives are, and they discuss this matter and they get to bring it to the Board and the Senate and they get to report on their findings. And then we create that Senate bill and it'll probably have to happen either next year. It probably will happen next year to make these changes. I'm not even going to see these changes. So the, and I do want to quickly address the point Owen had about the conflict of interest for Francisco is the quote honorable mention. I do I literally just want to say that that's a symbolic act and recent legislation that has been used just as a symbolic recognition of somebody, either an alumni or somebody who's not affiliated with ASUW who has worked on something because we don't have a system to recognize people like that. So that's a pretty unofficial kind of way of doing it in an official capacity. I know it's weird. And yes, I have been consulting Francisco because he was the one who sponsored a lot of the initial proposals to solve these issues. And so yes, as somebody trying to investigate a way to have institutional reform of course I would go to Francisco because he was leading a lot of the conversations in 2023-24. He was the Director of Internal policy. It was Ashwin's job. He's a very creditable person for that and so I went to him about his constitutional proposal and his task force and a task force, by the way, that created a task force that never convened. So and that goes to the point that was made at the very beginning of this. We're coming full circle now of governing documents are not always the thing that fixes everything, and I recognize that. I mean, gosh, the task force that was supposed to fix our governing documents ironically never convened. So it does take people as well and the task force in and of itself is not going to be a perfect idea. But we should have these conversations in Senate and Executive Board about how this is going to happen.

Erick Jacobsen: Ok before we continue, I will note that this debate is on whether or not we adjourn, not necessarily whether the bill should pass.

Kav Pasupathi: I was just going to withdraw my motion but before that I'll just say again, reform does need to happen, right? And Joseph's right. The task force is not the perfect way, but it is a way to do it. But at the same time, I also recognize their point that the whereas clauses do need to be reworked a lot. So my question is right now and like this is to everyone in general who's gonna speak next is, is there a way we can still do this in a bill, bring it to Senate, but also address that those changes that you guys want and you know, again, this is about bringing it to Senate, right? That's what I want mainly addressed because it does need to be brought to Senate in some format. So that's just it.

Kavi Pasupathi withdraws motion to adjourn

Nandana Jaideep: I'd say like the primary reason why having a conversation like this in Senate is highly unprofessional and disrespectful is that I've been in what, four to five Senate Meetings now just talking about internal reform and we've done zero internal reform. Like, frankly, I'm tired and like, respect really has to be mutual. And I'm just putting the pieces together in my head and Joseph, I'm sure you're well aware of everything that I'm trying to say but for the sake of the committee, you kept mentioning that you were approached during break and that has been something that some members from GPSS have also told me that they were approached during break and they said they have emails about certain joint resolutions and senate bills and all of that, which brings me to a point of what you said about collaboration, right? So people were approached during break, GPSS, UW Tacoma, because they were one of the main proponents of the previous bill. You guys are all collaborating behind my back is what I want to say. So how is that productive collaboration? So like the fact that GPSS has been involved in helping like write this in their capacity outside of GPSS president argument and then you can come up with the argument that ASUW is overly involved as it was said during public comment at Senate, which is again very overly inflated because other people have been acting outside of the capacity and this time it has shown again that again racism and disregard of women of color. GPSS tabled the previous bill indefinitely and immediately after they saw it because none of them were even involved in that conversation earlier. And a lot of them were like, what is going on? Why are we bullying young people of color? And then the fact that we are bringing this up here when you guys were talking about this over break with zero involvement from me when this bill primarily concerns me, my organization and my board, I'm just like please make this make sense because so frankly hearing Senate talk about this in a public meeting like that is us falling short of helping each other and working as a team and making sure that we're treating everyone irrespective of their gender, color, identity, with the respect and dignity.

Ashwin Anand: I'll follow up to Nandana's point, and I'll kind of include Kavi, which mentioned just what you mentioned just to your point, you're not here when this goes or when any of this happens. We are not here when any of this happens. All of the implementation happens when new Board of Directors come into play. People with that might have ASUW experience, but also people that definitely don't have ASUW experience. I am obviously a first timer to ASUW aside from like being in senate before, I would not know anything that was going on if I was pushed into a committee on structuring of organization as large as ASUW where I have zero knowledge, right? That's one thing I'll point out. Second thing, we don't even collectively agree that the task force is like the best option. OK, yeah, maybe there's some benefits to the task force. Maybe it's there's some negatives to the task force. We can't even agree on the implementation of the bill. And that's something that you pointed that the task force is not perfect. One thing that we collectively as an organization have agreed upon, and one thing that we're all open to is meeting together, basically of meeting all together to discuss these constitutional amendments and the reforms. It's something that everybody is open to and everybody's willing to join, right? So it's an agreed implementation plan.

Side note, The Daily, The Herald are all in the forwarding clause and so if you bring this to Senate, if you bring this to the board and it gets approved, it's not just for, you know institutional reform happening. It's to make a statement, right? And making a negative, net negative statement to The Daily and the Herald who don't have any context in conversations. Only spreads false information or a false connotation about ASUW to have implications larger than just our body of people, OK. So again, on the net negative thing, you know, within our shared meeting of every everybody in ASUW meeting together, we can gladly invite the Daily to invite the Herald to document our process and our discussions into how we're restructuring the organization, the constitution, bylaws, etc. That's a very open place for people maybe that aren't even in ASUW to understand what goes on behind ASUW, right? And to Kavi, your point, we can have a full constitutional amendment presented, including the voices of everybody in ASUW and even not in ASUW, right after we have a collective ASUW meeting. And that's something that will be presented to Senate because people in steering who hopefully attend this meeting in a grand ASUW setting will already agree on the changes they take, right? And that's something that Senate can agree upon, hoping that people in Senate can show up and attend. It's a very collective, agreed upon solution. So again, what I'm going to say here, and to Nandana's point, I don't want to have this conversation. Yes, the bill in its entirety is a net negative. And I've been saying this before, maybe I elaborated right now. What I've been trying to say is that we have a mechanism that people collectively agree upon more than this one where again, it's a close conversation where people have no context. And so I don't know if anybody else wants to speak, so I'll hold off on my motion to table indefinitely. But I will be presenting that motion just because we've had this conversation for multiple weeks. It's getting nowhere. Let's work towards a solution that actually counts.

Joseph Riggio: Point of information, I just want to clarify. You're saying that ASUW collectively has agreed on your version of the internal reforms, correct? And or sorry, maybe I'm misunderstanding, but my question essentially is what entities do you, was there a survey? Was there communication to entities about the internal reform? Was there communication with them about it?

Peyton Sax: Point of Information, was that a question are we speaking in queue with that question?

Erick Jacobsen: No so as a point of information that is directly to an individual currently Ashwin and then we will continue with the queue, which will be you.

Peyton Sax: Ok Cool. Thank you.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, to answer that question, I'm referring to the future. I'm saying that once we have a collective ASUW meeting where we're able to discuss all the changes that we as an organization entirely, all entities that have input and that have insight into this, we can formally agree upon a collective solution that can be translated into a constitutional amendment that will be presented to steering, presented to Senate, presented to board, and then actually enacted. The process is collective in nature instead of a bill that is written by maybe two to three people that again has like zero collective input from anybody on board. I'm just saying it's a much better solution, which is why I will motion to table.

Peyton Sax: I have to head out in just a second to go to our all staff to set up for that. So I want to point that out. And two, as a communications major and as a public relations specialist, when you see a bill that is rooted in pointing out different things that aren't supposedly on an institutional base, but they point out individual mindsets or or things that have happened the story that you don't receive as a public relations specialist is collaboration and communication. If I am an article writer and I see task or bill that calls out certain people for this that's not the story that you receive. I

personally am all for institutional reform. I'm all for public communication about this too. Joseph, I really hope you do come to Board to talk about this even more and like I know Board members go to Senate as well, but and we've been coming here too for the past few weeks. But I do just want to mention like that as a public relations specialist, that's not the story that you get from something that isn't Collaborative in nature. And so when you want to start something collaborative, you can't start it by harming people, whether it was intentional or unintentional. And something that made certain people feel marginalized. It's not going to support collaboration in the end. So that's all I'm going to say. I gotta go, but I'll see you guys with all stuff. Thank you so much for all of your time steering. I appreciate you. Bye guys

Erick Jacobsen: I'll go to Ashwin in a second but I did want to like just inform steering 'cause a lot of you are new to steering. So when it comes to like bills that we receive, if it is your feeling that this bill or that is any certain bill needs more work, it does tend to be the opinion of steering that either suggest that edits are made by the sponsor that are like satisfactory to steering as to what changes they want to make and then it's approved or it's rejected and then a new version of the bill is submitted that address all of the same things. So it is customary for that. And just as a reminder, steering our role is to decide whether a bill is ready for the Senate floor, not whether so like for example, if we vote to table indefinitely, that's not saying that we don't want something like something like this to happen or that we don't want this to happen at all. And similarly, if we pass it, that's not saying that we want this to happen specifically. It's in terms of the readiness of the bill as it relates to our standards and the standards of the Senate. So I just wanted to make that clear because I know we have some proxies today and some new people. So yeah, and then I'll go to Ashwin.

Ashwin Anand: First off in this I want to thank everybody for being here. It's a lot of information, especially to new proxies and people that have already been here for multiple weeks to hear all of this continue to, you know, spiral. But like Erick, to your point, right, tabling this indefinitely doesn't seem it signals that this bill is not ready and me personally I think taking that one step further, not only is this ready, not ready for the Senate floor, but it's it's just it doesn't need to be ready. This is something that addresses problems that we've come up with a solution in a different context and so my mindset with tabling this indefinitely is to approach it in a different way, right? And that's the approach that we are taking. And so I motion to table indefinitely. Hope everybody supports that.

Ashwin Anand moves to table indefinitely

Nandana Jaideep seconds

Approved 1-0-6

Kavi Pasupathi: I just want to say again there does need to be some sort of system for accountability, whether it's task force, whether it's a committee, or even if it's more just going through a checklist at the start of each quarter. And presenting what they've done, what they need to do, and just their entire task list, right? Just something needs to happen and I hope like that everyone can keep it in mind.

DISCUSSION

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURNMENT

Kavi Pasupathi moves to adjourn

Joseph Riggio seconds

Approved 4-2-0

5:41 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
