



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

2/13/2026

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 | E

Abigail Appleyard (she/her), Off-Campus Committee Chair | P

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

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

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

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

Detlef Gerbing (he/him), *Committee on ASUW Restructuring Chair* A

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

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

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

Alan Galvez (he/him), *SAO Advisor* | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Julia Tanner moves to approve the agenda

Joseph Riggio seconds

Approved 4-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Erick Jacobsen reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose

land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: I guess it's prudent to say that the board scheduled institutional reform meeting has been officially scheduled, or I don't know if it's scheduled with OPMA yet, but we've decided that that will be on February 28th. So not this Saturday, not next Saturday, but the Saturday after that. So it'll still be within the month. It'll be um pretty much all day, but you can drop in at any time. Any member of ASUW is welcome. It'll be in the HUB, most likely Hub 303, but we don't know yet. And there will be food because it's a like a workshop, a training sort of thing. So you are all welcome to attend, especially if you have anything that you'd like to be resolved within the bylaws or any other governing documents. Apart from that, I'll go go over it in my board report next week, but just some, the RSO Special Appropriations Fund has been in ready use and so considering we have a very high general fund, Khushi is working, I think, to supplement the special preparations fund so that more RSOs can access it because it's running out, which is great because we love RSOs. But apart from that and a couple other like minor things that I'll get to in my board report on Tuesday, Things have been chill. I have heard of one new legislation being planned and not many pieces of legislation being finished, unfortunately. So our, the list of planned legislation continues to rise. However, we do have our third resolution today, so I'm looking forward to that one at least, and I hope that the extra time is making people is allowing people to make the best product they can. Moving on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hey y'all, I sent out attendance notices for February 3rd so if your committee members have any questions or whatnot, so far I haven't received any emails about it, but just friendly reminder that one way for your committee members to verify their attendance is by having y'all just confirm with me that they were there through the attendance that you took during committee or just pointing to it. Well, I can also look it up, so it's important to take committee attendance so you know who's there. The second thing is GAVEL committee has been making a lot of progress. I'm excited to make the quarterly report for this quarter because it's going to be quite full. It might be so full that I'll have to condense some things and probably go topic by topic instead of bill by bill because we've been breezing through bill tracking. We're on session 28 right now, which is crazy. So yeah, follow up has been going really, really well so far. We've been able to get a lot of meetings with even regents and whatnot, executives and different departments and a lot of different projects are moving. And if you want to talk more about any specific project you're interested in, the GAVEL tracker is available, open to the public. It's in our Senate shared folder on our teams. So if you want to look at that, hopefully one day we'll put it on the Senate website when we have all that renovated so y'all can have access to it. But I'm excited. Also update, I have not forgotten about the liaison committee meeting. I just need to over the weekend find time. It'll probably be late February that it happens just because of schedule conflicts for me but hopefully that will happen and we can have regular meetings every single month. So that's all for me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: I don't actually have anything this week so happy Friday the 13th hopefully everything goes well today.

Erick Jacobsen: You can share the post you're working on!

Julia Tanner: Oh yeah, so I'm working with the publicity and programming committee to create a post and a series of resources on the ASUW website in regards to immigration issues and matters, so it'll be resources for all students, but there will be more immigrant focused resources on there. But yeah, it'll just be a page on ASUW website that'll just have everything, all the links and then I'm working on a post that will post in with ASUW, ASUW Senate and then whoever else wants to join on as a collaborator. So yeah, that is pretty cool. It should be posted before the 19th, before the know your rights event. So that's all I have.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Alan Galvez: Yeah, nothing major, y'all. Word of the day is a word I forgot that exists. So you've heard of a rascal, right? OK, maybe you remember this one. Rascalion. Yeah, yeah, it rolls off the tongue. I love it. So someone who causes trouble in a mischievous way. So there's the word of the day. And after talking to Brendan it sounds like y'all are doing a great job so far so keep it up. And that is the end of my report.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you so much Alan and thank you for being here. Moving on to the approval of the minutes.

Recess 4:11 pm

Reconvened 4:15 pm

Julia Tanner: Do I have to move to recess?

Erick Jacobsen: I mean I can just recess.

Recess 4:15 pm

Reconvened 4:17 pm

Julia Tanner moves to approve both minutes

Joseph Riggio seconds

Vote fails due to lack of quorum

Julia Tanner: Point of inquiry. We can't just make the movement again, we can't reconsider?

Erick Jacobsen: We can.

Joseph Riggio: We can reconsider technically. you'd move to suspend the rules and we'd go back to that and then

Erick Jacobsen: So you'd say I move to suspend the rules and reconsider the approval of the minutes.

Julia Tanner moves to suspend the rules and reconsider the motion on the approval of the minutes.

Erick Jacobsen: Joseph, as a point of parliamentary inquiry as well, is this like voting yes, no or abstain to having the vote?

Joseph Riggio: No, we just go back to reviewing minutes.

Joseph Riggio seconds

Brief procedural confusion

Motion to reconsider approved 4-0-1

Julia Tanner moves to approve

Sarah Parker seconds

Approved unanimously

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: We're moving on to R-32-3, a resolution to install mesh screens in on campus residence windows. This is Jothsna's bill. Do you need, assistance taking notes?

Jothsna Sundar reads [R-32-3 A Resolution to Install Mesh Screens in On Campus Residence Windows](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty. Are there any questions for Jothsna

Julia Tanner: Yeah, with the bug screens being replaced in Hansee Hall, I'm a Hansee Hall resident, so that would be nice. But is there kind of like a background behind that? Is it just based off surveys of what people would like to see or other information you've learned?

Jothisna Sundar: Yes. So this was because I went to a hall caucus yesterday and for Hansee specifically, I believe it was Corbyn mentioned that they are, they are there, but they're kind of like holes in them and they're like old and tattered and I was like, why not If we're putting them in the other buildings

Julia Tanner: Can I ask a follow up? Would you be open to an amendment to add a whereas clause just briefly explaining that?

Erick Jacobsen: And if you wanna put that as a suggested edit, that's often recommended for potential edits so that steering can consider it on the basis of certain changes will be made. Or at least that they'll be discussed.

Joseph Riggio: Yes, I appreciate the GAVEL forwarding clause. I know that's what we somebody we talked about doing. We still would appreciate just a brief contact list though. So doesn't this isn't going to hurt the bill going out of steering, but for me, it'd be great if we can compile that list before Senate. I know this bill is last minute. Yeah so just as long as before Senate, we can have a list of relevant people, it'd probably just be people from HFS and and certain people, ASUW Board members and leadership and whatnot. But yeah

Erick Jacobsen: that's on me I told her that didn't really matter. But I believe there's precedent for interpreting forwarding clauses as grammatical, so I will, either one of us can just add people if we feel like it. Are there any other questions or comments?

Joseph Riggio: I mean we we actually talked about this briefly beforehand, but I it's my understanding that a lot of the residence halls, like especially the windows and the types of bug screens that we use, they're gonna be different just because depending on when the building was made, so like a cluster is like Oak, McCarty, Oliver Hall, Spratlen Hall, those were all built at around the same time and have this similar window features. Whereas like Haggett or not, no longer. Well Haggett when it's built but McMahon and Hansee each separately have their own windows. The West Campus apartments for the most part have a uniform set of windows that they have the specific bug screen measurements. And so I guess the question for steering is just was that taken into account and is there a plan to to follow up with that difficulty?

Jothisna Sundar: Yeah it was my intention to add a hypothetical or like an approximate cost before and then I got really annoyed trying to figure out how big windows were in, yeah, you were not the only one I texted. I texted literally everyone I know who lives on campus basically. And then. So yeah, for the apartments, because I live in an apartment, the windows are approximately like 6 by 8 feet which based on that for the apartments, it would be like \$140,000 for just the apartment windows.

Erick Jacobsen: For just one apartment?

Jothisna Sundar: No for like all the apartment buildings together. Yeah, I haven't figured out dorms yet. I would like a better measurement estimate of like what the dorm window size is because I don't remember. And I'm totally open to including that. I was just like if someone asks on the floor and is like super adamant about that being included before we pass it, I can make a suggest edit.

Julia Tanner: With that, did you contact anyone in HFS, specifically building managers or people who would know more about like the window and screen installations?

Jothisna Sundar: I did not but that's a really good idea.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments? Julia does not like La La Land.

Joseph Riggio: I'm just gonna start the trend. I support this as someone that was mentioning this earlier to Senate leadership, but when I walked into my room when I first moved in on the window sill was like a line of 20 to 30 little tiny bugs just dead on the windowsill. And so they were, they'd gone through some of the holes and whatnot in there and there was a fun tiny infestation at one point over summer, I guess. The pesticides did the trick, but I guess they forgot to clean up the outlet. So, so I do resonate with this bill. I think that it's just a good, it's a good quality of life feature and actually I want to point to the whereas clause. 11 and 12 or lines on line 12 this actually I've experienced this myself personally, or I have opted to not open the window and just suck it up for air conditioning and whatnot or ventilation because of bugs and issues with bugs flying into my room. When I'm trying to work.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just saying like when I lived on West Campus, my dorm faced a street and I was always worried when I did have my window open that something I had on my window sill would be knocked out and could like potentially hit somebody like I had drinks and stuff that were just kind of sitting on my my counter. And so I feel like it's also kind of a safety thing from that perspective, just making sure that people don't have stuff that falls out or people don't get hurt, you know, leaning out of the window or something like that

Julia Tanner: I guess on that I'll make it brief because we can talk about this on the floor but I also support this bill. And as someone with windows screens, there are still holes. Like I've gotten multiple fruit fly infestation issues despite storing all my fruit properly so even with screens, like, there's definitely room for improvement.

Sarah Parker: I guess I just had a general question if - I lived in Madrona last year, which got renamed and I can't remember what it got renamed to. Spratlen. Spratlen. Gross. On the official record gross. My window screen like we could take it out so I was just wondering if there was like if someone asked because I am on GAVEL like we want permanent ones. OK, I figured people would like sneak on the roof or on the above the Learning Resource Center so.

Joseph Riggio: Also a comment for the resident advisor rooms in particular. I'm speaking from my experience. I don't know about the cluster spaces. I assume it's the same problem, but McMahon actually doesn't have bug screens. Our windows just open and it's just yeah, and. That's the perk of a legacy hall that was built in the 1960s with brutalist architecture is that safety from that perspective wasn't thought of. So yeah, we've we've had incidents before where we've had residents throwing things off out of the windows and off of the balconies and whatnot. This would address the window problem. Not so much the balcony problem, but yeah, when I was an RA in McMahon, I never opened my window because McMahon is also notorious for having a lot of bug issues too, a lot of Silverfish issues. And so that was one way that Silverfish would enter. Also through ventilation and stuff, but at the same time other bugs and like mosquitoes during certain seasons, it just wasn't a good time. And the building's warm, like it's a warm building. Have you ever been inside a McMahon? The it's just a warm, insulated building. So yeah, I doubly support this bill for that reason too.

Julia Tanner moves to approve and refer to On Campus Affairs

Sarah Parker seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on now to our second bill, SB-32-2, a Senate Bill to amend the ASUW Constitution. Joseph, do you want to explain why this is now a bill and not a discussion item?

Joseph Riggio: Yes, I can explain that. So after discussion with SAO advisors, it was of the opinion that they did a thorough look at the constitution and sort of the review process. And it was determined that it, the judicial recommendation can happen at the same time as the Senate bill for considering the question, just so long as eventually we receive recommendation from judicial and the Senate considers it. And that's if judicial even wants to make a statement. And it's actually unclear if that's true or not. It's very vague. But so we can move forward at least with the question and the constitutional proposal. It's already good because the restructuring committee already had the constitutional proposal because we just talked about it as a discussion item. But now we can have the bill associated with it too, to provide more context and sources and sort of a larger explanation as to why it's happening. So with that, would you like me to start with the bill summary and just read through or?

Erick Jacobsen: I say just read through.

Joseph Riggio reads SB-32-2 a Seante Bill to amend the ASUW constitution

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Joseph. As a reminder, we do not need to approve anything before 5:00 PM because it is not Monday. The only reason we have to approve things before 5:00 PM on Monday is because we need to send out the agenda 24 hours in advance. But we're good. So don't worry about the time we have the meeting for this and for the agenda and spring and future steering planning so keep that in mind. Are there any questions?

Julia Tanner: So starting off with the conclusion lines 159 to 163. I was wondering if you were open to either amending this so it seems less, It's very directly accusatory of the Board of Directors without sources. So I was wondering if you would be open to amending that to become more neutral or just strike it entirely, or if you were able to find specific sources.

Joseph Riggio: So the sources that these are referencing, the conclusion is like an overall summary of of the sources. The reason why they're not directly linked here is because the clause itself references the sources that came before in the section this is through well. This claim is more of an opinionated claim. It could be a that clause, honestly too. This is based on, so I'll just walk through each line. The prior attempts for constitutional reform were stalled by Board of Directors members during the same Board meetings, which is evident by the introduction date of the amendments. So all those amendments and board bills, if we scroll to the appendix to Appendix B, that's so basically we comprise a public folder 2024-2026, a set of constitutional reform folder that contains all of the agendas, all of the board bills, all the relevant documents, documentation to back this all of the sources that collectively you can probably look at the the judicial judgment is the one that we really wanted to highlight because that was kind of what was going on and then you can see in the agendas and the minutes. The conversations that were had about recommitting and vetoing certain pieces of legislation so that way the Senate bills would stall out. In fact, one thing that came from last year was the 20 day limitation to the constitution or ballot measure proposed questions which may or may not impact this constitutional amendment. So we have seen through these sources that the the claim is, at least in my interpretation, substantiated. I am open to amending the language to make it more neutral if there are suggestions but this is from my point of view, an observation that can be gathered by looking through the agendas and minutes.

Julia Tanner: Can I ask a follow up?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, but first I wanna say I believe the 20 day limitation had something to do with the technical thing of the ballot but go ahead.

Julia Tanner: I was gonna go off of that. You've mentioned the 20 day thing before. I was in judicial for the past two years and it's been around so I don't know, like it feels like you keep saying that it's new as in like the Board of Directors did it, but I'm pretty sure it's been a rule.

Joseph Riggio: So it's been sort of extensively discussed with the Elections Administration Committee. It is more of a procedural rule, but that procedural rule has been abused. It's that claim. I would have to look at the minutes and agendas to substantiate that claim. I recognize that on the surface, it would be hard to completely prove that, but we have seen these stalling tactics before. I will also note that this constitutional amendment has also undergone some, I would say, interesting interpretations of the procedure, especially through judicial. This was introduced to Judicial on January 12th. Now we have had some issues with scheduling meetings because the HUB power outage and then we had holidays. Those holidays I would argue should have been accounted for, but it's OK. We all make mistakes. I certainly have. I mean, I didn't even make the Teams meeting for today. But also I've repeatedly requested special meetings because we're aware of the 20 day limitation. I was not around when that limitation was made, so perhaps that's just a knowledge gap on my part. But it has been used to stall out pieces of legislation that otherwise could have made it on the ballot.

Erick Jacobsen: Julia, do you mind scrolling to 159? I added a suggest edit that that might be what you're looking for, but before you can talk more about that I'll go to Dylan.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah sorry its probably going to be loud I'm on the light rail right now. I wanted to raise a couple points. The first being, I feel like while I appreciate that this version of Senate Bill has removed all the stuff about individual members of Board, I feel like we're still engaging with it from kind of an adversarial angle. If we're talking about people like stalling legislation or stalling something on the bill to assigning a motive to someone they may or may not have, I think we should avoid that. I think if that's the rationale for this bill, I think we should think twice about it. Second of all, I'm a little concerned with how this bill represents the judicial ruling. I was on judicial at the time we passed that ruling, Julia was also so I'm interested to hear Julia's thoughts about this. And while I stand by that ruling in that Board definitely avoided proper process in their first like inputting the bill on the ballot and I don't appreciate them overturning our recommendation, I don't think they should have done that. At the end of the day, if we're going to talk about Board like avoiding proper process or I believe this bill uses language like concentration of power or abuse of power, I think we have to consider that after this bill got set before the voters, they overwhelmingly accepted it. Like after the the appeals of the reforms were set forward, voters approved it. So I don't really think we can talk about this as an abuse of power when the voters ended up being overwhelmingly in favor of it. And I think that's kind of a flawed premise in this bill. I do really want to hear what Julia thinks of that. But I'm a little hesitant to include that, especially because I just I, this is something I've talked about before. We put this in the JR I don't want to put something in Senate that's like rehashing, to be kind of slangy, rehashing old beef and rehashing old sort of internal squabbles within ASUW.

Joseph Riggio: I'm going to respond to your central point or central question, which was that you know, students voted on the repeal ultimately by a super majority. So my counterpoint to that is. This the constitution that was passed during the 2023/2024 session to be enacted fully in 2025, fall of 2025 was never fully completed. The task force that was supposed to redo all the bylaws never convened. And so students never got an opportunity to see what that system could have looked like.

So I could make, that is a very valid argument. However this argument too is also very valid in that I don't think there was enough education done to really have, because there's a difference between a voter making a vote or casting their vote and making casting an informed vote. And the fact that, you know, students probably didn't even know that this task force existed, that the bylaws were changing that internal reform was happening and that this task force that was supposed to do all this never convened, and that's extremely provable. We have sources that there's no agendas from that committee. There's no board bill or report that was ever given during a board meeting last year. So that task force never convened and therefore de facto in practice. It's like the constitutional amendment never happened in the first place. So most of this constitutional proposal is just reintroducing what students voted on by 90% of the student body who voted then, albeit the voter count was small then, and it was small last year too. We're trying to work on getting voter engagement back, but I would caution against arguments that are made with voters just because it's a tricky topic. In political science, it's always a tricky topic as well to talk about the validity of certain actions based on what voters vote for and how informed or educated that vote was. So I'll say that. And then to the point of rehashing old business, this business never died. Again, the task force that was supposed to work on all of this never convened. The people that are caring about this and are trying to support it in however way they can they want to remain anonymous because they're scared of what happened, what's going on right now, and they're not comfortable going to Board about these issues, partially because of some of the issues presented in this bill. Which to me concerns me as an advocate. It concerns me quite deeply that they want to remain anonymous because they feel uncomfortable going to board about these issues. That's why I'm OK sitting here and talking about these issues. Because they don't want to go public about it and that's really concerning to me. So I don't, this isn't necessarily rehashing old issues. These are issues that were never fully addressed to begin with and they are affecting students lives. Students who both have spent a lot of time and care and are trying to better the student life and I think we need to give this at least a chance for student, senators to consider and also just a point of parliamentary clarification. This is a new Senate bill. This is not the same Senate bill at all from the previous one. This has been made way back in on January 12th in fact, the Judicial Committee could have access to this as well beforehand. So this is an entirely separate thing than the previous Senate bill talking about a bylaws task force. So these are two separate issues.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll go to Julia but going forward just to keep everything concise and give everyone an equal chance to speak, I'm gonna implement a two minute limit on comments.

Julia Tanner: So I wanted to address some of the things Dylan said and also some of the things Joseph said. I might not cover all of it, so I might have to come back. But yeah, I was also on the Judicial Committee. Take my words of my opinion on our ruling with a grain of salt, just because I was pretty biased in being like involved in that whole process. But yeah, we ruled that because we did, at least for me, I saw a use of the suspensions of bylaws, I saw the use of special meetings and overall the power that the board had as being used to pass an amend or a constitutional proposal that any other average student wouldn't have been able to take advantage of the systems to pass. And so that was one of my biggest issues with the constitutional proposal that overrode the original one was that any other student wouldn't have been able to take advantage of that process. However, I want to caution or want to - I appreciated the changes Erick made because I think what I'm trying to get at is whether the board was intentionally taking advantage of the power and position that they had, or whether it was just available for them, why wouldn't they use what they had available to them? Because I think it would be fair to say that people in leadership in ASUW generally do care about the students. And so if they're acting through care with the students and they're just using the

processes they have available, it's not necessarily an intentional abuse of power. So I think it would be good to kind of go away from that wordage in this bill overall. Additionally, I would like to ask if this resolution at these constitutional amendments will address this use of power, will address the processes that are in place to allow the board to do these kinds of things of overriding student opinion. If you can call it that.

Erick Jacobsen: Just for the record the suggest edits I proposed can only be approved if this goes into a committee and then they vote on it, or if this bill is withdrawn and resubmitted as we saw with some of the previous bills. So I'll go to Joseph for two minutes.

Joseph Riggio: Really quick I just want to say we're not anticipating, we submitted this way early on because we knew that the 20 day deadline would approach and so we are on a tight timeline. If we want Senate to consider this we have a committee that's dedicated to it. And I think that we have some really awesome people on that committee with a lot of expertise. I think they could bring in and make their own amendments and whatnot. I'm perfectly happy and comfortable with any suggested amendments to alter the language to be more neutral. I stand by, uh, the opinion but for the sake of this, getting through to the Senate, I'm more than willing to compromise on that and and just stick to the very facts of the matter, the things that have sources and the things that we point to. Almost every clause in this bill has a source so if it's just a matter of rewording some things, I'm perfectly fine with doing that. And I'm I'm also perfectly fine with giving a statement preemptively to reading the bill that addresses that hey, there is some language in here that is left from steering. We are wanting to change that language because it is no longer steering's opinion that or steering's recommendation that this is in here. And I can explain why because we don't know the intention of the Board and we don't know the intention of the people that were responsible for for those decisions. So I'm perfectly amendable to that.

Julia Tanner: Just real quick also on the education of voters I do think we need to warn everyone in the conversation to kind of move away from this idea of how educated were the voters on voting on it. I think unfortunately since 2020, voter education has been really low, voter turnout has really been low. And so you could say the same thing about the first constitutional proposal that passed is students were fully educated on it. So this is just like saying we should move away from that idea and just take it as the students on both proposals. And then, yeah, I would really like if there was, if you did make a statement to say to the committee or Senate in general about language and encourage people to as they read through it, make amendments or suggestions to make the the language more neutral and moving away from intention or assumption of intention. And I'll be looking through it and making those amendments as well, if you can as well.

Erick Jacobsen: I will ask you given there are like, so I know there's the five specific key points that are mentioned, lines 181 to 199 and then the ballot measure question from 200 to 212 also state some things, some of which aren't in the key priorities. And I know even above, apart from the key priorities and the ballot measure question, there are some minor things like changing Board of Directors to Board of Executives. What was the like rationale behind these five specific key points and was there any potential considerations iteration of listing out all of the changes that are made so that people don't have to just go through the however many pages document?

Joseph Riggio: We're actually working on a document to make those bullet points. It's just been, we're students and just like Board members, they're also students and just like people working on this are also students. We're crazy busy. We have been over time working on a document, especially to to give to judicial that goes through really bullet point summary of talking points just of each thing that's changed because it's quite a bit. It's very minor, some of them are very minor changes,

but important changes. The reason why we condense the ballot question to be this is because these are the large key items that we're changing. The most notable things is that each would have the independent branches, judicial, electoral, personnel and introducing the new, new to this proposal is the auditory branch which is an accountability branch that would be chaired by the the Director of Internal Policy, which would be moved away from the board and wouldn't have a vote on board anymore. So we're trying this is experimentation and so each of these main clauses in the ballot question we have to be careful when it comes to this is the same kind of decisions I had to make for the student health fee is how much information is too much information. This is a ballot question that will go on their ballot and on their packet, and if it's too long, it's not going to be read to the full extent. So we might actually be, and they might overlook some of the more important points if we include all those minor details. So trying to condense it to be packaged in a way that students can understand the bulk of what's going on. And then if they want to learn more, there'll be a link to that where they can view the whole initiative and look at the minor details and we can even have that full minor breakdown that I'm gonna present to Judicial and Senate kind of explaining all the minor changes and whatnot. The also I want to address my Julia's point as well about education and voters.

Erick Jacobsen: I and before I go to Dylan, I will claim my one direct follow up to specify as far as to like the key points, like do you intend to put in the bill like a list of what's being changed beyond these five priorities?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah so the original thought was no for these same reasons they're over, we have regular attendance of around 100 senators and I think that again, we're trying to compile a list with those changes already and I'm perfectly happy to make like an appendix that has those changes if we do want to go over that and make amendments on the floor, like the restructuring committee would be great for this because they can look at that document and go, OK, what should be on the bill like so senators can see when it's read on the floor after committee edits are are passed and whatnot. So that way because senators are going to, if we follow the same process, then that means they'll be in committee first and so they'll have a chance in a smaller group to kinda review it and review that document with all those minor changes and see what things they wanna put on here.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah I wanted to say again in regards to like language around the abuse of power and stuff. I do appreciate, Joseph, that you're willing to be flexible on that. I think the best route for removing that if we are indeed feeling necessary, we should remove it is to like temporarily withdraw this bill and recommit it. Just because I think if we put the bill in front of Senate with this language in there and we make a show of being like, but we're removing this language, the insinuation is still made to senators that there's a perspective that abuse of power occurred. And I just think that kind of that retains the problem of like turning up the heat of discourse in the bill and Senate. And I would rather we not do that. I'd rather we just avoid the like personal or accusatory element we're trying to avoid here. And I think the best way to do that is by withdrawing the bill and recommitting it. I think it also gives Joseph more flexibility to alter things based on the feedback you're getting now. And again, Joseph, I do appreciate your willingness to to listen to our feedback in the the long journey this bill's gone through.

Julia Tanner: I just wanted to agree with Dylan on the idea of withdrawing and with that intention in mind of not to paint a first impression for the senators. And I also think including what Erick was saying, including the other points in this, this bill for a general overview of what's been changed through the constitutional proposal is really important, just because there are quite a lot of changes that I don't think people are going to be fully willing to read through on the Frankenstein of a constitutional proposal that exists now, just because of all the little edits and stuff. But I do think it

would be good to just withdraw and do those edits, and then it'll be a more cohesive, I guess is the right word to submit to the Senate.

Joseph Riggio: So the constitutional proposal, this is something I should have addressed sooner is all the language in that bill if you go to viewing mode. That's the new constitution. We didn't reuse the current constitution. We're proposing entirely brand new blank slate constitution from the original. It keeps some points from the previous constitution and I can go over that when I complete the list. But yeah, it's using the all that language is gonna be in there. It's just the review that it's are or they're from the 2024 proposal.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, I had my hand up so before I go to Julia, it's very brief, I promise. I don't intend to take up time as chair. My advice with regards to the previous comment on or discussion on key points and whatnot. My advice as speaker and from what I've seen in the senate is to include at least a summary of everything you're doing in the bill itself, even if not necessarily in the ballot question. So I would advise on that point to include all of the changes in the like that clause about specific points, and I know we didn't get a chance to meet on this before it was submitted or this specific bill. So that is, that is my recommendation. I'll go to Julia.

Julia Tanner: This is on the same point because my point still stands. Most students are not going to pull up like the old constitution and the new one and look at everything that's changed. We're voting on it. I know I did that for the judicial committee and it took like over 3 hours. And so I would agree with Erick that it would be really good to just have a points of like what's being changed, not quotes of this is being replaced by this. But just an overview of each thing that's been changed.

Erick Jacobsen: I will go to well, are there any other questions or comments? I will now go to Joseph.

Joseph Riggio: Okay do keep in mind what is probably going to happen - I'm 100% willing to meet and work with anyone. I know it's a three day weekend. I work weekends so I will be working on this. But if you wanna help me with changing or amending the language, if we do move to table it or table it indefinitely, what can happen then is I'm going to have to move to suspend the rules next week. So just temperature check consents assuming that I can go in and make proper amendments and anybody who wants to help me with that can. I know Julia, you suggested that you can go in and make some amendments and help with that and anybody else is welcome to join me as well. I'll be working on it this weekend. So if we do move the table it, just know that I will very likely during the Senate meeting move to suspend the rules and add the new version of the bill, it would be coded differently, be Senate Bill 32-3. It would be that would be moved on the Senate agenda for next week.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I go to Julia just as a point of information, I guess, Joseph, do you know when the last day amendment proposals can be approved is?

Joseph Riggio: So March 19th is so here's the complicated thing. March 19th is the last day that we as a Senate body could approve. Here's an issue. Even if we do approve it, the Board of Directors has reconsideration power. They can vote to have the Senate reconsider based on their proposed amendments or whatnot or recommendations that they have. If that happens where we let's say the last meeting of this quarter we passed this and it's reconsidered, it just dies. It's killed. I confirmed it with Brendan. So we don't have much time. If Senate gets behind this Constitution, if they do

support this, do know that we are going to be the ones to have to explain why it suddenly died if it doesn't pass board.

Julia Tanner: So with that I think it would be a good idea because Board of, member or Board of Directors members do show up to the Senate meetings. So I think communicating with them and asking them to show up to Senate so they can offer feedback to avoid a recommitted. That's just like a strategic thing I would recommend. Otherwise, temperature check wise, I wouldn't be opposed of you bringing it up if it has amendments this Tuesday. Which I can help make amendments over the weekend.

Erick Jacobsen: And even specifically like if they came to the committee, that would be the most helpful.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah I just want to say I am so sorry for a noise on the train. I don't view it as Senate's job to get this put on the ballot. And I think that Senate and Board should exercise due process with this bill and give it the same in-depth consideration they'd give anybody. I mean, this is a pretty important thing, right? Like we're it's something to engage in really substantial changes or reforms. I don't. I'm just not worried about getting this like on time or by the ballot measure, if we give it due consideration, if it takes the time it takes in Senate and take the time it takes in Board and then if that's not enough time I think that just means that this bill wasn't put forward in enough time. For that reason, I'm not a fan of suspending the rules on Tuesday because I think this bill should come back for steering. I think we should continue to consider it. I don't think we should be coordinating, like rushing this bill through so we can put it in front of voters. I think that's the kind of behavior that, frankly, the board was engaged in last year with their repeals. That's the kind of stuff we got frustrated about, judicial got frustrated about. I would rather not repeat it. It's no one's obligation to put this on the ballot.

Joseph Riggio: To address the first point as to whether or not this should be a Senate consideration We have our own section in constitutional amendments. It's Section C. That exists for a very good reason. It's a check and balance and make sure it ensures that Senate still has the power to propose constitutional amendments. We are a member of, we are an organization or an entity of ASUW with co-equal power to the board with certain respects. We should be able to propose our own constitutional amendments if we so choose. To the point of rushing this, again, I'll just state for the record, this was submitted on January 12th to Judicial Committee under the interpretation of the Constitution we followed to be safe, which is that we would need a judicial recommendation before we could consider it in Senate, that was the impression and that was what was agreed upon by Brendan too at the time, our SAO advisor. However, upon further investigation, Brendan and Coop found out that we could consider this Senate bill at the same time as that judicial recommendation, which is why we're acting now for the Senate bill. However, this constitutional amendment proposal has been in discussion for longer, it's been in discussion in the the committee of restructuring as a discussion item and it has been in discussion in the steering committee as well prior. So there has been time to look over this. There has been time for judicial to look over this. It's been a month and a half. And so by no means was this rushed. This was proposed at the beginning of the quarter. It should have allowed ample time for it, but due to extenuating circumstances, cancellations and meetings, trouble getting special meetings on the calendar and that is your time.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions, comments or motions at this time?

Julia Tanner: I do think it would be valuable to be heard in Senate sooner rather than later because it's going, it would be going straight into the special committee, which has already viewed the

constitutional amendments, heard some of the history. They're more informed than the general Senate. I don't think that it would be the same level as Board, especially because it's not unilateral. It's being done in not cahoots, but like parallel to the Judicial Committee. It's been discussed in steering. It still has to go through Board and we will still be talking with board. So I don't necessarily think that it's avoiding due process, especially because I do know as being on the committee that we will be looking closely over all of it before passing it out of the committee and out of Senate.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah it seems like I should clarify, maybe walk back a little, I said. I'm not saying that anything we're voting right now is like abuse of power outside the lines or anything. I'm just saying that I don't think we should take actions to speed this bill along. It has a lot of very complicated and significant stuff in it. It's going to need a lot more consideration than the average Senate bill, and I don't think that we should act with the intent of making sure we hit a deadline with the bill, because I think that encourages us to rush. So to clarify, I'm not saying this bill has been rushed. I'm saying that to try and move it forward to meet some deadline would be rushing and then it should not get any kind of expedited timeline that a normal Senate bill wouldn't get.

Erick Jacobsen: And just to clarify in terms of like suspending the rules, it is generally my opinion and the opinion of past Senate leaderships that that should be avoided at all costs, but that it's ultimately up to the senators and up to whatever circumstances are driving it and if there is a specifically time sensitive thing. So I will go to. Joseph.

Joseph Riggio: May I request that we take an informal vote on suspending the rules under the assumption that if I withdraw this bill, if I move to withdraw this or I can just withdraw this bill if I withdraw this bill, assuming that no, no one else has any questions or concerns. I do request that we can take an informal vote on whether it is OK for me to suspend the rules on Tuesday to add this, provided that necessary amendments are made and we can reintroduce it as a different bill.

Julia Tanner: I was actually going to go with what Dylan said as a good point of like having an official vote in steering to pass it out so I was just gonna agree with Dylan and if we did an informal vote right now, I probably would be against the suspension of the rules. And I'm sorry that I like went back and forth, but I do think that making the amendments and then just going through steering again would be OK because we're still going to be going over the Constitution in the committee. So it's not like we're not getting anything done in the committee towards this. It would just be this specific Senate bill would be just going through the same process.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll say as something to keep in mind, I would highly suggest that necessary amendments be clarified because I think an issue with previous bills that were resubmitted was that people had different ideas on what amendments were necessary and what amendments were satisfactory to approving it, and that led to like multiple withdrawals and resubmits and people still not being satisfied. So I would be clear with our language on what we're saying that we would support if we are saying we would support something like that and then also if we want to have the restructuring task force continue this as a discussion item now with this bill even before approval and if that fits with the sponsor's preferred timelines and steering's preferred timelines. That is something we can also do where like say we, steering suggests amendments XY and Z. Those are worked on or discussed outside of steering or within steering, the restructuring task force or committee. Sorry, WSA is on the mind. I chair this task force called the restructuring task force. The restructuring committee would be able to, like, make comments and amendment suggestions as well. It just wouldn't make any votes because there's no bill. That is something steering can consider or and the sponsors and Detlef can consider as shared. So I wanted to keep those two things in mind. With that I will ask for any questions or comments or motions.

Joseph Riggio: Well this is a little awkward because I'm going to end with a motion. Yeah, I'll be open to that if we're able to, as long as discussion is happening in the restructuring committee and we're able to dedicate a lot of time to feedback. We have an open meeting, so maybe we can even extend committee time if we want to to allow that conversation to happen. I'm more than willing to make that happen and then we can take it to steering the following and propose that I think that'd be more productive. So withdraw, I move to withdraw my Senate bill, Senate bill 32-2.

Joseph Riggio moves to withdraw SB-2-2

Erick Jacobsen: Explains that this kind of can't be done.

Joseph Riggio moves to table SB-32-2 indefinitely

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 3-0-2

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on now to the approval of the senate agenda. Anyway, we have no forums, we have one bill and and we can add restructuring. We can add this discussion on SB-32-3. So I added that to restructuring committee, not a task force. Are there any other questions or comments on this agenda?

Julia Tanner moves to approve the agenda

Sarah Parker seconds

Approved 4-0-1

DISCUSSION

Julia Tanner: Point of information, What was that reaction?

Erick Jacobsen: I was hoping we would discuss what other committees are doing, like sort of if people are comfortable just doing resolution revolution still and if we wanted to do something else to keep time because currently we have not a lot happening, but that was what I was hoping to discuss.

Julia Tanner: Can I move to suspend the rules and add a discussion item to our steering agenda?

Julia Tanner moves to suspend the rules and add discussion item ideas for 2.17 committee meetings to the steering agenda.

Joseph Riggio seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Fun fact two years ago on Valentine's Day, we had a JCC meeting about ASUW structure that went on an extra like hour or so. And so that's how I spent. Valentine's Day 2024.

Sorry, that sounded really depressing. I just think it's. I just think it's funny. I just think it's funny that we didn't have a meeting on Valentine's Day at one point that was that had a long discussion item. Anyway, I guess moving on to discussion items, spring and future steering planning. Can we link the spreadsheet?

Recess 5:29

Reconvened 5:31

Recess 5:31

Reconvened 5:33 pm

Jothsna Sundar: Yeah, OK, so before I start actually talking about this, I will preface this by saying this is mathematically and like methodologically super suspect. I'm sorry. So first I will explain how the data exists and then I can maybe explain. Yeah, let me stop talking. So first the screenshot on the side that is information from the registrar and it's like room bookings, basically saying that these are, I guess, how many rooms are booked for different classes at certain times. The numbers don't make a ton of sense to me because they didn't give me that much information, but I was like, I'll run with it. Everything that's green is fair game for steering on Mondays and Fridays specifically. So then I went to the time schedules for everything in the College of Arts and Sciences. I did not have time or the desire to go through every single college at this university and I figured College of Arts and Sciences was a safe bet. So this is all of the classes that have any amount of time after 3:30, because that is when the data from the registrar's office ends and based off of this there are so many classes that are scheduled from 2:30 to 4:20 and 3:30 to 5:20. And just in general, there are more classes on Mondays than Fridays and despite this being inconvenient for myself, I think I would recommend that we move steering to Friday. I'm very selfishly, I want to say just for next year, but if we decide to move it for spring, whatever, I will answer any questions that anyone has.

Joseph Riggio: Is this only representing lecture spaces? Because I'm skeptical of Friday's being really open because most college if this is based on College of Arts and Sciences, most quiz sections happen on there and so this is including meeting spaces such as classrooms and building spaces or is this just lecture halls?

Jothsna Sundar: So let me clarify, room booking - the room booking data is only the part that isn't typed in this the data on the left I guess. It's all like specifically class times. That has nothing to do with room booking, so that includes quiz sections, which is surprising.

Julia Tanner: For the data that's on the left. Are these times that there are classes or that there aren't classes?

Jothsna Sundar: Times that there are classes. Also I should have said this earlier. The data on the left is from winter quarter and then sorry, the data on the right is from winter quarter and the data on the left is from spring quarter, which is why this is mathematically suspect, but I did what I could.

Julia Tanner: Wait, OK, sorry, I'm really bad at reading data on a good day. So for this section of Mondays, this is basically saying that for this section there's no classes after 6:20.

Jothsna Sundar: No, it's just saying that there is one class that goes from 3:30 to 6:20. I don't remember what class it is, but it is one of them.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah. So to add on to that, it looks like, for example, on row 61 we have Friday 3:30 to 4:50 and on row 67 we have Friday 3:30 to 5:20 so this is like they overlap a lot. So we would need to work to create like a heat map of sorts to see when classes are. I also, based on the vagueness of the data on the right and the registrars unwillingness to provide more information, I think we may be more interested in going off of the data on the left entirely, which would mean we would have to start steering at 3:30 PM or later, which makes sense for other reasons too, but currently, I think that may be what we'd have to do. Are there any other questions or comments?

Joseph Riggio: I do want to emphasize or just reemphasize what Jothsna said about the limitations. This is only the College of Arts and Sciences. This is not other colleges and I believe what sort of sparked this whole conversation was majors that may fall out of the College of Arts and Sciences. So, well, definitely there's a lot of majors that would fall under this that are the sciences part of College of Arts and Sciences. But like College of Engineering and the Health School, whatnot are definitely, and I know that based on the data we have of our senator composition, most of them are College of Arts and Science majors. But one of the whole points of trying to figure out a steering time is that we can be more friendly to other colleges too.

Jothsna Sundar: Okay yes I do agree, I did bring up limitations. I might be wrong about this because this is kind of a blur, but is public health not in the College of Arts and Sciences? Okay that's my bad. OK, we could, if we don't wanna just use this data, we can go back again and get the rest of the times and the rest of the colleges. It would be great for me if we could split it up among steering and each person picked like a college to go through. But I think I think that's all I have to say right now

Joseph Riggio: Point of personal privilege, we get kicked out in 5 minutes.

Erick Jacobsen: I would say then we can move on from this. Maybe we discuss in our steering chat who, what colleges each of us looks at and then we bring back the data that we find to our next steering meeting or the meeting after that potentially. Are there any final, comments on this before we move on? OK, our next item of discussion is -

Julia Tanner: I was going to start the discussion.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, I'll briefly introduce it. Ideas for committees for tomorrow. Not tomorrow. It's not Monday. For Tuesday. Basically, do we want to do resolution revolutions? Do we want to do something else in committee? Do we want to also have like some sort of forum? I don't know. What do we want to do to fill time and make sure that we're making senators feel like their time is being used towards worthwhile means beyond those in committees or in committees without legislation?

Julia Tanner: Tejasvini did a fantastic job last year where she started resolution with her committee. So I think encouraging that would be really cool and have and I want to hear like feedback of the committee chairs that are here obviously, if that's something they'd be interested in doing, but just like voting on like a topic their committee members are especially interested in and then just drafting resolutions. Any thoughts on that?

Joseph Riggio: I'll provide perspective from GAVEL committee. We have noticed bills in our archive that used to do that. It's actually pretty common that an entire committee would sponsor a piece of legislation. So this is something that was precedent over the last decade, basically, and I think it would be good to bring that back.

Dylan Bianchi: Can I be honest this is probably going to be an unhelpful comment. I do think drafting these bills by like within the committee is the best way to spend the free committee time we have right now. But to be honest, like my committees, some members of my committee have been working on a bill to like rework the website and whenever I try to engage like the committee as a whole on that, I'm usually met with like a like a fish stare so I haven't found it to be hugely helpful, but I do despite my my cynicism, I do think that's probably the best way to be spending our time right now because it seems like the alternative is just kind of idle chatter.

Erick Jacobsen: I mean you can work on a different bill if you'd like and have those people like continue that one outside and start the process again with another one. If there were other ideas, Abby?

Abigail Appleyard: I think it's a good idea. When we were doing the resolution revolution in our committee, like we came up with a pretty decent idea that I think most people were happy to contribute to. And so I would be happy to like keep working on that with people. And even if it doesn't, you know, even if there are some people that are not super interested in it, I think there are people that like it would help them get their foot in the door a bit more with like how to do a resolution.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other comments? Any final comments?

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: All right, moving on now to the announcements and public comment period. If there are any announcements or if any member of the public would like to say anything, now is the chance.

Joseph Riggio: So I can't say fill out the Student Health Fee Survey anymore but what I can say is if some of your committee members are curious about the report and wanna get a sneak peek before it reaches the Senate from 4:00 to 5:00 HUB 121, the Student Health Fee Planning Committee is going to be meeting with the health directors for them to give the report. I've already been given the report and then distributing it to relevant parties and whatnot. I've shared it with the GAVEL committee already. So if you're interested or you know committee members that are interested, 4:00 to 5:00 before the Senate meeting, they can come down and hang out in HUB 121. We might have to move outside. There's a lot of people, but just so you're aware it's happening.

Erick Jacobsen: The report is also linked on the Board agenda from yesterday if anyone just wants to look at it without like the public aspect of it. Are there any other announcements?

ADJOURNMENT

Julia Tanner moves to adjourn

Joseph Riggio seconds

Approved 4-1-0

5:45 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
