



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

17 February 2026

Location: HUB 250

CALL TO ORDER

5:23 pm

APPROVAL OF SENATE AGENDA

Teddie Schmitt moves to suspend the rules and add SB-32-3 to agenda under summary of new business and into the on-campus affairs committee

Erick Jacobsen: All right, so this is SB-32-3. It was initially enrolled as SB-32-1. Summary: the Senate bill to propose a series of reforms to the ASUW bylaws and governing documents that shall reflect issues addressed in SB-32-2, which is the constitutional amendment and complement the constitutional amendments in that Senate bill, an act to amend the ASUW constitution. This bill establishes a task force on institutional reform. And again, just to provide context, this was submitted into Senate steering and after a lengthy discussion between steering with many members of Board present, it was tabled indefinitely. I believe the main concerns mentioned were some language which could be construed as inflammatory as well as ASUW Board is already planning to do instead of a task force a nine to five meeting on February 28th, which will just go through all of the ASUW governing documents and attempt to address any inconsistencies and work on reforms. So I believe the idea was for that meeting to replace the need for a task force with the justification of task forces taking a longer time. But this bill does go into very in depth on certain changes that it would like to see or certain problems that it perceives. So if you wanna read through it or scan through it to be as familiar with it as possible, that is your prerogative. But this has been motioned, moved so are there any seconds?

Collin Saywers seconds

Dylan Bianchi objects

Teddie Schmitt: I want to preface discussion on this bill with the fact that this is not a call out nor condemnation of the current members of Board. This is a solution to address issues of overburdening of the Board positions to adjust expectations for and the descriptions of the jobs that no students that student employees are not overworked. This bill calls for a task force to amend the bylaws to address responsibilities that are not being fulfilled due to overworking students.

Dylan Bianchi: This bill has been in steering for a while. It has caused steering quite a bit of grief because a lot of the content, I believe, does this version still include the clauses about individual members of the Board of Directors? Yes, it does. Well, positions specifically referring to individual people. For that reason, it is personal because it directs comments at persons and it has again caused quite a lot of conflict within steering. It kind of directs criticism of ASUW's problems at individuals, and it was the consensus of steering that we wanted to avoid bringing that kind of sort of animated, heated discussion to Senate. With cooperating with Joseph, who's the primary sponsor, a lot of stuff is edited out and it was, remains tabled as we continue to work on it to try and avoid that kind of complication coming to the Senate. I'm not sure why we need to bring this up now. It's still being worked on by steering. It will return the Senate, but we are really trying to have a conversation that's not rooted around individuals. Members of the Board of Directors who were named in this bill felt that it was a severe mischaracterization of their work. They were not consulted when the bill was in development but have since become active participants in this bill's development. I asked the senators trust steering when we say this bill like it will come, but we're working on it and then in its presence form, it is just not a great fit for the Senate floor.

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

Ishaan Verma: Maybe we could get more time to like read through this before we vote on whether we include it or not.

Erick Jacobsen: OK, so we can work on fixing that link right now. Oh, if you would like to, there's a couple ways we can do that. What you can do is if you would like for us to revisit it in a future meeting then there can be a motion made in a future meeting to add it to the agenda. If this motion fails, or if you would like it to be revisited later in this meeting then you can approve this or we can, are allowed to motion to move for a recess in the midst of debate, Brendan? So it is possible that I will, I will go around. I promise it is possible to if this whether or not this motion succeeds, it is possible to move for a 10 minute recess and then have a new vote or a motion on the topic.

Joseph Riggio: First of all, temporarily one of the review edits is there, so you can click on the link to view the bill. Now can anyone not view the bill? OK, yeah, let me, let me highlight it real quick so we can still do the distinction. One second, Can we see if that was on screen?

Aiden Reeder: Point of information just to clarify this is just going to committee first? It's gonna go for summary and it's gonna go to just committee and then from there can be considered so it shouldn't take any more any additional time besides the time of that committee, right?

Erick Jacobsen: I suppose it would follow the trajectory the normal bill introduced. Just the exception would be that steering would have not have approved that.

Joseph Riggio: Point of order, can I reclaim my time? It should be fixed now I refreshed the page. So can anyone not access the Senate bill? Just to be clear, I highlighted the change so it's distinct. So that way we know that this is still, this motion's under consideration. Actually, fun fact, it's actually Robert's rules that we're supposed to stand. We don't enforce that, but. So I want to provide some

context that will help people when deciding to make the motion. I am the sponsor of this bill, the sole sponsor of this bill that's intentional. A group of students who wanted to remain anonymous approached me about a lot of issues that they witnessed was going over the Board and it turned out that, we asked two questions essentially when we went through the bylaws and that's only one section of three sections going through this bill. The first question was were there violations of the bylaws, their job descriptions and the second was there public record approved that you'll notice if you look through the bill, especially Section 3, that there are sources attached to almost every single claim. And for the ones that don't have sources, it's the absence of a source because you can't have a source on something that doesn't exist. Or it's really hard to I'm going to. I had a speech prepared, but I'm not in the mood to give it because you'll understand why during public comment, it's unrelated to this. But back on this, so everyone can access steering meetings. On February 9th I, and I understand and I respect the objection and whatnot. The issue that I see, though, is this Senate bill was tabled indefinitely. The majority of the time that was given was to Board members. Other steering committee members didn't raise their hand and didn't comment on the bill. Steering member being the president who does have a vote. This was actually suggested and you can read it in the transcript. I encourage you to. It's February 9th Steering meeting. You can access it on Teams. You can message me. I can show you how it's public record. So initially we were going to have further discussion on this. It was not going to be tabled indefinitely. Our Director of Internal Policy suggested that maybe we can have more discussion on it to allow more time for Board members to share their concerns because we didn't have enough time that meeting. However, that decision was reversed. A motion to table indefinitely was put through and it was passed with one vote. Our President voted yes to table indefinitely and there were six abstentions, so it was 1 to 0 to 6. Mirroring the joint resolution, that was also tabled indefinitely to a vote of 1 to 0 to the abstentions. I forget the vote count. I am impartial when suggesting whether or not you want to add to the agenda is totally up to you. I highly encourage you grab a warm drink, a comfy blanket, sit back, relax, and watch the Senate Steering Committee meeting for yourself. Even though I'm the only sponsor for this bill, and I know I have a lot of support, it feels like I'm alone. And to a point that was very intentional. People are scared to talk about this. This is this alone should be concerning to people that well, I am the sole sponsor because people are afraid of retaliation. And if you watch that Senate steering meeting, just for yourself, you can make your own observations. I took a lot of punches that no person that I wish upon nobody in my position. This should be a space that is safe, that promotes respectful conversation about our internal operations, especially operations that aren't going well. We should be proud of our accomplishments and we should also acknowledge our failures and limitations and as the Senate, we are under ASUW. You're an entity of ASUW. We are the legislative branch. We have a say in our internal operations. This task force is a chance for members of Senate, which Senate would represent on this committee, on this task force that's being proposed and we can change it, we can amend it, we can change the language of it. It would propose a task force that could try and rectify these things. And yes, it is true. February 28th there's going to be and I encourage y'all to go. It's going to be from 9:00 to 5:00 and the date might change. I'm not sure if it was officially submitted yet, but put on your calendar February 28th. I want you to show up there and I want you to share your concerns as well. Especially because I do know that some of the

responsibilities and things that are in this bill, some of your own entities and constituencies can actually resonate with, and I know that. So please get this, get this in consideration. I'm not going to sway one way or the other, just make an informed choice and please watch that Senate steering meeting. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Going forward I will be implementing a 2 minute time limit on speeches just to ensure that everyone does get a chance to speak. If you are interested in accessing the recordings or the minutes from any of the steering meetings in which this meeting was discussed, this bill was discussed you can reach out to Jothisna. Her e-mail's right up there asuwsse@uw.edu. But I will look for hands again.

Avery Kirscht: Point of information, yeah, just my understanding, assuming that this motion to go through and it got added to the agenda and let's assume it made it to committee, Senate at large is under no obligation to pass the bill tonight. We could table it for a week and discuss it in more depth next week?

Erick Jacobsen: That's correct. Yes, it is up to Senate exactly what circumstances in which it does or does not consider any [bills](#).

Abigail Appleyard: I think this is super important stuff to look over but I think it's a little impractical to think that we could read this giant bill on our own in 10 minutes and like we have productive conversation about it. So I do think that it should be put on the agenda, but like we said that now that we're putting it on for next week because I just don't think it's really gonna be that productive if we try to read it really quick right now and our meeting was already shortened by our technical delays and also I think kind of the back and forth and like speaking like where most senators are missing a lot of context and a lot of confusion to bills. And so I do think it's important to take your time to actually read what the bill says versus like listening exclusively to the like little bits and pieces of conversation and history that people are bringing up because it's important, but it just adds a lot of confusion. So I think I would appreciate if it was put on the agenda for next week so that people had time to look on it.

Pierce Wallbaum: Naomi Law on teams is asking if we can add the link to the recording on the agenda.

Ishaan Verma: So yeah, after scanning through the bill, like I agree it is like a bunch of it is directed pretty personally at like positions, but I won't really mince words in when I say that like I don't hold that much sympathy towards those positions. Like we as Senate, like we're not paid to be here. We're giving up like 2 hours of our week just for just to like for the love of the game, you know what I mean? And they get paid. So like, if we're gonna criticize them for not doing their jobs, then like, you know, if we have to shame them a little bit, then like, so be it. With that said, I would support adding it to the agenda and then you know, if we don't get enough time to read through it in total and we don't get enough time to consider it properly, we can just push it for a week. But we should at least add it to the agenda for today to like get a head start on it.

Commented [JS1]: I would like the informal record to reflect that teams decided that Erick said shirts here

Dylan Bianchi: I just want to quickly emphasize two points. One, members of Board who were specifically named in this bill were not consulted during the research process and after. For that reason I am skeptical that this bill can be referred to as cooperative or an open-minded attempt to reform ASUW because it was not collaborative. I will say as a member of steering, I was out of town and unable to attend the steering meeting last Monday, so I cannot attest on how heated that got. But I will say if we want to avoid that, I really think we should wait on this. I think Abigail made a great point. I think we should wait for next week to address this. There is another version of the same bills still coming through steering and for the time being, I think we should table this for a week, let it come through, give everybody here a time to read this full version in addition to whatever version ends up before Senate next week. For that reason, I move the previous question.

Joseph Riggio calls for a point of information.

Erick Jacobsen: If this is what I think it is, I will just clarify.

Joseph Riggio: No its sort of relevant to Dylan's. You mentioned that there is potentially another bill that's on its way. Could you provide details on roughly the timeline of that bill?

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah. So for context, I was, again, I was not there on Monday, so I don't know what changes happened to this bill between the time I first read it two weeks ago and the time I saw it on our steering meeting on Friday. But there was a similar version of this bill that excluded much of the personal stuff. So you'll notice in this bill there's a whole section about various members of board and their perceived failings. That was omitted. It included, I believe, expanded version of the that clauses with more specific discussion, right. That bill is still in discussion in steering and will be coming soon. I think we should just wait.

Dylan Bianchi moves the previous question

Husna Chepkemboi seconds

Fails

Isabelle Green: Point of information on what's being defined as personal because what I'm hearing a lot of the objection to this is, is that it constitutes personal attacks on Board members. I'm not a member of Senate steering, so this is the first time hearing of any of this, but I've been reading through it as we're talking. This is referring to specific duties, sections of duties, and whether or not those were fulfilled. These aren't necessarily ad hominem attacks. They're references to the working of the Board, as I understand it. So I don't think it's necessarily reasonable to dismiss this as direct ad hominem attacks because they're not insulting a person by name or insulting anything about that person. They are talking about the operation or non-operation of the Senate and its fiduciary duties.

Erick Jacobsen: Is that a direct question to Dylan as the objector or just a general question in the Senate?

Isabelle Green: What exactly are we considering a personal attack here? Because that seems very relevant to the discussion.

Erick Jacobsen: Just to clarify, a point of information is like a question for someone specifically, but. You can just ask questions as discussion items without using any parliamentary language.

Aiden Reeder: I just want to point out looking through this, I don't see an actual name. It is by position and that is intentional because of the fact that this is not for a person. As someone who has been here for three years, I've seen a lot of the animosity between board and stuff and a lot of the failures, not failures necessarily, but inability to complete obligations by Board directors to actually get all of these duties complete. It, this is a historic problem and it needs to be a redistribution of these responsibilities. This has been such a thing since my first year when there was a constitutional reform task force through the Board and things still weren't finalized so there's several of us who just aren't comfortable or confident in Board's ability to completely do stuff, at least without Senate's say.

Blair Yeh: I'm a little scared because this is my first time speaking, I think. But I do agree with Abigail and Dylan that it should be like put in the agenda for next week, just so like, steering and steering, we can play out the proper timing and everything. And just because it's so much to unpack and like there's going to be so many questions. And if we do get it in today, it's just going to be like we're just going to go in circles, which I don't really want to do. I'm kind of tired. But my personal opinion about this. I ended up abstaining because I like, I felt like I was in like a really like I felt like I didn't like belong in that room because it was like I wasn't part of that like discussion or like heated disagreement. But one word that I or one phrase that I noticed was being thrown around a lot was I take accountability and I think their version of taking accountability or like BOD was just saying that they will take this, but not necessarily doing anything. So I think to most of us, taking accountability means taking the consequences that comes with your actions and they did use some arguments against the prime sponsor for this bill that did not seem very proper regarding this bill, which you will see if you decide to watch it.

Spencer Grubbs: Point of information, Can't if we just want to, if we want to put it like on the agenda for next week or whatever, could we, would it be like could we just move it into, I know it hasn't gone through committee, but could it be moved into like old business or something that would kind of like put it farther back in the line of things?

Erick Jacobsen: You can do that. I'll just answer. You can put it later in the agenda, but there is no guarantee that it would be viewed in the next meeting unless the motion was made either in the next steering meeting or the next Senate meeting to put on the agenda then unless you make a motion to add and then make a motion to table for a week, which is also possible, but you can't like directly. Also for the record, the motion has been made to add to the agenda for this week into committee meetings. So that motion will either have to fail or be withdrawn for a new motion to be submitted. With that I'll call for hands again.

Husna Chepkemboi: How many times has this bill been tabled in steering?

Erick Jacobsen: Well, it was naturally tabled due to not having enough time to talk about it for a few weeks. I don't know the exact number of weeks. So this was submitted January 12th. We didn't

have enough time to look at it each of those weeks. Discussion continued on. There were no motions made until the motion was made to table indefinitely, which so there are no motions made to table it, I don't think, except for the just the fact that it was naturally tabled because we didn't have enough time to look at it.

Liam Knochen: I believe that the Senate must be made familiar with SB-32-3. The bill concerns the shifting of student obligations so as to prevent the overworking of the student employees, the discussions they're in of transparency, of record keeping, of responsibility by their own nature demand the Senate's attention. I ask all of you to engage with it. Thank you.

Kavi Pasupathi: I was there that Monday I will admit it was it definitely was a lot to sit through, especially in person when you kind of just have, you know, two sides kind of vying for not control, I would say, but just for trying to advocate, it wasn't. It wasn't nice, right? There was some. It was just bad. But the main thing here is that I really, really recommend that people read through this thoroughly and definitely watch the recording as well, because without proper context, this isn't going anywhere. And I just like, you know, we need to like we haven't even approved the agenda yet and it's almost I think 6, so we need to make a motion on this and get things moving in this meeting because sitting here arguing about whether to add this to the agenda or not, isn't going to get us anywhere to doing something about this. So I'll move the previous question.

Kavi Pasupathi moves the previous questions

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Motion to add SB-32-3 approved by raised hand vote

Isabelle Green moves to table SB-32-3 until next meeting

Blair Yeh seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Isabelle Green: Joseph there's a lot of information here and this is largely based off of the speech you gave earlier. Like, I genuinely do want to understand what's happening here, and I want to do what's best for the Senate. We've got like 20 minutes at max, especially considering committee meetings, I don't want this to get shafted due to lack of time the way it apparently has been in steering. Like that's why I'm moving to move this to next week.

Erick Jacobsen responds to Jothsna Sundar's point of personal privilege and announces: The recordings are now in the agenda. If you want to see the recordings of all the steering meetings wherein this was discussed.

Joseph Riggio: I agree with you. Mine's extremely procedural. I would just recommend a very quick motion to move SB-32-3 to General Affairs instead of On Campus Affairs because there's already a bill in there and if we table, definitely we could table, we could, we could table for a week.

Also, I just want to note that all we would do for new business is just read a summary of the bill unless the speaker wants me to read more on it because that's our procedure and then it would go to committee and the committee could just decide not to read it. So that's an option too.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of debate.

Ishaan Verma: Selfishly I'm in General Affairs and I really want to read through this bill and I would say we don't push it and then if we run out of time, it'll get pushed anyway. So yeah, please don't vote to push this. Thank you.

Brendan Chang: If you want to amend your motion to be something else.

Isabelle Green: I'm willing to amend my motion to incorporate Joseph's objection, just because I don't think that's an objection, that's a modification. And frankly, I'm on General Affairs also, so that's an interest in this one.

Joseph Riggio: There's two ways to approach this. I guess is if you withdraw your objection, then you can make a motion that does the same thing except moves it to the committee and then tables for week. OK. Oh, sorry, withdrawing your motion. That's what I meant. If you withdraw your motion, then we can incorporate that. Or else I'll have to do a subsidiary amendment, which means or a secondary. So it would be probably, I would recommend withdrawing the motion

Isabelle Green: I can do that.

Ashwin Anand: Sorry everybody I couldn't be there for the entirety of senate. This bill has been discussed in steering extensively. I do have to agree with the motion to table at least for one week. I understand that, you know, a well, like a committee reading this bill would make sense. But I also think that reading this bill in its entirety and discussing it in Senate should be the like the entire intent here because you know we've discussed it at length in steering and that's exactly why conversations in steering have been where they are and so reintroducing this into a Senate floor. Like, I understand the intent here, but like again, I think motion motioning to at least table by one week is the right choice. Just because again, we've been having conversations with Board and like Senate. Leadership. I just don't really understand the point of moving it into General Affairs.

Nandana Jaideep: I just want to give some context on my end of things. I know Ashwin and I have been at steering since the since the last meeting of December, I believe and we've been discussing this bill exclusively and extensively for a really long time. And I just want to say that it got tabled indefinitely in steering because for obvious reasons, and I believe that the intention to introduce this on the Senate floor was not well-intentioned. And I just want to say that a lot of these claims made in this bill are purely defamatory and have a lot of false information, which we have addressed multiple times with the sponsors of this bill as like they have continued to ignore those claims. They did not give any of the people explicitly mentioned in this board bill any sort of prior notice or like the courtesy of a conversation before resorting to this and I believe that's not like how we want to present ourselves as an organization, I'd say respect is a huge value that we try to push for with an ASUW so I'd say like if we have an intent for institutional reform, which I believe is

great, I know people are working on the Constitution, the bylaws, we've continuously amended all of our governing documents this year. If that is purely our intention, I feel like this bill takes away from that goal, in fact, and moves attention towards personal grievances that the sponsors of this bill may have with certain members and brings it out into a public meeting and takes away from all of the productive time that we could be having to address student concerns directly. And I also want to say that we were never given sort of the courtesy of a conversation. I know a lot of the sponsors worked on this during break without us giving us any notice, without informing us sort of behind our backs, which isn't something that we appreciate or tolerate or like respect. So I just want to put that out there and say that. A lot of the Board members who have been at steering listening to these conversations, trying to be present, trying to like give them clarity, give them information to like to refute some of these claims made here have been kind of ignored and sidelined and this has been brought to the Senate floor without any of our knowledge once again and I just want to say that this isn't sort of like the avenue we pursue things at ASUW. We have internal procedures and processes for all these different things. And I'd really appreciate it if the Senate took all of that into consideration while looking at this bill sort of holistically.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll go to Isaac, but there's a spider on this podium, by the way.

Commented [JS2]: 🕸

Teddie Schmitt: Point of information you mentioned that this bill was discussed exclusively and and extensively during Senate steering. Do you consider one meeting to be extensive for a bill of this length?

Nandana Jaideep: this wasn't a conversation that was confined to one meeting. I believe, Ashwin, correct me if I'm wrong, but we've discussed this for like 4 meetings I believe. And for one of those meetings my entire board was present as well and we all talked about this as a collective and we addressed a lot of different parts of this bill and steering did table this indefinitely. So I'd say we had pretty extensive conversations regarding this. It wasn't just one meeting, it was multiple, multiple hours. And I've also spoken to the sponsor of this bill, but more board members have spoken to the sponsor of this bill outside of those meetings as well and we have tried to make it as productive as possible, but I don't believe it's been that way.

Avery Kirscht Point of information can you remind us what this debate is on?

Isaac Pasco: Point of information is there any chance we can get this moved to AAA?

Erick Jacobsen: lets all calm down please. Technically, yes, there's a way this can get to AAA. There's also a way this can get to general affairs or under any other committee and that way is a separate motion. That is not the motion we're currently discussing.

Adam Ford: I would like to respectfully ask that the original motion maker please rescind the motion.

Isabelle Greene: I'm gonna respectfully decline because if we're arguing —

Erick Jacobsen: Ok let's go through the order of people who are recognized. You may speak later if you so wish, but just in order to respect everyone's time and ability to speak.

Ishaan Verma: Point of Information, hey Joseph, if we table is for a week, is there a chance that steering can change the bill in any way?

Erick Jacobsen: I can answer that. The answer is no.

Joseph Riggio: I believe that was directed to me. Yeah, the the short answer is no. Steering, and the reason for that is the steering committee themselves is technically seen as another body that's voting on things. And so the steering committee itself would have to bring it from the table and then put it on steering agenda which is why I believe the motion to put this on the agenda happened.

Erick Jacobsen: Next up was Kathleen and then Elizabeth. From now on I will not be accepting points of information. I'll let you make them in a queue, but I don't want to interrupt the flow, especially as it has allowed people who've already spoke to speak again in front of others.

Kathleen Esnaurizar: I feel like this debate is kind of like needs to get back on topic about the motion and I think a lot of us like we just want to see it go through a committee, so I'd like to just move to previous question for us to at least get through this question.

Kathleen Esnaurizar moves the previous question

Aiden Reeder seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Motion to table fails

Aiden Reeder moves to suspend the rules and add to general affairs

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Adam Ford moves to approve the agenda

Collin Saywers seconds

Approved by raised hand vote.

Applause erupts

Commented [JS3]: of relief

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dylan Bianchi: Hi everybody I have two announcements one from OGR. We have a few bills that you can currently sign in pro on, which means you can go to the QR code, go to the website and then indicate to our state legislature that you support this bill. OK, first of all, Senate Bill 5855 would ban law enforcement officers for wearing face coverings unless they had a health or safety reason to do so. This is meant to cover all law enforcement but would realistically be targeted federal immigration enforcement that has been using masks as a means to avoid accountability by behavior anonymously. Next we have Senate Bill 5906, which would require federal and immigration enforcement to have a proper warrant to enter any public space such as a hospital, high school, elementary school or a college campus. This would ban them from the premises unless they have a warrant. OK, thank you, Erick. Then we have Senate Bill 5886, which would expand the rights of Washingtonians to their personal likeness to cover a digitally recreated likeness, which means if someone uses AI to generate an image or video of you have property rights to that image. You can have it taken down. You can obtain any revenue generated from it and I believe under this one, you can sue someone for up to \$3000 for using your forged visual likeness. That's it on the left. And then we have Senate Bill 5963, which would make recipients of the Passport to Careers program automatically eligible for the Washington College Grant. So Passport to Careers is a Washington State program that assists homeless and foster youth and would make people who are already receiving that program automatically eligible for the full award of the Washington College Grant, which is the like state financial aid system because in nearly all cases, someone who's eligible for the Passport to Careers program is eligible for the full award of the Washington College Grant. So it's kind of just a bureaucratic smoothing out, making it easy for people to access these resources. And then I also have an announcement from EAC that give me a second. This Thursday from 3:00 to 4:00 PM in the office you see we'll have an event where you can write letters to a children in a local hospital. There will be pizza served. Yeah. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Dylan. These QR codes are also available linked on the agenda. Please do sign in pro either now or on your own time later.

Abigail Appleyard: I just wanted to remind all my committee members that we have committee bonding after this.

James Yu: Hello, I am from Hall Caucus and I'm here to tell you guys that if you guys ever have any problems for dorm heating or A/C, please scan the QR code, fill out this form and address your

complaints and if even if you don't have any problems with heating or AC, please also scan this QR code and fill the form because we also want that opinion because we don't want the opinions to be skewed. So I want everyone taking out their phones right now. Come on, come on phones. I don't see phones. Come on. Oh, come on. Anyone who lives on campus, please, phones out, scan the code, fill out the forms. It's only a few questions. It's not very long. And thank you guys so much.

Zeta Tau Alpha Representative: Moving on. Sorry. All right. OK, I'm not used to speaking in a microphone. Anyway, I am from Zeta Tau Alpha and this Thursday us and Delta Kappa Epsilon are hosting our annual Costco Pizza and root beer float event and it starts at 9:00 PM until sell out. And I mean it's only like \$5. I encourage you all to pull up and besides all the proceeds that we make go towards breast cancer education and awareness as well as the November Foundation. And so show up and besides, it's like cheaper than actually going to Costco, plus a lot closer.

Gaby Lizarraga: Hi guys, my name is Gabby, I'm in Senate and I'm also the Community Engagement Intern on Latino Student Commission. As Julia said, we're hosting a know your rights event on Thursday from 6 to 8 in the HUB Lyceum. Student Legal Services will be presenting a lot of information. It'd be really good for you guys to come. There will be food and time to mingle afterwards. We're partnering with over 40 organizations and I'd love to see you all there. Thank you.

Joseph Riggio: I'm going to try and speak on this in the most positive way possible. So I'm gonna act as a student real quick, speaking just on the public. This is the first and last time I'm going to do this. So I mentioned I'm not really 100%. Well, for the past year, my mom has been battling stage 4 kidney and uterine cancer. November, she suffered a stroke. She was supposed to have surgery. She was going through chemo to remove the cancer and I got a call February 13th from my dad at 2:14 PM saying that the stage 4 cancer spread to the lungs, which for anybody who is unaware of what that means, that's essentially a death sentence. With treatment, radiation and chemotherapy, she only has a year to a few years left to live. Without that treatment, it could be much sooner than that and so I for my parents all the proceeds go to my parents by the way, this is a GoFundMe. If you wanna learn more about the story in more detail than what I'm gonna talk about now, because I realize we're running low on time to lighten up the mood, I created some milestones. If we hit certain goals, I'll do things like if we hit \$10,000, I'll shave my head completely. I mean, my mom did it, so can I. So yeah, that should provide some context as to why I've probably been a little bit out of it lately. But yeah, even if you can't donate money because we're all broke college students, just sharing this. I never thought I would say this again after the health fee closed, but if you can tell three to five people about it, that'd be great. I appreciate it. So yeah, all of this is going to go to my mom to pay for transportation expenses because — Medicare covered, my family is currently experiencing homelessness. Medicare covers the radiation and chemo, but it doesn't cover transportation like an ambulance. She's disabled. She needs a wheelchair. My tiny little PT30 isn't gonna cut it. so it's \$170 per day, five to seven weeks for radiation therapy. That's around \$6000. I did the math from the GoFundMe, so I would greatly appreciate your support to have my mother come see me graduate. Thanks.

Erick Jacobsen: are there any other announcements? I will go over to the microphone and we will move on. But if you think of one in the meantime, feel free to raise your hand.

James Yu: I think it's OK for me to say speaking for the Senate here, I am very sorry, Joseph, about everything that's going on and we're all with you here.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements?

FORUMS

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

NEW BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: We do not have any forums today, nor do we have any elections, so we'll move on now to summary of new business. Our first item of new business is R-32-3 a resolution to install mesh screens in on campus residence windows. The summary of this is requesting the installation of mesh screens in all on campus residence buildings. This is bug screens in particular and this is in the On Campus Affairs Committee which this is not. Oh, let me reconnect. OK. Moving on now to SB-32-3, I did already read that this summary when we were voting on it, but this Senate bill is to propose series of reforms to the ASUW bylaws and governing documents that shall reflect issues addressed in SB-32-3 and complement the constitutional amendments in that Senate bill. This bill establishes a task force on institutional reform, and that bill is in General Affairs.

Joseph Riggio: Aren't we supposed to be on the SB?

Erick Jacobsen: I read out the summary.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

On Campus Affairs

- Read and discussed R-32-3 A Resolution to Install Mesh Screens in On Campus Residence Windows
 - R-32-3 passed favorably (19-0-4)
 - Greyson Hedglin motioned
 - Matt Freire seconded the motion
 - Grammatical amendments made, as well as amendments to correct the number and names of residence halls on campus, added a whereas clause clarifying the singling

out of Hansee hall in the that clauses, and added a that clause specifying that all future residences built by HFS must have bug screens.

Off Campus Affairs

We took attendance and just talked about bonding and the SB that was getting added to the agenda as conversational topic

General Affairs

- Committee Meeting Begins at 6:25 pm
- Sarah took attendance for Teams, Pierce took in-person attendance
- Bill introduced to Committee: SB-32-01
- Pierce proposed a 5-minute recess to allow for everyone to read over the bill, Joseph present to answer questions when reading (broke for recess at 6:28)
- Additional 3-minute recess to reconvene at 6:36
- Reconvened at 6:36
- Joseph introduces bill and walks through it; Pierce introduces the Parli Pro procedures for discussing bill; Sarah keeping queue
- Isabelle Green, first comment, asks if they can contact him with questions on teams about bill
- Santiago Quesada, asks to clarify the purpose of writing this bill
- Nandana Jaideep, on Teams, begins with Budget (states that budget last year was passed collaboratively, shares that those in those offices involved did have office hours; also explains the purpose of adding a go-between between the ASUW offices; explains the need for office equipment)
- Question- POI, if she is making comments on GPSS, is there a bill condemning the action or no (Henry)
- Question- POI, asking Nandana if she is going on the record accusing Joseph of incorrect information included in the bill
- Question- POI, asking Nandana if they would release their receipts to defend themselves if the information being revealed is false; She says that she feels that she is being framed as guilty
- Ishaan, shares that it is on the BOD to prove themselves innocent, they are the ones in a position of power
- Joseph; shares that there was a JR with Tacoma and Bothell, tabled indefinitely in steering, never made it to GPSS
- Noor Alhazmi; Question about the SAF budget proposal timeline; Joseph responds, big delays in the budget passing last year, late this year as well
- Close debate about legislation, discussion about bonding directly after meeting next week

- Committee ends; 6:59pm

Academic and Administrative Affairs

We just had an informal discussion of a resolution to help transfer students, identifying how we could each contribute to gathering information about why the transfer process is difficult.

Committee On ASUW Restructuring

Called for recess for people to read the bill at 6:35

- Clarifying questions about the discussion being done

Recess ended at 6:45

Aiden: the strikes and additions were done tastefully to remove blame and goes into detail regarding what was going on

Addison: Need to mention that what was changed was not done to the “that” clauses, only the whereas

Aiden: working with the UAW 4121 union: a student rep working to represent non students is a bit of a concern. There is a want for connection to but not a representative of.

(in response) **Francisco:** It would not be a union representative, just a person who works with the union

Malia: questions about what UAW is and how the election for the position would be created

(in response) **Francisco:** there can be an inclusion in the enactment clause about how election for the position would work

Addison: GAVEL perspective, new academic year is the most common time to enact

Aiden: at a glance, the constitution proposal: there is a concern about a removal about the named voting positions. Likes the delineation about the specific categories for directors to fulfil. Immutable overview about the description of the job.

Kathleen: Agree with having the essence of the job description within the constitution

(in response) **Francisco:** Main goal was to be flexible, but we could add the positions into the document

Aiden: Conclusion for the second section should be in the document, maybe reworded.

ACTION ITEMS

- SB-32-2
- Everyone should read and take notes about the constitution and proposed changes

POST MEETING

- Meeting ends at 6:58
- We are going to be broken up into groups

OLD BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Adam Ford moves to adjourn

Maggie Schoenfeldt seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Adjourned 7:03 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
