



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

3/2/2026

HUB 307

4:02 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

Joseph Riggio (he/him), Vice Speaker | P

Julia Tanner (she/her), Public Relations Officer | P

Blair Yeh (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair | P

Kavi Pasupathi (he/him), proxy for 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), *ASUW Restructuring Committee Chair* | P

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

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: moving on to the approval of the agenda

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum 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: Moving on to the speakers report, I don't have much to report I don't think other than there's five pieces of legislation today. So we maybe this is the start of a huge wave and all 25 of the things that have been planned are all going to be submitted, but who knows? And 25 is, by the way, the conservative estimate. But yeah, who's to say? But I'm glad that we have legislation. Legislation is great. Yeah, that's pretty much. Oh, we had our board meeting, our special board meeting on Saturday. I spent a lovely five hours sitting in a room on a Sunday and looking at governing documents. It was the best thing I could have done with that time. No, but we looked over the Constitution. We made a lot of like improvements I think. And I will have a full slide tomorrow of like what are the different things that were proposed, a lot of like moving procedural stuff to the bylaws so that they're more flexible. We defined a lot of, we made sure we were defining powers. We simplified a lot of language. Something, for example, that concerns us is that there was really confusing language on how Senate can do constitutional amendments, which we tried to clear up. And so a lot of streamlining, a lot of the improving, some stuff was moved to the bylaws. For example, anything that referenced an office or job that wasn't established within the Constitution, that basically didn't exist we just decided to move that into the bylaws. So we'll be looking at that. That'll be going through judicial today. It's honestly mostly quality of life, but everyone got a chance to say their piece on every section of the Constitution. Apart from our board members, Joseph was there and Isabelle Green was there. So we had two senators. Yay. Which is, more than I would think the number of people that would be willing to sacrifice their Saturday for that. But I'm glad that we had, more input and I think we're able to do some good work. We will also be looking at making sure all of the bylaws are in line with the Constitution that there's no inconsistencies and also one thing we want to do is we really want to fix how appointments work to committees, because currently the system's really confusing. There's a lot of like different sections in the bylaws that say like how to do things or what committees fall under certain things and we wanted to fix that. It was a conversation that we started to get into, but it was a conversation more suited for the bylaws but we're generally, all members of board are interested in like improving that so that we can fill seats a lot more easily in the committees which we represent too. And then just if you have any opinions on the bylaws, you can bring it to our board meeting on Thursday or a board meeting next Thursday. You can also message me and I'll advocate for you and your suggestions, but the constitution I think the time has mostly passed because we had a pretty ample time for that. But if you want to make a comment on the Constitution anyway it will be in board on Thursday I believe.

Dylan Bianchi: So just to be clear this is turning into amendment that's going to be like board members trying to put this on the ballot?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. Yeah, I think that's it for my report. It was a productive meeting. I'll move on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: So you'll see in the coming weeks pretty much the last week of Senate, which is the following week for this winter quarter, not the last forever. We're back in spring, y'all. But I'll be doing the GAVEL report form and the liaison report form. GAVEL's gonna be hard at work. Liaisons are gonna be hard at work getting basically summaries and getting their reports in on what's been happening. GAVEL has done way too much, so the presentation style from last quarter no longer works because it's gonna be a 50 slide presentation if we do it that way. So instead each member is going to give a statement of what they've been working on, what they've been doing and the progress of different legislation that's being tracked. And that's just how we'll do it. Any GAVEL members who aren't there, I'll be reading their statement for them, so yeah, if you know a GAVEL member in your committee, many of you are. If you're a vice chair or part of GAVEL committee, make sure to remind your GAVEL committee members and liaisons to fill out the report forms. Liaison report form I'm having it due by March 9th, so or March 8th at like 11:59 PM. So pretty much March 9th. Also, yeah, I guess second what Erick said. I too was a member of the public well, he actually was a board member, but I was a member of the public for the Constitutional Reform Day. Huzzah. We made it through the six hour sunny day and there was Chipotle. So yeah, if you have any questions or whatnot, feel free to let Erick know. And other than that, I sent a notice out already on Teams. I had a lot going on last week and I was over my hours already. Senate attendance I'm working on today for the previous meeting, so it's going to be delayed. Anybody with a deactivation notice won't be deactivated until the following week to give people enough time to prove that they were there so people aren't just randomly deactivated tomorrow. Alright, that's all I have.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Cool I have all the fun stuff. We had steering bonding yesterday, so that was super fun, but we missed all the people that couldn't be there. And we also posted something on Instagram. The mannequin challenge was, it's finally up. Super fun. Thanks for everyone for participating in that. We'll have another one this week and then be more consistent from there and that's actually all I have. I don't have any updates with anything else. So have a great week, everyone.

Dylan Bianchi: Who ended up winning Uno?

Julia Tanner: Me!

Erick Jacobsen: We played a card game called Thief, where there's only one loser and it was me. That was fun.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: I wanted to share one of my favorite smells today which is the scent of petrichor. It's an earthy smell that comes up. Yeah, all doing great. Lots of legislation.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the minutes.

Recess 4:11

Reconvened 4:16

Kavi Pasupathi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to our first proposal of the day. it is OA-32-04, an organic act to provide RCSA representative on the ASUW Senate Steering Committee. As a reminder, organic acts go through steering as if it's the committee that it goes through. So we will have the opportunity to make amendments to this as well as questions and comments. Would the sponsors like to take it away?

Teddie Schmitt reads [OA-32-04 An Organic Act to Provide RCSA a Representative on the ASUW Senate Steering Committee](#) Whereas clauses

Collin Saywers reads OA-32-04 That clauses

Erick Jacobsen: Alright Would you like to explain a bit more why you made this bill and what process went into it?

Collin Saywers: So we wanted to make this bill because we realized that this committee has significant power over what legislation goes to the Senate floor. And we recognize that the Director of Government Affairs, who's the leader of the of hall caucus, which is a significant portion of the Student Senate, was not represented on this committee or given any sort of ability to represent that chunk when making decisions over what goes to the Senate floor, if anything.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for the sponsors?

Dylan Bianchi: Two questions relating to hall council leadership. So first of all, is everybody else in, like I'm not super familiar with the internal structure of RCSA, but like the top of RCSA so to speak, familiar with the bill where they're in support?

Teddie Schmitt: I'm president elect right now and it would take effect during my session. I guess I'm aware, the current RCSA Director of Government Affairs is aware, as is the A Res.

Dylan Bianchi: And this is something that they support? And then there's like a specific member of RCSA who would be serving as the I may have missed this be serving as the representative?

Teddie Schmitt: Yes, it'd be the RCSA Director of Government Affairs.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments for this council? I'll say that for the hall caucus is the only parliamentary caucus within the Senate. I do know that the Panhellenic

senators have regular meetings, but I don't know how we're defining parliamentary caucus here because it's like not like an official term. So that might be something that you'd want to keep in mind and maybe we might want to amend. Oh, also the last three sessions of the Senate, it was, including this one.

Joseph Riggio: One of the ways to approach that is we do have a definitions section of our bylaws. It's line 64 to 88. If you want to create a definition for that, open to a possible amendment there if you want to clarify it in our bylaws.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there other questions or comments for the sponsors?

Kavi Pasupathi moves to add a that clause adding a definition for parliamentary caucus.

Erick Jacobsen: What definition would you like to add? Would you like to then withdraw your motion and wait for such a time where we have –

Kavi Pasupathi withdraws motion

Joseph Riggio: It's not currently within our bylaws so you'd have to create that definition from scratch. I would recommend using pre-existing language in other documents. There might be language in RCSA governing documents that might help. There might be worth conversations with panhellenic society or the councils for Greek life. There might be other definitions that our people use that you can then be inspired by, but right now we don't have a definition for parliamentary caucus.

Erick Jacobsen: Also providing a little bit of history, which the sponsors are already aware of. This was suggested a couple times in the past. In fact, I suggested it last year but there were the counter arguments were basically that with RCSA as an outside organization, the idea of them like having some influence in like an internal committee could potentially not be conducive to like Senate's purpose or that because the representation for the living communities is through the Board of Directors, but that would be something to consider and they do have a representative through the Director of Community Relations. But those were things that were mentioned in the past and that's something that if you all want to be aware of, is something to be aware of. Also, in the past few years, I think it is currently in the Director of Government Affairs job description to go to steering and they haven't done it for a couple years in the past. Teddie, is it in there officially or what?

Teddie Schmitt: It is not there officially. It's heavily suggested in order to pad hours, but it's not an official like you must go.

Aiden Reeder: In that same vein of the reasoning of an external one, is GPSS not also considered external and like thus would be under that same designation, yet sits on steering?

Brendan Chang: GPSS exists under the ASUW Board of Directors, so they are part of ASUW.

Erick Jacobsen: They exist insofar as we let them exist. We do have joint resolutions. We don't necessarily have a system like that with RCSA, so that may be another distinction to keep in mind. But yeah, GPSS is a department of ASUW in all legal senses. We just decided one day that our graduate student committee should be independent and we let them be. But that's defined in the ASUW constitution. Are there any other questions or comments?

Brendan Chang: A little more context than that because I can see the gears turning. Washington only recognizes one student government body that exists within the university capacity here at UW.

So they have granted that to ASUW. So graduate students can actually run for Board of Directors. So ASUW was always meant to be as a whole. It just the GPSS just exist under a loophole through the constitution. The school recognizes, Oh yeah, they're separate body like unofficially, but for legal purposes they exist in ASUW so it's internal. It's a separate branch per se.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions comments or motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into old business

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to R-32-05 a resolution to direct ASUW and GPSS executives to create the Student Health Fee MOU. Can we lengthen that to Memorandum of Understandings just in case people don't know. And this is sponsored by Joseph, co-sponsored by Audriana Scott, Nina Chenu, Jesse Liu, basically the whole of a large portion of the Student Health Fee Planning committee and this is, directly follows the survey that happened. But Joseph, do you wanna take it away? Go right into the bill?

Joseph Riggio reads [R-32-05 A Resolution to Direct ASUW and GPSS Executives to Create The Student Health Fee Memorandum of Understanding](#) and provides context

Erick Jacobsen: Do we feel like it might be better if we like recess for 5 minutes to read it on our own? Or would we prefer to have Joseph read it out?

Dylan Bianchi: Could we have a little more than five minutes?

Recess 4:31 pm

Reconvened 4:38 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for Joseph?

Dylan Bianchi: I'm sorry I sort of struggle to follow the portion of the whereas clauses where it gets into like certain number of people respond to this question in this way and I was kind of I was losing the big picture. So with all those clauses that specify how many people respond to specific questions, I understand that's relating to what people who answered generally no, like there were caveats to that in terms of like how they would accept a lower fee, right?

Joseph Riggio: So here's the situation we find ourselves in. If you go to the very bottom of the bill, there's lovely appendices that have and also if you go to the survey report and whatnot, so the undergraduate responses, so we're in a situation, SGP 205 is the policy that we're referencing when creating a voluntary fee, a voluntarily imposed fee. Now the language of that is extremely vague. It says student support. That's it. And so we've talked extensively with Student Life and they've given us a couple options. The fact that this bill exists means we can move forward. Student Life has given us the green light to put this on here and we can move forward with the data we have. But the data we do have would imply if you read the that clauses, those that clauses are very suggestive that specifically I want to draw attention to let's see, lines, undergraduates only essentially. OK, so if you look at that clauses, there's clauses in there about the possibility that this can be an undergraduate only fee. Because what happened here is graduates overwhelmingly said no, and undergraduates overwhelmingly said yes. And if you would like to look at a visualization of that data, the appendices are much lovelier. Source #12 has the actual report. Some of the math that I did was based on, I

have a Power BI which is just a data visualization tool that Microsoft has that our health units gave me and all I did was they have 3 categories, the undergraduate, graduate and uh nonmatriculated which is basically, yeah, they're up there. So this is a lovely, better visualization of the actual report we're pulling from so it's better on all of your eyes. If you Scroll down to it has the questions on there. So that's support for the \$125 lower fee. But if we Scroll down, this is the response rate to supporting the idea of establishing a Student Health fee, which is the main thing. Our undergraduate response rate was and the graduate response rate, this is the situation we're in. So for us to even negotiate about having an undergraduate health fee, GPSS per the SGP 205 policy still needs to pass a resolution of their own so that they can negotiate. All this resolution does, it does not create the Student Health Fee by the way, it does not. It tasks the executives, so Board Directors from ASUW and executives from GPSS to come together and negotiate the fee details and the memorandum of understanding. So this is only directing as the title implies directing ASUW and GPSS executives to talk about the fee. That's all that's doing. This is like phase, survey was the phase one. This is phase two. There's like phase three which is we have to negotiate with Student Life and then after phase three is phase four which the report, regents will decide, and so this is for ASUW to consider the undergraduate findings. Then GPSS will consider the graduate findings and we'll reach our own conclusions.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions?

Dylan Bianchi: I'm really sorry. I'm just kind of, I'm asking about the whereas clauses here. I'm still unclear on like what the big picture here is when we're breaking down the numbers of people who are responding to different questions. So I'm following you that undergrads were more supportive than grad students. Are these indicating that undergrads had like they were in favor of the fee at like the current fee amount or that they were more were in favor of it as a lower fee like section two I think from like lines 244 going up to like, line, I don't know what 169 roughly, can you just help me understand what you're getting at with all these data points?

Joseph Riggio: These whereas clauses are just stating what the data is. It's not making any assertions the that clauses do, but essentially it breaks down. So question three is the only outlier here, but for the rest of those questions, it was the three questions that this applies to is question 1, 2 and 4. Question 1 was generally, do you support the student health fee? It was more complicated than that, but the question is in the bill language. The second one was, would you support \$125 per quarter per student if the health fee is implemented? And then if they said no, this is where it gets a little bit tricky. If they said no, or maybe they move on to the next question, question three, which asks what concerns that they have, that's why it's an outlier question, because it's select all that apply. And then question four also only contains the people who said no or maybe. So anyone who did not say yes to Question 2, because that means we're comfortable with \$125. Would you support the student health fee if it was lower? And we found that the question language here just analyzing it. Undergraduate students are far more supportive of a lower fee amount than the \$125.00 per quarter per student, and that was seen in both graduate and undergraduate with people.

Erick Jacobsen: So I guess summarizing that, these whereas causes are saying like the data, how many percent support versus don't support under different circumstances across the undergraduate graduates. So it is the same as the visualizations. It's just more wordy.

Aiden Reeder: I have both a question and a statement. I'm gonna make the statement first. One of the things that I remember hearing about at the beginning of when the health fee survey was sent out was that the student union was rather against the implementation of a fee because that is their stance there against the implementation of any fee that is like additionally taxing on the students,

even despite the fact that this would go towards the other goal of providing more services for students. And so if I remember correctly, many graduate students received word from their union to not support this. Which may have contributed to what the results are with that. With the results though, it is pretty obvious graduate students don't support the fee, and so they're having proposed with an undergrad only fee, graduate students are a much smaller portion of the population, but they're what I think 1/5 maybe

Joseph Riggio: 17000 compared to 32000

Aiden Reeder: That's a little bit more than I was thinking. That's a significant drop in funding compared to what the health units were prepared to receive I guess. Do they have an idea of how they would operate via this significant drop? Because that's much different than what they were expecting to get.

Joseph Riggio: So we got a budget calculator because we wanted to verify what the health units were saying were true. We trust our health units, but we wanna do that extra verification, right? So Student Health or Student Life gave us a budget calculator that SAF uses to calculate their fee and we plugged the numbers. I recently, about two weeks ago, ran the numbers again for if only an undergrad population was and I had to estimate a little bit for the summer enrollment because I don't know. But if we, the lowest we can go to break even would be \$100 per quarter per student for undergraduates only. So they would break even and they would be able to be removed from SAF because from my understanding it's that we don't know what SAF's gonna do. I'm gonna put that out there right now. But Haley has told me repeatedly that if this health fee is implemented and we take them off of the SAF model then they're not going to support those units anymore. If they break even, and if they're if they go below that, then SAF then that gets into a complicated situation where SAF might still fund them, which bureaucratically is a nightmare for capital budget requests and whatnot too, and just everything. Already, I'll provide a bit more context as to like and feel free. I know there's some committee members here too. If you raise your hand, steering members can yield time to you. So if you'd like to say anything or give a statement or whatnot but I will just say from coming from my perspective as chair an undergraduate fee is possible. We would break even at \$100. It definitely won't be as impactful as if graduates were to, but one of the conditions in the that clauses is that during negotiations or discussions a pathway needs to remain open for GPSS to join later if they choose to do so, because we're going to run into a situation where health costs for health care and health services and mental health services and prevention services are going to go up regardless. Federal policy is not friendly to us. State budget deficit is not friendly to us. UW is putting their money in other places. They're not going to fund it. This is why this whole entire student governed fee idea exists is because it's a way that students can govern their own funds and see best fit how to allocate those funds to the things we care about. And so with that being said, yes, if undergrads were to impose this fee on themselves, we would receive subsidies. We would receive these services that are offered from this. It might be a little bit less than what we expected because graduates aren't supporting it, but then that would cause a situation where graduates won't be supported by it, and bureaucratically they would have to make, they would have to create a model for undergraduates and graduates, so that way they can equal, they can apply the subsidies to the undergrads only and those services to undergrads only. And that's why we're gonna leave a path open for GPSS, because if they decide later to do their own survey and enough graduate students are like hey, why is why are our care costs like super high? And like we want to join this thing that undergrads are doing because their costs are lower. We want that pathway to be open for them.

Erick Jacobsen: And adding to that, if you want to make an amendment on the floor or in whatever committee this goes into, which would like mandate that ASUW like argue for that like argue that it be a certain number or argue that it have a certain provision you can do that because this bill will be instructing like how ASUW and GPSS execs engage in the negotiation. You can also like let them know afterwards or something or appear to those negotiations in whatever form they choose. Maybe they do form whatever, but there will be plenty of like opportunity from to like put certain things into the MOU if that's something that you want to keep in mind, and if you want to prepare amendments for the floor, that's also something to do.

Pierce Wallbaum: Can you just clarify the last that clause that just talks about the funding being conditional, given that the Husky Health Center provides SANE exams. So how we're withholding funding until they provide something that they can't provide because they don't have enough funding.

Erick Jacobsen: This is something I suggested. Basically we passed a bill saying Husky Health should do SANE exams. And they said we don't have the money to do that. And So what this is saying is we'll only give you the money if you use at least some of it to provide SANE exams. It's not necessarily like you have to do it first. It's that you have to do it with that money. So that's and if that's something we want to grammatically clear up, we can. But that was my intent. I suggested this because GAVEL ran into a wall on it. SARVA ran into a wall on it. And if they're getting more funding and if ASUW is helping them to get more funding, then I would certainly like for them to implement the services that students have been asking for a long time. But yeah.

Pierce Wallbaum: Have you talked to the Husky Health Center about if that's something that they agree with or if that? Is something that they would do?

Erick Jacobsen: Only insofar as GAVEL asked them and they said they don't have enough funds to do it. But I haven't mentioned this to like this specific clause to them.

Joseph Riggio: Just speaking from, I've spoken to some directors in executive positions and whatnot in Husky Health, most of the time it's they're open to the idea. Yeah, funding, kind of what Erick was mentioning or for instance, like they defer it to UW Medical or Harborview or other centers or whatnot that the UW either partially controls or fully controls. Because Husky Health Center can only do so much in its clinical capacity with the funding they currently have. So yeah, that's why this is in here.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions, comments or motions by anyone?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approved into on-campus affairs

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Dylan Bianchi moves to table R-32-6 and R-32-7 for a week

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: For the record I did include a proposals two section so that we could come back to these after we approve the floor agenda. Because if we would go straight into the approval of the agenda in a minute anyway so if after this we want to go back to that, we can. Proposals two already

has the ASUW federal agenda but those could also remain tabled. So yeah, we also have discussion items, so it's up to y'all.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Seeing that we have tabled these items we will now move into the approval of the floor agenda. We have no forums. Let me do what I never do, which is add things to summary of new business. At this time, does anyone else have anything, any comments, questions on the agenda?

Pierce Wallbaum: There's just a small space missing.

Erick Jacobsen: Off-campus and AAA do not have legislation. Y'all can continue resolution revolutions if you want. We also might have legislation for at least one of you later, but are there any other questions, comments or motions on this agenda?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

PROPOSALS II

Erick Jacobsen yields speakership to **Joseph Riggio**

Joseph Riggio: So this was sponsored by Towa

Towa Nakano-Harris reads [LD-32-5 Establish ASUW's Federal Legislative Agenda](#) bill summary

Joseph Riggio: Alright and we can go section by section.

Towa Nakano-Harris: Yeah it's rather long.

Recess 4:59 pm

Reconvened 5:02 pm

Recess 5:02 pm

Reconvened 5:05 pm

Joseph Riggio: Alright so we're going to go section by section first and once we get through everything, I would recommend then a motion for approval. So Towa, would you like to provide any context for section one?

Towa Nakano-Harris: I mean if people have already read it, unless if anyone has questions, I can.

Joseph Riggio: Ok so questions or comments about section one.

Erick Jacobsen: This isn't necessarily just for section one but when it comes to like the like UW federal agenda and it applying to us, I read the policy and I was also aware of existing laws. Basically ASUW legally cannot lobby unless it's on the state level. We cannot lobby the local or federal

government or spend public money to influence legislation. But when we do lobby, we can advocate for either our official legislative agendas or the UW official legislative agenda. We are allowed to have a different opinion from them. But we can advocate on what they say, even if it doesn't go through our Senate, if we are authorized to act as a lobbyist on their behalf. What that means is probably not much for this bill, I don't think, because this is, we're taking the stance of advocacy and not official lobbying. It's the same thing we do on a local level. We advocate on local policies that we like through our deputy DOLA and our president, but for legal intents and purposes we are not lobbying, it's just also established the legislative directive, because the legislative directive is the internal procedure by which we authorize OGR to engage in any activity.

Joseph Riggio: Alright any other questions or comments.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve section 1

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Joseph Riggio: We're going to go to section two now. Would the prime sponsor like to provide any additional context?

Towa Nakano-Harris: No.

Joseph Riggio: All right, opening up the floor to your questions.

Towa Nakano-Harris: If there are questions, I'm happy to answer.

Joseph Riggio: Ok great, questions or comments? Questions for sponsor or comments can be statements of support or against.

Julia Tanner: I was just going to make a statement of support. I've been really worried about like reading all of this and so this is very prevalent to me and so I'm in strong support of this section.

Joseph Riggio: Questions, comments, motions?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve section 2

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Joseph Riggio: I'm gonna continue asking, would the prime sponsor like to provide any additional context to Section 3?

Towa Nakano-Harris: No unless there are questions.

Joseph Riggio: Ok great any questions, comments or motions?

Kavi Pasupathi moves to approve section 3

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Joseph Riggio: moving on to section 4, would the prime sponsor like to provide any additional context for section 4?

Towa Nakano-Harris: No

Joseph Riggio: OK, deja vu. Any questions, comments or motions? It could also be statements of support, against, neutral, questions of curiosity as to why we're supporting certain things.

Julia Tanner moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Joseph Riggio: Well, that was split into subsection A and subsection B. So now are there any questions, comments or motions for the entirety of the legislative directive?

Julia Tanner: I just wanted to clarify so what does the process look like for this? Like how is this going to the federal government? How are we advocating on the, off of UW to the federal government. How does that process work?

Towa Nakano-Harris: Yeah, so and I actually don't know exactly what it is, but there will be a trip to DC soon by Brandon and I'm guessing a couple members of board where they're gonna go to, I believe, the US Student Association Convention. They're going to DC basically. And while I'm not completely fully appraised on what exactly they're gonna be doing there, I was, Brandon had me write this in preparation for that trip.

Kate Lawson: We're going to the Association of Big Ten Schools conference in I believe it begins March 20th, so super soon that we need this in preparation for lobbying that Brandon's going to do while He's there. I'm not participating in any lobbying, nor is anyone besides Brandon and Nandana, I believe, because they're the designated lobbyists. And I also believe that there's very specific ways that they're engaging in this so that it complies with all of our advocacy requirements and things like that. So maybe lobbying is the wrong word to use there, but I'm not participating in it, so I'm not entirely sure. But yes, the the conference will be happening at the 21st through the 24th. We will be in DC and Brandon and Nandana have some advocacy plans during that time that while I'm not attending, they'll be engaging in.

Erick Jacobsen: I was going to say the exact same things. Thank you Kate.

Joseph Riggio: I will also say that just being careful about lobbying and advocacy and whatnot, even if we are advocating, if we perform certain actions that could be interpreted as lobbying too on the federal level, even if it's so if it's supporting specific things like Medicaid, SNAP program, fortunately we're, I think we're in a clear for the immigration package because the university holistically just supports reform for immigration and international visas and whatnot but just being conscious and aware of being careful about very specific things. OK, any questions, comments, motions?

Dylan Bianchi: OK, agenda's been approved. Can we like give the stamp of approval now and then tomorrow suspend the rules and add it into the agenda that, well, is that optimal or do we just amend the agenda now?

Erick Jacobsen: We can suspend the rules and amend now I believe. So if that's something you want to do. I will say now that I do have time to speak, I discussed this with Towa, but we were thinking that it'd be treated like the State legislative agenda and be put into old business, potentially a section of old business before committee meetings, which is how the state legislative agenda went.

Or potentially just into regular old business, but that's something I wanted you all to keep on your radar before you make any motions.

Julia Tanner: For my purposes, if we put this and other legislation or yeah, other legislation on the agenda, is it OK that I talk about it in my e-mail and is it OK if the fact that I already posted the agenda and now it's going to be changed.

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, us amending the agenda now is officially like changing it. So it's all good with that. The only thing with the 5:00 PM posting thing is we have to post something, but we are allowed to make reasonable edits such as like if we approved legislation after the deadline. So you don't need to worry about running into any policies or anything there.

Dylan Bianchi moves to suspend the rules and place LD-32-05 at the top of old business

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Joseph Riggio yields speakership to Erick Jacobsen

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to discussion, our first item is an executive session, so if you are not a member of steering if you'd like to please leave.

Executive session convened 5:17

Reconvened 5:32 pm

Dylan Bianchi: Given we're at our 5:30 ending time, how time sensitive are these next two items?

Erick Jacobsen: Oh very time sensitive. We have the room until 5:45. Yeah, I at least want to say my piece and I sure, I'm sure Julia agrees on the second one the appointment and proxies isn't as time sensitive, but we'll go right into agenda speedrunning. So basically I'll start. Last year we had a steering meeting these two can attest where I was, said like a 2000 word like statement about how frustrated I was that Senate was just like so eager to move on with everything. It was specifically after a point where someone made a motion to adjourn before it was even 7:00 and there was more stuff on the agenda and that peeved me. And I thought about it and why it was upsetting and the conclusion that I came to was that it was the continued, a continuation of a long trend that started last year of people who wanted nothing more than to leave Senate and who didn't want to commit their two hours and who weren't making any comments or questions or motions and would be just sitting around saying nothing. And then eventually Dylan would realize that no one was going to say. Anything and move to approve something. And it was bad. But now we have a similar problem, which is not necessarily that no one's saying anything, but that people are still trying to move to approve things before everyone said their word. Obviously it happened with the AISC bill, where people literally had their hands up for a question and someone still made a motion. But I've also noticed in other bills, even when there's no like when there's probably no questions. The people are like racing to be the first one to make the motion to approve. And that's not great because it's not conducive to discussion. And that way people have discussion, they're competing against people who are competing to get done with it quickly. And I mean, y'all know, we don't have a lot of things.

We don't have a very stacked agenda usually so it's a problem because we wait three weeks for a bill, we get a bill, and then everyone wants nothing more than to get rid of the bill. And it's something that's just very frustrating to me and it's something that I want to have a discussion on in order to see what we can do for people to actually, like, engage with Senate again. Because let's be honest, we do a lot. We give them free snacks. We don't have to do that. But yet people still complain when we don't have it or when we've run out early. We give them bonding activities after Senate. We give them icebreakers before Senate. I'd like to think I'm an entertaining chair to some degree. We're not trying to bore them to death. And when they get into committee, they get to like, just chat about what they're passionate about. And a lot of people don't get to do much. And honestly, when it comes down to it, all you have to do to be a senator is sit still for two hours or put on a teams call and leave for two hours which a lot of people do, and it shouldn't be that much to ask that we at least try with things. So I want to have a discussion on that and partly something that I, one of my conclusions from last year that I also for those of you who are aware who were elected committee chairs at the start of the year, I did include this in your like orientation, but basically I want our members of steering to be examples for senators. Show them what they how they like should be acting. So like try and ask a question or say a comment in every bill. Even if it's just I agree with this, even if it's just hey, who did you talk to about this? Try and like engage with it to show others that you can engage with it because a lot of the comments that we got, a lot of the feedback that we got in the end of the quarter survey was that people were afraid to speak up. And if you look at things and you look at the fact that no one's saying anything unless people are like jockeying to approve something as fast as possible, no, that's not an environment that's conducive to people like speaking their mind and if someone's like afraid to already or like nervous too already, they're going to be basically shut down by that. So I want us to be the trailblazers. I want steering to try and ask at least one question or say at least one comment. It doesn't have to be in depth, but I think Dylan did a great job last year, not as a committee chair of speaking a lot and I think last year our committee chairs once we like talked about it, started to do better, but I tried to include it in the orientation, but I didn't like follow up on it and the orientation was over summer, so that's really my fault. But I would like to see more out of all of you and I would like to see that reflected in our senators who. Let's be honest, are barely doing the bare minimum right now, and it's that's fine if it's absolutely what they want to do, but some people are definitely trying. I think more people would try if we like, let them. So I also wanted to ask that when it comes to motions to approve, I don't want any of you to necessarily think about doing it unless there's a lull. Historically, the way our chairs have acted is as a sort of like guiding hand. Like if no one's speaking, maybe they'll speak right. If no one's speaking at first, they'll speak first. And if people have spoken and now with silence, they raise their hand to move on. And that's sort of the role that I'd like you all to play as steering members is to like recognize these ebbs and flows in conversation, encourage conversation where we can set an example where we can and only once we've seen that nothing's gonna happen, then we can move on because yeah, I mean with my legislative directive, the first hand that shot up was to approve. I didn't even get to field any questions. We had time. We had plenty of time. And for the other bills, none of them were time sensitive. Like I'm sure bug screens can wait. So I'd like to see more things like that. And I think that starts with us. But I'll let Julia speak more, because I know she has many thoughts as well.

Julia Tanner: The thing that comes to mind and a few senators have actually said on the floor this session, is this idea of like a rubber stamp of like, we're just here to look at legislation and just be like stamp of approval. Like we're an echo chamber, we all agree, whatever, when that isn't necessarily the case, like people are going to have dissenting opinions. And so I think one thing with this in terms of like leadership from committee chairs, a good idea to kind of keep in mind is let other

senators be the ones to make motions and to like in the meeting and stuff like that. And your role is just to either ask questions or encourage your committee members to ask questions, bring amendments, et cetera. So whether you have that conversation and your committee be like, hey, like, what do you guys think of the legislation that's either coming up or that we just reviewed. And like me as someone, especially with nerves like I totally understand that people are nervous to speak up. Be that person that you can be like, hey, just like send me a statement if you don't want to talk, I can talk for you. That kind of thing but just be the lead on like not motions, but amendments and questions and I feel like that would automatically increase the conversation. Because if there's what, like 5 people in this room, if five people ask a question or say a statement, that's five more people that to add to the conversation.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah I definitely agree. All of us in front, we can't. We don't have that. We can like, provide context if we can but I mean, there's only so much entertaining I can do. And I mean, it's really something that one of your major roles is sort of informally, but also when it comes to adjournment, Dylan, I know, I know you hate us and you really want to get away from us, but I would say another thing is not just like setting an example that we're eager to leave, but also like adjournment and approving the agenda are the easiest motions to make. And it's, I don't want to say gateway drug. It's sort of like a stepping stone to speaking more. And so if those like really simple motions are something that y'all can like leave to other senators, then that can maybe help them feel more comfortable speaking. The exception of this is the previous question moving the previous question. I also think in terms of like guiding that discussion it is also y'all's role to like, realize, like, maybe we're talking in circles, maybe we're spending a lot of time on this. Maybe I'll raise my hand and move on.

Julia Tanner: Can I add something to that point? Hopefully we get to a point where we're having longer conversations, but especially with controversial, bills, that's another rule is to like, be like, oh, this is circulating. I'm going to raise my hand and be like guys, guide the conversation this way or restate what's already been said. Be like we've already established, this isn't, let's move on to something else.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, unfortunately, what we're seeing is we're seeing two extremes. We're seeing someone present a bill that everyone likes and people think that that's an invitation to just move along because let's be honest, there's no bill that's perfect. Every bill can be improved. I have written so much legislation. There's not a single one that I was completely happy with that I don't think deserved any amendments or needed any amendments. But we're seeing bills that people support just going through like that and we're seeing that bills that people don't support going in circles again and again and again and we spend an hour approving the agenda or we spend multiple weeks on WUE and like at some point, yeah, this is something that we should just leave to a vote, but also at some point we just can't have a vote right now because we need more time and more improvements. So you can look over bills and think even small things like, oh, I think that what about this? Like timeline's an easy one. Have they specified a timeline? Do you agree with the timeline? Do you think it's realistic? Who do they talk to? If it's a like a administrative or an academic policy, maybe you want to suggest, oh, what if we start with College of Arts and Sciences or something? Like just it doesn't have to be like a groundbreaking revelation. But if you speak a little bit more, then that's more of an invitation for others, but I'll open the floor to any comments

Dylan Bianchi: I'd first like to take accountability. I could definitely take my tongue firmly out of my cheek and make fewer I want to go home jokes. I will say in defense of the like 7 sharp adjournment. I know for me personally it's like I think senators are budgeting 2 hours for meetings.

Unless we have like a time sensitive matter, I'm a big advocate of just saying like alright seven, we can wait till next week. But I also admit I should be a little less flippant and I will abstain in the future. I can also make fewer procedure motions. I'll do that in the future and I would agree I think. One thing I think we can do is that generally I think the way we've kind of structured our like goals as a Senate has been a bit around like volume. I think this is something I've raised to you in like our quarterly, yeah, check and I just, I think the number of resolutions passed is just not a good goal for us. I think like number of resolutions enacted is, but realistically that's gonna be like a lower number. I think we should really emphasize putting every single bill through the wringer, like really working it over. Like I have a personal policy to not for vote for any bill that hasn't been costed if it would cost money like as an effort made to make a price estimate and like where the sponsors talk to someone in admin. I think like you said, trying to apply that standard and generally maybe shifting how we talk about bills away from like we're trying to get as many as possible to like let's really work this one over. I also think it would really be helpful. I mean, Erick, as in, I don't know if you can say this in public comment or if you'd like one of us to say in public comment, but I think senators respect you, respect Julia, respect Joseph. Just having someone go up and say like, guys, like, let's slow down. Oh, sorry Jothsna. I'm so sorry, be like, but maybe let's slow down and focus on considering bills more than like I don't know. Part of it I think is helping or helping senators understand that when we approve something that is like really just the first step and the subsequent steps are easier if we work a lot harder in the bills of like GAVEL'S job is easier if we produce a build that is like really exhaustively tuned to what administration is and is not what we do.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you Dylan, I agree. Also another small thing was like when we're like getting to that seven mark adjourning over approving so that we have more time for things. If it's like time sensitive, obviously that's something, but if someone doesn't say, if the sponsor doesn't say this is time sensitive assume it's not. And then also I've tried to do like, oh, does anyone have any questions? And then go into does anyone have any questions or comments? And then go into does anyone have any questions, comments and motions? And that works here I've noticed because like Joseph said, does anyone have any questions or comments, Kavi raises his hand to make a motion and he's like, oops, I can't do that. You can. But it's sort of like a way to guide it. And it hasn't been working in Senate, cause I say, does anyone have any questions? And I get I move to approve.

Julia Tanner: It's 5:45.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURNMENT

Pierce Wallbaum moves to adjourn

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 4-1-0

Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
