



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

3/9/2026

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 Katria (she/her), GPSS Vice President of Administration | A

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

Detlef Gerbing (he/him), *ASUW Restructuring Select Committee* | 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

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

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the agenda, are there any motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Erick Jacobsen reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and

bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the speaker's report, I don't have much to report except that end of the quarter, this is the last week. Pretty cool. Yeah, we're talking about if we want to make spring meetings go until 7:30, but that would be an announcement that we'd make when that decision's finalized and maybe we talk about it first steering meeting of spring. Yes, Senate meetings. This will not go to seven, 4:00 to 7:30 would be wild. And apart from that as we run down to the end of the year or no to the end of the quarter, next quarter we will have a cut off for membership. We will have leadership elections, committee chair elections at the end and certain liaison elections. So we'll be accommodating for all that. We're currently planning the ASUW Elections forum with EAC and with GPSS. So we have a couple exciting things planned for spring.

Dylan Bianchi: So we have 6 really usable weeks in spring quarter right?

Erick Jacobsen: More or less. I'd say, yeah, we're also seeing what forums we can schedule, but we can figure out if there's like if time is limited, how we deal with that and how we accommodate. But that was another, that was a reason why 7:30 was floated as a potential newer adjournment time in spring so that we can do all those things and still have time for legislation if the long-awaited wave hits us. So that's something we're considering. There's also something else. What was I going to say? I swear I was going to say something else. Well, oh, website. Yes, we plan to start using the website in the spring quarter. Please clap

Applause ensues.

Erick Jacobsen: And we'll be working with OCOMM, OID and SDC to make sure it's accessible. We leadership will be working on making sure it works and working with OCOMM about seeing if in spring quarter we can get our wish list from last year fulfilled. That was delayed due to the like migration and all the data loss, but now that we're back up and running, we can move on aspirational goals for the future. But yeah, moving on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hello I just want to apologize. I was not able to do attendance notices. I'm going to try and get them done tonight for the previous meeting, but like everyone through dead week and finals, it's been kind of busy and I'm already over my hours. Yay! So expect those attendance notices soon. However, I will say that just a reminder that we I have a policy where attendance resets each quarter. So the only thing that people would have to worry about is being deactivated. So even if a senator reaches or has two unexcused absences, if they reach a third one by missing this week, just let them know that they would be deactivated and they'd have to either meet with me one-on-one or prove that they were there, or go through the reactivation process again from whatever means designated or signature getting 5 signatures again. So that's the only exception to that rule, but everybody else will have their attendance reset going into the next quarter. Also next you'll see on

the floor agenda, we have the GAVEL report quarterly report as well as the liaison quarterly report. I'm still making the liaison one, but the GAVEL one, I'm excited for that one. I'm really excited. I hope it doesn't take forever. We tried to plan it so it won't. Each member is **going to** give a statement on what they've been working on and whatnot. So I'm excited about that. And then additionally, yeah, going over Senate website and whatnot, I just want to talk about particularly changes that are relevant for the attendance policy and whatnot. For those who are maybe new or unaware, it's very typical that we actually have our votes, those votes are supposed to be public, like every time we vote on a piece of legislation or do elections or whatnot, those are public records, so they do live on our website as well as we typically. We tried to put a different meeting, the agendas and the minutes. I'm going to put all the agendas and minutes from the last few meetings on there next week. I'll have a bit more time to do that. But as we start to really use the Senate website, more things will start to live on there and Senate leadership will go through probably at the beginning of next quarter and walk through exactly how that that will work. Other than that, that's all from me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Hello everyone. . I know Dylan already said that he has to leave tomorrow's meeting early, which sucks, but is there anyone else who's not going to be able to stay for like maximum 20 minutes after the meeting tomorrow? OK, because we, me and my interns, really want to film a reel reintroducing members of leadership and committee chairs. So if it turns out, I'll re ask the steering chat tonight to see who's not able to stay after the meeting and if more than just Dylan isn't able to make it, then I'll make the executive decision just to do the first week of spring. But yeah, hopefully we can do a little a fun little reel. It's just you spinning in a chair in slow motion basically. But I sent the reel in the chat. So that's all for me. Very unserious.

Erick Jacobsen: Can we use CapCut technology to edit Dylan into the real post facto?

Julia Tanner: Yeah, probably. Yeah, we'll be doing individual cuts anyway, so we'll be using CapCut beforehand. So we want everyone there like behind. Well, we'll figure it out.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Alan Galvez: Hey everyone, Brendan did not mention anything new to report on his end, but word of the day is petrichor, which is that lovely smell that happens when it rains and that chemical mixture mixes in with the dry soil and the plants so, but that's about it.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

Recess 4:10

Reconvened 4:15 pm

Recess 4:15 pm

Reconvened 4:17 pm

Recess 4:17 pm

Reconvened 4:19 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Any motions?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 5-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on now to proposals. Our first one is R-32-06 A resolution. To reduce the impact of ICE on student life. And this is sponsored by Avery Kirscht. Is that how I pronounce? OK, never said it out loud before. Would you like to read the bill starting from line 22?

Avery Kirscht reads [R-32-06 A Resolution to Reduce the Impact of ICE on Student Life](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for the sponsor?

Julia Tanner: I just wanted to comment and say this is a really well-done resolution and I am in full support of it.

Pierce Wallbaum: I second that. Thank you for writing this. My only worry I guess is that there are spring 2026 timelines here and being that it's week 10 of this quarter, I'm just kinda wondering what happen to these events? Maybe it would be better to ask before fall 2027 just to give a better timeline. Would you be open to that is my question.

Avery Kirscht: Yeah, I think I'm certainly open to pushing back the timelines. This was written like those. Those timelines were aside on a few weeks ago when. We thought that this would reach the floor a little sooner. So I'd definitely be OK with pushing back those timelines. I would ask that they still be sometime this academic school year. Understand that this is somewhat time sensitive and waiting until after the summer seems a little excessive. We could do summer 2026.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, two things. Just wanted to say a second like this is a really good written piece of legislation. My question is more on the badge in. I think it was on one of the that clauses. I'm not too sure, but it would reference like Odegard. I'm just wondering how that specifically would work and also if like you've done any class analysis on like how much it takes in order to hire people for each building. I know you mentioned like the number of buildings and like classrooms, but just a little bit more logistical info on that would be great.

Avery Kirscht: Yeah by badge in what I meant is we'd use our Husky ID's basically to tap in to each hall, which there's already card readers outside of every hall and every door. They lock after a certain period of time, and if you have access to the hall after hours, you can use your card to get in. That's what I meant by badge in. I don't know if Odegaard is the best one to one comparison. That was the one that first came to mind and the one that seemed easiest to me though I'm happy to clarify what I mean by badge in, though I wouldn't think there needs to be any further cost given that there already is card readers outside of every door.

Joseph Riggio: Yeah so I want to bring attention to a couple different things that I just briefly found. I'm trying to look for Jackson School of International Studies response to immigration enforcement too, because they have been, uh, distributing flyers and putting signage already as a department for like areas I know Thompson Hall has stuff like that and I think the LSJ department at one point before our staffing was reduced was trying to do the same thing. The two links that I put in the steering chat and also I sent you to Avery is the UW protocol for responding to immigration on on-campus as well as the Provost what they said on March 24, 2025 when it comes to safe campus. I was just wondering if now I know that this bill would do probably a much more thorough job at actually making sure that everywhere is compliant with the procedures to protect students. But I was just wondering if you looked into these resources before if perhaps, perhaps like a meeting with Jackson School could happen, or like if there were other inspirations for this bill that you drew from.

Avery Kirscht: I haven't looked into these resources exactly. I am aware that there are certain departments doing the signage outside of their classrooms. I know Miller Hall has one of those too. Or does that? I know LSJ has been making sure their doors are locked during classrooms or during class hours. The goal of this legislation would just be, to your point, to make sure that everywhere is compliant. If there need to be further meetings, if you felt that that would be something that would be necessary, I'd be happy to do that. Again, my concern with delaying this further than it's already been delayed is that this is still a rather sensitive issue and I think having something on the record is important. That isn't to say that we can't come back later and you know, update it through further. Resolutions or legislation, whatever that is. And I absolutely don't intend for this to be the end of this kind of work.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add that something like meeting with JSIS can be an implementation thing with Gavel, but if you want to leave a comment, Avery, that in committee you go over potential new whereas clauses because even if the committee passes it out right away, you'd probably still be waiting a bit anyway, so you can use that time to add any whereas clauses that you feel might be necessary based on these conversations as well as to if you want to clarify the badge stuff. Are there any other questions or comments for the sponsor? Are there any motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into AAA

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on now to R-32-07 a resolution to advocate for the establishment of a permanent staff position at the UW Food Pantry. This is sponsored by Jothsna. Would you like to read the resolution in full?

Jothsna Sundar reads [R-32-07 A Resolution to Advocate for the Establishment of a Permanent Staff Position for the UW Food Pantry.docx](#)

Erick Jacobsen: All righty, are there any questions for our sponsor?

Joseph Riggio: Just a comment. Yeah, I also spoke to the Husky Food Pantry, and this was the same sentiment that I got from them too, is they're stuck in sort of a bureaucratic mess when it comes to requesting. They're capped at a certain number that they can, a percentage that they can request per year, which and they already, since they received so little to begin with, a percentage of that is not going to be a big enough increase for the type of expansion they're wanting to do. And so especially for like hiring full time staff or getting more student positions so I just want to commend the sponsor for drafting this. I think this is needed.

Pierce Wallbaum: I really like this legislation.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve into off campus

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We're making good time. Our next item is SB-32-04 A Senate Bill to Amend the ASUW Constitution. This is the resubmission from SB-32-02 which we tabled indefinitely with the assumption that it would be resubmitted eventually. And this is also, I believe, reflecting the comments and discussion that the restructuring committee has had. But I'll hand it off to Joseph to read. No, no, I'm not. It's too long. Let's take let's take 5 minutes to read it. Is that too much?

Recess 4:37 pm

Reconvened 4:42 pm

Recess 4:42 pm

Reconvened 4:44 pm

Erick Jacobsen: We are back. Joseph if you would like to read the that clauses out loud please.

Joseph Riggio reads SB-32-04 that clauses

Erick Jacobsen: That is time. Can you put a note on where we're at?

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: We are moving on to the approval of the floor agenda and we're moving on to the approval of the floor agenda at present. Take a look at it. I already added in R-32-6 and R-32-7. I have a timestamp for SB-32-3 to only take at most 30 minutes. This is something that us as leadership agreed on, including Joseph. And I also put a timestamp for old business to start at 6:30 because I would prefer committee chairs know going into it when it's going to end because I feel silly running around and going, all right, I think let's do it based, let's end at 6:32 because I said so like that hasn't really working as well for me, so I wanted to start doing it this way. But every committee but General Affairs has a bill. General Affairs can work on resolution revolution stuff if they'd like, or do some ice breakers, whatever you want. No nominations and elections. I put everything in summary of new business and we have the liaison and the GAVEL reports. Joseph, how long do those take?

Joseph Riggio: The liaison report form can take roughly, let's just say 10 minutes though probably be under. Gavel report form is 15.

Erick Jacobsen: OK. Let me ampersand this to keep it all in one line. Perfect. OK. Any questions, comments or any agenda?

Dylan Bianchi: I'm just going to throw this out as a comment before I make the motion because I'd like to hear back from people. I think we should make the legislative directive a special order and put it before new business, but after the liaison and GAVEL reports because I think it will like it could be time consuming and it like really has to be approved tomorrow because we're not going to have a meeting before the conference where Brandon and some Board folks are going out to ABTS, so that's my proposal.

Erick Jacobsen: I would say before going to hands, special order is typically under summary of new business before committee meetings.

Detlef Gerbing: What is Special Order of the Day?

Erick Jacobsen: Special order of the day is a very special thing that we can do which is typically only reserved for legislative agendas. And what it means is that it doesn't go through committee, which this didn't go through committee either for the same reasons but it's placed above committee meetings. This is in terms of time sensitive bills that have like a timeline set out in our like bylaws and stuff typically and we basically get to it before we get to anything else. Again, we only really use it for the legislative agenda but it's just priority bill sort of.

Joseph Riggio: Also with special orders of the day I think we would have to consult SAO in terms of if we'd have to read aloud the bill fully again or if us reading it still because otherwise I would just move to instead recommend that instead of a special order that old business part one and old business part two because special orders we would have to read the bill in full. I don't know if and that's all that says like it doesn't matter if we run it before or not and we should probably check with SAO if that's the case, but to play it safe I would recommend just making part one and part two of old business so we don't have to do that.

Dylan Bianchi moves to separate Old Business into part one and part two.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We now have old business part one for the federal agenda and old business Part 2 for everything else. Timestamps are still all on there. Cool. Are there any other questions, comments or motions on this agenda?

Pierce Wallbaum: Just a quick question. Why do we need like the 10 minutes and 15 minute timestamps? Cause like if it does take more than 10 minutes, does it cut off the report and we just have to move on to the next?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes. We've treated it somewhat loosely but the reason we have it is because we don't want to eat up too much of our time and we wanna like make sure that our business is built around an expectation that we have a certain amount of time to do it. It's not something that's strictly necessary if you wanna make a motion to remove it.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve the agenda

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on now to discussion. Our first item of discussion is appointees, liaisons and proxies. So this is something that Board's been talking about is clearly our current like system for appointments, getting people to like committees and stuff isn't working because we have Board members like put out an application and then it gets zero to one applicants and then we wait a month and then we have to either deal with that or sometimes they've they asked Senate to like elect someone for it. So that's a conversation that we'll be having in Board on when we talk about bylaws, amendments and I wanted to get some insight into how you all think Senate should play into that like. Do you like the idea, first of all, of board being able to like delegate appointments to Senate if they want, like on a year to year basis, not like permanently? And do you want to have any sort of designation of what Board appoints versus what Senate appoints apart from just if it's in the bylaws, Board appoints it like for example, do we want to say that all university committees are only appointed by the DUA or only appointed by the Senate? Is there any discussions that y'all want to have surrounding that as we discuss like what the best appointed liaison proxy system is for ASUW as a whole. You have no thoughts at all?

Joseph Riggio: I know that we talked a little bit about like packaging certain liaison positions together. What we could do like, I'm just thinking like for instance, faculty councils, well, we there's a faculty council that is relevant to information technology and cybersecurity. I forget the actual name of it, but we could have a student advisory or Student Safety Advisory Board or conduct review board be sort of related package liaison positions and that same person can sit on that faculty council. I know that something we talked about even for GAVEL committee is having certain members of GAVEL be appointed certain positions depending on their interest and what legislation they're tracking. So I know we talked about packaging. I just wanted to bring it up as an idea.

Dylan Bianchi: Sort of just spinning off of packaging, one thing I informally discussed with one of them like once was it might be best for a position like DUA, I think DDE is similar where they have just a ton of liaison positions to hire like 5 interns and then have those interns make whatever meetings they can. Because as as we've seen at great length this year, it is pretty difficult for the actual Board member to make all those meetings and that would also be helpful because then you know quarter to quarter people's schedules change. You have this staff of interns who are all somewhat familiar with what each committee does. You can kind of move them around as necessary, obviously ideally you keep the same person in the role. So that's one good move. I think Senate is also a pretty like Senate is also a pretty good move. Plus side, we can appoint them relatively quickly, which we did with the housing bill I was working on. That was great, was pretty effective. And I know that the general appointment process for board is just, it's kind of a pain. There's a few rules that really trip things up, notably the whole rule of I think you need three applicants for a position in order to hire anyone, which is absurd. I don't know how much flexibility we have around that rule. Also, they just take a while. The problem with Senate as I see it that's why I think like hired interns might be preferable is that we've had problems this year with Senate liaisons dropping out. I think the reality is that Senate is not a super high barrier to entry wing of ASUW, which is good because that we need to have a wing in ASUW that's not high barrier to

entry, but as we talked about last week, the result is that realistically we do have members who are not as committed and sometimes people get into liaison positions are not, just don't really have the time to commit to them and then drop out. And if we had like a consistent problem with that, it could become an issue. Though frankly, I still do see that as preferable to just like, and having a lot of turnover as preferable to having like six weeks to hire a single board appointment liaison.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other thoughts on, I will go to just a second, but on this as well as on if there's any procedures that you think we should put in our personal bylaws because currently we recently had a change where if no one is going for the position, I can appoint someone in the interim instead of just me being the one in the interim. Because like then we have this issue of we're not gonna elect all 20 liaisons. Now it's more than that in a week. So I'd be I the speaker would be having to go to all those meetings as well and that's just not sustainable. But do we want to also have a process for like appointing GAVEL members specifically to Senate liaison positions that are more like issue based or something? And what about us doing packaging as well because there's sort of two different processes. Currently there's a Board process, Senate process and I currently sort of have influence in how both can go, so I just wanted to have a holistic discussion about that. So do you have thoughts on Senate specifically as well?

Joseph Riggio: As the supervisor to liaisons, our retention is actually really good this year. It could just be circumstantial that it's just this year that we have a lot of really passionate people. We've only had to do reelections for I think three times and one of them was a very quick turn around. One of them was they got, they were elected and they immediately realized they couldn't do it. And then like we had a couple more resignations and whatnot. But in the in the total grand scheme of things the vast majority of liaisons have been submitting forms and participating and well, some of them just the committees haven't even convened yet. So there's that issue too. So it's not necessarily that I think in Senate we can't attract talented and strong candidates for these positions. I would actually argue the opposite. But what I will say is from HFS background and experiences when I promoted my hall council, I got 78 applications and I did 55 interviews and how I was able to do that is take advantage of move in, take advantage of autumn quarter because that's when first years are still trying to figure out what they want to do on campus and it's a war of first impressions. Like the reason hall councils start off so successfully is because it's right there in their living community. It's the first thing people see. So if we need to develop a strategy to where ASUW does a lot of front end promotion, super heavy during Dawg Daze, super heavy during and I'm talking about across entities. I think that's also going to contribute to getting more applicants for these positions because if we're trying to hire in the dead of winter, well, it's the dead of winter and it's hibernation season, so no wonder. But that's just my two cents.

Erick Jacobsen: So it sounds like potentially a combination of these things could be like right at the start of the here we advertise for some sort of like intern pool specifically for like appointees. And then as we go, we figure out based on scheduled interests amongst the like directors, like which meetings they go to and we potentially reform the three applicant rule as well and have the option of deferring to Senate if they'd like and then within Senate as another discussion we can talk about if we want to like how specific things go to GAVEL or not, but how does that sound? Are there any other suggestions for tweaking this? Things about this, that suggestion that you don't like, that sort of thing? Any thoughts? Questions, comments, hopes, dreams, fears?

Dylan Bianchi: Joseph made a good point about the retention rate. Maybe I was just suffering from confirmation bias. One challenge that I would send is I will note is that oftentimes like the coordinated approach of ASUW to a given issue, topic or like a specific body is going to come from

the board member who's going to deal with it right. So our coordinated approach to the whole issue with the engineering school and the RSO stuff that was coming from Kate. And so it's best to have whoever, I think in this case it was just Kate dealing with it. But if there was like a liaison dealing with a committee, it's best to have them pretty closely in touch with that board member who's essentially directing our policy, which is easier when they're that board member's, when they're that board member's intern rather than a Senate liaison. But you could also just have a Senate liaison meet regularly with the board member. Just a thought.

Erick Jacobsen: I mean yeah that's something that we can easily do. We did it with the like housing committee bills where we were like, oh, this person will not just report to the Vice Speaker, but also the President and the Deputy DOLA. And that was also a conversation we were having, god, was it like winter break or even like summer break where we were like, who, is the Vice Speaker overseeing liaisons the best thing? How can we like alleviate some of that difficulties and if most or if some of the like work is split between the board member who's already dealing with that stuff, and the Vice Speaker who's dealing more on the Senate side of like when we need to replace what, what are how reports look and that sort of thing, then that could be a good solution as well. Are there any other thoughts?

Detlef Gerbing: Oh yeah, I was just going to speak specifically to the like the Senate and like the GAVEL part we were talking about. I think that's a great idea. I know it can be challenging like definitely to get a bunch of people together, but I think GAVEL is like generally like from what I've experienced in GAVEL is that it's a very like highly motivated group of people. So if we wanted to like even for like an interim position just have them like fill in that certainly wouldn't add too much to our caseload, especially because the bylaws have us working at three, is it 3 or 4 maximum 4 maximum. We would generally stay around two or three. Theoretically we could have someone who's you know, more motivated pick up that little extra liaison meeting. It shouldn't be too hard as well.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah and I'll say I really like the approach of, I know it didn't work out with Mailinh's schedule, but like the idea of appointing Mailinh to like a council that would deal with the issue that her GAVEL bill is on. And that's an approach that we can take, especially with like interim policy and stuff.

Kavi Pasupathi: Speaking to first of all GAVEL is like a really good idea if you like urgently need someone who's motivated enough to fill in that position for a while. That's a really good idea. And the second one was when we're talking about liaisons and like as far as I'm concerned, a lot of like Board and a lot of the committees that we liaison for, they intersect with like certain groups like you could group them into certain like board members positions. So maybe they could like meet with those liaisons once a month and then we could also have like the Vice speaker takes like maybe a quarterly or bi-quarterly, they like they meet them with them twice a quarter just to see how their liaison positions are filling out. That way Senate also has like we have an idea what the liaisons are doing, but liaisons also have a direct point of contact to people who have like the power and like the influence to make things happen in terms of their like relationship.

Erick Jacobsen: Perhaps we even replace the like monthly report that's required with formalizing the monthly meetings that started and then keeping the quarterly report the way it is and that being the only thing that the Vice Speaker does in that sense. These are all great ideas. Are there any other great ideas? No pressure. Any ideas at all? Any mediocre? No. If there's no further thoughts, we can move on.

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and add Proposals Part 2.

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Dylan Bianchi Objects

Joseph Riggio: I want Senate to have the opportunity to know that this will be, if Senate wants to have a constitutional amendment on the ballot for this election cycle, I want to make it very clear to Senate that they have the option for that. We do have the option for this to be placed on next year's ballot as well, but I'd rather Senate make that decision.

Dylan Bianchi withdraws objection

Approved 2-1-2

PROPOSALS II

Joseph Riggio reads SB-32-04 from line 458

Erick Jacobsen: Cool. I think now is a good time to introduce sort of rules that leadership discussed would be implemented in both SB-32-3 and SB-32-4 for discussion. It'll sound like a lot but I really want to have a structured and directional conversation, so it'll be only two minutes per person. We will only have 30 minutes for each item in each meeting so that we don't take it time that would otherwise be used for other bills. There will, I will not accept interruptive points of information and I will enforce, of course, that you cannot speak out of turn unless it's like an interruptible motion, like a personal privilege. The sponsor will be able to claim time to answer any questions that are asked in the queue, but not to comment if there is no questions asked, he would have to raise his hand, be back in the queue and I will emphasize on the floor as well talking about the bill and the reforms in specific and not like any actions of any person that anyone may disagree with or not like just the bill on its merits. And then as always, I'll prioritize senators who haven't spoken yet and then senators who have spoken and then members of the public. Board members, for the record, are senators, so they are counted in this as well. Members of the public is not senators. But yeah, those will be the rules that we introduce. I'll also put it in a, in my leadership report. But with that in mind, are there any questions on this bill?

Julia Tanner: At the risk of looking foolish, I wanted to talk about the ballot measure question itself. Specifically the better fiscal responsibility of the Board of Directors. Do you have a place you can point to that shows how this proposed constitution is going to improve fiscal responsibility?

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, so if you go to the back clause 17, so fiscal responsibility meaning like multiple entities would be looking at the budget and having say this would require that like if there were changes that were unrelated to inflation, legal, or cost of labor adjustments, that the Finance and Budget Committee would have to approach those people and have a conversation with them and that would be enshrined in the Constitution, not a bylaws thing. It'd be enshrined in the Constitution. So a bylaws amendment wouldn't be able to override that process. It makes, it ensures that the Senate and the Board of Executives can approve our budget. Right now we approve our HFS rates proposal. We approve the UPASS proposal, but we don't approve our own budgets. It's solely the Board of Executives that have that power and authority right now. So it would make sure that senators would be in the know of the finances of our own entity.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah my question is more on a high level since the Senate constitutional amendments are in judicial right now are being reviewed. Hypothetically, if this did go to the floor and judicial, you know, came back with a recommendation saying that they wanted a change, what does that process look like for like removing it from the Senate floor, recommitting it to the Senate floor, et cetera, et cetera.

Joseph Riggio: So Brendan and Coop went through the constitutional amendment process and they only said that we just need to submit it to judicial and that if they want to make a statement on it, they can. And if they do end up making a statement, the process or that it doesn't, there's no recommit process to judicial. Again, judicial would give their statement and that's done. I would imagine it's up to the judicial committee how they want to deliver that statement, if they want to come to the Senate meeting and deliver that statement, if they want a liaison to do that, whatever is in their jurisprudence. So that would be on them to do that and make that effort. We would treat it as a sort of favorable, unfavorable, neutral recommendation if they have specific components. The statement, we'll make sure the restructuring committee directly receives that statement so that they consider judicial recommendations too, and it would probably be read on the floor in Senate.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll add that I encourage Judicial if they have a recommendation to read it on the floor. Either our liaison doing it or the Secretary of Judgments or whatever. But yeah, just for full transparency. There's vague language in the Constitution that it's technically not required to receive anything from Judicial, only that it's submitted to Judicial. So it is up to them how they proceed and where that goes, and then up to the Senate how they react to that information. Are there any other questions or comments?

Julia Tanner: And then kind of adding on with regards to the ballot measures because we've talked a lot about cooperation with Bothell and Tacoma campuses and this includes cooperation with GPSS. Can you also point to where the proposed constitution will be addressing that cooperation? Is it just through the memorandum of understanding section or is there somewhere else?

Joseph Riggio: So for GPSS and this is something that can be further clarified. We also mean like GPSS right now. I believe our constitution does guarantee that both, GPSS is its own entity that lives in the ASUW that would be kept the same here as well, is to ensure that there is a seat and whatnot reserved for GPSS protecting both the Senate and also Juan's position as, for Board of Directors would be in here. Some of the things already exist in this constitution that our constitution already does but for the sake of transparency to students, we want that to be emphasized in this too even if we're not directly changing it, it's still because we're proposing entirely new constitution formatted differently too. So we just wanna make that clear. The one thing that I will entertain amendments and whatnot for is including UAW 4121 as an explicit mention, since we do propose a Director of Labor Relations to be added as well as liaison spots with between 4121 and codifying those in the Constitution. Other than that though, GPSS is largely kept the same.

Julia Tanner: Do you mind putting a comment there to make sure that that change is done?

Erick Jacobsen: And I'll also ask because it does say greater cooperation with these, with Bothell, Tacoma, and GPSS. So if it's like, if nothing's being changed regarding GPSS or Bothell and Tacoma, then I would clarify continued cooperation or something, which is a conversation that restructuring can have. So if you can include that in your comment.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I'm struggling to find the exact line number. I know somewhere here you discuss a bylaws reform task force that was supposed to be convened, I believe, under the Director

of Internal Policy last year 24-25 and I know that did not happen, but there was the effort between Jacob and Zoe, you know, previous your predecessor and then Ashwin's predecessor, to reform bylaws and produced pretty comprehensive overhauls. Did you talk to either of them about why like essentially how that worked out, why there wasn't a task force, and what the two of them were doing like that? You discussed that with them?

Joseph Riggio: No, I did not. I don't think I would make the argument that that's not necessarily related to the scope of what this is trying to do. Regardless of whether or not those conversations happened the governing documents, as they read right now, the argument is that they need to be changed. So if those conversations did happen, great. I would, I could inquire further with Jacob. I don't know if Zoe is around right now. Last time I thought she was applying to Oxford, I was pretty sure, or doing Rhodes Scholarship, so I'm not sure. But I can definitely talk more to Jacob about that and get that information later if you want.

Dylan Bianchi: Just so you know Zoe still lives in U-District, she's pretty easy to reach.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I go to Ashwin I'll say if you don't necessarily think that it's essential whether or not it happened, I would make some clarification of like of that in the bill in committee if that's what you would and the committee would prefer, just to make sure everyone understands completely what the intentions of every single clause are, because if it's unclear then and that can lead to a lot of like back and forth that we'd like to avoid. I will go to Ashwin.

Ashwin Anand: I'm going to just kind of add onto what Dylan was saying is like since a version because I spent way too much time looking at this constitutional amendment and ours since this has been proposed earlier. And like the implementation, you know, struggled, right? Understanding like why the implementation didn't go well and then maybe the reasons for why the implementation wasn't really carried out is important, I think. And then so like just kind of adding on to that, like understanding why things have failed in the past and why we're reattempting this effort, I agree that Senate input should be created, but I think my goal for everybody here is to like ask yourself why this change is being created and like why it's, you know, again major or this major. It's like a complete rehaul. There's like 6 other branches, right? And so kind of asking yourself, so where the back and forth would be on the Senate floor as to like why the creation is needed etcetera. I feel like a lot of it is going to be like very minute details and so if you figure out like a lot of the broader details you can fill in your constituents on like why these broader changes are being made and so if they have any like smaller questions you can do that. So like my recommendation is like really gain familiarity with this and like, you know, take your time to understand the changes so that you can better educate people when this goes on the senate floor. So that's like why I think that this should be postponed by a week or like until next quarter to where they understand it. I know that there's a deadline with constitutional amendments, but a rollout like this does take time.

Erick Jacobsen: And I will say just for the record that we are rapidly approaching 5:30.

Joseph Riggio: I just want to reiterate, first, I would encourage y'all to really read and read the sources. For Section 2, Section 2 is where we have those proposed efforts and that context. I know not all senators want to look at the sources but in this case it's really important. We have an entire, Frisco and I made an entirely public folder dedicated to housing those sources and we tried to organize it in a way that's user friendly. So I would definitely encourage looking at the appendices and if you want to know a lot of the details about why that's happening, a lot of the minutes and the agenda items and different things that are in there is evidence that we use for this, even though it's not explicitly in the, all of it is not explicitly in the bill, the point of this bill is to propose a new

system. Not just based on those changes, but we added Section 3 and by we I mean I added Section 3 that goes over aspirational clauses and all this is, is just philosophical arguments, legal arguments and different things for why we should change the organization this way. We don't have to have a grounded historical backing reason for why we need to do things a certain way. If we want to experiment and try new things, that is also a way we have a restructuring committee that's dedicated to going through this whole entire thing and making sure that it's a process that accounts from a lot of different perspectives. And that's the reason why I have liaisons and GAVEL members in that committee. So that we had a lot of different perspectives on this issue. So by no means is this the final product and I really do encourage y'all, I want to give senators the opportunity if they want to expedite this so that way they can see this implemented next year that they have that option. This has been in discussion for over 2 months now. Two months in Judicial, which is unprecedented, as well as in Senate and the restructuring committee. It's been a discussion item and I think it's time for them to finally receive that bill so they can make amendments on it.

Erick Jacobsen: Right on the dot.

Julia Tanner: I forgot I wanted to ask about in the Section 3 aspirational clauses, the second whereas clause it starts on line 153. I'm still really confused about where these numbers are. So I just want a clear question on that.

Joseph Riggio: I don't know if you saw my comment Julia, but they're coming directly from the senators sheet that we have internally. So I created the count function in the attendance I believe if you scroll to the very end, it's an AJ column. I just put count if it's protected or designated seats. I can also do the count again, but yeah, essentially like how many, how many people are how is it? OK, uh, if I redo the count functions again, I don't know why they're not here. I swear I put them here but those are directly sourced from the senators form and I did hand count the Greek Councils and other stuff, but you can verify that.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions, comments or motions? Keeping in mind it is past 5:30.

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Dylan Bianchi: It's past 5:30, right? So I mean, we're supposed to go. And also we lose the room at 5:45, right? Meaning at 5:45, which is, you know, 13 minutes, 12 minutes we're gonna have to go. I just don't think we really have time.

Joseph Riggio: Senators should decide whether or not they want to try and push this forward on the ballot for this year or next year. I will say that if we decide to adjourn, that means there will not be an opportunity for it to be, that kills it for being on the ballot. And I don't want us to make that decision. I want senators to make that decision. So I would, even if there's stuff that we disagree with still, this has been worked on for the past few weeks to try and correct a lot of the language. I've adopted all the different provisions and recommendations. I've given the opportunity for people to look at it again and I would like to think I've been graceful with it. But if if we decide, I would much rather us continue to discuss this while we have the room. We have gone until 45 before, so it's not unprecedented.

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

Dylan Bianchi: I would just like to point out that this bill has received this completely standard procedure and I think that. Part of what's happening here is we've got to remember that this bill is, it's still your personal project, Joseph. It's not an official Senate endeavor and Senate doesn't have a response like we're talking about Senate, you know, needing to consider it before this deadline. And it's not Senate's responsibility to arrange that. It's the sponsor's responsibility to arrange that. We're running it up. It's time here, so I think it's fair to talk about it for 10 more minutes. I'll withdraw my motion, but I just want to say that I don't think Senate has like an official responsibility to consider that, but I'll withdraw my objection.

Dylan Bianchi withdraws motion

Erick Jacobsen: Also, for the record, there is precedent of bills being passed a year before the constitution, the ballot that they're on. Like last year we passed an SB for a constitutional amendment that will be on the ballot this year. So I just want to make that clear. Like that's not unheard of either.

Joseph Riggio: Ok so I do want to bring to everyone's attention that there is a constitutional amendment that was put through judicial that by the Board of Directors that came about through the Constitutional Reform Day on February 28th. They had to suspend the jurisprudence to put that on the judicial agenda, because normally you have to wait five days to submit anything for review. They had to suspend the rules and do that, and they reordered the proposals because I can't make those meetings on time because of my assistant resident director roles. The problem is this constitutional amendment has been discussed for months, and yes, it does a lot of bigger changes to the Constitution. However, there are pretty substantial changes that the other constitutional proposal makes too, and judicial got that through in a week by comparison, which is a remarkable change. It was a remarkable turn around time. They're gonna vote Thursday, and I recommend that y'all go to the Board meeting on Thursday because there's a different constitutional amendment that's being put on the ballot that did rush through procedural processes as well. I have not rushed any of the procedural processes for this constitutional amendment so far, and by doing so in my opinion, this has just exposed the fact that our constitutional amendment process is very quick for the board and not very quick for Senate. I don't want to argue on the intention of that, but I will say that that is what it is. This stalling has happened before and it's been documented in history. In fact, this constitutional amendment has sources documenting why past constitutional amendments have been delayed before and also bylaws reforms. So I just want to bring that to people's attention that there is going to be a constitutional amendment on file.

Erick Jacobsen: And if anyone has questions on that constitutional amendment that board passed, you can talk to me and again, you're always welcome to attend board or if you have comments that you want me to read out on your behalf, I can or points you want me to raise. But yeah, just for the record, because I also announce in my leadership and there's a link to all the changes if you're interested. But are there any other questions or comments?

Julia Tanner: Yeah I wanted to push back a little bit on the not rushed part. I understand that this has been in the conversation space for months. However, when it's specifically your requested that like we tabled this right to allow more time for discussion, both in the restructuring committee and also among leadership and people in steering who had issues with it. It's still like there's still could have been more space of talking face to face and discussing different things and making changes but instead we had to make comments right before this meeting because that wasn't entirely made clear that that conversation was going to be had. Additionally, although the restructuring committee did a lot of work so far, there were significant sections and Detlef you can either agree or disagree with

this as the as the chair, but there were sections that the restructuring committee did not go over within the groups and we did not have a full committee conversation either. It was smaller groups going over specific sections. So I just wanted to push back on that is like if we are proposing something that is offering these immense changes to the Constitution, it's going to take a while and it needs to include conversation with every possible party it can. And I acknowledge that the board has rushed through their proposed constitutions before, and that is extremely frustrating coming from someone who was on judicial as well for two years so I see that. I understand that and I'm not like agreeing with that as like OK for board to do. However, I also think that it's incredibly important to have significant deliberation over these changes and I don't feel like that has been fully realized.

Erick Jacobsen: I will also add that even if it goes into committee tomorrow there's no guarantee that it's passed tomorrow or before the deadline at all. But I did I see hands.

Dylan Bianchi: One thing I want to push back on is, Joseph, you're kind of phrasing this in terms of Senate getting an amendment passed and board getting an amendment passed and while the other amendment is backed by multiple members of board and was developed in a big public meeting that as I understand it wasn't like super well attended, but Board was there. This amendment is not Senate's amendment, it's your amendment and Frisco's amendment and Senate has not formally considered it yet. We've had the informal consideration in the restructuring committee which was formed like essentially exclusively for this bill I would say is a pretty wide amount of help given to it, but I do want to push back on the idea that it's there's like preferential treatment for Senate versus Board because this, again, this really isn't a Senate bill yet.

Detlef Gerbing: I'd like to speak to Julia's point a little bit just so I can like speak like very transparently about what's happening in restructuring, what was happening these past couple of weeks. I've had people break up into smaller groups, kind of go over the discussions, we can get the kind of like nitty gritty details out. And then our discussion tomorrow was going to be our first big reconvene of like everyone and all these working groups to kind of discuss like what we think as a whole committee. Yeah, tomorrow those discussions will be taking place. We'll go over like any issues we have with judicial, like any like I think I know judicial, executive, legislative are three of our more hot topic issues. We're going over that and there's still like a couple other segments that we still have committees working over right now as well.

Joseph Riggio: To address what Dylan said yes this has become a passion project. Didn't start that way. And every resolution, every piece of legislation that goes to the Senate is a passion project to some extent. So I would push back on that narrative. The thing that I would say is I would actually second what Erick was saying is even if it does go to the restructuring committee, that does not mean it passes. I've already made a promise to leadership that I will not suspend the rules and move this up on the agenda or I will not do that myself. I won't. And then same with the Senate bill on institutional reform I already made that promise. I'm going to keep that promise. The, what I want, especially if y'all are going to convene and have a big session on what you do like, what you don't like, it's gonna be way easier if you can directly amend the bill because right now as a discussion item, you can't do that. Legally, you cannot. So steering is holding up the restructuring committee from making those amendments and making those changes that we all want to see.

Avery Kirscht: Really just thinking logistically here even in on the slim chance that it did pass committee tomorrow and somehow made its way to the floor, there's no way it passes the floor tomorrow given how these conversations have gone in Senate, it's not gonna pass this week. It's

probably not gonna pass next week. I don't know if it makes a ballot measure. That'd be the only thing, the only reason I would think it would make sense to let it be discussed a little further.

Erick Jacobsen: I will go to Joseph in a second but I want to like discourage the idea of like we're holding up, like we're a step in the process. We have every right to consider it however we want. And while we can and I do encourage us to consider like how the rest of the process will go in terms of when we make our decisions, I don't want it to necessarily be like we have to do XYZ by XYZ or else XYZ like we can consider that, but I don't want to like make that a thing cause like this is also like a important normal procedure. So I just wanted to emphasize that. We'll go to Joseph

Joseph Riggio: Again like if that happens, that happens. I want senators to know about their options. I want senators to know that there is still an opportunity for them to place it on the ballot, even if the Board has recommit power and they could just technically kill it for this year anyway. I want senators to know that they have that option and they're not going to have any of that option if we keep it in steering and don't put it on the agenda.

Erick Jacobsen: I will say we have one minute left in this room. Yeah if we're gonna make a motion, I would say we do it now, no matter what that motion is.

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Blair Yeh seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Dylan Bianchi: Its 5:44. I think we have unresolved feelings on this bill. So I think it's time to to go and I would say wait for next week, but unfortunately, it's wait for next quarter.

Joseph Riggio: I just wanted to see if there were any motions to approve before we adjourn.

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

Dylan Bianchi moves the previous question.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Adjournment fails

Erick Jacobsen: We don't have the room anymore, but we are not adjourned. Uh, are there any other questions, comments or motions?

Blair Yeh: My Mac is about to die.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve into restructuring

Kavi Pasupathi seconds

Approved 2-1-2

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURNMENT

Joseph Riggio moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-1-0

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
