



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

27 April 2026

HUB 307

4:04 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

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

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

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

N/A, GPSS Director of University Affairs | E

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

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

TBD, *Director of Internal Policy* | E

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the agenda. Do I hear any motions?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 4-0-2

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Erick Jacobsen reads the following statement: The ASUW Student Senate acknowledges the Indigenous peoples of this land, and the land which touches the shared waters of all tribes and bands within the Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations, and the Duwamish peoples, whose land our university currently occupies. It is our role and responsibility as guests to understand how our impact entangles the caretakers.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: I'll announce this in my leadership report tomorrow, but two of my projects have come to somewhat of a conclusion because I got \$19,000 allocated to the Food Pantry for the grab and go bag program and \$5,000 allocated to the Student Legal Services to waive all immigration related fees. So, that's pretty cool. And I have more to say in board reports about other things that happened, but it wasn't me doing those things. And then election results have been announced. If you have not heard, Dylan will be our Vice President next year. If you're familiar with the entire UW for you, ticket won, and then Simon Thompson won Community Relations. So, election season is over. We'll be moving on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hello everyone, I'm back. I hope you enjoyed my lovely story from last week. Thank you, Erick, for being so kind to read that aloud to the audience. So, and I know this stuff. It's what I read out in the leadership reports. If you look at the leadership report slides, so you'll know exactly what he said. So, I'm back. It does mean I'm slightly behind on attendance. I just verified it today, I'll send out attendance notices tonight, people won't who are going to be deactivated due to attendance this next time won't be for this Tuesday, but the week after. Again, reminder and try to encourage people on Teams too, because I'm noticing that some of the Teams senators feel pretty shy or reluctant to ask people to be their proxies because they don't really know too many people like in person for Senate. So I would encourage all of you. I know we have a jam-packed schedule for committees. But I would greatly appreciate if you took some time and even with the teams people would be like, hey, just a quick second, let's find somebody who can be like your regular proxy or whatnot. So that way I can spare the committee chairs from proxying regularly. Which thank you, by the way, for doing that for emergency proxies. Other than that, the Liaison Committee meeting happened on Saturday. We had a lot of really good discussions. Husky Health Advisory Board stuff, talked about STF for a little bit. And so I'm happy to provide those notes and those updates to anybody who is curious. GAVEL Committee, we'll have GAVEL bonding during

the GAVEL meeting Thursday. I'm bringing donuts. So stop by, say hi. And GAVEL Committee members, you'll have donuts. Yeah. That's all for me.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Cool. Okay so we have lots of posts in the works for Instagram. I'm working on posting a really fun reel right now today so stay tuned for that. And then for the website, we finally got the senator bios and the senator roster updated. So it's not completely updated. We don't have the restructuring committee on there and we have to figure out like leadership, like listing off our names and stuff like that. But if you go to the Senate roster, you should see yourself and your name links to your bio, which you can edit. You can add a picture, you can add a bio. And then we're also trying to figure out how to edit the statistics because on your bio you can see how many or how many pieces of legislation you sponsored and co-sponsored. So we're just going to make sure that that's up to date and ready to go as well. So that's pretty exciting. It's not required to update your bio, but it's fun. Some of the chairs have already done that and it's great. So yeah, and I think that's all for me. We'll be talking about steering bonding later in this meeting, so I'm not going to touch on that. But yeah, have a great week, everyone.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to our advisor's report, it doesn't appear that we have an advisor present. Brendan is away, and there may have been some miscommunication in the SAO Office.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: We'll move on to the approval of the minutes.

Recess 4:10 pm

Reconvened 4:20 pm

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 5-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to Proposals. Our first proposal of the day is R-32-12 A resolution to support the implementation of FreeFoodAlert under the UW Food Pantry Food Recovery Program. We will open that up. I do not believe Ava or Angelina are here. I don't think they were able to make it, but I will read the bill on their behalf and I do know a lot about this. Oh wait, Collin, you're listed as a co-sponsor? Yes. Oh and Radcliffe. Okay. So are either of you comfortable reading out the bill?

Collin Saywers reads [R-32-12 A Resolution to Support the Implementation of FreeFoodAlert Under the UW Food Pantry Food Recovery Program](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, would you like to share a little bit more about this bill?

Collin Saywers: I think it's a very good step to take to address food insecurity on campus. I wish that Ava was here because she could tell you a little bit more than I could, but I would encourage that, I would encourage you all to pass this bill.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for our co-sponsors?

Isabelle Green: So first of all, this sounds really interesting. Second of all, how, like of the different universities that have taken up this like program, how effective has it generally been as a resource for the food pantry? This is more just a question of curiosity.

Collin Saywers: I personally couldn't speak to that. I would refer you to Ava or someone else in the room who might have knowledge of it.

Erick Jacobsen: Jothsna would you like to?

Jothsna Sundar: Sure, I don't actually have that much more information. I do know this was a project started by Angelina Durbin, who is the current Food Recovery Coordinator at the pantry, as like a Mary Gates Leadership Project, who has, and she's run into some issues with funding. I believe that like there's been a lot of like the food that they offer up through the program is redeemed very quickly and very easily. I don't know how that interacts with like food pantries specifically at other universities, but the like rationale for placing this program under the food recovery coordinator is just to have like an actual like staff position who is coordinating and running these efforts and not like leave it up to the wind.

Joseph Riggio: So what I'm gathering from if you go to the third reference, that's our membership. That's exactly how we would implement this program. So a university administrator has to be the one to do this. I don't know exactly what that means. Maybe Ava does. But we should make sure to define that in the, I would assume, I don't know if the food pantry has administrative authority in that capacity. It might be a contracting thing so I'm not quite sure. However, something that might be considered when this goes into committee and something for Collin and Radcliffe to take back. It looks like they have a one semester free trial. So a pilot program is possible. And I don't know how the semester is going to, I think we would have to work with them on how the quarter system translates to the semester, 100% Free Food Alert. But it, it that might be something to consider too, if we get pushback from the Administration about it.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I go to Jothsna, I will clarify. Working with the food pantry is a special advisor to the Vice President of Student Life. So that might be the person that would be doing it, but there's also, because there will be a permanent staff director of the Food Pantry, that might also demonstrate it, but it's under Student Life. I think it's hard to tell if we don't know like what their definition of an administrator is, but by my definition, we'd be fine. And I'm sure we would be able to like designate who is considered an administrator.

Jothsna Sundar: I do just want to say that I believe the pilot program has like been used already.

Ava Wahl: Yeah. I think it was actually my contact with you, Angelina Durbin told me that you guys actually participated in the pilot for the program last year.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, we, we had a recess during Senate last year, because there was like a humble feast event going on, and Free Food Alert, we tested it by sending everyone out. If you're older and you remember.

Joseph Riggio: Was that like a single one-off test though, because this is more of a trial for a duration of in coordination with the University Administrative that would be authorizing this, so this seems, I don't know if that was a one-off thing.

Erick Jacobsen: I believe it was a one-off thing, like I don't, there wasn't like a one-year pilot or anything like that. I think there's also the fact of this as a resolution, the main goal is to like declare support and the logistics of how it will be implemented, because there's also a 10% discount if it's a multi-year contract, can be figured out later in the like implementation side of things, but if we want to make note of these ideas in whereas clauses during committee edits, we can, and then it'll be like a, whereas ASUW could get a six month free trial this way, or, and whereas ASUW can get a 10% discount

this way and just like putting all the information in the bill and like giving the authority over like figuring it out the next step. That way the bill might have a more streamlined timeline.

Ava Wahl: I will also say, I also talked to Angelina today and there is like a little update. We are going to need to do an amendment, which we could do on the floor, but we are going to need to move on the whereas clauses to the that clauses, actually, because do I have in there, if I correctly remember, the ASUW Student Food Co-op decided to send the remainder of their funds to the UW food pantry to cover costs for this following year. So for the first year of implementation, we're getting all of our necessary funds from the student food co-op before it dissolves. And so I was told by Angela Durbin that that had already been decided. But it turns out we're going to need to add that entry to the that clauses as well. And that's what she just told me today.

Julia Tanner: Unless I'm not seeing it I don't see anything about that.

Erick Jacobsen: I will leave comments on what's being discussed, so that committee can do these amendments. I think whether its been, I think that will happen if the bill can't like authorize that, but the board is already planning to do that, I think they just haven't made the like action yet, pending the passage of this resolution, so it'll be like a recommendation that Senate recommends.

Ava Wahl: Yeah you can write that down. I actually will have to check with, Angelina because she actually was the one that helped me to write that section of the bill.

Erick Jacobsen: It's also possible that there were like there was like a bill for \$8000 and another bill for \$10,000 but she might know better than me, but I only have records of \$8000 last year, 10,000 this year.

Blair Yeh: I don't know if this is like a general question if you know but if this does get passed and enacted, would the food be like served or would it just be like packaged for people to take home and cook?

Ava Wahl: It would be served. So it'll be kept safe and monitored on site. So let's say like after there's a catering event that has ended and there's a lot of food left over, there's an alert that's sent out and students can come and get food on site because a lot of the food is going to be served. It's not like we can package it and people can take it home necessarily. Most of the food that's going to be at catering events. It's going to be perishable within a time frame unless we continuously monitor temperature. And so most of it is going to be like onsite.

Pierce Wallbaum: So going off of that, would it be like someone from the food pantry that goes to the site to monitor the food?

Ava Wahl: Yes they're going to have a volunteer team that is responsible for monitoring food at catering events after catering events end or ongoing during that period. And so they were planning to work on gathering volunteers for that right now. It'll be, yes, it'll be volunteers from the food pantry, possibly volunteers from other RSOs, yeah.

Blair Yeh: Would there be a way to project how much food from catering events would be left over? Because like what if a lot of people show up to an event and then there's no more food left but you guys like have volunteers there and like had people like expecting to get food?

Ava Wahl: That is actually a really good question. I'm not entirely sure about that at this point but I would assume that we're only going to, they're only going to probably plan to send volunteers like, probably like partway through a catering event or like at the end when we know that there is going to be food leftovers.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions, comments, or motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into General Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: I will add this to summary of new business as well before I forget. Our next agenda item is OA-32-07, an organic act to amend the responsibilities of the steering committee and officially establish parliamentary caucuses. Francisco, would you like to read this bill out in full?

Francisco Dojenia reads [OA-32-07 An Organic Act to Amend the Responsibilities of the Steering Committee and Officially Establish Parliamentary Caucuses](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, is there any other context you would like to give?

Francisco Dojenia: Given that this is the third legislation concerning the review of legislation by the steering committee in the session, I wanted to figure out a way that it could address many of those problems into general reform to the bylaws in the review process of the steering committee itself. So that's the purpose of this. And the

parliamentary caucuses idea is just something I also thought of which I thought would be helpful to organizing actual student policy towards like students on campus.

Julia Tanner: First of all I appreciate the work you're putting in to addressing the concerns that have been brought up in the past. I just wanted to start off with a motion actually, because I don't know if it completely accurately reflects the nature of steering committee.

Julia Tanner moves to strike "exercises unmatched influence on what student advocacy, if any, comes out of the Senate" from the whereas clause starting on line 34.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Julia Tanner: Like I said, this is my opinion. Others can correct me if they think I'm wrong. But I don't think that the Senate steering committee exercises an unmatched influence because what student advocacy comes out of the Senate is determined by senators and whoever is introducing legislation to the Senate.

Joseph Riggio: For me I'm just going to ask Frisco about their thoughts on this as they were the one who wrote the language.

Erick Jacobsen: Are you yielding to Frisco?

Joseph Riggio: If we're not in a period of debate I can't yield.

Erick Jacobsen: Well we're now in a period of debate.

Joseph Riggio yields to Francisco Dojenia:

Francisco Dojenia: If this motion passes will that passage be removed from the legislation? So I think I wanna say this is proving the very point that it is pointing out. And that's that. I don't know what, I don't know what else to explain that if you, if the steering committee can remove language from a bill when this proposal is proposing that they can make amendments, but they just need to be presented to the floor, then... I don't know how else to explain why I wrote this.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, before I get to all these hands, just to clarify, Steering can only amend organic acts because it is the committee, the standing committee that organic acts go through. It can't amend any other resolutions. So it's just treated as a standing committee in this case so that's not like for everything.

Julia Tanner: Just to reflect what Erick just said amending is, it only happens in Oas. In the case of OAs, we do not have the ability to change any other kinds of legislation. And I will address the fact that this OA, says that that steering can offer amendment ideas, because I would argue that goes against the very nature of what you're trying to do with the OA. If steering can edit, like offer amendments on any legislation, not just OAs, then it very much shows our influence on that legislation and how senators, especially if committees, can't amend those amendments, their opinion on the legislation and what they will do with that legislation, it will be influenced by a steering committee.

Erick Jacobsen: And before I move on to Dylan, I will add any amendments that steering makes to always, they aren't like permanent. You can like make a motion on the floor to add that passage back or anyone can.

Dylan Bianchi: I'm also kind of concerned about this phrase because, yeah, having been in steering all this year, we've seen a consistent pattern where bills are put forward with pretty like inflammatory language, like a phrase like unmatched influence, which is on a pretty basic factual level, false. There is if steering tables indefinitely a bill, which is steering's strongest weapon against a bill, it can be brought back by the Senate as we know, because there was a bill that was tabled indefinitely and they brought back in Senate. In fact, so three bills have kind of in theory like died in steering, right? So you had the Joint Resolution 32-3 that had to do with Tri Campus collaboration. That one had a vote in Senate saying that did not add to the agenda. Then you had, oh, Joseph, is it SB-32-04. I don't want to split hairs over the numbers which Senate decided to add to the agenda after it was tabled indefinitely. And the third bill was the one to recall Ashwin, which was tabled indefinitely after Ashwin resigned, thus rendering the bill redundant. This is something that's come up in Senate where people have said that steering is killing bills or bills are dying in steering. It's like it is just not true. Steering doesn't have that power. And steering is processing these bills, I think, largely on factual merits. And so when we have stuff like this that advances a subjective claim and this might just be me, but the citation here is, yeah, it's not working for me. Oh, I can't access it. Okay, so these things then cause a bunch of derailing acrimony in Senate and that's why we've been concerned about them. And now we have a bill trying to address that. It's also using acrimonious language that still has no basis.

Erick Jacobsen: For the record the definition of acrimony which I just had to look up, is like ill will. I will make a quick clarification on procedure as well. Steering does not have any final power on any piece of legislation. The closest thing is the Senate order for recall, which wasn't a bill. It was just formatted as a bill. It's like an action and like it's treated differently for a lot of reasons, but a bill like something that has any power equivalent to the Board of Directors or anything to form student opinion, steering has

no final authority on. And that's like the reason why, for example, we are like legally required to have an open public meeting. We do have an open public meeting, but we are not legally required to because we do not have any final power because anything we do, Senate can undo. Anything we undo, Senate can do. So I wanted to make that clear as well.

Joseph Riggio: point of parliamentary inquiry, wouldn't committee orders require Steering to pass? Because that's...

Erick Jacobsen: So committee orders are the exception. Thank you Joseph, which are things to exercise steering's power of oversight over Senate and ASUW as well. Thank you. I forgot about committee orders. Okay, so we are required, but for any other bill, any bill that Senate would otherwise see, we can't stop anything from happening.

Jothsna Sundar: Yeah, all I want to say is that even in this context of making this amendment that will be reported to the floor in my Clerk report. I can see how that would have been useful in previous weeks and quarters like before this, but that is sort of the state of things currently. That's all.

Aiden Reeder: The statement I want to add is I think that it's on both sides. I do think that the statement of "exercise unmatched influence" is, if any its little bit gratuitous in its expectations, but it's not wrong. I mean, I think it is interesting that, like amendments made here aren't like aren't confirmed by the rest of the Senate, right? Like every other committee and whatnot, they just happen. And so I do think that's an interesting thing that maybe in future things would that that would be interesting to address, as this is just a committee that sees that. But in terms of that, this does have influence. We've seen that in like in all of the examples we've seen, is that while everything can be undone, it takes an inordinate amount of time to actually get that through in an inordinate amount of talking to actually achieve that. And that is vastly delayed by when this happens. So like basically the influence that we do get to do is largely determined here by what is quickly done. And so I think maybe narrowing down perhaps the language would be pertinent to the discussion, but not removing that entire phrase as it completely disregards the power that Senate steering does have over what Senate sees. Largely, unfortunately, senators don't see what is in steering they should but they don't and I think that just needs to be acknowledged.

Erick Jacobsen: We are in a period of debate.

Julia Tanner: We also have a time-stamp for 4:50

Erick Jacobsen: Oh well this bill has been tabled for a week. The queue has been cleared. I'm so sorry to anyone who didn't speak.

General confusion over what happens to the motion and the debate before remembering that the time-stamp means we address the time stamped item and return to the previous item.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: We're moving to the approval to the floor agenda. We have speaker nominations. I guess it's it was unwise for me not to do the question before this, so we'd have to make an amendment on the floor to put the question in, but we can do that. Every piece, every committee has two pieces of legislation, except for off campus, which has one, and on campus, which has three which we may want to like balance that again and then restructuring have one. Old business will start at 6:40. We adjourn at 7:30. And then Dylan mentioned to me the possibility of having like an old business like time sensitive and old business not time sensitive so that we avoid a lot of the like if someone has a time sensitive bill and they want to like make it item A, but then someone else wants theirs to be item A instead, it's like a there is like a distinct separation, so we don't have to necessarily split hairs as much about the specific ordering as much as we have time sensitive bills before not time sensitive. So that's something as well that we can discuss.

Blair Yeh: I was going to say that I think the On-Campus Affairs committee finished committee edits on R-32-05.

Joseph Riggio: Clarification on that, It got recommitted by board. So it's back in on campus.

Erick Jacobsen: The board recommitted it. OK. They had concerns they wanted to see some amendments.

Dylan Bianchi: I'm going to say this as a comment. I do think we should do like 2 separate sections because I think it's causing a bit of friction in Senate it pretty consistently to have like old business that's stuff that's not time sensitive, stuff that is time sensitive. I also think what we saw this in play with the WSA bill is that sometimes moving bills around gets interpreted as like authoritarian or like we're stealing time for people, we're not giving bills adequate consideration. Just have that be like a more clear thing with the agenda going into it. I think might just move over those concerns. I would say nothing that in old business, unless someone else wants to provide a different

opinion. I think in old business right now seems like it needs to get passed before the end of the year. The two of the things that are sticking out to me right now are like, are my bill regarding Tent City 3, because that would that is like a strict timeline with like winter 2027. the Health Fee MOU bill and or sorry, no, the JR 32-5 the immigration bill and the WSA bill as things that we can maybe tag while they're in committees as when they get approved out of committees they would go into like special section of old business.

Erick Jacobsen: We can also reorder so the most time sensitive ones are the first ones in committees. We have that power, but we can't, I don't think you can do it in committee, because it's like the agenda of the Senate. So if someone wants to make a motion to, I guess I can just, because we're just working on this, is everyone happy with me moving the most time sensitive bills to the top of each committee? Everyone's good? Everyone's happy? We hope you're all happy. We want you all to be happy. Dylan, did you envision that the old business, like time sensitive and not time sensitive, would be like in the same spot in the agenda or time sensitive before committees?

Dylan Bianchi: I think time sensitive just a moment. We can maybe change that later, but for now, I think just before regular old business. And then maybe we could tag some of these bills so that when they pass out of committee, they automatically go into the time sensitive section.

Blair Yeh: I think that's smart.

Isabelle Green: Is that similar to the like favorable, unfavorable verdict that things get passed that committee with?

Dylan Bianchi: No, it'd be like we we we just we put like a thing next to the bill saying time sensitive. so that when it gets passed, it goes into a certain section of all business.

Erick Jacobsen: Joseph, do you know if that's possible? I mean, I guess with Roberts, anything is possible.

Joseph Riggio: Basically I mean, it's not defined in our rules or anything, is that if we want to do that in an unofficial capacity, we can. I will caution, though, that it's going to be, some of these have very clear timelines that are not negotiable. Others, this does create the opportunity, and maybe this is a future Senate steering thing to figure out, is if we do keep the model of time sensitive versus not time sensitive, there's going to be a lot of discussion on what does time sensitive mean and prioritizing bills, which I would caution. But for now, if we want to just create the section and create above old business, fine.

Abigail Appleyard: I would just say that the only things that should be in time sensitive should have provable deadlines. Like you need to have a reference explaining what date it needs to be passed by and a link to why that is. Because I think like, yeah, like Joseph was saying, everybody thinks that their bill is time sensitive because it's time sensitive to them.

Erick Jacobsen: With that then I think that would like disqualify a couple of these. I think only the Health Fee potentially if that continues, and Tent City 3 would have provable deadlines. WSA, as we discussed in Senate last week, doesn't necessarily have a timeline that needs to be passed by from what we've seen, and the JR is something that's urgent but doesn't have like a provable deadline either. So I would keep that in mind.

Blair Yeh: Basically Abigail said what I was going to say, but she said it better.

Isabelle Green: I would agree with Abigail that this seems like it's opening the door to a lot of fights over what qualifies as time sensitive. And it may actually end up being counterproductive if people are bickering over what qualifies or doesn't. But I would say expanding slightly the definition of time sensitive might be helpful. Like if it has a provable deadline or if I'd say like you get 30 seconds to make a compelling case and then the committee votes whether they think it should be time sensitive or not. Just like formalize some kind of quick structure to determine whether something is time sensitive or not time sensitive because otherwise we're going to end up spending half a committee meeting arguing over it.

Erick Jacobsen: I think that also potentially complicates things in terms of like well, at that point, why don't we just wait and have someone make a motion to move it up? So it seems like this may not be very logistically feasible. I'll also keep in mind it is 5:00. So by OPMA, we need to get the agenda out soon.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: The agenda is approved without the time sensitive, right? It has the time sensitive label, but nothing is automatic, so do with that what you will.

Blair Yeh: I just wanted to ask if there's like any repercussions if we don't like pass the time sensitive bills by the end of the year?

Erick Jacobsen: I mean, there's in certain cases, yeah. Like for example, in Tent City 3, if we don't pass it by a certain amount of time, it won't be like they won't be able to like negotiate in time to get it done, especially with the timeline of the open letter, as I understand it. And like there was a deadline for the regents for the health fee, but then like when it comes to WSA and the immigration bill, it's like urgent in the sense of there may be like negative consequences if it if it takes too long, but it's also like not as measurable.

Pierce Wallbaum: I just wanted to go off of the time sensitive aspect. In student legal services, more often than not, students feel like their legal issue is an emergency. That's just natural. And so I definitely think if a timeline can be proven and that is linked in your bill, that is more feasible. But without like a direct timeline, I don't think like we should be prioritizing bills based on like votes or like opinions of if this is time sensitive or if it's not. I think it should just be a concrete date that proves it's time sensitive. Otherwise you could get very competing perspectives or ideas about what is time sensitive and what's not, and that can cause lots of tension.

Erick Jacobsen: It sounds like this is potentially a very complicated issue that may not be something we can solve this meeting. If we want to implement some system of time sensitivity, that it seems like that would be best done as an OA with a lot of these considerations in mind that we can consider at a later date. With that in mind, I think, because we did approve with the time sensitive and not time sensitive section, but the time sensitive tag isn't substantial because it doesn't, like, we didn't confer onto it any like actual authority to move things quickly. So I think to avoid confusion, I'm going to grammatically edit that out. But we had reordered them in order of like how time sensitive they were. And we do have the separate sections.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just going to say like, this is, okay, I'll stop talking about this after, but like having maybe a consequence for if you want to say that a time sensitive bill, then it would make sense for it to be tabled if it didn't get met. And of course you can always bring it back, but at least that gives senators, like, you know, there's some sort of caution that you take with that, but that's part of the discussion that we're moving on from, so.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, that could be a consideration if someone wants to draft an OA to implement some system like this, but I think it's good for now to treat it like ad hoc and with whatever emotions we feel need to be made.

Joseph Riggio: As a reminder we're going to to move back to proposals where we left off period of debate.

PROPOSALS II

Erick Jacobsen: OK. So we're coming back into our period of open debate about OA327's motion. After this, I highly encourage us to move into discussion items because at least three of these. need to be talked to, or at least one of them needs to be talked about before tomorrow, and the rest need to be talked about very soon.

Erick Jacobsen: We're on Jayden.

Jayden Kim: Roberts rules allows us to table during a motion right? I don't know if our rules allow that because Francisco's not here

Erick Jacobsen: If Robert's Rules allows something, we do, because I'm not aware of any contradictory rule in our rules. I'm at a website that says you can postpone a motion, but I have no idea if that's actually Robert's Rules. Yes, so I'm gonna direct that over there.

Jothsna Sundar: Can't someone just move the previous question or like withdraw?

Joseph Riggio: Point of parliamentary inquiry Is it possible for people to yield their time to other people for a reason?

Erick Jacobsen: It's so possible.

Abigial Appleyard moves the previous question.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 6-0-0

Erick Jacobsen: now we're moving on to the initial amendment.

Approved 5-1-0

Julia Tanner moves to table for a week and jump to discussion items

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 6-0-0

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: Our first discussion item is legislation submission practices. Aiden sponsored an OA last week. If you weren't here, basically it was with regards to the unofficial rule that people meet with me when submitting legislation. And so I wanted to open a discussion about if we feel like we should discontinue any mention of that from the website and the form, given the concerns that were raised.

Aiden Reeder: I think you should reword it. I don't think you should discontinue it. I think you should, like the statement I believe last I checked was you must do this or whatever. I would say it is strongly encouraged that you do so for like a specific reason to do this stuff. I think it's not a bad idea to meet with you. I just don't. prefer what could happen if future speakers were to abuse this.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, yeah. For the record, I don't have access to the form, but Joseph just showed me it does say you must meet with Erick

Abigail Appleyard: I was just going to say kind of along the lines of that, if the goal is to like, you know, ensure that we're still passing quality legislation, but prevent a future speaker from abusing that authority, I would say maybe we change it to you must meet with a member of Senate leadership or your committee chair just to like check in about it and make sure everything's kind of in line with the types of or with the structure of legislation that we passed. That way, like we still kind of have that check just to make sure everyone's on the right track, but you know, we don't limit it to one person.

Erick Jacobsen: With regards to that I will say it is like my job specifically to give advice on legislation and not any other member of Senate leadership. I don't think that would necessarily go to the heart of these concerns and it might introduce like other issues of like team cohesion within leadership and like who's in charge of what. But like Committee Chair, I don't mind. I think we just also wanted to move away from the general idea of a requirement

Pierce Wallbaum: I just want to say I do really agree with the motion, or not the motion, but like the idea that it should be strongly encouraged. Because it can feel very like reaffirming to have someone who's in leadership look at your bill and like analyze it with you. But I am pushing back a little bit that it should be required that anybody in leadership look at it, even if it is just the Speaker. I think anything that could be wrong with a bill can be amended or edited in steering. And so I don't think taking the

requirement away would necessarily cause any major issues or delays about getting legislation on the floor. And so that's my two cents.

Erick Jacobsen: I will also say for the record, I counted last week, I think about 16 of the bills out of 42 that have been submitted across all types of bills were submitted without meeting with me anyway, so I also don't think this would necessarily create any issues.

Joseph Riggio: Can I have a point of parliamentary inquiry? . Erick, where in the job description does it say that you advise or that you oversee before, it says after Senate passes legislation, but before that, advising legislation?

Erick Jacobsen: I will open up the bylaws. While I'm searching that, I think that's the case, or I was told that that was the case so I'll check. And if not, that's maybe something we want to clarify, because it's been something the Speaker has done for years. The website says, the way the website words it is, "steps to success. Consider each of the following prior to submitting a new piece of legislation to get it on the floor faster and produce better results. Have you met the Senate Speaker? Have you contacted the individuals or organizations that would be affected and does your goal require a bill?" So are we all comfortable with that wording? Okay. So, are we all in agreement about the strongly encouraged language on the form?

Dylan Bianchi: I just have a question. like the speaker can't like stop someone from submitting a bill, right? Like these meetings are purely advisory.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, no, the speaker can't stop anyone from doing anything.

Dylan Bianchi: So what power does the speaker have over the agenda?

Erick Jacobsen: No, that's what, well, even though it's a requirement currently, 16 bills have been submitted any way, so it hasn't been like, it hasn't happened yet where anything like that has been a problem.

Dylan Bianchi: But like, is it possible for that to be a problem? Like again, like the speaker can't stop someone from submitting a bill, right? They can only provide their thoughts, their advice on it. And so this is in no way an impediment to submitting a bill.

Julia Tanner: For right now, especially with someone like Erick as speaker, it's not a problem. Like there is no power over stopping the legislation from getting on the agenda. And we've seen that because Erick hasn't met with some people and those pieces of legislation have still ended up on the agenda. And so I think, I mean, Aiden's going to speak on this too. Aiden and some other students' concern is not what's

currently happening, but what could happen of like this weird authoritarian speaker being like, no, you can't put your legislation on the agenda. I'm going to stop in any way possible because you didn't meet with me. And so it's like, it's trying to make up for something that may happen that could happen in the future.

Aiden Reeder: Yes that's practically it. It's A precautionary approach. I think there wasn't intended, but there can be something to be said about confirmation bias is like if there's any unintended consequences of, you know, going to submit a bill and saying, oh, you have to do this, suddenly it's like, oh, well, maybe I don't feel comfortable doing it, or like that delays the process of actually getting it in. There can be kind of a confirmation bias of like, oh, well, that never happened because we didn't know about it because I didn't, we didn't see it. That wasn't intended, but that can be something. But again, this is just precautionary. This is against someone who would seek to use this because there's not something against that. That's the intent of this.

Blair Yeh: It was just a question about the Senate Speaker's hours like office hours. Like, is it just like you drop in at whatever time room is it like you have this time available and people make like appointments? Because I feel like that would be like really good and easier for people if they're like if they really want to meet with the speaker to write legislation. And so they don't have to like personally make an appointment and like tell you like everything and you have to like, and it'll just be like more complicated and slow everything down in my opinion.

Erick Jacobsen: It's drop in.

Christina Coop: What's the origin story and intent of? having somebody tell you first about their proposed legislation?

Erick Jacobsen: It dates back a little before my time but I think it had to do with like making sure people understand like the processes and like sort of the standards that steering has so that we don't like end up with a situation where like someone brings a bill. It's not done correctly in some way and it's delayed because of that, but I'm not aware of any specific like event that led to it. There may have been, but I'm not familiar with any.

Christina Coop: So there's a process where they drop in their proposed legislation so that it gets on the agenda, that kind of thing?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, and then separately from that process, they're expected to meet with me, generally speaking.

Joseph Riggio: I will clarify that doesn't exist in our rules and bylaws in that way of a mandatory system and neither do I believe has it, at least when I was in last year. I don't believe that was the case. So this is more of a de facto in practice what Senate leadership has chosen to do rather than something that's defined in our bylaws and rules. So there's nothing against it. There's nothing for it.

Christina Coop: Are there other ways you guys could make sure that people understand the process and procedures and have some sort of acknowledgement that when they are submitting, they like acknowledge that they understand this is the process?

Erick Jacobsen: I think that's a good idea.

Pierce Wallbaum: Doesn't that already exist with like the Microsoft form when you submit your legislation? Like maybe you could add that in like read this part that goes over steering Senate and when we meet and that you should be there to speak when you book stuff like that, like basically what a speaker would tell you in person.

Erick Jacobsen: I know we have like some information on the website and stuff, but we don't necessarily, I don't think, have I acknowledged this or something, so we can definitely implement that. Are there any other thoughts on this?

Blair Yeh: I think what Pierce said is a good idea.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay so in that case Joseph can you change the question to like, this is strongly encouraged or then you must, and then implement the, I acknowledge that I will blah, blah, blah for all the steps and such. I acknowledge that I am familiar with the process of Senate steering and Senate legislation or something. OK, with that, we will move on, unless there's any final discussion. And Joseph, I haven't looked that closely, but I haven't seen anything yet other than like general like presiding over Senate stuff and just the fact that you know, anyone that isn't the speaker can't do anything unless the speaker says they can sort of thing. But I can give a closer look at it. So we'll move on to the speaker election question. And for this, while it is not, we legally cannot impose it upon you, I would kindly ask that if anyone is considering running for speaker, you leave the room so that you don't necessarily have an advantage on anyone who hasn't seen the question yet. Leaving the room does not mean that you have to run for speaker, but just if you're considering it. Okay. So last year we did three questions for the speaker position so this year I've drafted 3 questions. I think we should go through one by one. So read out the first question that I drafted. It is the chair's role to maintain neutrality, present objective context when necessary, and prioritize senators in the queue who have not yet spoken. Within this role and other aspects of serving as

speaker, how will you uplift and empower the quieter voices of the Senate and balance them with the louder, more engaged ones? What do we think about that as a question?

Isabelle Green: So it's an interesting phrasing. I would try and phrase it more neutrally as in how as speaker would you ensure balance in debate and ensure that everyone's voice is heard.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, so how will you ensure that there is balance for everyone's voice to be heard? Do you want to expand on that a little bit from now? Okay. It is the chair's role to maintain neutrality, present objective context when necessary, and prioritize senators in a queue who have not yet spoken. How will we ensure that there is balance for everyone's voice to be heard? Are we all happy with that? We can also come back if we feel like it's like the weakest question and we want to do a question on something else. The next question I drafted is, using one ASUW related example, describe your philosophy of leadership and how you deal with making difficult decisions under pressure from various stakeholders. Sort of goes to like the general like running of Senate and a lot of the things Speaker has to do generally.

Abigail Appleyard: We might want to avoid asking for like an ASUW specific example just because I worry that that would like discourage some people who maybe, you know, anyone who is in Senate leadership this year or a committee chair might feel like, well, I don't know if they're really talking about me being the type of person to run, you know, like, I think. it's perfectly fair to use any other leadership experience that you have. Maybe you could ask that it was something from college, not like pulling from high school. But yeah, I think I would just avoid anything that's going to limit the people who run inadvertently.

Erick Jacobsen: That makes sense. changed it to use an example if possible or if applicable.

Julia Tanner: This is small, but instead of using philosophy, maybe use leadership strategy or strategy of leadership.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay. Everyone happy with that? Okay, I'll reread the question. Describe your leadership strategy and how you deal with making difficult decisions under pressure from various stakeholders. Use an example of that. Good? Okay. Last question, outside of your duty of presenting and advocating for passed Senate legislation at the Board of Directors, your role as board liaison is very broad. How will you use it to bridge the gap between the Board and Senate, maintain the independence of the Senate branch, and involve the Senate in the advocacy work of board members? How do we feel about that?

Julia Tanner: I feel like its like a three parter that might need a significant amount time to answer. Is there a way to like scale it down and potentially?

Abigail Appleyard: Yeah I agree with Julia. I think maybe, you know, answering one of those parts or two, but just specifying that you don't have to answer all three could be good just because it's kind of a lot to get to in like 90 seconds.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, do we want to make it maybe like the main question is how will you use it to bridge the gap between your board between the board and Senate and then like such as involving senators and advocacy work or something along those lines? Or do we want to not offer a suggestion and just have them think about it themselves?

Julia Tanner: I liked what Abigil said about, like, you can pick one or two, like explain, or I don't know how to phrase it specifically, but like explain one or two of how you would.

Erick Jacobsen: So there'd be two questions you answer these, and then the third question is like, answer one of the following. How does everyone feel about that?

Julia Tanner: I think it should be like answering one of the following work.

Erick Jacobsen: Answer one of the following: how do you use your role to bridge the gap between the Board of Senate to how will you use the role to maintain the independence of the Senate or 3, how will you use the role to involve the Senate in boards advocacy work? So reading that out in full, outside of your duty of presenting and advocating for passed Senate legislation in the Board of Directors, your role as board liaison is very broad. Answer one of the following. 1, how will you use the role to bridge the gap between the board and Senate? 2, how will you use the role to maintain the independence of the Senate? Or 3, how will you use the role to involve Senate in boards advocacy work? Yeah. I still feel like that may be a lot. Do we want to maybe, if we feel like all three of these questions are important or something like that, we can like rearrange how we're doing questions but I think. It should be like everyone's answering the same questions because I think that makes it better for people to compare candidates and think about who they think would do the best job on things. So I guess my question is, do we think all three of those questions are important and do we think any of them should replace any of the previous questions?

Joseph Riggio: Just from what I'm reading over your shoulder, it seems like 3 and one are pretty...

Erick Jacobsen: We can also do like how you use the role to bridge the gap between the board and Senate while maintaining its independence. And that's one question that incorporates all three elements, I think. How do we feel? Is that still too much?

Jothsna Sundar: I feel like that was a concise way to state it, and I feel like if you can't answer it, then this job isn't for you.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, so the new suggestion is outside of your duty presenting and advocating. for past Senate legislation in the board of Directors, your role as board liaison is very broad. Answer, no. Just goes directly into how you use it, how you use the role, that role to bridge the gap between the board and Senate while maintaining its independence. Good. Okay. Are we happy with all three? Moving on to our next discussion item, June 2nd Senate meeting. June 2nd is the inauguration for the board, which includes as well, our Senate Speaker once they're elected. So it's in the middle of Senate. What we discussed was maybe like having a recess, like what we discussed among Senate leadership was like having a recess for the inauguration ceremony and then coming back afterwards and extending the meeting a little bit. Because that's also like the day that we have cake. So it'd be like a, like maybe an hour recess, I think.

Blair Yeh: For cake?

Erick Jacobsen: No for the inauguration. And then we'd have cake afterwards, but we might end later, like 8 instead of 7:30. Or 8:30.

Dylan Bianchi: Would it be so horrible for me and the senate speaker to leave Senate and come back? I will say like, I'm perfectly willing to like just go for the part, like the inauguration involves like a speaker and yeah, a bunch of stuff other than the actual like swearing in, right?

Erick Jacobsen: I think its also though about like participation from senators and getting everyone to like be there at the event. There's food. They might want that, like watching the event, seeing their new board get inaugurated. That might be cool.

Christina Coop: It is by invitation. Yeah, we have we have to put a cap on.

Blair Yeh: Wait for cake?

Erick Jacobsen: No, not for cake for the inauguration. There's going to be cake, but it won't be at the inauguration.

Ava Wahl: Point of information, what kind of cake?

Erick Jacobsen: I don't know. What was the cake last year? We told them to order the same one.

Dylan Bianchi: So it sounds like senators will not generally be able to go to the inauguration. Given that, like, even though I am a paid employee of Senate, I'm willing to miss most of the inauguration, like be there for the, I have to be there for and just go back and forth. The Senate, obviously, there's no Senate Speaker appointed yet to talk or speak on how they feel about it.

Erick Jacobsen: I mean, we can also come back to it on May 5th and like decide differently

Pierce Wallbaum: I was just going to agree this should probably be tabled especially now that we know it's by invitation only and that there's a cap on attendance. We probably shouldn't just be encouraging all the senators to go. And so, yeah, just probably tabling it until we know more

Joseph Riggio: I agree. I was going to point of information for Coop, is it just invite only or is there an RSVP form?

Christina Coop: We haven't got that far along in the planning committee beyond being like, we kind of need to make sure attendance doesn't exceed a certain amount because then we can't feed everybody.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any thoughts? If not we can move on.

Blair Yeh: How is like the whole senate Speaker elections going to go?

Erick Jacobsen: Oh that's a good question. Okay so for Senate Speaker elections and as well for Vice Speaker and PRO, it will start very similar to what we're used to. There will be 30 second introductions. And then there will be 3 questions instead of 1 for the speaker, 2 questions for the Vice Speaker and PRO. And. They will answer those. They'll have 90 seconds each. And then there will be a period of time. I don't think we've decided how long that will be. I'd have to check how long it was last year. There's a period of time for like endorsements where senators or members of the public can speak in favor of a candidate or multiple candidates. They cannot speak against a candidate. They can only speak in favor of a candidate. And that is anonymous on the minutes, just put it as a senator or a member of the public, and we ask the candidates to leave. And then we get to the voting and then the person comes back. We make sure the IRV is done correctly so we don't do what we did three years ago and say that someone got a job and they didn't. And then we announce.

Pierce Wallbaum: Also last year with GAVEL chair. But I was just going to ask, so did you say that there was two or three questions?

Erick Jacobsen: Three questions for Speaker, two for Vice Speaker and PRO. And then one question for all the committee chairs

Blair Yeh: When are the questions going to be available to review?

Erick Jacobsen: When is the premeeting email going out? I'll send you the questions and then you include it in the pre meeting email and we add it to the agenda then just so that everyone gets it all at the same time. OK, so that's what we'll do, and it'll go out tonight, and then we'll decide next meeting, Vice Speaker and PRO questions. And maybe, hopefully, we can get to some of the Committee Chair questions as well. Thank you to those of you who have submitted questions already. If you have not, then please do. Just Teams them to me. We'll move on quickly to steering bonding

Julia Tanner: Yes okay, so the when2meet there wasn't a single time that we would all be available. I think two people were able to attend if we did it on this Sunday, I believe. So I'm going to resend out another one, I guess, like this next week or the week after. But I just wanted to solidify what we were doing. And so it sounded like a resounding, like, card games again, right? So I just wanted to hear, like, from each person, if that's actually what they want to do of like just card games and hang out and food again. Or if we want to do something else, because I'm fine doing that. It's been fun.

Erick Jacobsen: Due to time I'll say does anyone have a problem with that again?

Blair Yeh: I'm most likely going to bake so does anyone have any allergies?

Dylan Bianchi: Please don't put grass pollen in anything.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Joseph Riggio: Speedy for the announcements. May 1st everybody, McMahon Hall is putting on a huge picnic and Terrace Garden movie night, 6 to 10 P.m. So you can pop in, say hi. There'll be s'mores. We have an electric s'more burner from UW Dining. It's going to be awesome. If you come between 7 and 8 p.m. you might be able to get some smores.

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Blair Yeh seconds

Approved 4-2-0

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
