



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

May The Forth Be With You 2026

HUB 307

4:00 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* | E

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

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 4-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

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

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the Speaker's report. I did have some things to tell you that I wrote down. But while I find that, we did have the board bylaws retreat on Saturday. So that's what I did all Saturday. And there were a lot of things that got discussed and implemented. It hasn't officially passed yet because there will be a vote, there will be a bill coming to board on Thursday. So if you didn't get a chance to go, you can still make your voice heard or still have me say something on your behalf. Thank you, Collin, for being there. I think we had a couple senators there, which was really cool. Pierce was there too. Yes. Thank you, Pierce, for being there as well. We had cool people there. I thought it was cool. If you're interested in what was passed, it'll be in my leadership report for tomorrow, and I'll have a link to a document where I summarize literally every single thing. Okay, and then I did want to talk briefly on, I know sometimes we won't have many committee meetings for the rest of the year, unfortunately but when we do, I know sometimes it can get tough managing tough conversations, and I know for some bills there have been some tough conversations. So I really encourage maintaining Robert's Rules and making sure everyone is speaking to the bill and not to the people speaking on the bill either. So just a nice conversation with decorum directed at the bill itself and whether Senate should pass it and how it should be passed out. If you ever need support with dealing with things like that, please let me know. I think that was all I had so we will move on to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hello everyone, yay I did Senate attendance notifications. So no one's deactivated because of attendance this week. So, or last week. Congratulations. So remind your senators and your committees to check their emails, see if they got an attendance notice. These are very bureaucratic notices, meaning I just input it on a spreadsheet and I just look and see if it has the big giant X that your unexcused absence, and then you're on an email list. And so there's ways to prove that you were there and present if you had a proxy, but for some reason it didn't go through, you can just let me know. Or your committee, if we have committee meetings, your committee chair can also vouch for senators that they were there during committee. Same with saving records of votes that went through. Quorum vote does not count. We don't have quorum vote count as the attendance vote because people could hypothetically

immediately leave after the meeting quorum vote. The goal is to have people there for the entire meeting to represent their constituents when they're voting on bills and legislation so, and other matters like elections, which I think we'll mention that later. We have a whole discussion item on, but I'm quite excited for tomorrow's elections. We'll be doing Vice Speaker and Pro nominations tomorrow as well. I don't have really any updates for GAVEL Committee other than we're working on our annual report. A lot of different pieces of legislation has been on the move and working. Kavi and I met with the Counseling Center today to talk about R-31-4 to fund the Counseling Center. I know Addison has been hard at work for the Okanagan Charter. Detlef has been trying to work with American Indian Student Association or Student Commission on the smudging bill. So other than that. Liaison report forms were due on May 1st. If you haven't submitted your liaison report form, even if you're in a committee that hasn't convened or if there hasn't been much going on in the month of April, still submit the report so I have a record. They were due on May 1st. I've reached out to everybody who hasn't filled it out yet. But other than that, that's all I have.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Hello everyone, I hope you're enjoying the sun and the flowers. Please, I just texted, or not texted, but I just sent a message in the steering chat if you could like one of the messages when we're planning like the last bonding event of the year. One is for the 16th, one is for the 17th. So yeah, just like one of them and whichever message gets the most likes, that's the day that we'll have bonding, which is, will be next weekend, I think, if I can do math right. Yeah. And then if you have any recommendations, and this goes for everyone in the room, if you have any recommendations for changes to the website, just let me or anyone in leadership know as we continue to like build a wish list for next year and there are things that we can do right now. So yeah, just let me know and have a great week.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Brendan Chang: Hello. May the fourth be with you. Keep watch for the revenge of the fifth tomorrow. Your word, I thought would be fitting, this week will be Padawan. A learner or apprentice who would actually be training growing preparing skills. They say Jedi, but you can also, it's translatable to leader.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on now to the approval of the minutes.

Recess 4:08 pm

Reconvened 4:13 pm

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Joseph Riggio seconds

Approved 4-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: We're moving on to proposals. Our first proposal is OA-32-7, an organic act to amend the responsibilities of the steering committee and officially establish parliamentary caucuses. We will not have you read it again, Francisco, but if you would like to summarize it or start us off with anything you'd like, the time is yours.

Francisco Dojenia: My first concern is the language that was discussed to be amended out is no longer on the bill itself, and so I'm concerned because we,

Erick Jacobsen: It was amended out, the vote passed.

Francisco Dojenia: Oh, after I let, oh, that's so cool. OK, well, that brings up to a broader concern about, I know I'm reading the rules and it says, like, yeah, the OAs can be amended by the steering committee. But, and you can say that senators can readmit the language back into the legislation, but this differs from other committees and how other legislation works, because rather than suggest to this broader Senate as a whole that the language should be removed. You're placing the responsibility of the senators to place it back in to the legislation rather than have the senators approve the amendment itself for it to be removed in the first place. So unlike other committee suggestions, because although it only is in regards to OAs, I think it would be important that any other legislation that comes through the Senate, through the steering committee, should be a suggestion as an amendment, rather than actually removed in the legislation itself.

Erick Jacobsen: We did discuss as leadership and we also thought it was kind of weird that organic act amendments by steering in committee are different from any other legislation amendments in any other committee. So as part of the like annual bylaws

and rules review that. Leadership does, we also we did discuss removing that provision and making it a suggested like in any other committee. That is also something that could theoretically be added into this OA, but I just wanted to throw that out there. Are there any questions or comments at this time?

Abigail Appleyard: Hi, this is, I wrote notes from last meeting so it's possible these won't make as much sense as I think they would have at the time, but I know we talked a bit about, or the term objectivity is used in the bill, specifically, I think saying that, you know, we're not being objective, but I was just wondering like, if there were specific examples of discussions in steering where we were not being objective about the quality of the bill as like a measure of if it should go to the floor. I understand that, like, I feel like a lot of times, you know, stuff comes in the steering that might be controversial. And, you know, the more controversial a bill is, the more you want to scrutinize whether something is being factually accurate or not. So I was just wondering if there were specific discussions or comments that were not objective to the quality of the bill's writing and fact checking.

Francisco Dojenia: I don't have a specific example and I'm not saying that any of you aren't objective when it comes to reviewing legislation. And it does say on line 76 that speaker will provide an objective review, but that's just like a given because like what the speaker should do and like any rules or regulations that we have. It's to ensure that future people don't. like disregard or like have actually have an objective with you. It's not. I don't have a specific example because I don't think any of you have done that, but it's just to make sure that it actually is in the future. Jaden, did you have your hand up?

Jayden Kim: I was just going to briefly mention that steering is granted certain powers of oversight, I believe, is what it says in the bylaws. So I guess it would have makes, I would just like to put it on that it kind of makes sense they have the ability to make edits to organic acts, which concern the organization of Senate itself.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, and adding on to that, the, I think the specific language of the powers of Oversight within steering is from a time where we used to have an Oversight Committee. And this committee was tasked with the oversight of not just Senate, but ASUW as a whole, and those powers of oversight were moved to the steering. And so that's where that line comes from, is that the Committee on steering isn't just like the people who make the agenda and the people who take a first look at bills. We are also the Oversight Committee of the Senate in many ways, which is not to suggest that Senate as a body doesn't have oversight powers, which it does. It does have more, but some of them are vested in the steering committee, such as requests for information, we can do that at any time and things like that.

Joseph Riggio: Just a quick note. I think its important for us to look at our bylaws and current governing documents obviously, to look at, you know, what the steering committee is empowered to do and which, you know, oversight has become a part of it. But we also need to consider what steering should be for the future as well. I resonate with that. And so, you know, the language in here can change. I mean, these organic acts, we can amend the bylaws and our rules specifically for Senate for this purpose. So if we need to amend addition, take more care if we decide to move forward with the organic act and push the Senate, which I highly encourage we do, even if we disagree with a lot, or if we have agreements or disagreements, I think Senate should still see it. But at the same time, thinking about all the possible language changes that would need to happen to successfully implement something like this without confusion for next year, is important. So if we need to clarify, like in the steering committee's description about oversight and then who would then have oversight powers at that point and like thinking about those things as well, because I'm not sure if the bill this bill as written adequately addresses that, but it is something we need to think about as this bill.

Julia Tanner: Yeah so for lines 43-47, it's the last whereas clause before the therefore be it enacted, can you explain more about how you came to the conclusions presented in this clause and intentions of including it? Well, intentions are obvious, but just explain a little bit about more how you came to these conclusions.

Francisco Dojenia: Yeah, about like dying in committee and pigeonholing and stuff like that?

Julia Tanner: It's the one that says the lack of independently organized parliamentary legislative caucuses besides Hall Caucus.

Francisco Dojenia: Yeah, we all know that like Hall Caucus is the most organized set of senators in the Senate and given the fact that they are like passed, like present a lot of legislation to the Senate I think some cases their ability to organize on behalf of their constituents and their constituent group. And if we had something similar with that, like Greek life or if there was like environmental sustainability, all these other senators that represent like similar constituencies, I think. If they're able to work more closely together, then they could present similar kinds of legislation in the same organization's capacity, but it, you can say this is an inference, but based on how like caucuses work in the Senate and like at other levels of government, I think this could be reasonable to expect if it were implemented in the student Senate.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, just first of all with regards to the clauses that would kind of create an ability of steering to express opinions, think particularly through majority and minority opinions, my concern there is just that this would institutionalize steering being

a subjective or opinion-making body, which I don't think is a good move. But I think if people perceive the problem of steering, imposing their opinions on Senate, which is a perception I disagree with, but I can understand, I don't think the solution is just to then build those opinions into the system. I think it just kind of institutionalizes the problem and will probably just lead to further frustration with steering. I guess, like, personally, my approach is always that, you know, there are bills I heavily disagree with that I want to be heavily critical of on the floor that I just don't comment on in steering because they're perfectly well written. You know, Erick's WUE bill, for instance, I kind of laid into on the floor, but in steering, I don't even know if I commented on it just because I was like, oh, you know, it's an Erick bill, it was well written. Side note on the caucus thing, I was wondering, have you spoken to anyone in Greek life or any environmental groups or anything like that to see if they want to start the caucus or if they have not started up a caucus at this point?

Francisco Dojenia: No, I've not reached out to them and we're not forcing caucuses to like exist, but it's more of a suggestion in the last like third, like the last that clauses.

Erick Jacobsen: I will say Greek life, well, they don't call anything a caucus. The Pan-Hellenic senators do have like a monthly or quarterly meeting or something. So it depends on like what we're defining as a caucus because Hall caucus is only a caucus called one. Like it has no recognition as a caucus in any practical sense beyond that. So that is something to keep in mind that there is like regular Greek life meetings, but it's not like labeled caucus.

Abigail Appleyard: Yeah, this is kind of another comment on kind of just the caucus idea in general. I don't think that's a bad idea at all if people want to do that on their own time. But I guess, again, this is me remembering from our discussion last week, but it sounds like this is something that would take out time during Senate. And I just don't know how practical that is because as I think I can confidently say I'm probably the smallest committee or the off campus is the smallest committee. Like we oftentimes probably don't have enough people to make quorum anyway. And I think like, you know, we've seen with the constitutional restructuring committee and stuff, like having members pulled away for that already affected our quorum, like these people on that committee are most likely to show up to Senate to begin with. So I'm just not sure, like, if we have time to do that during Senate and how practical it would be. But again, I mean, sorry, that's more of a floor comment because that really doesn't have to do with the writing of the bill, so you got it, you got a quote from me there, Frisco of me saying my opinion, but yeah.

Brendan Chang: Yeah, I think my main question is whose job is tracking all these caucuses? Public Relations Officer is mentioned here, but I don't see a change in the

officer's job description. So, whose job is it going to be to track all the caucuses to maintain the caucuses just structure and, like, it's mentioned here in the application process of, like, what does that look like? But like, who's who's basically whose job is it to maintain it all?

Francisco Dojenia: That's a fair question. We could amend the job description of the Public Relations Officer to do that. I'd be open to that. And, like, they will, they will be listed on the website, so it's more clear which ones are a part of the application processes.

Brendan Chang: And how much time do you anticipate each week?

Francisco Dojenia: Well it depends on the amount of senators that want to formulate caucuses, so I don't think it could be. I don't know, I can't give an estimate because I don't know how many students would be interested in this.

Erick Jacobsen: I had a quick question and I'll go to Julia. Sort of a little bit related to what Abigail was saying, I noticed in Rule 15 that's added for parliamentary caucuses, it says meetings do not necessarily need to meet during Senate meetings. Is the intention that they could or would in some circumstances? And if so, how would that factor into the agenda?

Francisco Dojenia: Yeah that's the point I wanted to clarify because they don't need to meet in Senate. I would prefer that they don't actually, because the point that Abigail made, because that does take a lot of time into the actual agenda of the Senate. So some caucuses might be formalized and others aren't, because we can't restrict students and senators from coming together to try to enact and formulate policy, but this entire that clause is just trying to make it a more formalized process to make it more accessible to senators that might be interested.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm sorry I recognized you in the queue earlier did you have more to say?

Francisco Dojenia: I just wanted to clarify that, because they don't need they don't need to happen in Senate and like, honestly, they shouldn't, but they can if they wanted to.

Julia Tanner: I have a few things so I'm sorry if it's a bit scattered. But to Abigail's point and like this discussion that's been happening, meetings do not necessarily need to meet during Senate meetings. I would recommend that we change the language in this if you support the idea that like, meetings should not really happen during Senate

meetings, because the emphasis seems more on like actually happening, if that makes sense, during the meetings. And then with this, I wanted to cover the Greek Senator thing and then changing the Public Relations Officer job description. For the Greek senator like caucus, again, these are like these are voluntary caucuses. They're not mandatory or anything. But as Erick said, that there are already formalized organizations outside of the Senate. And so there is a little bit of a concern of like stepping on people's toes if a caucus were to be organized through Senate, that's like outside of the formalized processes in Greek life. And then there's also the fact that Greek life, or like, historically, we have struggled with Greek life senator attendance to Senate. And so I don't really see this caucus remaining much or retaining much attendance. So that's a concern again, because it's voluntary, that doesn't really factor into the bill as a whole. I just wanted to note that. And then with the job description changing, with the amount that I already do with like the busy work, that takes up a lot of my time of activating members. And then with the hopeful, like in my transition documents and going forward, the hope of more of an outreach role of public relations to get more representation, to get people that would actually fill those caucuses, so people that are concerned about the environment, about diversity, about all of this kind of stuff. I do think that adding more to the job description in regulating caucuses is not going to be the best because it's going to be refocusing the Public Relations Officer back onto internal things only and take away time from outreaching and making Senate and ASUW more relevant to the student body as a whole.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments?

Joseph Riggio: Considering the scope of some of the amendments that might be needed, I would, if we want to continue this discussion on this, great. I do want to recognize that there was other legislation in the queue from last week that we need to get to, if we need to table this or wait for the prime sponsor to bring back the amendments and I can work with you on that if you want, great. If we want to keep talking about it, great.

Erick Jacobsen: We do have 20 minutes until we have to move on from proposals.

Dylan Bianchi: Honestly, though I'm not like this bill's biggest fan to be frank. I do think we should probably just move it to Senate and let Senate handle this stuff. I think as far as like factual errors go, there's nothing really in the bill. And I think Senate is capable of kind of handling any substantial amendments that might need to happen. I'm also just cognizant of the kind of the climate right now around steering, you know, substantially changing bills. And so I think it might be good to just move this to Senate, let Senate handle it on the floor.

Erick Jacobsen: And if anyone wants to leave any comments that can be gotten back to on the floor, if you'd prefer that over like making an amendment in steering, that is also something you can do even outside of the meeting.

Abigail Appleyard moves to approve OA-32-07

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: Our next item is R-32-15 A Resolution in Support of Establishing Departmental or College Student Advisory Councils. This bill is sponsored by Joseph. Would you like to read it out loud for us?

Joseph Riggio reads [R-32-15 A Resolution In Support of Establishing Departmental or College Student Advisory Councils](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like to provide any additional context?

Joseph Riggio: So this is expanding on an organic act passed last year also sponsored by me, that allowed, or that explicitly said that student advisory boards and student advisory councils can hold a designated seats in Senate. I was really hoping to kick off this initiative in aAutumn Quarter. Got really busy with the Health Fee and a bunch of other stuff, so I'm doing it now. I made sure to get a lot of different co-sponsors as well to carry this forward past graduation because I will no longer be as contactable as the prime sponsor. But I felt that this is an important initiative, especially given budget uncertainties, recent cuts, departmental advisors shifting, and the RSO fees that are happening and the engineering fees and fines. I think that we should be holding our both our faculty, administrative or administrative faculty and departments and the colleges accountable and student voices should be further developed in those areas.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions or comments on this bill?

Pierce Wallbaum: I just want to say I really support this bill. I think it does a great job at providing leadership opportunities for students and improving the transparency on the administrative side. My only little thing is that in the forwarding clause, Rania Hussein, their information is just up, so maybe that should be changed before, but other than that, I really do support this.

Francisco Dojenia: I also want to concur like because this is a good bill, it enhances like student advocacy in colleges and departments. I was wondering, Joseph, if you like.

reached out. I know you have the Foster Business School Undergraduate Business Council, yeah, but did you reach out to like because I know the College of Education has their own student association and the law school I don't know how many other like colleges have them but I was wondering if you reached out to these other student associations and how do you think they feel kind of be incorporated into whatever student advisory council is created with the department of the college?

Joseph Riggio: I'll answer your second question first. This bill has a lot of flexibility for them to just exist. That's why I like the differentiated capabilities of the departments, if we do have to go to the college level, just making sure if one already exists, great. Then we just work with that. Last year, I tried to reach out to every departmental advisory council or college board, and that included undergraduate business councils, that included the computer science and engineering, I don't think I got into contact with the law one. But either, so what didn't end up in this bill, because it's hard to prove and I would need a source for it, but take my word for it. Some of these college, the college level ones are fine, but the departmental ones, especially the ones that rely on RSOs either have disbanded, temporarily disbanded, or struggling to get membership, struggling to retain, which is why there's a lot of clauses in the that section about the department or the college needs to help the student advisory council with outreach. They need to help them exist. They need to help them with their application process. They can't just let them die and weather out because that's what's currently happening is some of those ones that already exist aren't as strong as they could be right now.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions or comments? I will go to Dylan and then I have a question.

Dylan Bianchi yields.

Erick Jacobsen: I was just wondering if you've looked into other colleges and is it like common for college, a lot of departments and colleges to not have any sort of formalized representation like this? Like are we the odd ones out here or is this like a systemic problem in a lot of places?

Joseph Riggio: I haven't looked at other universities. I was just focusing on the University of Washington experience because, to be fair, we are quite different than a lot of universities. We are a huge school. We have, again, 186 or more academic departments, each with a decent student population, some way more than others. I know like, for instance, the College of Engineering has their own structure and system for how they use student representation that looks very different. Another point of this bill is there's no like universal system. It's very, like a hands-off and kind of let them do their thing, or it is run by the executives. Like many of those college boards are run or

operated or chaired, not by students, but by the college, like the dean or the assistant dean or whoever is responsible for running that. And so this is trying to empower students more. I have not done benchmarking, so no.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into AAA

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on to R-32-16 A Resolution to Add Gluten Free Options to Dining Halls.

Ava Wahl reads [R-32-16 A Resolution to Add Gluten Free Options to Dining Halls](#)

Pierce Wallbaum: I just want to make a general comment. There's quite a few grammatical errors that I would like to see changed before this goes out. Mostly the inconsistency between capitalized letters. A lot of the letters after, whereas like the first letter is not capitalized and there's a lot where it is. I just think that should be changed. Also, there's a few words like menu in line 44, that should not be capitalized. Also, gluten in one of the whereas clauses shouldn't be capitalized. And like in line 7, whereas the limited food options for students, several of those words have capitalized letters, that is just not grammatically correct. So just things like that I think should definitely be altered before this goes through.

Erick Jacobsen: I also notice that there are a lot of whereas clauses that don't have citations, this was missing the one on this.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, and then the second thing was just the fact that there are a lot of blanket statements here that I don't know if they're entirely accurate. I'm not saying that I don't support this bill. I have a friend who is gluten-free and she ordered a gluten-free burger and it was not gluten-free and was sick for days. So I'm definitely in support of bringing attention to this and increasing the training for HFS student employees to be able to separate gluten and gluten-free options. But I think this could definitely be stronger with more citations.

Blair Yeh: Kind of the same thing as what Pierce said, I am really in support of this bill like once all the errors are fixed, I am gluten intolerant and the lack of gluten-free options in the dining halls are really unfortunate. But I did have one question. To get a gluten-free meal, would it cost extra money? Like at restaurants I know they like charge a few extra dollars for something if you request it to be gluten-free.

Erick Jacobsen: it is 4:50 I will allow Ava to answer that if she knows the answer.

Ava Wahl: Are you talking about like, would it be additional money, like just like in general restaurants? Are you talking about like specifically here, like will it cost more money for HFS to get more gluten free?

Blair Yeh: Like would they charge students extra, like do you know? Its fine if you don't since you're not like the prime sponsor.

Ava Wahl: Oh I don't know exactly but sometimes gluten-free options are gonna be more expensive, so it depends on what HFS has to do with it, but like, if there's different options and one is gluten-free, oftentimes that one is gonna be more expensive.

Blair Yeh: Which one are you guys pushing for? Do you know? Like, for no extra charge for students?

Ava Wahl: I would assume that Skylar was pushing for no extra charge just because that would be equitable, but I don't know if that's even feasible. So I just like, I don't know a lot about the context of this bill. I'm going to reach out to Skylar with a list of these concerns and explain to her, I guess, like also like explaining to her about steering and maybe like to come next week and I'll be there as well and I'll explain all these concerns and questions to Skylar as well.

Erick Jacobsen: It is 4:50 so we will move on to the approval of the Senate agenda or the floor agenda. And we are moving past bills.

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: So I moved up summary of new business to before elections so that we can at least get a chance to tell people what steering has approved. We do not have any forums tomorrow. The vast majority of our meeting, if not the entirety of our meeting, will be the speaker elections. We will have 90 seconds to answer each question per candidate, 30 seconds for an introduction, 30 seconds for a conclusion. We will also allow people to speak in favor of candidates for 30 seconds. And after we elect the Speaker we will move on to nominations for Vice Speaker and nominations for PRO. So we will decide those questions later in our discussion items and amend the agenda to reflect it. But this is what we're looking at now. We removed committees because on the off chance that we do get through all of this before 7:30, we discussed as leadership and I think the most efficient use of time is to go into old business rather than to go into committees and then come back like to immediately adjourn within minutes. So at least

getting some time to talk about bills and that sort of thing, if we even get that far, we most likely won't. Are there any questions or comments on the agenda?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on to discussion. Our first item of discussion is an executive session.

Executive session convened 4:53 pm

Reconvened 5:03 pm

Erick Jacobsen: We're back on the public record. We are back in our regularly scheduled meeting, and I'm going to have to ask some of you to leave again. Anyone who is interested in running for Vice Speaker, you could exit the room, please. Now, we are moving on to our discussion about the Vice Speaker questions. I have Joseph's drafts right here. The first one is "As Senate parliamentarian, what is your strategy to educate senators about the complexity of ASUW governing documents?" The second one, there will only be two, is "as the chair of GAVEL," I'm not reading that out, "as the chair of GAVEL, what is your leadership philosophy for efforts to enact student opinion and how will you ensure members feel supported in their work?" What are our thoughts on these questions? I see thumbs up. Many thumbs up. Does anyone have any specific thoughts? Like maybe wording it differently. Or not.

Blair Yeh: I think the second question is really well written.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you. Ok are there any other comments? If that's the case we'll keep it at that. Thank you, Joseph, for drafting these perfect questions.

Erick Jacobsen whistles to bring potential Vice Speaker candidates back to the room.

Erick: Jacobsen: Moving on to the pro questions. If anyone has even a passing interest in running for Public Relations Officer, and if you run into Pierce, let him know that we're moving on to PRO. Thank you. This is also two questions. The first one is "in dealing with new senators, the Public Relations Officer is split between recruitment and team

building. What approach will you take to ensuring recruitment reaches across departments, RSOs, and communities for equitable access to student advocacy?" But yeah, let's start with this one, because they're a bit lengthy. So are there any thoughts on this one?

Dylan Bianchi: Is it possible to like see the text of it

Dylan Bianchi looks at Erick Jacobsen's laptop awkwardly over his shoulder.

Abigail Appleyard: My only thought is that its good. I think like, that's a very important aspect of it is like the equity and stuff so I'm glad that that's being emphasized. I think, I know Erick, you're concerned about only your questions being edited so far, but it sounds like this was your question as well, so.

Erick Jacobsen: That's true I was not concerned though. I love being edited. I do not love being audited though. OK, we'll move on to the second question. "In addition to the Student Senate Instagram, tabling, posters, and emails", wait sorry. "In addition to the Student Senate Instagram, tabling, posters, and emails have been historically utilized to increase the exposure of the Student Senate to the student body. How do you intend on utilizing these tools, along with other marketing strategies, to increase student awareness of the Student Senate and ASUW in general? Is this similar to my question from last year?

Julia Tanner: I don't remember. It mentioned social media but I think it was like how to utilize Instagram specifically.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other thoughts on this question or like on either question?

Dylan Bianchi: This is kind of a wild proposal here. What if we had a third question? Ten seconds of speaking time that was just asking candidates to name like a fun bonding thing for all of Senate. I know, I'm like kind of going out of limb here.

Erick Jacobsen: It is a departure from our original structure, but I don't necessarily mind it if we like it.

Abigail Appleyard: I'd like to propose a fourth question about how you'll get steering members to fill out When2Meets.

Brendan Chang: Y'all are so mean.

Erick Jacobsen: We're in a silly goofy mood today.

Dylan Bianchi: Can I propose language? What is a fun bonding activity for all of the Senate?

Erick Jacobsen: Would we like to do something like a 10 second thing for Vice Speaker as well?

Dylan Bianchi: I mean, no offense to Joseph, I just feel like, Vice Speaker is, if I say more serious, it's like, if I say less fun then I'm offending Joseph. It's not as much of a clear.

Erick Jacobsen: Just say both, more serious and less fun then you're offending everyone.

Dylan Bianchi: It just felt like a fun one.

Erick Jacobsen: We're going to move on to announcements and public comment.

Julia Tanner moves to go back to proposals.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 6-0-0

PROPOSALS II

Erick Jacobsen: We are back into R-32-16 but it sounds like there are a lot of things we wanted to have cleared up with the sponsors. Are there any motions on that?

Dylan Bianchi moves to table R-32-16 for a week.

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on to R-32-17 A Resolution Guaranteeing Transparency and Agency Regarding AI use and Investment.

Dylan Bianchi: given that we have like lots of proposals and the sponsor is not here, I'm going to recommend also tabling this for one week.

Dylan Bianchi moves to table for a week

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: moving on to R-32-18 A Resolution to Integrate Major Entrance Advising to A&O.

Ava Wahl reads [R-32-18 A Resolution to Integrate Major Entrance Advising to A&O](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Alright are there any questions or comments on this bill?

Joseph Riggio: If you wouldn't mind sharing, if you happen to know, if not, that's okay but what were some experiences that you're aware of that you've heard of that sort of inspired this bill?

Ava Wahl: Ok yeah that's good. I don't know, I'm not super clear, considering that Isabelle is the person who did. So just for like context, Isabelle, she was the one that wrote the bill and then I co-sponsored it, and then I also helped her to like edit the language. That's essentially like what my position was in this circumstance. So yeah, she just expressed that like when she was applying to UW and then she heard from other people that basically like, there not being explicit instruction about the differences between different majors basically, and how to go through that process, like from the get go is really confusing. So because they didn't have information from like the very start communicated to them in like a stark manner, then it was really confusing later on and so she expressed concern that there wasn't adequate information about majors in A&O part one, so like the asynchronous aspect of it rather than just the synchronous aspect. Typically, the advisors will talk you through the importance and the process of picking your major, but there's a lot of students in those sessions, and it typically gets pretty busy, and it's not always very clear because it's a lot of information that has to be completed by just that one person. And so, it's about a thought based on, I think, their experiences and what they've heard from others, particularly people that are probably thinking about double majoring or triple majoring or unsure. They just think it's like a very confusing process if there isn't actually like an asynchronous kind of like plan or framework given to you up front.

Abigail Appleyard: Okay this is kind of just a clarification but when it says in the that clauses line 38 through 42, it says "the University of Washington upon mail notification of acceptance." Does that refer to like acceptance into your major or acceptance into the university?

Ava Wahl: Acceptance into the university. I'm gonna bet on that's what its about.

Pierce Wallbaum: Two things. The first, I want to say I really support this bill. This was actually our mock-up bill that was proposed by Isabelle during the resolution revolutions. Yeah. And we evolved it then and as a first-generation student who's triple majoring, I would have loved to see this as a freshman in my A&O modules. My second thing is just I want to fix some of the writing. The first phrase clause, A&O, there's spaces between the and symbol and the A and O, but then in other parts there's not. So if we could make that consistent. And then also line 25, first year does not have a hyphen, in another spot it does. So if we could make that consistent and I think that was it.

Blair Yeh: I guess this is like a personal experience comment. Like me and all my friends, we didn't have like any issue at all and it seemed pretty clear. But I guess for those like who like think that they really need the help, this would be really good to have.

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

Joseph Riggio moves to approve into General Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: And little head count. Currently, On Campus Affairs has no legislation. Off Campus Affairs has one piece of legislation. AAA and General Affairs now both have two, and restructuring. So I would probably prioritize On Campus and then Off Campus for these next bits of legislation.

Dylan Bianchi moves to table R-32-19 for a week.

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to R-32-20 A Resolution In Support of Ending UW's Starbucks contract. Thank you, Radcliffe, for your patience.

Radcliffe Cushman reads [R-32-20 A Resolution in Support of Ending UW's Starbucks Contract](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like to expand upon the bill in anyway?

Radcliffe Cushman: This has been written over about two months with support of UW Students Against Starbucks, which is the youth wing of SWU. So we have been collaborating with them. They could provide a lot of sources. They've been a very good

partner in this. Also, if you scroll down, I want to bring attention to Appendix A which just shows how people view Starbucks on campus. There's a lot of red there, and some gray, and very few green. Yeah.

Julia Tanner: I just wanted to comment on first how well this is written this is. It's a very good job and I also support the bill in full. Yeah, just wanted to comment.

Joseph Riggio: I'll start by saying great job. And I'll provide a little bit of critical feedback because surveying is sort of my thing. Tell 5 people to fill out the Starbucks survey. So. It looks like the survey that this is based off, so the Harry Bridges Labor Center. Obviously, I'm not worried about credibility in there, but it was approximately 120 survey responses were collected over six weeks, which I mean it's hard for me to apply that to the student body, even though I know amongst my friends anecdotally and like the sentiment is very much the same. I think people would largely want to see a local coffee shop. This doesn't discredit the bill in any way because Starbucks is well known for their labor violations and union busting practices. This has been a long conversation, but I do worry that, because they will scrutinize this bill to hell and that, that the inclusion of the appendix and the survey demographics might actually hurt our case if they look into it. But other than that, I think this was a very well-written bill, very well researched, and I'm very happy we're partnering with SAS.

Pierce Wallbaum: Can I ask Joseph a question?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah you may.

Pierce Wallbaum: Given what you just said, do you think maybe it would benefit if there was wording added saying, like just acknowledging that while this isn't a representative sample, a study has been done? Do you think that kind of helps that then?

Joseph Riggio: More transparency the better is is the good rule of thumb for ethical survey practices.

Pierce Wallbaum: Can I ask Radcliffe how you feel about adding that in the bill somewhere?

Radcliffe Cushman: Yeah, I had thought about it, but I wanna focus on getting it out, because it's coming to the end of the year, so yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions, comments, or motions on this one?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve R-32-20 into On Campus Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

ADJOURNMENT

Pierce Wallbaum moves to adjourn

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 4-2-0

Adjourned 5:32 pm.

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
