



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

5 May 2026

Location: HUB 250

CALL TO ORDER

5:02 pm

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.

APPROVAL OF SENATE AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the approval of the agenda, are there any motions? We would need to suspend the rules to approve today's agenda for the record.

Adam Ford: First I have a question. Why do we need to suspend the rules?

Erick Jacobsen: We took out committee meetings and moved summary of new business above elections so that we can still let y'all know what business passed through steering, and we can go straight into old business if we get any time at all for legislation.

Adam Ford moves to suspend the rules and approve the agenda as is

Collin Saywers seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jenna Miller: Hi everybody, I would like to say my cat does not like Erick more than me. She just likes to lick the product off his hair. The Queer Student Commission is having a craft night this Thursday from 4:30 to 6 in HUB 214. We're going to be making carabiners again. This is super cool. All of the things are going to be provided, and it'll be fun and gay, so you should go. Yeah. Thank you.

Reaa Dureja: My name is Reaa I've been here multiple times. I just want to address something that Erick said that was wrong, and I just want to clarify it. He said it was a sharp decline for voter turnout from last year to this year. I got the technical data today. It's 12.1% based on the technical data, so suck it, Erick. Moving on to the complaints. The judicial hearing is tomorrow at 5 p.m. These are all the complaints that are listed. Please reach out to Judicial or me if you have any questions or if you want to know more about it see me after Senate. I have all the copies of the complaint. It's publicly available so you all can see it. So if you want to, please let me know.

Zoe Love: Hi everyone, I'm Zoe Love, I'm the GPSS Policy Director and newly the GPSS VP of External Affairs elect. So I will be our student lobbyist next year at GPSS. And I just want to share more about my experience with the Washington Student Association again. Sorry, I've been here a bit but I really want to share a particular just like positive experience I've had. So at the Fall General Assembly, I was able to meet Ali, who is the Washington State University Graduate Student Lobbyist and during committee days, he really broke down some really complicated legislation for me about the defunct graduate student loan program at the state, which allowed me to lobby throughout the, or not lobby, advocate throughout the year at different points and really helped us build more strong information about how to help that move forward in the next couple of sessions. He also lobbied alongside Annika, our current VP of External Affairs, all year, and really helped us build a strong policy just strategy at GPSS. And I just want to share this experience because I got to work with him at Spring GA where we planned our next year and we will both be working together with the WSA next year, hopefully. And I am hitting the ground running with this role. I already have ideas with him and we've shared ideas about our organization. So just wanted to kind of talk about him and an experience I've had that shows how strong WSA can build relationships and help have

other people there in Olympia to help build strong policies for Huskies and students around the state. Thanks.

Maggie Schoenfeldt: Hey there, if y'all are interested in lobbying at the State legislature with UW Impact, we're holding a student advocate mixer tomorrow night at the UW Club from 6 to 7:30 p.m. This is a great way to get involved with state and federal advocacy. I've been here before talking about some of our action alerts so that's one of the responsibilities that we conduct. And yeah, we'll have drinks and snacks, so I hope y'all come on out.

Avery Kirscht: Hey everyone, I'll keep it quick. The undergraduate transfer student advocacy committee, I believe we have, yes. We're running a survey that we're hoping to get some responses to so that we can come share our research with all of you. So please, if you wouldn't mind taking a few minutes to fill it out, it's like 2 to 5, if that. So please, we'd really appreciate it. Thanks.

Aubrey Coulombe: Hey, everyone. My name is Aubrey Coulombe, and I am the VP of Philanthropy Assistant for Zeta Tau Alpha. And this Thursday, we are having a Raising Cane's feed, and it's like \$10 to buy into the feed. And with that, you get a slice of Texas toast, some chicken, and like a beverage of either a sweet tea or a lemonade. So I highly encourage you guys to pull up. The food's going to be nice and good. We're going to be serving on the median, which is in front of this new house. And yeah, please pull up. It will give funds towards our philanthropy, which is breast cancer education and awareness. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: We also have two things here that were sent to me. The UW Women's Center has an event taking a unified stance against human trafficking with King County Counselor Jorge Baron, and that is on Thursday, May 7th at 3:30 in Cunningham Hall. Then also the American Indian Student Commission is holding the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Relatives event panel and resource fair, and that is on May 16th from 10 AM to 1 PM at the Intellectual House so show up. Are there any other announcements?

FORUMS

NEW BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, with that we will move on to summary of New Business. As Jothisna said in her Clerk report, we approved 4 pieces of legislation through steering. So I will read their bill summaries and where they were referred. We do not have committee meetings today, though. OA-32-7, an Organic Act to Amend the Responsibilities of the Steering Committee and Officially Establish Parliamentary Caucuses. The bill summary is the Committee on Steering holds a large amount of responsibility and influence over the direction of the student Senate. To ensure senators and students have greater oversight over the steering committee's review of proposed legislation and to better organize specific student interest groups represented in the Senate, Student Senate, reforms to the steering committee's functions. Oh, sorry, there should be a comment here. To better organize specific student interest groups represented in the Student Senate, reforms to the steering committee's functions and the codification of parliamentary caucuses is being proposed. Next resolution is R-32-15. A Resolution in Support of Establishing Departmental or College Student Advisory Councils. Summary of this is, , this resolution calls for academic departments to create student advisory councils to foster spaces for student participation and departmental decisions. Departments are crucial for deciding how to allocate resources and budget to provide programs, resources, and advisor support to students, which is in jeopardy amid budget cuts across the university. Furthermore, students ought to participate in deciding departmental leadership hirings, courses offered within the department, and the general curriculum that faculty are trained to teach. Student advisory councils provide a direct advocacy pathway for students to engage in important decisions that impact students' educational outcomes. And this was referred to AAA. Next resolution is R-32-18 is a resolution to integrate major entrance advising to A&O. Bill summary is a resolution to integrate major entrance advising to the asynchronous online component of Advising and Orientation, A&O, in order to enhance academic preparedness, student options. And this was referred to General Affairs. And our next bill is R-32-20 and the bill summary, oh wait, the title is a Resolution in Support of Ending the UW Starbucks contract. And the bill summary is Starbucks as a prolific labor rights violator should not be a campus partner when local businesses could provide that service to UW students supporting the local economy and not a national labor rights violator. Thus the contract that UW has with Starbucks should end as it has in other universities around the country, and the UW should pursue partnerships with entities with fairer labor practices. And this bill, whoa, sorry. This bill was referred to On Campus Affairs.

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Erick Jacobsen: With that we will move on to Speaker nominations and elections which will be the main part of our meeting today. Okay, we move on to the nominations period and while we await our batteries, we will need you to speak into this microphone. So if you would like, if there are any nominations or any, if anyone wants to rescind their nominations, please come to the front.

Justin Amaral rescinds nomination

Kathleen Esnaurrizar rescinds nomination

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any nominations? With that, the nomination spirit is closed. Thank you. And we will move on to the Elections. So, if the candidates would like to please come to the front. It's good that we don't need the microphone just yet. If you could line up in order of nomination as it appears on this screen. While they figure out what order they need to go in, I will explain how this will work. We will go in order of nomination for 30 seconds for an introduction. We will go in reverse order for the first question, we will go in the original order again for the second question, reverse it for the third question, and go back to the original for the conclusion. There will be 30 seconds for the introduction and conclusion. There will be 90 seconds for each question per candidate. And at the end, we will have a period in which you may speak in favor of one or more candidates. And you will have 30 seconds each to deliver a statement. So we will start with the thirty-second introduction period, and we will start with Pierce. Whenever you're ready.

Pierce Wallbaum: Hello everybody, my name is Pierce Wallbaum. I use he/him pronouns. I am a second-year student, and I've been in Senate for two years. I am the Student Legal Services Outreach Coordinator, I am the Public Relations Officer intern, and I am also your General Affairs Committee Chair. Thank you so much.

Spencer Grubbs: Hi I'm Spencer Grubbs, I'm a second-year student here and I currently, I've been in the Senate for all of this year. I currently represent WashPIRG, which is a student advocacy organization here on campus, and through them I have experience advocating on behalf of student issues and directly lobbying the government in Olympia.

Avery Kirscht: Hi Everyone, my name is Avery Kirscht. I'm a third-year political science major. It's been my absolute pleasure serving with all of you this year, and I hope to continue that work next year as your speaker. Thank you.

Detlef Gerbing: Hey y'all, I'm Detlef Gerbing. I'm a first year studying political science and public policy. What I've done this year is I've been the AAA Vice Chair before going to the Chair of the Restructuring Committee. I've been a GAVEL member all year. I'm the Oliver Hall Hall Council Executive, so I'm on the executive board and the executive director. And fun fact on me, I'm also a tour guide on campus. So if you see me on campus, that's probably what I'm doing. Thank you

Ruby Santos: Hi everybody, my name is Ruby Santos. I'm a first year studying political science and economics. It's my first year in Senate and I've been serving this year as your vice chair of On-Campus Affairs and also been a part of the GAVEL Committee where I specialize in environmental policy and legislation. In my free time, you can typically find me on the UW Debate Team or studying with Asian American University.

Francisco Dojenia: Hello I'm Francisco Dojenia, he/him pronouns. I'm a graduate student earning my master's in teaching with an endorsement in history, and I earned my bachelor's degree in Education Communities and Organizations, and history. For five years, I served in ASUW in various positions, from a senator, a volunteer, and an unofficial advisor. And during that time, some of the positions I held were the Chair of the Oversight Committee of the Senate when it existed, the Director of Internal Policy and the Outreach Co-chair of the Elections Administration Committee. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Alright if you could stay up here. You will have 90 seconds if I figure out how to do that on this. A minute 30, right? Yes. Yeah, I know everything. You have 90 seconds for the first question which is, it is the chair's role to maintain neutrality, present objective context when necessary, and prioritize senators for the queue who have not yet spoken. How will you ensure that there is balance for everyone's voice to be heard?

Francisco Dojenia: Yeah I think the best answer to this question is already in this question. It's just prioritizing students who haven't spoken in the first part, because we definitely need that perspective, because a lot of the time our discussions and debate can become kind of repetitive, because when one student has a concern about a bill, then everyone else starts to say kind of the same thing, and that doesn't really go to further discussion or make the legislation more substantive or address the problem that's actually occurring. So if that ever does happen, which it kind of usually does a lot

in Senate sometimes, then I'd kind of nudge senators and remind them that you all can make amendments and you can work with the author if you're the person who has the most concern about it. But I think if we are able to at least propose a solution to the problem that we all identified, then we'll be able to actually get more to the substance of it, actually address what is the main problem of the bill and hopefully move it forward. Because I think that every bill has substance and generally tries to make the life of students better, but it kind of the nooks and crannies of it. So if we can actually change the language and make it something that we can all agree upon, and that's the direction we should go towards.

Ruby Santos: It's my firm belief that in order to create a space where everyone's voice is heard, you must first create a space where everyone feels safe to speak. In order to prioritize senators in the queue, you must have senators who are speaking on the floor. That's why I believe that one of the most important characteristics in a Senate Speaker is a Senate Speaker who is approachable. I want all senators, especially first years and new senators, to feel like they have a place where they can write their own legislation and are comfortable to speak on the floor. And that begins with welcoming office hours where they can go to seek help for drafting legislation and asking basic questions about how Senate works. That welcoming atmosphere extends past the speaker's office hours and onto the Senate floor as well. To ensure more balance, I want to create an environment where senators who are more reserved or shy can still ask questions and feel comfortable speaking on the floor. I think that the Senate Speaker is the first person to really set the tone for a Senate session. I was class president for the second largest high school in Washington State for three years, and we had extremely large student council meetings. One of my main priorities when leading those meetings was making sure that new students and younger students were comfortable speaking out and being a part of that process. I want to echo those same principles in our Senate session next year as your speaker. Thank you.

Detlef Gerbing: Alright so I think what makes Senate truly unique is that it's a space where we can all share our unique opinions regarding, I mean, through comments, legislature, or through debates. And I think what really matters is, like, to echo the point just made, the safety is ultimately the most important thing. I think we have a lot of great precedence with Erick through actually monitoring that conversation, through moderating that discussion as it relates to, I think, the time limits and ensuring that senators who have spoken a lot kind of have like a shorter time limit on particularly

divisive issues, as well as ultimately prioritizing senators who have not spoken are great examples I would like to employ as a speaker of the Senate. But I also like to kind of expand on our safety ability. So when it comes to negating and minimizing negative comments, ensuring that pointed comments and interruptive comments are minimized so that students can actually have the ability to speak their mind safely and comfortably, which is ultimately what will lead to the most productive Senate possible. I've kind of had experience doing this as the restructuring chair because we have navigated some pretty divisive issues and recognizing the floor, upholding the rules, as well as making sure that everyone feels safe to share what could be controversial opinions considering the nature of restructuring reform is vital and something I have practiced and am willing to do on the floor. As it relates to hall council as well, we've navigated a ton of different kind of brainstorming ideas. So when it comes through brainstorming, you again get a lot of diverse ideas and those are all necessary to formulate a good opinion, but ultimately you have to ensure those are protected. And that's something I will be sure to work towards in Senate as your Senate Speaker. Ultimately, safety and inclusivity is the goal of the Senate Speaker and something I will uphold. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like me to repeat the question? Alright, 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. How will you ensure that there is balance for everyone's voice to be heard?

Avery Kirscht: Well there's no doubting the importance of the work that we do here in Senate. As the sole opinion body, as the sole opinion making body for ASUW, we need to have the discussions that are full and that are truthful and where everyone does have the ability to speak. Though I think all too often, and we've all been a victim of it even just this year, all too often we rush through bills and discussions aren't had to the extent that they need to be. So senators are left uneducated about bills. So what I would propose is that we add an objection to previous motion or previous question motions so that when there are still hands in the queue, when there are still people on the list who haven't spoken, they have an opportunity to discuss what's really important to them and to their constituents. I think further, when senators are implicated in their colleagues' comments, they need to have at least 30 seconds to respond to those comments directly, rather than having to wait behind a queue of people to address the issue after the moment has passed. Thank you.

Spencer Grubbs: Yeah I'd really like to echo Ruby's sentiment. I think it is incredibly important, that Senate is a welcoming environment and that people feel comfortable being able to speak up. But how, once everybody is comfortable in raising their hands and getting ready to speak up, how does you, how do you actually manage the people who are raising their hands? And I think that the easiest way to, or the most, the best way to do that is through acknowledgement delegation. So first of all, calling out everybody as their hands come up in a way that is balancing the priorities of the queue, and then also calling out and delegating, making sure that those are actually written down, and making sure that the queue is actually acknowledged as something that is meant to be gone through.

Erick Jacobsen: All righty. Would you like me to repeat the question? 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. How will you ensure that there is balance for everyone's voice to be heard?

Pierce Wallbaum: In my experience as the General Affairs committee chair, I strive to encourage communication and dialogue between senators, especially those who haven't spoken yet or who I know are less likely to speak. This has been incredibly important in making sure that our conversations reflect the full diversity of perspectives that we have in this room. And so as speaker, I'd like to bring the same approach by working closely with Senate leadership to maintain a clear and structured queue and prioritize senators who haven't spoken. I think the more insight and opinions that legislation gets, the better and more powerful it becomes outside of Senate. And so making sure that everyone has the same opportunities to speak on legislation is a necessity for our organization. Also, being neutral is crucial in the role of speaker. When my committee has legislation, my goal is to remain neutral by guiding conversations and only intervening to add context or answer questions. And so taking this experience, I want to enforce Robert's Rules, parliamentary procedure, and if needed, use tools such as setting firm time limits to help create a space where everyone feels comfortable enough to speak, but where few people aren't dominating the conversation. So ultimately, I want to create an environment that is structured and fair, and I'll work towards this goal, along with Senate leadership, to make sure that we can produce the best work that we can. Thank you so much.

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the second question, describe your leadership strategy and how you deal with making difficult decisions under pressure from various stakeholders. Use an example if applicable.

Pierce Wallbaum: My leadership strategy is centered on facilitating and supporting senators. I want to make sure that all senators feel heard and respected, and doing this requires structure and organization. So when making difficult decisions, I ground myself in the decision and try to consider as many perspectives as I can. My intention is always what best supports a fair and equitable process that accurately represents students' opinions rather than any individual preferences. This means actively listening to different viewpoints and ideas and finding a common ground. Because even when we don't all agree, it's important that everyone understands how and why a decision is made. So, for example, in situations where competing voices are happening on a piece of legislation, I prioritize making space for everyone's voice to be heard while keeping us on track so that the conversation can keep moving forward. I think open communication is the most important tool that we can use in this room and is something that can always be improved by setting clear standards and expectations, as well as making sure that dialogue stays respectful and productive so that everyone feels comfortable participating. Thank you so much

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is describe your leadership strategy and how you deal with making difficult decisions under pressure from various stakeholders. Use an example if applicable.

Spencer Grubbs: Yeah so my leadership strategy comes in in three steps. So first, the first layer and the most basic layer and the fundamental layer is listen to the opinions of all of the stakeholders who are actually involved and engaged in the discussion. What are the opinions, what are the perspectives, and what is the general consensus as it stands? If that is not able to move and facilitating that discussion is not able to come to a conclusion, and move on to the next layer, which has to do with, well, what does my role tell me about how to move this forward? What are the specific things that are what are the specific things that are defined within my capabilities in a normative sense of what are the official obligations that I have. And then if needed and on specific circumstances, especially things that have to do with things that are not specifically content, like the content of legislation, I then move on to like what are my personal

beliefs. But that is only the last thing and only in specific circumstances that do not have to do with the content of legislation itself.

Avery Kirscht: The best leaders I've ever had are three things. First, they're engaged with their teammates. That means they're visible, they're personable, they want to talk to you, and they know you. Second, they are invested in success of the team and the people on it, not only professionally, but also they want those people to build and win. personally. And lastly, they're consistent with their expectations. They have the same expectations of you that they have of themselves, and they never, never break that. As your speaker, those would be the three values that I would lead with. My sole goal as speaker would be to ensure your success and remove any blockers that are hampering you from being successful, be it in Senate, in school, whatever it is, I want to help you. That is my job, and that is what I will do.

Detlef Gerbing: So when it comes to making decisions, difficult decisions in a timely manner with regard to stakeholders, I can't help but think of my time in GAVEL and specifically two occasions I have had in GAVEL where I've had to kind of weigh the opinion against what admin is saying and see where I can meet in the middle. The first of which comes with the Cascade Lane Bill, which Addison currently has, but I worked with the Board of Regents on originally. In my meetings with the Board of Regents, I met with Tyler Lang, who kind of represented the admin side, and we had this strict kind of UW budget that we couldn't really move around, but I was working with him, working with the bill had allowed me to work within, and kind of work to see where I can further put the student opinion at, which ultimately kind of what I will do as speaker. I will be sure that the student opinion at the base of all my decisions, the legislation at the base of all my decisions. And secondly, my work with Lexus Nexus and Westlaw on that bill to cut ties with them. When Erick and I met with UW Law Libraries and UW Libraries, again, we were at a very hard standstill where it came to the libraries could not really move on their position, but we still wanted to further the objective of the bill, objective of the Student Senate. And I had to, we both had to work together to kind of figure out how we could further this bill's idea of like ensuring student safety, digital safety on campus. And we did achieve that goal by working with the privacy office. But it goes to show ultimately that whenever there's a big decision, whenever there's stakeholders involved, whenever it comes to advocacy or anything of that sort, I will always land on the side of the students. I will always be there to help further any opinions we have based in legislation, based in opinion. And I will always do the best I can to ensure that we

represent that difficult decisions are grounded in our fundamental opinions. And thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like me to repeat the question? Our question is, describe your leadership strategy and how you deal with making difficult decisions under pressure from various stakeholders. Use an example if applicable.

Ruby Santos: While the role that I'm running for today is Senate speaker, I would describe my own personal leadership style as revolving around listening rather than speaking. And I would like to apply the same thing here in Senate. I believe the role of the Senate Speaker is truly about facilitation. As A collective, all of you make up UW student opinion. And my role as a Senate Speaker is then to reflect that student opinion back to Board and back to the University of Washington's administration, kind of like a big funnel. Now, I think of myself as a pretty analytical and level-headed person so I just have to ask, did anybody here in high school take AP Government and Politics? United States government politics? Yeah, so we're going to take a little trip down memory lane that I think will help accurately describe my leadership style. Do you remember the trustee and delegate models of representation? Well, according to Heimler's History, they talked about how the trustee model uses their own best judgment to make decisions, even if it goes against their constituents' wishes whereas, under the delegate model, they vote according to the direct will of their constituents. As speaker, I would like to lean to that delegate model from unit 4 of AP Gov. I want to actively listen to stakeholders like administration, GPSS, RSOs, and Board, while at the end of the day, still remaining loyal to my constituents, which are all of you, to accurately reflect that student opinion and the will of the Senate from this facilitatory position. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is describe your leadership strategy and how you deal with making difficult decisions under pressure from various stakeholders. Use an example if applicable.

Francisco Dojenia: When I was elected Director of Internal Policy, three years ago, my main responsibility was to interpret the Constitution along with the judicial committee. And over that summer, I realized that there was a concentration of power with the Board of Directors in comparison to the rest of the association. So I passed a board bill that established a task force on constitutional reform, which gathered the Student Senate, RCSA, the Judicial Committee, EAC, and a bunch of other stakeholders so we can actually delve into the political organization of our association to ensure that it is

equitable, that it does represent student interest, and it can adequately represent the democratic voice of the students on campus. And during my proposal, the Senate had a concern about the way I proposed that we change the Senate constituency, and so they talked to me, they reached out, we were able to formulate an opinion or a better proposal from their perspective. I had a few hours of a meeting that I had with the steering committee over a couple hours one night, and so the core of my leadership policy is to be a collaborator, to organize, because we need to have consent from the groups that we are reaching out to, the groups that we need to have a perspective on, because we're all here to work together. We're all here to represent student interests and making sure that we have consent from all the groups that we're supposed to be here to represent. And if there is a concern that they have, we can alter and change our proposal in the first place. So reaching out to all these groups, that's highly important to me.

Erick Jacobsen: Alright, yes stay up here. Our next question is 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. How will you use that role to bridge the gap between the Board and Senate while maintaining its independence?

Francisco Dojenia: I think emphasizing the word independence is highly important because as I believe Avery spoke before on how we are the official opinion making body of the association. And although we work with the Board of Directors, my position or the position of the speaker would be to represent all of your guys, really representing all of your guys' interests. Because the primacy of your opinions is more important than any perspective that I can have. Even though I have experience as being in the association for like 5 years now, I think representing, I know that representing all of your interests before my own is the responsibility of the speaker. I literally would speak on behalf of all of you. So making sure that we have a dialogue with the board of Directors, all of them are technically non-voting members of the Senate in the first place, besides the president who does have a voting seat, but already having that dialogue, encouraging them to come, encouraging them to actually comment on legislation before it even gets to them, so that we already know their perspective on the bill, and encouraging senators to show up to board meetings, encouraging the public to show up, and having your constituents possibly come along, because having that dialogue, it has been a bit icy between our two entities of the past couple of years, but I think my goal would be to bridge that gap by speaking on your behalf, by speaking on your proposals, by speaking

to senators. If we do have legislation or agenda items in the Board agenda that concern like environmental sustainability, then I reach out to our senators that represent those kinds of organizations because I need their opinion and look past, look on past resolutions. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: That is your time. Would you like me to repeat the question, Ruby? The question is 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. How will you use that role to bridge the gap between the Board and Senate while maintaining its independence?

Ruby Santos: I know that seniority is a big consideration when it comes to electing a Senate Speaker. And while this is only my first year in Senate, I believe that it is truly what I have done in that first year that makes me one of the ideal candidates for this position. Having someone newer to Senate as Speaker provides a unique perspective and insight, and I've been able to build a solid foundation still. With my work in GAVEL, I've learned how to navigate the complicated world that is implementing legislation in ASUW. But on top of the solid foundation, I'm also new enough not to let previous bias or history impact my ability to remain professional when acting with entities like the Board of Directors or GPSS. Bridging the gap circles back once more to my idea of approachability and patience that I brought up in that first question. Approachability and patience enable the gray area and broad tasks of the Senate Speaker to be a little more doable. I can also utilize my high school experience and previous areas to this position. For other aspects such as putting together the Senate budget, I can draw upon my time in 2024, I worked with the local school board and with my own school administration in order to learn about the budgeting and audit process. Additionally, my time in student government has allowed me to learn the ins and outs of academic constitutions and bylaws and how we can adhere to them. On top of that, I was captain for my high school speech and debate team and continue here on the UW Speech and Debate team. This practice has given me the skill set to communicate in a way that's direct and effective. Also, my perfectionist tendencies have made me aware to things in Senate that we can streamline such as our committee attendance process through the help of tech geniuses like Kavi. I'm excited to see not just how we can apply this motivation and happiness in Senate but also amplify it. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: That is your time. Detlef would you like me to repeat the question? Whenever you're ready.

Detlef Gerbing: So when I think of Board Liaison, I kind of break it into two parts in particular. The first of which is like an advocate for the Senate. So again, like I said in the previous point, the ultimate goal of the speaker is to kind of advocate for Senate. And Board is to me being an advocate for GAVEL, advocating for ASUW across an admin, across various RSOs and stakeholders, even the city of Seattle. Ultimately, my goal has been to represent student opinion in the best I can, the most honest way I can through grounding myself in legislation, through grounding myself through student opinion. And I think there's no better way to do that than on Board. That being said, though, ASUW, Senate is kind of only half of what can get really get us through the implementation process for policy, which is ultimately what we're all here for. So this brings me to the second half of what I was saying, where it matters that we work with Board. Board Liaison and Senate Speaker is this vessel between board and Senate. demystifying both entities, ensuring that ultimately there's visibility of board and Senate and Senate and board, and ensuring that, again, we are working together because we are ultimately two wings of the same bird. We can really achieve new heights if we're working together, we can achieve great policy goals that way. So ensuring that relations are public, that they're well-kept, communication is key. That kind of brings in the second half of the Board Liaison position is ultimately really the goal here, and yeah, thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Avery would you like me to repeat the question? The question is 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. How will you use that role to bridge the gap between the Board and Senate while maintaining its independence?

Avery Kirscht: That's a rather topical question. I don't need to tell you guys how divisive and difficult a year it's been between ASUW Board and Senate. Though, with a new Board comes new opportunities to build those partnerships back. And my confidence is buoyed by the fact that the president and vice president-elect on the trail stressed the importance of communication and transparency. And that work begins in Senate. It can be done really easily in two ways. The ASUW budget, absolutely 100% needs to be passed and approved by the Senate. Students deserve a voice in how their money is spent, and that is something that is achievable. Second, the executive hired positions on

the Board need to be approved and passed through Senate. Students also deserve a choice. Students deserve a voice on every position that we put on Board of Directors, not just those that we put on the ballot. These two things help achieve the mutual transparency and communication goals of Board and Senate. They have been long-term asks of Senate, and they are something that we can do in the next year. However, As much as I desire to work with Board and I sincerely hope this doesn't happen, if there is an attempt to go around Senate, Senate needs to be comfortable asserting itself. And as your speaker, I will do everything in my power to help you do so. Thank you.

Spencer Grubbs: Okay to keep things really short, I want to use my position as Board Liaison to Senate to empower, or sorry, the Senate Liaison to Board to empower Senate through transparent communication. That's my big idea. I want to make sure, or as somebody who has gotten to know many of the new members of board over the past couple of weeks, I want to be, I'm in a position to be able to hit the ground running and being able to reach out and work directly with members of the board to bring them to Senate and to give them, bring them to Senate regularly so that way they can keep Senate in the loop on important decisions and keep us informed so that way we can be informed when we are making decisions that impact the whole school and form student opinion.

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like me to repeat the question? The question is 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. How will you use that role to bridge the gap between the Board and Senate while maintaining its independence? You have 90 seconds whenever you're ready.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah I think this is a really good question to raise. I see being a Liaison as having two sides. On one side, it's my responsibility to clearly represent Senate to the Board and not just what we discussed or the outcomes of bills, but the different perspectives and context behind each piece of past legislation and why it matters to senators. Being the official student opinion making body, I would like to push all of your ideas and perspectives through the Board. On the other side, I'd be working closely with the board to bring relevant context back to Senate in a way that keeps senators informed and Boards decisions transparent. I've seen and heard the frustrations of many students who feel that there's a disconnect between Senate and the Board, and as Liaison, it is my job to make sure that you're all aware of the communication and

collaboration happening between the two bodies. I've really appreciated seeing the Board of Directors reports. This keeps senators informed about ASUW beyond Senate and encourages communication between board and Senate without compromising Senate autonomy. On top of that, I'll be frequently searching for new ways to collaborate with the Board, including inviting them to Senate to engage with senators in a way that builds trust and community in Senate while maintaining the independence of Senate. And maintaining the independence of Senate is key to our organization's democratic processes. Senate is a space that cannot be influenced or factored by external factors, and making sure that we remain grounded in representing students is always my top priority. Beyond this, consistency is something I'll also be pushing for. Strengthening communication is something that all of us would benefit from and this isn't to blur the lines between the two, but to make sure that we're all doing the best work that we can for UW students. Thank you so much.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Pierce. And you can stay up here for 30 seconds for your conclusion, whenever you're ready.

Pierce Wallbaum: Just to summarize my goals and priorities, I want to increase the transparency between board and Senate and push for more collaboration. I also would like to see more legislation happening next year, and I want Senate to be a place where everyone feels welcome and where they have a voice. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Spencer Grubbs: You guys have heard me talk too much all year in Senate so I'm just going to use my remaining time to shout out my other candidates. And I just want to say that I think that no matter who you guys choose, the Senate will be in good hands next year. Thank you and please consider ranking me.

Avery Kirscht: This is a big vote. And while I think I would do a very good job, I sincerely ask that you vote your conscience and choose the leader you believe will best lead you. I'll see you guys all next year either way. So I really look forward to working with you all in session 33. Thanks so much.

Detlef Gerbing: I just kind of want to address that, like I am a first year student, I am a young student, but I've been across a lot of A student entities, again, going from vice chairs to chair to working on steering, also engaging with our RSOs through GAVEL and things of that sort. I really do think that the youth brings a young perspective, a new perspective that could be necessary and towards saying, like looking objectively at

certain things, as well as ultimately bringing a ton, a ton of passion. I love serving ASUW. I love serving all of y'all's distinct voices, whether here or in GAVEL. Regardless, I am excited to be a servant for y'all next year. Thank you.

Ruby Santos: Kind of echoing Avery's sentiment, I have loved serving this year as vice chair for the On-Campus Affairs Committee and as a member on GAVEL. In one way or another, I do want to be back in this room. But with that said, if you're in need of a speaker who's level-headed, approachable, and up to date on her AP gov knowledge, I think you need to look no further. While I may lack in seniority, I can more than promise that I make up for it in patience, dedication, and integrity. Thank you for your time today.

Francisco Dojenia: Whomever you elect as speaker, they will be the 7th one I've worked with over my time in ASUW. And there are two qualities I've really identified with being a good speaker. One is competency and the other is advocacy. Because a competent speaker can know all the things about parliamentary procedure in the Senate in ASUW but if they don't advocate for the interests of all of you before their own interests and end up not being a good speaker. So out of all the candidates here, I hope you all rank the person you believe to be the best and most competent advocate. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: Alright, thank you all, and if you would like to step outside and follow Brendan. We will now have our period in which you may speak in favor of a candidate. If you would like to do this, again, you may speak in favor of as many candidates as you would like. You may not speak against a candidate. If you would like to, you may line up in front of this mic, please.

Radcliffe Cushman: Are we able to make motions like recess at this time or are we only speaking? Is the only action right now speaking for endorsement?

Erick Jacobsen: You can make motions at any time.

Radcliffe Cushman: If I'm to recess to informally discuss, would candidates be invited back in or would we continue without them?

Erick Jacobsen: We wouldn't, okay, to clarify, they're not out there because we can make them do anything. They're out there because we like ask them, so we could bring them back in. They could also still be here anyway, but historically, we have never had a situation in which we recess before voting or have any informal conversations with candidates.

Senator: It is ranked choice voting, so I'm here to endorse Avery. I think you should rank him one, but definitely two. I think that he understands the importance of advocating for the Senate because next year, especially as the Senate continues to grow and continues to gain power, We need someone who is willing to speak up for the Senate and ensure that the Senate is being heard and they're being properly represented. I think that Avery is the best one for that job and has the most integrity for this. Anyways, vote for Avery. Thank you.

Senator: I first want to take this second to take a moment to endorse Pierce. I think a particularly important aspect of Speaker is the fact that you are helping senators write legislation. And I think someone with experience, especially like in Senate recently, is someone that is crucial to this role. I also want to take a second to endorse Avery as well. I think he's done a lot of work. He has shown that he is going to be very, very collaborative with you guys in whatever capacity he can and that he absolutely will defend Senate with all he can.

Senator: I'd like to endorse two people. The first person is Ruby Santos. She's proven herself to be someone who's a real go-getter. She came into this year green and she's learned a lot about ASUW in a short amount of time. And she, in my opinion, is the number one candidate who will be the most impartial at all times. I'd also like to endorse Avery. He's shown himself to be an incredibly capable senator, and he's here to fight for you.

Senator: Okay hi I'm here to say that Detlef is someone I've had the privilege of watching in action, and what stands out every time is his calm integrity. He treats everyone he works with with genuine respect. He's thorough, careful, and hardworking, and he has follow-through and dignity. The Senate Speaker role calls for someone trustworthy, diligent and principled, and I think Detlef is all of that. He also has worked closely with next year's VP, which gives him a leg up in terms of communication with the next Board of Directors. Yeah, I think he'll be a great, great option.

Senator: Hi I'm just here to endorse Ruby. As a co-member on the debate team I know that Ruby has the ability to debate for things that she doesn't always believe in and to advocate for things that she doesn't always believe in. And even when she does this, whether she believes in it or not, as you do in debate rounds, she is always incredibly respectful. We do a format called IPDA where you're supposed to be polite. And I know that Ruby carries this through and through.

Senator: Okay Hi guys, I worked with Ruby a lot in High School because we went to the same high school and she did a pretty fantastic job in terms of leadership. She won the award for it for our graduating class as well. And aside from that, from things like constitutional debate, sorry, of advanced leadership and creative projects like the culture fair. She's very reliable and dedicated. And don't tell her I said this, but she's a pretty big goody two-shoes, so she'll definitely follow the bylaws. So very personable, and she got a 5 in AP Gov thank you.

Senator: I would just like to take a brief moment to speak in favor of Avery as someone who saw him in action at Huskies on the Hill, but I'm sure this applies in other areas. I've seen just how good he is at advocating for what he truly believes in. And just as someone who has very similar views to him in terms of maintaining Senate independence, I can't think of a better candidate.

Senator: I will give a general endorsement. I'm not going to rank anyone in any particular order but Pierce, Spencer, and Avery are all people that I have had the opportunity to work with in steering, of course, and then also had Spencer and Avery within my committee. And they're all very, very passionate about what they're doing and I think that that is a really important quality and they all are very diligent. And so I think that's something to consider as well.

Senator: Just in general, when you are voting for someone vote for the person that you think is going to push you the most. Push this organization to be the best, to push you as a person, to be the best person and leader that you can be. I don't really know anyone else. I had the privilege of knowing Avery on a more personal level for about a month and a half, and what I can say is that he pushed me to be the best leader I can be, and I think more importantly than that, to be a better person.

Senator: The big A. Avery Kirscht. I think it's really important to be competent in your job, but also to be a huge political dork. And this dude is the biggest dork I've ever known in my life. So no one tell him, no one tell him I said that. So please, in my opinion, you should vote Avery and also Pierce.

Senator: I've had the wonderful chance of working with most of these people. I know them personally, all great candidates. I do specifically want to endorse Ruby for all the things that have already been said, for all the things that she said, especially welcoming environment. We know we need that. We need someone personable to work with Board going forward. We need a big nerd, and she knows her stuff. I've seen the way that she

guides on campus when Blair is not there, and she has great leadership skills, and is extremely level-headed.

Senator: I endorse Detlef. The only person I will endorse, I believe in Detlef. And the reason why I believe in Detlef is he has absolutely astounded me. And there's not many people that have shocked me. I ran for a senior patrol leader in my scout troop when I was 14 years old, telling high schoolers what to do. The fact that Detlef is doing as much as he's been saying, it's not even just by saying, it's just everything that he's involved in. is just astronomically like crazy. I mean, Oliver Hall, Director, his participation in GAVEL has exceeded.

Senator: That is your time. I will not make an endorsement but I will speak. I have been in this role for a year now. And I think that when you are considering what candidates you would like to rank and in what order, there are a few things that I would hope that you keep in mind. Knowledge of Senate procedures, knowledge of what has been tried and suggested before, ability and experience in writing legislation, the ability to make quick decisions, and to know when to make decisions with teams. The ability to stay neutral and to build relationships with people even if you disagree with them, and to be able to advise on bills even if you disagree with them. A passion for policy and the work that we do here and the advocacy, and the ability to handle pressure and stress is a very difficult job. So I hope you all keep that in mind. With that we will begin our voting period. This is a ranked choice vote. You can rank as many or as few candidates as you would like.

Voting period

Erick Jacobsen: This might be a while. I think we're going to move on to Vice Speaker elections or nominations. And then we will, we will have the results soon, I promise, but I just, I would be loathe to hate to waste this time. I am the speaker. We will take nominations for Vice Speaker. I'll go to Ava, Kavi, and then Francisco. And whether or not you ran in speaker election, you can still nominate yourself for other positions. I would just suggest if you win the speaker election that you withdraw your nomination, unless you want us to elect another speaker again.

Ava Wahl nominates Collin **Saywers**

Collin Saywers accepts

Kavi Pasupathi would not like to nominate **Detlef Gerbing**

Detlef Gerbing accepts

Francisco Dojenia nominates **Pierce Wallbaum**

Pierce Wallbaum declines

Naomi Law nominates **Adam Ford**

Adam Ford accepts

Simon Thompson: For what it's worth I nominate Avery Kirscht but I can't do that.

Bridget Pasco nominates **Avery Kirscht** specifically on Simon Thompson's behalf

Avery Kirscht declines

Francisco Dojenia nominates **Addison Wooster**

Addison Wooster declines

Francisco Dojenia nominates **Spencer Grubbs**

Spencer Grubbs accepts

Elizabeth McAleer nominates **Ruby Santos**

Ruby Santos declines

Erick Jacobsen: With that the nominations period has closed. and it will reopen next week when we elect our next Vice Speaker. We will move on to the Public Relations Officer nominations. Does anyone have any questions about the Public Relations Officer role? With that are there any nominations?

Collin Saywers nominates **Pierce Wallbaum**

Pierce Wallbaum accepts

Ava Wahl nominates **Radcliffe Cushman**

Radcliffe Cushman accepts

Cecillia Hellman nominates **Kathleen Esnaurrizar**

Kathleen Esnaurrizar accepts

Ruby Santos nominates **Sumaiya Zunairah**

Sumaiya Zunairah accepts

Avery Kirscht nominates **Matt Freire**

Matt Freire accepts

Greyson Hedglin nominates **Detlef Gerbing**

Detlef Gerbing declines

Justin Amaral: nominates himself

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any nominations? With that, the nominations period has closed. It will reopen next week when we elect our PRO.

OLD BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: I guess we can move on to Old Business. Joseph, your bill is up first. Alrighty. Last meeting, we read it.

Applause.

Erick Jacobsen continues: Yes. I will once again go over the rules for this discussion. And these are all rules that we agreed to as Senate leadership, including the sponsor. Okay. We will have 30 minutes for the item overall, and then it will be automatically tabled, and we will move on. You are allowed to make motions during this time, but it doesn't mean that we have to vote on it within 30 minutes. You will have two minutes per person to speak, and then you will have to add yourself to the queue again if you'd like to speak again. I will not accept interruptive points of information. If you have a question, you can raise your hand and you will be added to the queue. You may interrupt if it's a personal privilege motion, which is if something's impeding your ability to read the legislation or function in the room somehow. Any question that is asked, I will immediately go to the sponsor or the co-sponsor and they may claim time to speak. This is also limited to two minutes or per response. You may talk only on the bill, not about any, not make any personal remarks or comments. And as always, I will prioritize senators who haven't spoken and then senators who have spoken, and then members of the public last. Board members are senators. All right, are there any questions on the rules? OK, yeah, whose committee did this go through? General Affairs? Pierce would you like to come up here? Alrighty, I will open up the bill and then you may give your

committee report. I will include this as part of the reading of the bill, so it will be excluded from the timer as per the motion made last week.

Pierce Wallbaum: This went through our committee kind of a long time ago. It did pass neutrally 13-2-3. To summarize the changes that were made, we struck this whereas clause. We just felt like it was too vague. That's all I remember from that one. This, we actually took out the first half of this whereas clause to make it its own whereas clause on line 658. Okay, there it is oh, 654. And then lines back up 191 to 194 we thought that this lacked a source, and so I think we just amended the wording here. Yeah, we just amended it because it didn't have any source to it or anything. And that is all we did.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Pierce. We will have 30 minutes for this item, starting now. You may have two minutes to speak per person. Are there any questions, comments, or motions?

Joseph Riggio: Real quick, I want to point out some obvious things. So this bill was introduced way back when in the beginning of winter quarter. Many of the stuff that is in this bill, especially section 3, either has been resolved by Board, has been actively resolved. I want to just point to the language that we purposely wrote as the date that this bill was introduced, as these responsibilities largely had to do with over the summer and autumn quarter, like for example, special appropriations fund, which was open in winter quarter. I also want to point out that on Saturday, there was a bylaws day that the ASUW Board, they haven't passed any of the recommended amendments that they made, but there are some issues that they did address. Suspension of the bylaws was one of them. I do want to point that out. Also, just for all the whereas clauses, where there's a source, I recommend looking at the source. If you have any questions about that, I'm happy to answer. Francisco can answer as well, especially sections one and two. And I recommend amendments for the task force to make it not retroactively applied because it is past week five of spring quarter, so I would recommend amendments for that task force, too.

Aiden Reeder: Looking at the committee amendments, I actually think these are actually all very reasonable, and so I am going to move to approve the committee amendments.

Aiden Reeder moves to approve committee edits

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Approved via unanimous consent

Adam Ford: First, I would like to ask the sponsor if he was suggesting an amendment that would strike every that clause pertaining to the task force.

Joseph Riggio: No. What I'm asking is that the, I'll scroll to it real quick, in the two minutes that I have. So what we're saying is that we said that this task force shall meet no later than week five of spring quarter. That can't happen because it is week six of spring quarter. So that's what I mean. So some of this, when it was written, we were hoping that the timeline would line up so that it would be spring quarter around this time. Even though the Board, I wanted to just take a second to acknowledge that even though the Board of Directors did meet to discuss this, it was advertised very last minute. I had to send people Zoom links from the restructuring committee and other members as well, and literally inform people that it was happening. This process needs to have, where the that clause is on line 691, Judicial representation, EAC representation, JCC representation, not just senators who happen to be in the know like the day before or Board of Directors. This needs to be an institutional conversation and this is what this task force proposes.

Erick Jacobsen: We have the Results.

Drumroll commences

Avery Kirscht elected Speaker

Erick Jacobsen: Congratulations, Avery. Thank you to all candidates who participated. I know it's really scary being up here and speaking and running for office, so you're all very brave. All right, we'll continue with the queue. Back to our regularly scheduled programming. Who was next?

Cecillia Hellman: I'd like to move to amend the bill to add the incoming Board of Directors to the forwarding clause.

Erick Jacobsen: We can take forwarding clauses amendments as grammatical.

Kira McKey: Okay this is a comment. But I do have slight concerns about the pieces of this bill. I think one of the goals here is to like make ASUW, improve relationships between students and ASUW and the wider student base through more efficient like BOD work, and I think that's great. I support that mission, but I think that including information that is no longer, that isn't updated, especially involving the budget, like the

70K deficit piece may just kind of scare people and make things worse, if that makes sense. I understand that there's the line about this being kind of old information.

Technical difficulties

Reaa Dureja: Line 168, 169, and 184, all those documents are publicly available on EAC's website. We are the most updated website in ASUW, so I would like that reflected. Yeah, election results, ballot measures, and EPP all are publicly available.

Maggie Schoenfeldt: I'd like to provide some context before I make this motion. I'm one of the members of the Undergraduate Transfer Student Advocacy Committee and we have convened and we've been actively doing things on committee and there was an open application process. And for that reason, I think lines 570 through 583, at least that's what it says on my version under the Director of Community. Community Relations rolle. For that reason, I think they're outdated, and so I moved to strike those.

Maggie Schoenfeldt moves to strike lines 562-573 Clause on Director of Community Relations

Ruby Santos seconds

Reaa Dureja objects

Maggie Schoenfeldt: I just think because there were applications, we're meeting, this responsibility has been fulfilled and part of the reason that it took a while for the transfer committee to reconvene was because the Director of Community Relations didn't have like a proper transition period, and this committee hadn't met for five years. So there wasn't really like a precedent or recent precedent for it. So I just think it's outdated and we should reflect the most recent information.

Reaa Dureja: That's absolutely fair. My only concern is that because it's been a recurring issue that's not convened for five years, I would be more comfortable rather than just like striking all of it altogether to say that this has been an issue in the past. And this year it has convened, even though it's a little later, and I think that should be included so that's on public kind of record, and then we can make sure that it doesn't happen again. I think I'll be feel more comfortable with that language.

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

Aiden Reeder: I think that both these statements are absolutely true. I think one thing that I do want to remind everybody of is that this is, while we have had some examples of these institutional issues from our previous Board, our current Board, these are institutional issues, and so it is just as pertinent to like remove things that are that have actively been fixed, as well as add in things that have historically been an issue and so should still be reflected because those are true facts. So, I think I would support both of these, honestly, and perhaps whatever, whatever he is thinking it could be based off of this statement mostly just for that last whereas clause and then something else saying that it has issues meeting, but I just wanted to make that known.

Kathleen Esnaurrizar: I just want to say that I kind of agree with the objection because I think that we can just amend and add something about that the committee has now met. And so you can just say that even though it took a long time, they have now met this year, but then it's still reflected upon that previously it's been an institutional problem that it hasn't met before.

Adam Ford: I largely agree with the previous sentiment. I'd just like to add that the goal of institutional reform is not to ignore things that have been fixed but present solutions to anything that have been institutional. So like even if things have previously failed to be met, It's good that we reflect upon why it wasn't initially, so that we can better orient the ASUW for the future.

Maggie Schoenfeldt: I'm open to moving to withdraw as soon as I see an amendment that is like actually drafted and reflects this rather than reflecting the out dated language and reflects that the committee hasn't met for a certain amount of time.

Erick Jacobsen: And can we get the proposed amendment up on the screen?

Reaa Dureja: We can make an amendment. I just want to find when the application was open and when the, if anyone has any information on when the committee convened, I think we can draft up a motion really quickly.

Maggie Schoenfeldt: As I see we are in the process of making an amendment, and so we can move on to something else. I'm going to withdraw my motion.

Maggie Schoenfeldt withdraws motion

Julia Tanner: Kira put the last bit of her comment in the chat. Can I read it out? Okay so she said, I think I cut out at the end there, obviously. To finish my point, I think including

info that isn't up to date, even including the disclaimer that this bill was written months ago, may end up just stirring up more trouble for everyone and harming further the relationship between ASUW and the student base. Specifically line 56 to 59, we are now at a \$0 deficit and discussing the prior deficit seems more inflammatory than beneficial.

Erick Jacobsen: And can we reflect that these suggest edits are approved.

Aiden Reeder moves to replace the whereas clause on lines 562-573 to read "whereas for the past five years the UTSAC committee failed to convene until the 2026 winter quarter; and whereas such a delay in establishing the committee negatively impacts students, as it limits transfer students' ability to participate in shared governance, delays advocacy on time-sensitive academic and resource-access issues, and undermines the committee's ability to effectively represent transfer student interests at the start of the academic term;"

Maggie Schoenfeldt seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Kaitlyn O'Connor: Lines 602-610 states that Article 12, section 3 outlines the functions of Office of Government Relations reads that we are to prepare monthly reports on all lobbying activities and make them available to the public. And whereas OGR has not made any such report public, leading to a lack of transparency surrounding ASUW state lobbying efforts. What I want to say to that is that legislative session moves very quickly. I think a lot of you have seen me. I give public comment during the beginning of Senate, as well as we have a public Instagram account. Nowhere in the statute does it say in what form we have to put these reports out in. I think because of the nature of legislative session, it moves very quickly, and I think it would be an added burden on us who are already planning Huskies on the Hill, who are actively lobbying, and who have to do our own outreach to make sure that we are kind of making sure that we're actually getting progress made. I'd be happy to discuss what it would look like to have a report, but I move to strike line 602 to 610.

Kaitlyn O'Connor moves to strike lines 602-610

Erick Jacobsen: something And I think speaking to like parliamentary interpretation, I think if you made a report within the month that is in the public record, that counts. So Kaitlyn moves to strike that whereas clause or that section. Are there any seconds?

Reaa Dureja seconds

Aiden Reeder objects

Kaitlyn O'Connor: I'm happy to hear what you all have to say and I'm happy to like further discuss this because I think that like it's important and I want to make sure that we're being transparent. But yeah.

Aiden Reeder: I think that's actually a fair point to make. On this matter, I think it's more of the, I think what this would be better to point out is the fact that perhaps these reports were not maybe adequately seen as public, even though they absolutely were. So I think that the point that this can make is they can be construed differently and say maybe we need to make these changes because like ultimately what this is doing is trying to say that we're not happy with the way this is going and that that's the stronger side on it, not just completely removing it at all.

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

Joseph Riggio: Yeah for, you're going to notice a common pattern and a common theme with this amendment and other potential amendments and whatnot, is that there's a lot of technicalities to the language. So one of the main points of this bill is to emphasize just how convoluted our bylaws are and why the task force and the that clause needs to exist in the 1st place. The fact that we're having this discussion now of like what does a public report to the public mean and what capacity does that mean should be something that we, that different entities collectively decide, especially OGR and participating in that as well, and the Board of Directors importantly, but also ASUW Senate as well which is what the task force would do. And so I would encourage as we think about language amendments and whatnot, obviously if something is extremely factually horribly wrong and there's sources of whatnot to back that up, fair. But pointing out language that the bylaws, this is a direct quote from the bylaws. And the question for the debate is whether or not what's considered actually public or adequately public or what's legally public versus practically what people perceive as public are two very different things. And I think we need to solve the thing that affects students

Erick Jacobsen: Alright and if anyone has specific ideas for what amendments may be made to the bylaws, that is something you can prepare before the task force meets if this bill is passed, or if it's something quick and easy that I can do on Thursday, you can let me know. But I do encourage that if this bill passes and the task force is convened, there will, they will probably not know what was said here unless they looked at the

minutes. So I do suggest preparing that if necessary. Are there any questions or comments? We are still in a period of debate.

Justin Amaral: Yeah in the initial move to strike it, the reports mentioned, they said that they do Instagram. The OGR Instagram didn't post for the entirety of the month of March. So I do not believe, or what was the month before this, April? Yeah. My bad. Wait, it might have been March and April then. Yeah. Both the month of March and April, there was no post on the Instagram, at least like on the squares. And I don't remember things during public comment about it. So I do believe that we should keep this clause and at least amendment, amend the last whereas clause to reflect our dissatisfaction instead of just saying that they haven't made any public reports, I think would be better than striking the whole thing. Thank you.

Kathleen Esnaurrizar: Hi this is Kathleen again. I'm kind of just reiterating what I said the last time too. I think of like, it's good that we note these things and we could put an amendment to be like, oh, there has been some Instagram things about it if we want to. But otherwise, I think it's good to have this again on here to kind of just note how the convoluted bylaws is and how specificity is like matters and stuff.

Kaitlyn O'Connor: To Justin's point, it is really important that we keep that in because I think to all of your points, like, it's about addressing where there are gaps and the fact that, like, I think Joseph said it, the fact that we're even having this conversation means that there are gaps in this. Legislative session concluded, like, and I fully take responsibility for the Instagram. I think that the primary thing is that legislative session wrapped up at the beginning of March. We were then, I was kind of like, legislative session was a lot. You get very burnt out. And I was also accumulating a lot of information within that about what actually passed and what did not. I did come and talk during public comment. I think that it's also really important to acknowledge that the work that you guys do is important and shouldn't be diminished in like not adequately representing because I think it does. I think that I am going to withdraw my initial motion. I would think that I would just like it to be more amended because I think it reads that we're not, like there's a lack of transparency because of the work of OGR, which we have, like, I take responsibility for a lack of Instagram posts, but I think at the end of the day, like we have really I've done my best. The people of this office have done their best. We've really advocated for students and really pushed for students. And I'm really proud of the work that has been done, the legislations that have been passed.

But I think that some of this language is just a little inflammatory saying that we're contributing to like a lack of transparency.

Kaitlyn O'Connor withdraws motion

Aiden Reeder: I absolutely hear that. I have real quick draft an amendment. It's not the I think the most streamlined and unfortunately I don't have any direct sources.

Aiden Reeder moves to replace whereas clause from lines 605-607 to read "Whereas the reports given were limited to social media posts and brief announcements during public comment which may not be as easily accessible or unobscured as filed written reports; and whereas while OGR maintained the letter of the bylaws, the spirit of the bylaws, and presenting comprehensive results to the public may not have been upheld;"

Adam Ford seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Reaa Dureja moves to suspend the rules and remove 30 minute time limit

Collin Saywers seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

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

Kyra Lui: I just want to say that the captions in in the, what's it called, in the minutes has like switched me and Kira on Teams' name, so I just wanted to make sure that gets reflected correctly.

Aiden Reeder: I wanted to ask the sponsors what a good timeline would be for this. I'm honestly not sure, but those do need to be updated.

Francisco Dojenia: That's a good point. Just remove the weeks or?

Joseph Riggio: I would highly suggest making this start late autumn quarter. And for, the reason is we doing it over summer, we're not gonna get any money, and I, some of these require at large selection currently by the Director of Internal Policy, which takes time. So suggestion week five or week six of autumn quarter might be a timeline appropriate for that. If we want to adjust the weeks to meet that, that would be my recommendation. Just so people have over the summer they can take some time to transition into their roles and then autumn quarter they can focus on kicking everything

off the first six weeks and getting this up and running. Right now we have it as the director of Internal Policy serves as Chair. A friendly reminder that a task force pursuant to the ASUW bylaws has to be chaired by a board member. So we can change that if we want, but it does have to be a board member who chairs the task force.

Justin Amaral moves to amend lines 687 to change chair to Senate Speaker

Adam Ford seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Joseph Riggio: Point of Parliamentary inquiry, Erick, would you recommend, It's more than grammatical, that from Senate Speaker to the Senate representative to the board?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah I mean we can change it to and okay, so just for anyone who's confused, the Constitution says that the Senate has a representative to the board. It doesn't say that the speaker is the board rep. That is something within our bylaws. It is also something that's not permanent. For example, the succession of the board seat is the same as the succession of the chair. If I cannot make a board meeting, then Joseph is automatically the Senate representative to the board. It's not like a proxy. It's the chair, the seat is actually moving. So Because of the restrictions in the bylaws that only a member of the board can participate, and because I think Justin, correct me if I'm wrong, that was the intent. I think we can take it as grammatical to change Senate Speaker to, or to, it should be the Senate representative to the board. And it means the same thing, so it's grammatical.

Aiden Reeder: I just want to speak on the amendment that was just made. I think that is very valid. I do want to make it known that the board is probably going to vehemently go against it, so that that might be something that is, as if this is recommitted, that will be sent back to us. I did want to try and make a motion.

Aiden Reeder moves to update all mentions of week 5 Spring quarter 2026 to Week 5 of Autumn Quarter 2026, and preparations and planning for summer quarter to instead say preparations and planning for winter quarter and Week 2 of fall quarter to week two of spring quarter.

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Justin Amaral objects

Aiden Reeder yields

Justin Amaral: For some of these never mind, the year was changed for these. My bad, I did not hear that part.

Justin Amaral withdraws objection

Kathleen Esnaurrizar objects:

Kathleen Esnaurrizar: He just missed the line on, for me, it's 706, I think it's 701 up there. Instead of saying week two of spring quarter, just say week two of fall quarter.

Kathleen Esnaurrizar withdraws objection

Aiden Reeder moves to amend motion to add change of week 2 of Spring quarter to read week 2 fall quarter

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Ava Wahl: moves the previous question

Collin Saywers seconds

Raised hand vote inconclusive move to website vote.

motion to previous question approved

Motion to change quarters approved by raised hand vote

Reaa Dureja moves to add voting representative from JCC and DIP to task force membership

Radcliffe Cushman seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Teddie Schmitt: moves to amend line 720 to read 2027-2028

Aiden Reeder seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Aiden Reeder: Yeah, someone do that. That is one of the things that I changed. Yeah, that should have been me. And that was all that I had.

Teddie Schmitt: Because it seems like there is nothing else to be said, I move to approve this legislation.

Teddie Schmitt moves to approve SB-32-03

Adam Ford seconds

Approved 72-6-6

Applause

ADJOURNMENT

Adam Ford moves to adjourn

Many seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Adam Ford yields

Joseph Riggio: Attendance vote?

Reaa Dureja moves previous question

Adam Ford seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Approved by raised hand vote

Adjourned 7:33 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
