



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

30 March 2026

HUB 307

4:02 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P
Joseph Riggio (he/him), Vice Speaker | P
Julia Tanner (she/her), Public Relations Officer | P
Blair Yeh (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair | P
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
Maitri Karia (she/her), GPSS Director of University Affairs | P
Nandana Jaideep (she/her), ASUW President | P
Detlef Gerbing (he/him), ASUW Restructuring Select Committee | P
Ashwin Anand (he/him), Director of Internal Policy | P
Kate Lawson (she/her), Director of University Affairs | A
Jothsna Sundar (she/her), Senate Clerk | P
Brendan Chang (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Abigail Appleyard moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

SENATE ORDER

[SO-32-01 A Senate Order for a Special Election for the Recall of the Director of Internal Policy](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to our special agenda item. The Senate Order 32-1, a Senate order for the special election for the recall of the Director of Internal Policy. The reason this is not under proposals is because per the bylaws, this is an item that we have to get to within two weeks. So it is a top priority in order to maintain compliance with the bylaws so before even like reports or anything. And I mentioned a little bit in our chat, but I'll go over it again for the sake of everyone. The way recall works is Senate can use a Senate Order to order a special election. And within that special election, a vote can be made for recalling an elected board member. The way Senate does that is through a Senate order that needs 10 people to second. And the way we do that is through co-sponsors. So we have over 10 co-sponsors on this bill. Those people have seconded the bill. It is presented in a bill so that it's in written form, but it is not a bill by any traditional means. It cannot be amended. It is also our prerogative to vote on each charge separately. It is Steering's task to determine the validity of these charges. Then validity is the only word used in the bylaws to describe it, so it's up to Steering's interpretation on what that means but I would suggest that it's more on the factual end. and well-cited instances, that sort of thing. And in this sense, steering acts as a sort of grand jury and then if even one charge is advanced, then the order advances. But if any charge is voted to be invalid, that charge is dropped. This bill cannot be introduced on the floor if there's, if steering votes down all of the charges, nor can it be, nor can charges be amended or added. And I believe on the floor no charge can be dropped. It's like wholesale on the question of ordering the recall, though, and not necessarily in terms of the charges validity. So it's like a grand jury and a jury, sort of. So we'll vote on each of these charges separately. There's 3 categories of charges. Two are relevant here. The first one is failure to perform tasks assigned by governing documents and the second one is a continued unintentional violation of governing documents. So the charge 5 is a continued unintentional violation, and charges one through 4 are classified as failures to perform tasks as ordered by the governing document. If this passes steering and goes into Senate, we will have a forum where the director in question will

have 20 minutes to give a speech in their defense and 10 minutes to answer questions. And this forum precedes any action. Are there any questions on the recall process?

Brendan Chang: Not exactly a question. It's more of like, like if any charges are voted on and it passes steering then at the end of it is when you do, like, have to have a separate vote to schedule that forum. So, it's more of like we all have a discussion and a vote to, like, like, schedule the date kind of situation. Yeah, so it's not like it's like it needs to be on the next agenda. It's more of like, you know, okay, maybe like next week or something like that is up to you all, and then after the Senate, should Senate, you know, for any reason, have like, it goes to Senate and then they do end up passing it, It's not, the special election isn't like legally ordered. The Board of Directors still has to meet in within 30 days, then pass a board bill to call that special election and nothing else can be on that. So it cannot be added to this General Action. That's just like a little bit more content, but yeah.

Abigail Appleyard: If the time, if we reach 4:55, I think, and we have to pass out the Senate agenda, do we just stop talking about this for a minute, pass it out, or do we have to fully stop talking for the day?

Erick Jacobsen: If that happens, I would probably suggest that we evaluate whether we want to continue today or not, but we definitely need to have had our votes on all five by the end of our next meeting.

Brendan Chang: There's technically only two timelines in this process. Every other part of this process doesn't have a timeline by the any documents, which 1 is, you technically have to have fully completed one of this, the any charge related to it must be done at the end of next week, and then the forum must have these scheduled by this next steering. That's basically the only timeline of that. And then the second part is, should it pass Senate, the second timeline is the special election must be called by the board of Directors within 30 days of it passing. So those are the only two timelines. Every other aspect of this does technically does not have a timeline.

Erick Jacobsen: Any other questions? Okay. With that, we will enter into a reading of the bill and we will go section by section. The section 1 precedence won't need a vote because it's not a charge. So Teddie is the primary sponsor. Would you like to read out section 1 for us, please?

Teddie Schmitt reads SO-32-01 Section 1

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you and we will go into Section 2, Charge 1 which is classified as a continued failure to complete tasks assigned by. Would you like to read out charge one for us in full, please?

Teddie Schmitt reads SO-32-01 Section 2, Charge 1

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you we will now enter into a discussion and then we will have a vote. A vote will have to be moved, we won't like automatically enter a vote. So the rules of discussion are similar and I will set out some ground rules for discussion as well. No person shall have more than two minutes to speak, I will have a timer. And I will not accept interruptive points of information. So again, members of the public are welcome to speak, but I will prioritize members and I'll prioritize members who haven't spoken and then members who have spoken and then I will, the next in priority is non-members. So are there any hands?

Nandana Jaideep: Hi guys, hope everyone had a good spring break. I just wanted to touch on this section and give my thoughts. So we, to talk about the bylaws, I'm going to say that it's kind of ironic that this section says that the Director of Internal Policy has made no effort to make sure that our bylaws are up to date and on par with how our organization is structured because the thing is that even though these committees have been inactive for like over a decade, previous directors did not make that effort. And this year, in fact, we did a comprehensive constitution and bylaws overarching like revamp, which was headed by the Director of Internal Policy. They put in all the work to amend those documents and make sure that they were all up to date. Everyone was invited to our retreat. All of that information was public. And we had members of the Senate and steering present at those meetings. And we made sure that everyone was included in that process. So I suggest before making such claims that we go ahead, we do some research, we like think about what the things that have been done so far and make sure that when we publish claims in a public meeting that they're accurate and not misrepresentation of someone's work. because that is dangerous territory and we don't want to be making defamatory claims as an organization.

Erick Jacobsen: When it comes down to the vote I will go to Ashwin next, but I think something I forgot to mention, when it comes down to the vote, the consideration I think for this category is a failure to complete tasks assigned by, is a consideration of, is this task assigned by the governing documents and was this task accomplished? So I just would like everyone to keep those like questions in mind as discussion commences, but I will go to Ashwin and then call for hands again.

Ashwin Anand: Thank you, Erick, thank you everybody in steering. Sorry, I couldn't be there in person today. I'm still back home in California. Just to touch on the charges again. We as board decided to conduct a wide sweeping bylaw change this quarter, last quarter, and even the quarter before that because there's multiple inconsistencies across the bylaws and the Constitution. It's been an ongoing effort. Judicial, and to put it on a timeline, judicial has looked through the ASUW bylaws as early as the start and middle of fall quarter when judicial took a look through, board is now taking a look through etc. And so we are currently ongoing of reforming the entirety of the bylaws together, just to gather student input, etc. These changes will be reflected as of week two or week

three per this plan. Each board member is still submitting the proposals of what their own job descriptions entails. And so You know, personally, I have my own working document of the bylaws that has every single one of these changes, specifically with the standing committees. These have been removed. And when the communications director brought this up to my attention during the steering meeting, I actually went ahead and added this as a change and an amendment to the bylaws that would be proposed this quarter. And so understanding it in the general context, these changes have been made. There has been an effort. And again, they haven't impeded the working ability of other directors within the organization. Just to provide a little bit of context onto this charge itself. But again, I appreciate everybody for being here and listening and hearing me out.

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

Teddie Schmitt: During our conversation that we had, you mentioned, just to clarify, that if a charge is brought forward and voted through, if the person charged against does and repeals it, then the charge is dropped automatically. Is that correct?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, I think that more goes for the continued unintentional violation. But if the wording is continued failure, as is quoted, then yes. Basically, if there's a task that isn't here, if it is accomplished, then there's no charge. And Brendan, would that have to be, would that automatically mean no charge or would?

Brendan Chang: Can you repeat the question again? I think I feel like I didn't hear it properly?

Teddie Schmitt: So if a charge goes through and is voted on, and then before it gets voted on in the Senate, the person who is charged against, they complete that task, would it then be removed?

Brendan Chang: So the charge is as of the moment that it is presented is how, if you think of it as a grand jury situation, that's probably how, like, it's up to the Senate whether or not they deemed it as corrected per se, like, if it passes steering and it's been voted on and it goes into like a forum type situation, then it's like, that would be it's up to Senate at that point in time to determine whether or not if it does disappear, like you have to follow the process and nothing in the governing document says it just goes away if that makes sense.

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

Ashwin Anand: Yeah and just to the point that was brought up, this is something that you'll, I think, see within this charge and some of the other charges, is that there is still that component of ongoing. I'll mention this a little later on, just as to the individual charges themselves, but there are ongoing efforts within the charges themselves in

order to either reconcile or provide a little bit of clarity as to what's going on in the future. So hopefully that can be taken into consideration.

Nandana Jaideep: Sorry, guys, forgive me for my delay. I'm literally in a plane right now. But I just wanted to point out that I'm sure we all read The Daily article about what happened in Tacoma and all the like complexities that comes with things like this. And I just want to like, as President, it is my job to protect our entire organization, whether that be Board, whether that be Steering, whether that be Senate. So I just want to make sure that when we make hefty claims or when we call for procedures that are of this large of a scale, we make sure that we are compliant and we are following all of the regulations we need to and make sure that every claim that we make is extremely accurate and cannot be refuted. Because that is when we enter this gray area of when you make wrongful accusations or in the case like The Daily wrote about, like make a recall and then evidence comes out that it wasn't true. A lot of that puts the organization at jeopardy of lawsuits and multiple other things. So just wanted to point that out there for anyone's knowledge. I'd suggest everybody go. read that article for just some context, but yeah, I'm happy to answer any questions as well.

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

Dylan Bianchi: Did any of the sponsors of this bill speak to Ashwin about this specific issue? Or Peyton for that matter?

Teddie Schmitt: No. It was over break when I was writing it, so it was a little difficult to reach out to people. I found out I was having issues trying to reach out to people about this.

Owen Rivera: Yeah, I was also, I was not made aware of any of these claims. If you don't know me, I'm Owen. I am the Personnel Director, the Chief of HR. So I kind of want to echo what Nandana said, and if there's claims, I would just like to make sure that they're you know, easily verifiable and have actual evidence. Of course, I would have loved to have a conversation with the sponsors of this bill to, you know, know a little bit more about the complaints before this was brought to Steering, but I also just kind of wanted to ask what the timeline would be of, in the event that this did pass, passes through Senate, there would be a special election right around the time of the normal ASUW elections. I just feel like it could possibly hinder the integrity and the success of our normal elections. You know, it's hard enough to get people to vote as it is, but you know, just food for thought.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, thank you. And, you know, I guess, although board members have already kind of spoken to the general bill itself, within, again, just this charge specifically, there is that ongoing effort with the entire sweeping bylaws changes. And Kind of to Owen's point, I would have loved to have been made aware of this charge and multiple

other charges, or at least had a conversation. You know, I completely understand that it was break, but being notified about this during break, technically, I'm still on break. And you know, coming here and providing reasoning that could have been made through a conversation. Again, it, I'm not going to say that it puts me on the spot. This is stuff that I have to answer to, but I would have loved to have a conversation. But again, if we did have this conversation, I would have presented you all my documents, et cetera, of the ongoing changes that we're making to the bylaws, et cetera. So. I'll leave it at that within this charge specifically, there is effort being made in order to amend those bylaws and to remove these standing committees. And also, again, these standing committees aren't impacting the way that the Board of Directors that are cited are, you know, working.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just a little bit confused if there was a set timeline that the Director of Internal Policy was supposed to be following for these amendments. Like, were you given a date by you need to complete this and have this published by, or is it theoretically just the end of their term? Because I feel like that deadline is really important in understanding like, you know, how far back they are on their work or, you know, if I don't have a deadline for something, I'm not working on it until it makes sense for me to work on it so I can't really judge.

Erick Jacobsen: I'll go to Ashwin in a second to answer that but from my understanding, there is no like timeline. It's like an ongoing sort of task thing, like the Director of Internal Policy just oversees amendments generally, but I'll let Ashwin speak more in depth if you'd like.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah and that was just something that I was going to second. There isn't a set timeline for this. Other charges do have timelines that we'll probably be diving into, but for this one specifically, again, ongoing work, I haven't done it yet, and technically this charge is like at the moment, I haven't done it. So again, it's ongoing. There's no timeline. So realistically, again, that's why I said like by week two or week three, unless again, barring delays, by week three, we're going to see a majority of the bylaw amendments come through and hopefully be voted on so I'll leave it at that.

Joseph Riggio: There is another component in the charge that I think we should probably address as well regarding the historian aspect of the position. I just want to make sure that's covered. I believe that's lines 29 to 31, the DIP as the ASUW historian, required to maintain and record history. And also, it's not in here, but under that same clause is putting on an event typically it's in Spring quarter, so this is more of a point of information to Ashwin, how has planning the ASUW history event been going? That's something that the Director of Internal Policy does oversee.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, as an event that is carried out in spring quarter and was carried out last year in spring quarter, the planning is underway for this event. And so most

likely this event will be around the post-election times and I'll be working with EAC to promote the event as compared to the previous year in order to really scale up the event. So again, that's an ongoing effort. I'm going to probably, you're going to hear ongoing effort multiple times from my mouth, but yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: And I'll also clarify that while obviously y'all are allowed to ask Ashwin about things outside the scope of the charges. If something isn't noted specifically in a charge, it's not something that's sort of a consideration as part of the recall order. So you are welcome to ask questions like that, but I would just keep in mind, like something like that, for example because it's not like explicitly cited as a charge, is not a consideration in the ultimate question of recall. I will go, are there any other hands?

Dylan Bianchi: This is kind of a general comment that I'll ground in this specific charge. I do think what's happening at UWT right now is instructive, because UWT is kind of completely it seems consumed with all sorts of interpersonal issues, and you know, the recall thing has gone into court, and one among many sort of sources of tension in what's happening at ASUW is that the Former President Elias Feleke, argues that he was not given adequate time to essentially do a better job. That the UWT policies gave a time in which the President had to like essentially fix the issues that were being raised before they could be removed from office. I don't believe our bylaws have that same period, but the spirit here I think is something we should consider. On a charge like this, where Ashwin, if it was brought to his attention, could theoretically just draft a bill that changes the language in the bylaws, put it before Senate, you know, after being reminded, that's a lot more efficient than like removing Ashwin from this role and then finding another Director of Internal Policy to do something like this. Now, ultimately, it is Ashwin's responsibility to do his job and to make sure that he's fulfilling all those requirements. It's not like Senate's responsibility to remind him to do that. But when these violations do happen, it's just more productive, it's frankly kinder to try and be patient with each other, to talk to each other before we put something like this forward. So for this particular charge, I'm just a little concerned that it's kind of subjective. There's not a clear timeline and if this whole, this particular charge could resolve sooner if someone had just like talked to Ashwin about it before putting it in Senate.

Owen Rivera: I was just going to super quickly build on what Dylan said. The personnel policy there is kind of like a time span of, you know, getting reform for an employee after a memorandum of warning is issued. There's a two-week time span where they're monitored by advisors and superiors in the organization, so that's something I thought worth mentioning. Also for the event that is celebrating ASUW's history, I was actually an internal policy intern last year who worked on the Walk Through Memory Lane, which was the event, and it wasn't started planning, the planning started around week two or three, so Ashwin is on track. We had a conversation about it, but he's gonna get it kicking in the next week or two, because that's when, Zoe did it last year.

Abigail Appleyard: I feel like kind of the lesson from this charge particularly is we should have better timelines on when things need to be done. Because I don't think, I think it's really difficult to assign blame like this when you don't have a very distinct period by which you said this needs to be done by. I also think I agree that it would be a little inefficient to go through this whole process for this charge, given the timeline with elections coming up. It just, you know, if this can be solved in a conversation, I think that's a lot more productive than removing someone from a role that's about to be filled with someone else anyway, causing confusion to voters about, you know, what position they're voting for, who are they voting for a certain amount of time, and all that sort of stuff.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah I just want to add on one more thing on top of what Dylan said when we like make those that into recall or like recommit certain things, I believe it's important that you have considerable evidence. And that's why we have stuff in the personnel policy for certain employees that are hired by the organization. So when we hire them, we make sure that we give them the grace period after a period of warning for them to like make things right. And if they don't, then that is our evidence to go ahead and reopen that position or remove them from their position. But this sort of procedure where there is no evidence in this claim specifically, because we do not have timelines for bylaws, I think that's just the way things have been, simply because sometimes you don't need to change bylaws. I think ideally our bylaws should and constitution should not be changed every year. Like that is not a precedent that we're trying to set. So this is something that takes time, it takes effort, it takes thought. And we want to make sure that everyone feels included in that process because we all have differing opinions. So I want to make sure everyone has time to come to a consensus. So all I will say is that before presenting something like this, it is really important that there has been time where the person has had an opportunity to resolve. And if that person ended up did not resolving, then that is your evidence to then put forth a bill like this.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I take hands again are there any questions, comments, or motion, I would say that we consider timeline for addressing these charges. There are five charges to be considered within the next two meetings. So as long as that's a consideration, obviously, you don't have to make a motion now if you don't want to, but we can continue talking on this, or if anyone's ready to move on you can make a motion on that.

Abigail Appleyard: I just had a point of information I guess. If someone wanted to like strike a charge, what kind of wording would you use to say that? Because I guess I'm only familiar with saying I move to approve something.

Erick Jacobsen: There's no real like set way you have to do it, you can just say I move to strike a charge or I like I move to like validate or something, but Brendan, do you have something?

Brendan Chang: I would recommend, either if you are looking to, it would be a motion to dismiss this charge or a motion to approve this charge. And a failure of one doesn't automatically mean the other, it's just one has to explicitly pass, if that makes sense. So if one fails, it doesn't mean that it just you can automatically. It just seems like one must pass, so I would just recommend there would be a motion to dismiss or a motion to approve.

Joseph Riggio: As you can see, sorry, let me collect my thoughts a little bit. There, for this charge in particular, I mean, personally for me, I do think that, actually, I do agree with Ashwin on this, a lot of the timelines and whatnot, they're not explicitly laid out here. A lot of the charges, if things are ongoing, then that's that. However, there are 16 co-sponsors. I want to make that apparent that a lot of the co-sponsors seem to be newer senators, so I just want to make something really clear. We should not be discouraging dissent. I find it really problematic that we're using words like protecting ASUW or calling these things defamatory. This prevents people from challenging ideas and structure and opinions that may or may not be problematic. And even if they are problematic, having this discussion is still warranted. There's a reason the recall is in our bylaws and can be used by any senator or any student for that matter can submit a bill about it. Having these processes is checks and balance. We're a state agency after all, we need to hold ourselves to a little bit of a higher standard. And so just keeping that in mind, I really don't want to frame this as all the responsibility of doing all this really scrutinizing research and everything. You know, one thing that we mentioned in like the constitutional amendment in the Senate is like an auditorial branch because this is so much work. And that's not excusing or claiming that more research couldn't not have been done for some of these charges but I think we should be careful with our wording and how we describe the intentions of people who have worked on this bill.

Pierce Wallbaum: Given that these objectives are ongoing and that this charge fails to provide a timeline, I will move to dismiss this charge.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to dismiss charge 1

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Approved 6-0-1

Teddie Schmitt reads Charge 2

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, this is also classified as a failure to perform a task assigned by a governing document. Are there any questions, comments, or motions on this one?

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, thank you. Specifically within this charge, as someone who ran in the elections and had to serve community service hours by week six of fall quarter, which is the exact timeline of when these community service hours are supposed to be completed, I have completed my hours. I did complete them. The last whereas clause saying it can be assumed that none of the community service hours were completed I think, like if you want proof that I completed community service hours and attended my local temple where I usually serve, I think you're more than happy to request that, but I've served my hours. And for the next charge specifically, I'll talk a little bit about enforcing those community service hours. Simply, you know, absolutely fine.

Erick Jacobsen: I will also clarify at this time that the burden of proof is on the sponsor for all of these charges in case that's helpful.

Nandana Jaideep: Thank you Erick I think what you said is the perfect segue of what I was trying to get at. Thank you, Joseph, for explaining to me what checks and balances are. I think from my three years of being in ASUW I think I've got a good grasp on it. The reason I said protect ASUW is when it comes to legality, it's a very fine line of when you deprive certain people of their due process rights, that is when the organization will be at fault. And that is what I'm trying to avoid us getting at, especially if you look at Tacoma as an example. Once again, feel free to read that article. But I just wanted to say that making claims with no proper investigation process that has taken place with the personnel director informed, with Ashwin's supervisor, which is the president who I serve as is informed or there have been no personnel complaints filed. There has been no performance plans given. So I really like, I'm finding it hard to kind of gauge where these charges are coming from and what the exact timelines and evidence that has been used to back up each of these claims have been. So just throwing these things out there is in fact defamatory and putting the burden of proof on the accused, in fact, violates the clauses of due process. Hope that clarifies what I was trying to get at, Joseph.

Erick Jacobsen: And going forward I will emphasize the importance of addressing the chair or the bill, unless there's a specific question for anyone.

Dylan Bianchi: This is going to be corny but I think again, the best way to make this whole operation work is to kind of be nice to each other. In this case, I think Ashwin had a clear responsibility to do a better job of sharing his community service hours or directors' community service hours to the EAC chair. And also, it seems that had the sponsors asked Ashwin about the community service thing and talked to him about it, he might have had an opportunity to kind of correct that mistake. And it seems like, again, like a lack of conversation and not talking to each other and kind of going to each other's throats here, which seems to be happening in this meeting, is just hurting our organization's functioning. So, yeah.

Teddie Schmitt: I want to highlight in this bill I am referring to the completion of all required community service hours, not just those, in this, this charge is about all the completion of all the required community service hours, not just the ones of the Director of Internal Policy.

Erick Jacobsen: Which would be the next charge.

Teddie Schmitt: No the next charge. And I would like to highlight that the bylaws itself, I mark it there as reference one, do specify that they need to be done in tandem with the Elections Administration Committee and the incoming judicial committee Secretary of Judgments. And I will mention, and it's later on, I didn't cite it here that the judicial committee also must sign off and certify the hours done.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other hands? I see some on teams.

Nandana Jaideep yields to Ashwin Anand

Ashwin Anand: Yeah perfect, specifically, I mean, again, I'll mention that I have completed these community service hours. Just a little side tangent of community service, I do it almost every weekend that I can. Within the actual sign-off and approval of the community service hours, number one, to be completely honest with you, I wasn't aware of the process going into the position because it wasn't located in my transition document. And so within like the actual completion of the community service hours, and again, I'll bring this up in the next charge itself, me and Board had conversations before week 6 of when these community service hours were supposed to be completed. And I had tasked it again with the Board of Directors to complete their community service hours and I'm pretty sure that everybody has completed their community service hours. And so going back to it again, a lack of communication, I think, is like that root problem. If we had had conversations in order to like prove that we've done our community service hours, I would have been more than happy to share those with you. But again, enforcement is charge three. Personally, with charge two, I've completed my community service hours and I'm, you know, I wish Reea was here today, or the chair of the EAC in order to speak her mind, but that's my perspective.

Joseph Riggio: It's a point of information for the prime sponsor. Lines 27 to 30. I just updated the charts, so the lines are going to be a little bit finicky. But could you expand on source 9 and 10?

Teddie Schmitt: Yes of course, let me pull them up. Yes. So I had conversations specifically with the EAC Committee Chair regarding community service hours, and she explicitly said that she had not been informed about any violations enforcements at all, which led me to believe that they were not done, or at least not done through the proper channel as stated by the governing documents. And then the source 10 also confirmed that the secretary of judgements had not been trained, which again furthered

my thinking that they had not been done to the proper standard as required by the governing documents.

Abigail Appleyard: Is the director of internal policy in charge of training the Judicial Committee Secretary? Because from source, sorry, this is also for either you or for you. Because in source 10, it sounds like that the message is like a quote from Brian Kim It says "we have not trained Madison", so I was wondering kind of who is in charge of training.

Teddie Schmitt: I presume the Judicial Committee. I'm not fully certain on it. I don't know.

Brendan Chang: It's the SAO advisor actually. But I'm not, it's a, well, how the election process works to maintain neutrality, one advisor does elections, one advisor does judicial outside of election season, and one advisor then takes over during election season, to be as neutral as possible. That advisor's job, at least to what I understood how it's been the last couple of years since I've been here at least.

Abigail Appleyard: Sorry, quick follow up. So, if it wasn't Ashwin's responsibility to train them, but he did the hours, how is he supposed to? I guess I'm just confused about if the hours were done, but they weren't recorded because someone else that he wasn't responsible for training wasn't trained, how, like, how do you proceed with that being his responsibility?

Erick Jacobsen: I guess its up to steering how they want to proceed about that, but I'll let Teddie respond briefly.

Teddie Schmitt: The specific wording in the bylaws is that he is responsible for ensuring the enforcement and the completion of, and so whether or not they were done has to be, the EPP I cited later on the EPP from last year references that, let me cite my words properly, yeah, community service shall be established and certified by the judicial committee outside of ASUW or off campus community service being regulated by the judicial committee. And I was under the impression that none of that had happened regarding any of the community service hours.

Dylan Bianchi: Erick or Joseph, procedural question. Are we able to table these things? In this case, maybe give steering or give members of Board a week to bring together proof of community service that they can send to Reea? Is that something we can do?

Erick Jacobsen: I mean as long as we have voted on all five charges by the end of next meeting, we can do whatever we want within that. Brendan, do you have anything to expand?

Brendan Chang: Technically around the rules, you can technically motion to move past this charge and then come back to it later after we've reviewed other charges. I cant

think of exactly if there's anything specific in any of the documents that you have to go one by one and whatever that it is. But Roberts Rules does afford you that you need to technically move around with any question, if that makes sense.

Erick Jacobsen: So yeah we can move around within that as we must, but I will again emphasize the burden of proof is not on the director. It is on the, obviously we can ask, but I just want to make sure that that's the consideration as we get to the votes.

Owen Rivera: I just kind of want to bring up a point that has come up in past years as well specifically in relation to the, like, complaints that are filed against, you know, candidates running. Traditionally, it's been very hard to enforce something like community service hours on, you know, people who were never ASUW employees and, you know, did not win and basically have nothing to do with organization after that. So I believe it's kind of hard to, you know, place every single, you know, all the responsibility on a single position when the enforcement is basically impossible for employees who, or not employees of ASUW who ran in, you know, had a violation.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah just to kind of touch on a couple points that were already brought up. The first thing was about the like the training of the Secretary of Judgments and ultimately that has fallen, that is with the SAO advisor right now and currently they're actually about to go on go their like elections complaint hearing training all today. And so they will receive adequate training for that. Within the enforcement part, again, this is going to be kind of a mix of charge two and three. I certify through any means necessary that I have completed my community service hours before week six of fall quarter. Again, I've relayed all of this communication to the Board of Directors who I have oversight over that I can relatively, you know, try and enforce those community service hours with them. It's, there has been ongoing efforts and, you know, people of community completed their volunteer hours, their community service hours, they have come back and served the community and this is another props to the Board of Directors. We hope to be as public as possible. And so, you know, we try to serve the community as best as we can.

Julia Tanner: Yeah so Teddie, you mentioned that the EPP discusses the process of enforcing community service hours?

Teddie Schmitt: It discusses that they must, yeah, section. Section 9 for the one linked because it's different from this year's, section 9 subsection D goes into it a little bit and it does state how they like how they're, who they're overseen by and who they're certified by and then the violation and then the what happens if you don't get them in time.

Erick Jacobsen: And that's source 9 which I don't. personally have access to, but sorry, continue.

Julia Tanner: Yeah, so when running as candidates, you must read the whole EPP. I was on judicial last year, and so a lot of the violations, we were very clear. If someone claimed, oh, I didn't know I was supposed to do this, or I didn't know I was not supposed to do this, it's a non-argument because you're supposed to read the whole EPP. So, Ashwin, I just wanted to kind of push back a little bit about lack of knowledge of these responsibilities. I understand the transition documents have not been consistent. I totally see that. And I also acknowledge what Owen said about enforcement being close to impossible with these volunteer hours, but I just wanted to just say that the EPP was something that all candidates are supposed to read, and therefore that process would be, should be kind of in that knowledge space.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there other hands?

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I'd like to echo Julia's point, having also been on Judicial last year and helped make these decisions. I think Ashwin, as Director of Internal Policy, of all people, it can be reasonably expected that he understands his obligations, and he submit information correctly and all the stuff he processed. And also, I'm going to keep hammering the empathy button here and say, I think we should consider moving past these to give Ashwin specifically, but members more generally, the opportunity to properly submit community service hours so we can straighten this out. Yeah, I think it's in everybody's best interests.

Nandana Jaideep: Hi okay so I just wanted to give people a little bit of context. So the community service thing in the EPP, I believe, was added last year or very, very recently. So before that, we did not have any sort of enforcement guidelines for this. This is our first year even exploring this sort of thing. And I want to say that the EPP was a wrong procedural choice for any sort of enforcement for the board of Directors. And I wasn't sure who was like primarily responsible for that, but I think anything that you hold the BOD accountable for should be outlined in the bylaws, because the EPP is a governing document or set of guidelines specifically for candidates running in the elections, not something that we use to govern ASUW so I believe the charges should be limited to governing documents, because that's essentially like the role of those documents within our organization. But I would suggest working with us to add maybe some sort of guidelines like this into the bylaws, and then I believe it will be properly justified to hold any person on Board or in the organization accountable to these things, because then it is clearly outlined in the rules that govern them.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah and I'm just going to quickly go off another last point right here is that, you know, again, Julia, to your point, like all candidates have read the EPP. I read the EPP before running, even though I missed some parts, most of the parts I got down. With that being said, within the bylaws, like the line that's being cited about the enforcement of the violations, I will say has a lack of specificity into the actual

enforcement mechanisms in addition to the reporting of such, you know, the community service hours, et cetera. So to your point, it's more that like we, I tried my best in order to enforce those community service hours, or again, this will go to charge three, but I tried my best to enforce those community service hours using the honor system with people that I trust that love to serve the community and did serve the community. With that being said, like again, I can speak for the board and myself that we have completed those community service hours.

Kathleen Esnaurrizar: I just want to kind of like talk a bit of what was said that, like, I think the main idea of the charge isn't necessarily that the hours weren't done, is that they weren't verified through proper channels, and I think that's like the main problem. So, like, even if you can show evidence that it was completed, they weren't verified, so that's why I feel like on line 31 when it says like "can be assumed", kind of makes sense because when you try to see if those hours are verified, there's no channels that say they are. So I think that's like the main idea when we're looking at these charges, we're getting like different ideas.

Teddie Schmitt: A couple of things I wanted, yeah, echoing that. I wanted the calling out on lines 24 and 25, that it is the must work with the incoming elections minister and the judicial committee Secretary of Judgments, which was not done based on the evidence that I got with my conversations with them. I also wanted to clarify that the EPP is a governing document. I asked you that over break that it was a governing document. I made sure to clarify that. I also wanted to mention that the election, the EPP I'm citing is the 2025 EPP. And like I mentioned, section 9, subsection D does explicitly state everything. I opened up the 2026 one first, saw it and was like, interesting. But I checked the file history, no edits were made to that section. And I went back to find the older one from last year and it does confirm.

Owen Rivera: So I just have a clarifying question and then a follow up to that. So you said it specifically says that the EAC Chair is supposed to work with the Director of Internal Policy, correct? I just want to bring us back to the Instagram screenshot that was provided as evidence. in which there's a conversation with one of the EAC co-chairs where she herself says that since EAC has no jurisdiction over it, we were not in the loop. So I mean, I don't think that you can blame Ashwin fully for something that in our government documents that says in collaboration with when, you know, Reea had no knowledge of it. And she also mentions that for the past two years, she hasn't been informed at all about violations enforcement.

Nandana Jaideep: I just wanted to give a quick clarification about the governing documents point. But EPP is a governing document, but specifically just for the elections or for candidates. That's what I was trying to say. The actual governing documents of like the organization are a sort of bylaws and constitution.

Erick Jacobsen: It is 4:55 pm which thank you, Julia, for pointing out. It is now time for the approval of the floor agenda, which means this item is automatically tabled. But after we approve the floor agenda, we can come back to this through a motion, which I would encourage if we want to get through more than one of the charges today since we only have this meeting and next.

APPROVAL OF
SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: So it is 4:55 p.m. We're moving to the approval of the floor agenda. So, yeah. I don't know, it's the agenda. We did push up R-32-7 and R-32-6 based on time sensitive content in conversation with sponsors and such so that would be old business part one for those two, and then we'd go back to old business part 2 at 6:30 again, so that there's a set end time to committee meetings with the other ones in order.

Abigail Appleyard moves to approve

Blair Yeh seconds

Joseph Riggio objects

Abigail Appleyard yields

Joseph Riggio: We forgot to put the Senate Bill for Constitutional Reform in the restructuring committee.

Erick Jacobsen: Right, yes, sorry. Is that the only one in committee? Okay, yeah. We are in a period of debate, by the way.

Dylan Bianchi moves the previous question.

Abigial Appleyard seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Motion to approve the agenda fails 0-5-0

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and add Senate Bill 32-04 into the Select Committee on ASUW Restructuring.

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Abigail Appleyard moves to approve the agenda

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: And now, since we've tabled the previous items, we move on to discussion, which is the Denzil Suite forum questions. Our forum with Denzil Suite is next Tuesday. Any thoughts on what we want to ask him?

Pierce Wallbaum: Can you quickly clarify his role or the jurisdiction?

Julia Tanner: Are we going to like all the reports, like, because the approval of the agenda was timestamped for 4:55?

Brendan Chang: We can just jump back to what.

Erick Jacobsen: We can? OK cool, so we can jump back to the Senate Order.

Brendan Chang: We just have to address that agenda item at that time.

SENATE ORDER

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, we are back in the Senate Order. But by the way, Denzil Suite is the Vice President of Student Life. We're in charge 2 still. I will maintain the queue.

Ashwin Anand: To be completely honest I forgot my point. But just kind of working at a very high level, it was just something that I was combing through the bylaws within kind of something that Nandana and Owen mentioned with the personnel complaint process. With any of like the violations to the bylaws, I remember my previous point, but within the any like violations to the bylaws, et cetera, technically a formal complaint has to be lodged and then that process carries through. So I think specifically, it's Article 2, Section 3, I'll read out a small snippet of it. It says, should a member of the ASUW be found in violation of the code, it should be reported through the personnel process and sent to the Personnel Director, who shall then subsequently lead an investigation in coordination with the VP and Personnel Committee. All codes of ethics complaints should be processed through the personnel/ judicial committees. And it lists out the actual process itself. So like while y'all can submit this bill, we still have to follow, like the

rest of the Board still has to follow the procedures outlined in the bylaws. So one thing I want to say is that the Senate order plus the bylaw process, we need to figure out which one is in compliance with one another. But beyond that just mentioning the charges specifically, again, I completely understand the reporting process. It wasn't something that was located in my transition document. One thing I, as we have this discussion and as ongoing bylaw changes are made, this is something that I'm going to be making a point out of and really clarifying the process of how to enforce the elections, like community service hours into the actual bylaws and as well as my transition document. So again, the reporting process hasn't been done. And then I completely, I get like the, it can be assumed part. But again, we would really appreciate the communication beforehand to at least. I would have been able to provide proof instead of kind of just jumping into this. I'll leave it at that.

Joseph Riggio: This is ultimately going to be a point of information to Ashwin as a fellow parliamentarian. Yes, that is the article two of those bylaws refers to the standard code of ethics, not necessarily that a non-ASUW employee because the sponsors or whether or not they're employees, we have our own Senate as a co-egal branch, but Section 4 of our, Article 7, Section 4, the ASUW Constitution, which overrides the bylaws, has processes and procedures for recalling Directors, which section A, the Student Senate, by the concurrence of two-thirds of their present voting membership, orders a special election for recall. This right here is the investigative process. We are currently validating claims, as Erick said, we're a grand jury, kind of jury later on, but this is the investigative process. This is what, if ASUW employees have personal grievances, they have a process internally in the personnel complaint process that they could use, they're not obligated to, but they could use if they so choose. That there is a separation here. The Constitution protects this. This is a valid way to approach this.

Erick Jacobsen: Since that is not a question, I will not take it as a point of information.

Joseph Riggio: Sorry, yeah.

Abigail Appleyard: This is a little separated from what we've been talking about right this second, but I was just wondering what kind of like prompted you to write this specifically? Like, was there something that came up, like an interaction where you're like, oh, I should start looking into this more?

Teddie Schmitt: I've been noticing a pattern. This is my first year here. Actually, this is my second quarter at ASUW. So throughout the last quarter, I've just been noticing some patterns that I found slightly distressing regarding like role fulfillment. And I was just generally interested in looking at some of these governing documents, seeing how they compared to my last universities. And I noticed some things and it prompted me to want to write this bill to ensure that things are like enforced and done well. I feel like there needs to be accountability for issues that are taken. And I've noticed, at least from

what I've seen given past things, there maybe hasn't been, and I wanted to see if I could do something to help move things along.

Blair Yeh: So I had a comment that I wanted to make but also a question. I actually don't like the use of the word assume. Like I hate that word. Like you could have asked. I would like to say that. I am a co-sponsor but I do feel like you should have communicated and asked. But I, my question is that, since it is outlined that you have to validate your community service hours, did you not like try to do it beforehand?

Ashwin Anand: Yeah I'll answer that really quickly. The verification of the actual hours themselves wasn't a process that was 100% familiar with by the time week 6 had rolled around. Although I had initially had those conversations with the Board of Directors in order for them to at least start their community service hours. That was, again, it was an oversight in the transition documents, the bylaws themselves, et cetera. It was located in the EPP, but in the current moment that I was in, I was referencing the bylaws in my transition document within that first five to six weeks of when I was starting the position to really get that going. So again those hours have been completed. I'm trying to speak as much as I can into the enforcement and stuff. That's about all the information I can give you. Can I like pause there and then like start a new 2 minutes afterwards?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes, because you were next in the queue. So that was an answer to the question. So now you may go.

Ashwin Anand: Thank you. Just kind of referencing some points maybe before, to be completely honest with you, when I was notified that this bill had been written, my first question was why. I, again, had no previous communication with the sponsor of this bill. There was nothing on my end and the other fact of the matter is like, I'm the only board member that is listed in this bill and that there aren't any other Board members that are also listed in this bill so again, I understand that the charges are on me and so I'm here speaking to steering to provide my insight. Within the accountability aspect, like again, I completely understand on this charge that will be on charge three that there is that aspect of accountability between like what I'm doing within ASUW to the broader ASUW community and beyond. I've tried to be as transparent as possible. And so again, I would really appreciate some type of communication about this beforehand, but within the charges themselves, you also have to place it in context timeline. Like recalling me also leads to a concurrent election with for a position that, you know, like I'm not going to be in this position in two months, someone else is. And so there is the aspect of time et cetera. And so just at a very high level understanding of this charge or any of the other charges really constitute a recall is I think something that should be posed. But again, happy to answer any questions and move forward.

Owen Rivera yields

Dylan Bianchi: It seems pretty clear to me that Ashwin had a responsibility here that he could very reasonably have been expected to meet and that he failed to meet. And also, I think we should just ask ourselves, like, what is the actual spirit of these rules? Like, would we rather go through these recall processes for this charge or would we rather just give Ashwin and the Board an opportunity to rectify the mistake? Like, the reason these rules exist is not to trap up Board members or any member of ASUW. It's to get people to do things. And in this case, a member of Board failed to do the thing they were supposed to do. I think they've been issued a warning. They should now be given an amount of time, a reasonable amount of time, a week until next steering to rectify the issue.

Aiden Reeder: I got a couple of things to address here. So first start off of the fact that Ashwin is the only one to be mentioned here is it's because of the single, it's a singular investigation. I know that in my talks with other sponsors and it wouldn't be out of the question to at least look into perhaps failures to fulfill obligations on other individuals. This is just a beginning, a start. Continuing on with that as a matter of whether or not like this is a waste of time and going on with that, that was actually a concern of mine, the fact that this was Introduced late. There are other elections that do have to happen and this does perhaps muddy the waters a bit. A phrase that I do appreciate and I think needs to be taken into consideration is that accountability has no timeline, whether early, whether late. If something wasn't done. it should be held accountable. I agree that this is like this serves as an early warning. But determinant upon what this committee decides, what Senate could decide perhaps, would be whether or not we do go through with this not whether or not it should be served.

Erick Jacobsen: Before I go to Owen and take more hands, with regards to Aiden's point on like potentially looking into other things, the steering committee currently acts as our oversight committee. So if anyone wants to have a discussion item on anything before submitting a bill, you can. You can also submit a bill, that is well within your rights, but I wanted to make people make aware of people that, as the oversight committee of the Senate over all of ASUW, if you would like a discussion item on anything further or outside the scope of this bill, please feel free to talk to me.

Owen Rivera: I just kind of want to wrap things up by bringing us back to the fact that all, I mean, I'm assuming that the language in EPP means that all candidates need to be signed off for. And it's already been established that that is not possible. So I, and for the sake of, you know, efficiency and getting down to what is, you know, really matters, rather than, you know, something that where there's another employee who has a shared responsibility and didn't even, you know, know about this, about the function of a document that they, you know, have to go over pretty thoroughly, I just believe that this doesn't have much merit as reasons to recall someone.

Erick Jacobsen: I see hands. Are there any questions, comments, or motions? Keep in mind we have 19 minutes left in this meeting. We have only this meeting in next to get through all five charges.

Joseph Riggio: I want to touch briefly on Owen's point. I agree with you that practically, it's nearly impossible to try and, especially if they're not affiliated with ASUW anymore, yeah, that's a head scratcher. But that doesn't leave out the current employees, the people who are still affiliated. That we should also be holding accountable as well. That process, that is the process of what I assume my interpretation of what this charge is getting at is, you know, yes, it's for all violations. And all violations does include violations of current and former ASUW employees as well. Also, just a reminder, I was going to make a motion, but it seems like we want more discussion on this. We are approving whether or not these claims are validated or not. Senate will ultimately decide if any charges go through, Senate will ultimately decide on that, we're just making sure that the evidence that the prime sponsor has submitted, as well as their arguments, hold up to what their claims are in the bill.

Abigail Appleyard: That was a great segue because I was going to say that since we are assessing whether the charges are valid and they appear to be valid. I think at this point we should just, I'm going to make a motion. I'm going to make a motion and it doesn't necessarily reflect how I feel we should proceed in this situation, but for the sake of getting through all of these charges and honoring what our role with going through these charges is, I would move to approve this charge.

Abigail Appleyard moves to approve Charge 2

Blair Yeh seconds

Nandana Jaideep objects

Abigail Appleyard: Again, this doesn't necessarily mean I feel like this is something worth someone losing their position over, but because our role is to assess whether the charge is valid and we have decided, I think a lot of us feel that the charge is valid, I think we need to move on. Be able to talk about other charges and then let Senate decide whether that's worth someone losing their job over, especially not at this point in the timeline.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah I think it's super important that we discuss and at least try to get on the same page before putting something this high level out into the Senate, which could possibly like put one of us in jeopardy of like, you know, accusations that may or may not be backed up by any evidence. So I think until we all come to like some sort of consensus or even agree to like how we feel about a certain charge. I don't think it's fair to just move on for the sake of time when it's somebody's job, reputation, and all of these different things at stake. I just think that's extremely unfair and kind of

disproportionately, it's like the disproportionate treatment of certain people versus others.

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

Pierce Wallbaum: I just want to say I completely agree with Abigail. I think that most of us have assessed the validity of this claim and it will go to Senate and they can decide if this is something that is worth recalling for. And for that reason, I move the previous question.

Pierce Wallbaum moves the previous question.

Abigail Appleyard seconds

Approved 5-1-1

Motion to approve charge 2 approved 5-1-1

Erick Jacobsen: This charge is approved. For the sake of record keeping I will renumber it as charge 1 since the initial charge 1 was removed. And we move now to charge 3. Teddie, would you mind reading charge 3 in full for us, please?

Teddie Schmitt reads Section 2 Charge 3

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, we are now in discussion but before we get to all these hands, I noticed that there's some inconsistency in source numbering. Joseph, would you mind correcting some of that?

Nandana Jaideep: I just want to go back to when someone made a statement that these claims were; the claims made have been evaluated prior to today. May I ask how that was done? And also, how much notice was given to the person being tried today? Because I think it's important that we have that on record.

Erick Jacobsen: I don't remember who said that. Nandana who said that? Do you know Jothsna?

Jothsna Sundar: Can I ask? Can you restate what you are asking about specifically so I can check the record?

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah, I think someone previously made a claim like in this meeting about how a lot of these claims made have been evaluated already prior to this meeting. So I was just wondering how exactly they were evaluated in a non-public meeting.

Jothsna Sundar: Based off of my memory of what happened, I do have the transcript, that I think is referring to what Abigail and Pierce said about moving on from charge 2 about how members of steering have, feel that they have evaluated that the charge is valid, that it has enough evidentiary support. Feel free to correct me if I'm wrong.

Erick Jacobsen: So in that case, it was not necessarily a statement of this has been evaluated beforehand, but within this meeting, they felt as if it was evaluated enough. I'm getting nods from Pierce. Abigail, do you?

Abigail Appleyard: Yeah, I mean I think we talked about, Ashwin said that he did, he wasn't able to validate everybody's hours, so that's evidence that it wasn't done. And so we moved on from the charge. It wasn't anyone saying that, oh, we had looked at this previously in a non-public meeting, just from the discussions that we had been having in Ashwin's own commentary, there was evidence saying that he did not perform that aspect of this job.

Pierce Wallbaum: Yeah, and what I said was, I feel, because none of this said that we should all be on the same page, but I said I feel we have all assessed the validity of the claim. I didn't say that it was before this meeting or outside any public meeting. I just was talking about within this meeting; we've all looked at this. We've heard Ashwin say he has not done what he was supposed to do. Therefore, that was the motion.

Erick Jacobsen: So the statements in question were about within this meeting, not necessarily beforehand. Ashwin, you are next in the queue.

Ashwin Anand: I'm going to be completely honest here. We've already had ample discussion about this. Charges 2 and 3, they reference basically the same thing. I'm going to continue to reiterate that I was in charge of making sure and enforcing that Board members, specifically within my purview, were able to commit their community service hours. And to my knowledge, Board members have completed their community service hours. The actual verification process was located over, might have been located in the EPP, but not wasn't located in my transition document, nor the actual bylaws through which I'm supposed to reference. It says in conjunction with the EAC, et cetera. Again, enforcing community service hours has been done. I think that is what we're trying to get at here. Speaking specifically to the accountability point and the action step, not only have Board members completed their community service hours, but there is no further outlook from this. Speaking from a personal aspect, even if this goes to the Senate floor, the only further action that's being taken is my recall. You can't enforce, you know, like a redo of the community service hours that Board members have already completed previously, because that isn't within the Senate order. I'm just going to put all this out here. And again, I'll continue speaking on it, but these hours have been done. If you had had a conversation, if the prime sponsor had had a conversation with me earlier, we would have resolved this.

Abigail Appleyard: I had a question about the first whereas clause under this charge. It mentions, okay, I'll just read the whole charge or the whole clause. "The community service hours for the elections violations must be enforced with the coordination of the EAC chair and the judicial. Secretary of Judgments, as well as overseen by the judicial

committee of the prior year.” With regards to that last part, I was wondering for anyone who was on judicial last year, one, were you involved with any of this and was the chair involved? Because Ashwin would have been the chair for this year, so this is the last year's guy, I guess I'm confused how he's responsible for verifying this, if it seems like someone else was in that role at the time.

Erick Jacobsen: You two were on Judicial last year, so I'll give you both if you'd like to.

Julia Tanner: I mean yeah it was quite simply no we haven't worked on enforcing the volunteer hours. Like, I didn't receive any messages or anything about it. I was not aware that it was, I was, I should, I should cover, I was never made aware that as a member of judicial, I was responsible for further enforcing these hours. I was under the thought or impression that, I ended up resigning my seat at the start of this year, I was under the impression that when I resigned that seat, I was done. I was out. Can you let me, who is our Secretary of Judgements last? I can't remember her name.

Dylan Bianchi: Aditi, maybe Aditi was involved or knew about it, but like I could ask her for the or I could if I may, but yeah, go ahead.

Julia Tanner: And just like a follow up the Judicial being in charge of actually enforcing it was new as of last year. I don't think any of us were fully cognizant of like the former judicial committee would be in charge of what they like, what the volunteer hours that they gave. I think I assumed that it would be this year's judicial committee enforcing it.

Blair Yeh: I would like to speak for both sides of this charge. For against it, I would like to say that none of this was clear to any specific people. So I don't really think that it's the Director of Internal Policy's fault that he wasn't able to do this, but I do believe that he should have tried to do it somehow or asked a few questions about it. But also for the other side. Hang on. For the other side, he did say, or Ashwin did say that he has verified personally and with people that he trusts, as he said earlier in the meeting. I don't know if that's word for word, but that's just like no specific accepted way as specified in the documents.

Dylan Bianchi: I really like how Blair put it. The evidence as put up by the sponsors is very clear here and was very clear in the last charge that the correct process for verification has not been followed. That's it, I abstained on the last charge because again, I'm in favor of us just pushing this a week because there's kind of this missing piece of evidence here. Ashwin claims to have verification that every member of Board did the service hours, including for this charge, we're discussing whether he did his service hours. If he can take that verification, send it to Reea, and hopefully send it to us since we're considering these charges, I think that would make the point, make everybody's lives a lot easier. So I think we should push this charge next week.

Erick Jacobsen: So that is not a motion, we continue on. We do have a couple other people in the queue before I get back to y'all.

Owen Rivera: So I just wanted to bring up like the role of like EAC and specifically line 39, where it says the EAC chairs were never informed about the timeline of serving the hours. The EAC co-chairs by all you know, for all intents and purposes, should know the EPP like the back of their hand. So I just have a problem with this specific kind of like, like language. There's no reason that Ashwin should have to inform one of the EAC co-chairs about something that's in the EPP.

Aiden Reeder: This is actually kind of a callback to something Blair said of like the assume statement. I think something that might be better serving in charges 1, formerly 2 and 3 here would be a rather, I just want to like mostly ask honestly I think it might be better stated as "must be assumed" rather than "can be assumed" because if there was no official certification, then for all intents and purposes, it was not fulfilled until such time. So I just want to know if that would be a better verbiage because I do agree that assume is in that context is not the strongest case to be made.

Erick Jacobsen: Brendan would that count as a grammatical change, or does that change the meaning? Okay, because that changes the meaning, it's not something that we can amend within this current order. But if that's something people want to consider in the future, records shall so reflect. Now, are there any other hands?

Joseph Riggio: Point of order, just saying we have two minutes for this and then we have until 45 until we get absolutely kicked out here. So technically 7 minutes.

Pierce Wallbaum: I just want to push back against what Dylan said a little bit. It's been stated multiple times that the burden of proof is not on who is being charged. So pushing this back so that said person can prove that this isn't true, just doesn't make a lot of sense to me, as it's not their responsibility to do so. And as the charge stands, it doesn't really matter if Ashwin trusts who told him what, because like Blair said, that's not any, that's not verifiable nor is that something that they should be doing in their role. And so that's all I just want to push that idea back. I don't think this is a very time sensitive manner and so pushing it back to do something and this can't be amended anyways so that just doesn't make a lot of sense to me to push anything back. So I think that should be considered as we move forward.

Blair Yeh: On a similar note, I wanted to say that Dylan's idea of pushing this back so we could get more proof of the volunteer hours is a good idea, just so we wouldn't be assuming anything. But at this point in time, it would be really hard to validate the volunteer hours you did over summer. in 2025, since it would be like you would actually have to have, or in my experience, you would have to have documents from the place

that you volunteered at and it's been so long that there's probably no chance that they would remember anything unless you have like a personal relationship with them.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah I just want to go back to like the main argument here. I think if none of us can even agree to like kind of figure out how to enforce this particular rule that's in the EPP and not in any other governing document, I don't think it's fair to like charge anybody of violating that essentially because a lot of this is up to interpretation and things that we haven't qualified yet. I know last year this was included in the EPP, but whoever like took the charge to put that in the EPP did not put any enforcement guidelines in the bylaws or anywhere else. So I feel like since this is the very first year this has been done, it is extremely unfair to sort of charge Ashwin with these like violations, especially when there were no enforcement guidelines to accompany any of these requirements.

Ashwin Anand: I have a couple points. First thing is just kind of going off Nandana point is that, you know, entering a new role, being given six weeks to accomplish a task that was again newly placed into the role was something that I had to kind of reconcile with. Again, with the actual verification process specifically, I know that the board members have completed their hours working off of trust, working off of that honor system. Again, it seems here that we're tending more towards the guilty until proven innocent aspect. The burden isn't on me in order to provide that information and so, you know, with there also being multiple roles with the EAC chair, et cetera, having to be, you know, a part of this process like, again, I've done my best, I've tried my best, but recalling me for the specific charge it just does not seem like it's a tangible thing. But again, to the point that I mentioned earlier, charges 2 and 3 are very closely related. And since steering has already approved charge two, or now charge 1, it again, I'm just, I'm going to say all that just to put that out there. This is already going to go to the Senate floor and so it's going to be discussed there. I'll bring up like more points over there, but I just, I think we're spinning circles here.

Teddie Schmitt: Okay. A couple things. One, I hate to bring this up. I have a time conflict with steering. I have expressed permission by my professor to be here that I'm okay to miss class this week. I would appreciate if we can get through it. I understand if not, there's still a lot left in this. Where else was I going? It is mentioned in the bylaws that to ensure that ASUW Elections are enforced during summer and Autumn quarter in coordination with the incoming EAC Chair and the Judicial Committee Secretary Judgments. It's in the bylaws that this is a part of the Director of Internal Policy role to be done and that they must to be enforced. I have a question for Ashwin as well about what like when he took up the role because I was under the assumption and that he was in the role during the summer quarter as well. I just wanted to verify that.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah I was in the role during summer quarter where I had summer hours. I was also in the role during Autumn. Again, I've said what I needed to say in terms of the responsibilities that I was giving, the responsibilities and information that I was given. Again, I would have appreciated communication before this bill came out during spring break. I would have been more than happy to discuss it instead of bringing this to a Senate floor with over 100 people.

Brendan Chang: Something that made me realize I might feel like I might have to clarify something, and maybe I missed a part of something earlier, but just so I'm just, a couple questions for whoever wants to answer a part of like how this all works, and if I, because I don't have to set a file up for whatever reason, it's like a failure to complete duties in the governing documents, and this charge is only specifically in the EPP, not the bylaws, or it is the bylaws?

Teddie Schmitt: It references both. I specifically cite the EPP as it's considered a governing document, but there is sources taken through the enforcement of it that was mentioned in the bylaws.

Brendan Chang: That's probably like the clarification then is the, if for in terms of how the hierarchy of documents works, what's considered, so it goes constitution, bylaws, and special orders, whatever the rules, so like in this case, Robert rules, policies and procedures, operational documents, is what it's called. Governing documents are specifically constitutional bylaws. Anything else that's not a governing document.

Erick Jacobsen: Can the bylaws designate another like a policy or procedure as also a governing document or okay, so I think the bylaws said that they were governing documents, so that may be the source of this confusion.

Brendan Chang: So, in terms of that, then that I would have to like, I have to my knowledge, by law, it's literally just like how it's like, it actually might be in that book, it's like a triangle, it's called the hierarchy of government documents, like it's like and so it's like specifically to that, that is. my knowledge, but I'm also not a lawyer. I just was not, so that is beyond my scope of my knowledge at this time. I just wanted to clarify that technically, like from my own personal knowledge and how it's how it's listed in the hierarchy of documents, the EPP would be considered an operational document, like pretty much everything else.

Erick Jacobsen: To that point, Teddie, I pulled up the bylaws. I was mistaken. It doesn't call them governing documents. It says there's organizing documents, which are under the bylaws, so it's constitution bylaws, organizing documents, and then procedural documents, and the EPP is considered a procedural document. So in that case, it is not a governing document. And I apologize for my mistake.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just wondering Teddie, would you not feel comfortable with one of your 16 co-sponsors representing you like next Senate meeting? Would you feel like you would have to skip because they couldn't adequately discuss it?

Teddie Schmitt: I have the most knowledge of it because I'm the author of it. I'd be fine if one of them was able to, but I know a lot of them also had class conflicts, so it was I had to reach out to a lot of asking if they'd be willing to come if that interfered with anything.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, just three things specifically before next meeting. Yeah, next meeting. One thing, again, just keep in mind the timeline of the recall. I get completely that the charges are being talked about and steering I respect everybody's time and I appreciate all of you for being here. But the other thing you need to really consider is like, how does this recall really affect the next elections process? How does transition work when, if I am recalled, et cetera. The second thing I'm going to point out, and specifically this is to Teddie I would really appreciate if the prime sponsor of this bill is here and present, as specifically stated that like people that have that are listed as co-sponsors are people that have only seconded the bill and not written the bill. So I would really appreciate it if you were here. And honestly, I wouldn't feel comfortable trying to prove myself again in this like guilty and proven innocent aspect until the prime sponsor is actually here to talk about what is located in this bill. Because I had no context to the vote previously, no conversations with the prime sponsor before this, et cetera. And I forgot my third thing, so I'm going to leave it there.

Nandana Jaideep: Yeah I just want to reiterate one more time Thank you, Brendan, for bringing that up once again. But since the EPP is not even a governing document, it's only a procedural document for elections and candidates, like I mentioned before, we are crossing a very fine line here and like borderline dangerous territory. We need to really be careful about how we're approaching this and make sure that we're not charging people and trying people based off of things that don't govern our organization. So I just want to let that be clear on the record and really take that into account when we talk about charges two and three specifically.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay, are there any other questions, comments, or motions? It is 540 PM.

Joseph Riggio: If we're talking about the validity of this charge, I do understand that this is hella confusing, even for Parliamentarian. The I mean, ultimately, the bylaws are being cited. The first whereas clause in this charge cites the bylaws, which is a governing document. That's irrespective of source 9 is that I have to update that source. But it cites both the bylaws and the EPP. And the EPP, it's in my interpretation, it is the governing document of the election or the EAC, or at least how that committee operates procedurally. And if they are required to work in coordination with the Director of

Internal Policy, therefore they would have to abide by both in a weird sort of way, because whatever the EAC would do, we need to abide by the elections policies and procedures, especially if it's during that election cycle and following whatever responsibilities were set out or requirements were set out, which is like week 6, account for that. And so I would imagine that even though what's being cited here is the bylaws, which is a governing doc for the responsibilities of the Director of Internal Policy, it's just that the EPP is used as a reference to specific or minute details of how that process should have worked according to what the EAC would do if they work together. That's from my interpretation of it.

Ashwin Anand: Yeah, and just to specifically talk about it, and Brendan, thank you for bringing that up, is that the actual process of which through verification, since now we've determined that the EPP is a procedural document and not a governing document, technically verification isn't then like shouldn't be cited in a charge or should be held against me because that isn't in the bylaws itself. And so I'm going to reference charge 2 and charge 3 that now if we're making this determination, verification should not be a process or like shouldn't be a part of this and that what is only considered is what is in the Bylaws, which is like the coordination of with the EAC Chair, Secretary of Judgments, etc. And to that point and focusing specifically on that, with no like clarity on like what coordination looks like, how it works with the Secretary of Judgments and like the judicial committee the year prior, like realistically speaking, there's nothing that like I can prove. I, you know, there's literally no like specificity as to like how I can prove myself innocent. You have something from the EAC Chair, but you know I will say that I tried to verify it the best that I could and with coordination with the EAC Chair could look in a number of ways. It doesn't even have to be a verbal, like a verbal, like verbal conversation with the EAC Chair, et cetera. I'll quit yapping, but anyway, focus on the bylaws and just verify that.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, if the Robert's Rules doesn't accept non-bylaws documents as governing and the bylaws don't even consider it bylaws, our constitution only recognizes the bylaws. And if the amendment that the board passed passes in elections, it will authorize for other organizing documents, but if it recognizes it as a procedural document and not a governing document, I would also emphasize that we focus on the bylaws and constitution. So the bylaws section in question is the Director of Internal Policy Job Description. So Article 3, Section 7, Clause D. It doesn't say week 6 and it doesn't say verification, but it does say ensure violations are enforced during summer and autumn in coordination with the incoming EAC Chair and the incoming Judicial Committee Secretary of Judgments. So those are the details with which we are discussing.

ADJOURNMENT

Abigail Appleyard: It's 5:44 so I move to adjourn.

Abigail Appleyard moves to adjourn.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5:45 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
