



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

22 May 2026

HUB 307

4:05 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

Joseph Riggio (he/him), Vice Speaker | P

Julia Tanner (she/her), Public Relations Officer | P

Blair Yeh (she/her) On-Campus Committee Chair | P

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

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

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

N/A, GPSS Director of University Affairs | E

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

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

N/A, *Director of Internal Policy* | E

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

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

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

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

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

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules and add OA-32-08 as item B of Proposals

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: I don't really have much to report. I've had one of my check ins with y'all and I know Dylan and Abigail sent me times that work for them. I will get back to you, I promise. Just not right now. And then, Blair, if you could respond and schedule your check-in with me, that would be awesome. I've also started some transition meetings. I met with Pierce to talk about how the Speaker and the PRO role interact. So I'll be reaching out to Addison and Collin soon after I finish my two big papers that are due this weekend, which is fun. And I'm also creating like basically like a list of like all the legislation that we passed and it's a lot. We should be proud. And then I'm also going to, I think I'm going to turn that into like my last board report of like, here's what we did, and then just overload them with all the cool stuff we did so they beg me to stop, yeah. And I think that is it for the speaker's report, so I will move to the Vice Speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Hey y'all, still working on attendance from last meeting. I'll try and get that out. I'll probably do it Sunday, Monday. I know it's a three-day weekend, so happy Memorial Day, everybody or Memorial Day weekend. Other than that, though, I'm still working on the GAVEL annual report, liaison reports. If you have committee members that are liaisons, reminder that the report is due by Friday. or next Friday, 29th, if you can get that in, or by whenever they have their last meeting, just so I can work on it a little bit ahead of time. That would really help me out because I have two quarterly reports and then an annual report to do for GAVEL. That is all I have.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: Hi. I posted an Instagram reel today, meaning me as in Pierce did it, on behalf of the intern team. So, you should check that out. But otherwise, I don't have anything. So, enjoy the weather this weekend and show up to field day later. Yeah.

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Alan Galvez: Nothing to report. Flummoxed is the word of the day. I love the way it comes out the mouth. So bewildered or perplexed. There you go. End of report.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

Recess 4:10 pm

Reconvened 4:20 pm

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve both minutes

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: Interestingly, my joke of when all the co-sponsors come to the podium was not followed up with an explanation on why that was unreasonable.

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Anyway, we're moving on now to proposals. We'll start with R-32-27. Skylar said she would be here at, she said her class ends at 4:20, I think. So, if we want to entertain a motion to flip around, Joseph.

Joseph Riggio moves to suspend the rules to move OA-32-08 to the top of proposals.

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to OA-32-08 an Organic Act to Establish Executive Legislation and Ensure the Neutrality of the Chair. Take it away, Collin.

Collin Saywers reads [OA-32-08 An Organic Act to Establish Executive Legislation and Ensure the Neutrality of the Chair](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like to speak a little bit on this bill before we move to questions?

Collin Saywers: Yes. So, what brought this about was sort of the conversations that have been happening this year regarding moving the Senate voting seat on board but back to the Vice Speaker, which I did not think was a good idea. And so, and then also the concerns over like the optics of having a Board member presiding over bills about the Board. So this was an attempt to rectify that situation.

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty, then we'll move to questions. I did not have a chance to look at this bill yet, so I have a couple of questions, but I'll go after everyone else. Does anyone else have questions?

Joseph Riggio: Brief comment, I just put it as a review edit that we can talk about later if I make it. Can we take this as grammatical? I believe, Collin, the section that you're referencing for line 41-42 is section 3A specifically, because section 3 has three subsections, with A being the qualifications.

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, we can take that as grammatical. My first question was, like, what made you choose the bylaws over the rules, especially because I think it says that you can suspend the rules to suspend this part of the bylaws, so what was the choice between bylaws versus rules?

Collin Saywers: Are you referring to like the overruling?

Erick Jacobsen: Yes because if it's like a suspension of the rules to overrule a judgment that's laid out in the bylaws why not just like put this procedure in the rules? So that way we don't have to explicitly say, you can suspend the rules to suspend this?

Collin Saywers: I think the rationale there was just that it would be this same thing as any motion to suspend the rules, like what happened with the Joseph Commendation Bill, like I suppose if that was something steering would like to have in place a motion to suspend the rules, they could, that would be fine. But it just seemed the easiest to just have it be a suspension of the rules.

Joseph Riggio: From my interpretation of what this would do I think the reason why it was explicit, and correct me if I'm wrong, Collin, but to suspend the rules, because we have a bylaws document, we have a rules document. I think what you were getting at is we need to codify something like this a little bit more so that way we, if a senator were to suspend the rules, if we were to place this in the rules instead, that means hypothetically we can suspend this whole entire procedure. Which I think kind of defeats the purpose of it because the point is to have it enshrined in our governing documents

that the chair cannot preside over marked legislation designated as executive legislation. So. That was my interpretation of it, at least.

Julia Tanner: I had a question because I think it was mentioned in the whereas clauses. again, this is my first time reading it as well, so I apologize if there's anything that I'm missing. But is there an intention or is there, was there thought behind like who would be replacing or if it would just be like the chair stepping down for, like, how, do you see like a replacement of that spot for the time that that executive would follow the normal procedure if this, if Erick were to yield, go to the Vice Speaker, the PRO, and then committee chairs?

Confirmed

Erick Jacobsen: I had another question for Collin. Is the idea that this designation of executive legislation is the same level of like a Senate bill designation, or is it like an additional, like, will there be like an additional line in the template and like, in order to like note that designation, or is it just like an EL coded bill separate from SBs and other types?

Collin Saywers: So what I have been envisioning was nothing would change on the bill beyond on the agenda, in italics executive legislation with a link to why the parliamentarian designated it that way. So that's what I thought would have been the easiest to do. It's also why I didn't try to create a new, like, EL coded legislation, because I think that would be good.

Joseph Riggio: Would you be open then to an amendment possibly on line 26 that clarifies that the designation of executive legislation on Senate agendas will be assigned?

Collin Saywers: Sure.

Joseph Riggio: So it just ensures that there's clarification on that.

Joseph Riggio moves to amend line 26 to add language to read "the designation of executive legislation on Senate agendas will be assigned to any of the previously listed classifications."

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Dylan Bianchi: This is kind of a question, kind of a comment. I think this is a good idea, just as the bill to spare the speaker from a position of like having board members or senators scrutinize that how they're chairing on a given issue. My principal concern is just that like most of our legislation in some way involves the Board of Directors, usually just through like the forwarding clause or through like a clause asking them to act on a

certain issue. But it's not going to be like, are we talking about legislation that only concerns the entire Board of Directors, legislation that only reflects upon the performance of the Board of Directors positively or negatively? Like I was just a little unclear.

Collin Saywers: So ultimately its mainly about like bills concerning the Board of Directors in so far as like the exercise of their duties. So if there was like a commendation or a condemnation or a recall, those are the primary bills which would earn that designation. Or like institutional reform would have also have that designation. Ultimately, it is the judgment of the parliamentarian, and at the end of the day, it's also the judgment of the Senate body, because if they think that it was wrongly applied that designation or the bill doesn't really need to be considered executive legislation, they do have the ability to overrule that.

Erick Jacobsen: I guess I'll piggyback off of that with my next question, which is, could you walk us through the like intentionality of like including bills that are unrelated to the Board, but just have this a primary sponsor being a board member? How does that fit into this?

Collin Saywers: So that is specifically about the relationships the speaker would have with certain Board members. So if like a board member had a passion project and they were the prime sponsor on a bill and then the speaker while exercising their role as chair made a ruling that that board member did not like, the Speaker then for like jeopardizing their relationship with that board member. And it's sort of like a conflict of interest. If you want to strike that specific provision, you can do so.

Erick Jacobsen: I would say my follow up question to that would be where do we draw the line of like all these people the Speaker has to keep relations with? Because also I would say like what if like the Vice Speaker or the Pro or the Clerk sponsors legislation or, because like we work together pretty closely and that's also relationships that we want to keep intact. What if it's like someone's friend or roommate? I don't know like what sort of standardized rule we can set up or what sort of standardized rules already exist, but. It seems like that's getting away from the intention generally of the bill, which is if it relates to the Board, duties, operations, et cetera, that's a conflict of interest and we want to recognize that. I feel like this strays into the territory of towards something that we need a more general rule about, and I think that that's what I'm concerned about.

Collin Saywers: Yeah, I see where you're coming from. If you think that the bit about the primary sponsor isn't necessary, I'd be open to changing that.

Erick Jacobsen: I guess in relation to that question point of parliamentary inquiry for Joseph, do we know of any like set conflict of interest yielding provisions in Roberts or in

our own rules? And if there are none, maybe this is something that the future Vice Speaker potentially could work on because I feel like there should be like, because I know the only thing that I'm aware of is that if there's like a, I think the word is pecuniary interest, there's a financial interest for this for the chair. No, it's not that. I don't know, it's a weird word that I've only ever seen in this context, but it's why I yield the chair for the WSA bill is because they sent me a paycheck and it's why I abstain from all that. So Joseph, do you want to elaborate?

Erick means "pecuniary."

Joseph Riggio: Well to that point, actually section 3 which is the section that Collin called out, section A, is qualifications of the chair which does outline, so the provisions that we have explicitly in our Senate rules, I don't know in-depth conflict of interest with Roberts. Other than that, they do mention conflict of interest in the chair, but it's sort of determined kind of by the body. So, one, the speaker elected by the Senate body shall chair all meetings, the Senate committee, Senate steering unless otherwise prescribed. Two, no member who has a personal or financial interest in any matter on the floor, nor someone who is a sponsor or co-sponsor of the issue, shall preside over its consideration without unanimous consent to the Senate. The ASUW president cannot chair meetings of the Senate, and when the speaker is not eligible to preside over the body, they will be allowed to designate an alternate member and we designate that through Section B succession. So, we do have a clause that vaguely says personal or financial interests. In Erick's case for WSA, you were correct in that you did have a financial interest in that organization. Personal is pretty vague right now, but yeah, that's what currently exists.

Erick Jacobsen: Collin my next question then would be like, do you think it would be easier to include it as like an extra part of that clause, like a personal financial or like professional relationship interest or like someone who's the sponsor or like target or like subject of a bill. Just because this and maybe like less words. I don't know. I don't think that's strictly necessary, but I wanted to hear your thoughts.

Collin Saywers: That would be fine.

Joseph Riggio: I'll warn that there's a balance of vagueness as well as to allow flexibility, but I believe at least like the intention, and again, correct me if I'm wrong, Collin, but I think the intention is there's a specific issue that is trying to be addressed, specifically saying that our Board representative, because it's new this year. You know, the Senate Speaker, we haven't had a vote on board until this year. So it's still new for all of us and sure, you could make a very loose legal technical argument that personal could fall under that category, and even if you were to add the word professional, in my opinion, like, okay, then what's the definition of professional? Like, we're going to have so many arguments over this. What I like about this organic act is that it does clearly define like

operational, recall, condemnation, commit, so things that already exist that we don't have to spend a lot of time deliberating on. And there's also a pathway for Senate to overrule it. It might be more words, but how many people reasonably look at our governing documents to that extent? And it's going to be the Vice Speaker Elect's job to interpret it and also enforce it and teach it. So I will, that's where I'll leave that.

Julia Tanner: And then it would be reasonable to assume that in the cases of what we've seen this year with the Vice Speaker representing or drafting a bill that was very controversial, if the speaker would step down and this passes, the speaker would step down, the Vice Speaker was the one who sponsored it, so they would also step down so that succession would just be followed that way?

Collin Saywers: Yes.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions, comments, or amendment ideas

Joseph Riggio moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 3-0-3

Erick Jacobsen: Now we'll move on to R-32-27. I assume this is supposed to be a Resolution to Add Gluten-Free Options to Dining Halls. Skylar, would you like to read your bill out in full, please?

Skylar Best reads [R-32-27 Add Gluten Free Options to Dining Halls](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you Skylar. Before we open discussion, two things I'll note, I changed "I" to "the sponsor of this bill" since if the bill passes, this is the Senate saying this, not you as an individual. And then I don't see any like in-text citations so if you want to go through and add a suggest edit, just take brackets and then a number of the citation. With that, are there any questions for a sponsor?

Pierce Wallbaum: I want to start off by saying thank you for this bill. It's really important that students, you know, are not being exposed to something that they shouldn't be. However, I do just have a few questions. The first one's really annoying, but I'm mostly just a little concerned about like their grammatical like capitalization a lot. I don't think gluten is ever capitalized, or like unless it's at the beginning of the sentence so I think it's only capitalized in this bill. I think it should all be lowercased, including like gluten-free. And then there's a few other moments also, like after whereas clause on line 14, it says students. The S should be lowercased. Also on line 8, same thing. So I think just checking the grammatical capitalization stuff. Other than that, I do have a question if you talked to HFS about their gluten-free options, or like, because you also ask for like more food options, so obviously that's going to cost money, more

variety, stuff like that. Just wondering if you've talked to any of them or gotten any feedback or estimates or anything about costs?

Skylar Best: I can talk to them if needed.

Abigail Appleyard: This is just another grammatical type thing but the first that clause says that local point and Oliver Hall, and I feel like it should be changed to center table instead of Oliver Hall, just because we are talking about the dining hall specifically.

Skylar Best: The pizza place, isn't in center table though? So that's the only reason I said Oliver Hall, because it's technically not center table. It's like a separate building.

Abigail Appleyard: You caught me. I'm A West Campus resident, so I did not know that. But that makes sense then. Is there another name for it like specifically, just to be clear about like, does it have a name? That pizza place?

Skylar Best: I think its just pizza place.

Erick Jacobsen: I guess this would be less grammatical and something more for committee, but if we're also including like hub dining as well, because that's under HFS, we can just say that all HFS related dining services or something along those lines.

Collin Saywers: HFS still lists the pizza places being part of Center Table.

Erick Jacobsen: In that case, I think we can grammatically accept that as center table, but if we want to include HUB dining that would have to be an amendment. Are there any other questions or comments for the sponsor?

Joseph Riggio moves to approve into Off Campus Affairs

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the floor agenda I believe Joseph said we have 45 minutes for the Lincoln Johnson Forum. I moved announcements and public comment after the forums because I have a feeling Lincoln will be there at like 5 and I want to like get to him first. But we do, we, I forgot to do that. We will need to add some liaison things. But we have now reflected all of the legislation that we have.

Pierce Wallbaum: R-32-09 was actually voted out of committee.

Erick Jacobsen: Cool, okay, that's been reflected. I think at this point we removed the timestamp for old business, unless you all want it to stay.

Dylan Bianchi: Are we prioritizing just working in committees at this point?

Erick Jacobsen: I think this is a good question. We have 6 bills in old business, but then also, like, you know, yeah, I'd say we prioritize committees.

Dylan Bianchi: Yeah, I would agree because it seems like those are the things we have in terms of time sensitive legislation which I guess the WSA bill which probably isn't going to get passed anyway are in committee, so we might as well give that time in committee. I'm looking at all those, and I'm not saying anything. It's like super pressing or time sensitive by the end of the year type stuff.

Joseph Riggio: I'm in favor of removing the timestamp and if we want to add it back later after reflection, because our elections are going way over time, and we feel like we need to get to some stuff, we can. I will say, though, I just emailed HUB events. We're going to have the room until 8:15. Hopefully we don't lose quorum. But we're hoping to push our meeting maybe a little bit longer as needed to get through some things.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm adding the 3 fee committees onto here. I think those will be the only six liaison positions that we elect. Yeah. Francisco was asking if we were going to do EAC. I think that's best left for next year at the start, especially because it's not as urgent as like the fee committees, JCC, judicial or anything.

Julia Tanner: Because we want to keep going as long as we can, in these next few meetings just to get through as much as possible. I'll start including in my pre-meeting brief and even my leadership report to like plan to stay longer or plan to get a proxy for the end of the meeting just so that we can keep quorum for anyone who can't like stay.

Joseph Riggio: I think it might be wise, do you know if you can include that in your leadership report too, but just like saying something and being like, hey, or I mean, I can, it's my responsibility too, but I can say something about proxies, yeah.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm also removing the A after question, if it's like the only question that's being asked. Does everyone feel comfortable with us just including the same question for SAF, STF and UPASS as we did last year? I'll get that reflected in a second but I think we also in our fall discussions, a lot of chairs indicated that they didn't want to like spend as much time going in depth about questions. So, also to save us time, I can write the question and get it on the floor if needed. So, if you want to move on, we would need a motion to approve this agenda.

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve the agenda

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 5-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on now to executive session.

Executive session convened 4:53

Reconvened 5:08 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, all right, we're back in recording. If you want to extend the executive session, we can via motion. Also, if you have specific ideas to talk about, we can talk to Julia outside of this meeting. Otherwise, we'll move on.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: So I guess we'll move on to announcements and public comment. Are there any announcements or would any member of the public like to speak?

Julia Tanner: It's Joseph's birthday so you should all say happy Birthday but not sing it.

Erick Jacobsen: You should all sing it right now.

Pierce Wallbaum: Happy Birthday Joseph.

Erick Jacobsen: Any others? Raise your hand to say happy birthday.

Pierce Wallbaum: Joseph how old are you?

Joseph Riggio: 22

Erick Jacobsen: I don't know about you. If there's no other announcements, we'll move on to adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-2-0

Adjourned 5:10 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
