



# The Associated Students - of the - University of Washington

ASUW Student Senate | Session XX

---

May 20th, 2014 | Paccar 192

***Call to Order: 5:07 P.M.***

---

## **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

**Isaac Prevost** instructs senators to pick up their name tags to show you are an active senator, with pro and con statements we will have lines, so please hold up your name tag for priority.

He says Steering moved committee meetings before Old Business.  
He calls for objections.

*The motion carries without objection.*

**Isaac Prevost** says that there are two rules from Steering for R-20-39. We do this for bills that have a lot of attention, one is to implement pro/con lines for second readings, once it starts, there will be two lines, one for active senators and others for guests on each sides. This is instead of him calling, a more formal way to represent each side equally. There will be a clarifying questions option as well. We'll have pro/con question in a loop to make an equal balance. This is the same format we used for the international student fee discussion. This is the best way we believe we can do this.

*The motion carries without objection. Rule one is adopted.*

**Isaac Prevost** says the second is to limit speaking times from 10 to 5 minutes; this is so everyone has the opportunity to speak, with as much time as possible to have a variety of voices. You can still speak twice, and priority goes to active senators first time, if you're a UW student first time 2nd priority, a guest first time, you have 3rd, and so on with second times speaking. That's a way to emphasize to make sure that the members and their constituents are represented. Traditionally you have 10 minutes, where you can yield to others, but to have as many people speak as possible, Steering is proposing a 5-minute cap. If you use both, that's a total of 10 minutes.

**Rachel Frank** asks about proxies?

**Isaac Prevost** says you don't get additional time. If you are yielded to it doesn't count from your time

**Ryan Roulier** asks if we can propose new rules?

**Isaac Prevost** says they can only override our rules with a 2/3 vote.

*The motion carries without objection.*

**Ryan Roulier** proposes a rule that non-senators may only speak once.

**Isaac Prevost** thinks this is out of our bounds, we have to offer the same treatment to everyone, but priority goes to senators.

**Alex Switzer** asks if every legislative committee has resolutions?

**Isaac Prevost** says 20-44 he would like to put in GA. Then they would all have one.

He asks for additions, deletions

**Mandy Humphries** moves to remove r-20-40, the sponsor has withdrawn.

Seconded.

The motion carries without objection.

**Alex Switzer** moves to place new business after unfinished business with a limit of 15 minutes.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Alex Switzer** speaks to it, on campus doesn't have a current bill, if we got through R-20-45 that would allow them to have a resolution in their committee. Since we only have one more general meeting, he feels it would benefit to have it in a committee this week,

**Russell Wiita** says we have a lot of debate in old business, we shouldn't add anything else before it. Sometimes committees won't have legislation, which is a reality.

**Kevin Shotwell** supports the motion, if we don't get to an item of new business, we won't get to this. There's one more that Senator Bendis just submitted.

**Timmy Bendis** says the last three are generally commemorative. It should be expedited with the rules we invented, 45 seems similar. They should be simple in first readings. He supports the motion.

**Isaac Prevost** calls a voice vote to move new business after unfinished business with 15-minute cap

The ayes have it.

Chelise says in unfinished business, R-20-44 should be started on 2nd readings.  
Seconded.

*The motion carries without objection.*

**Russell Wiita** moves to approve.

A clicker vote is conducted for the approval of the agenda.

*77-0-3. The agenda is approved.*

---

## **SPEAKER'S REPORT:**

**Isaac Prevost** says that election nominations are today, there are 3 leadership positions ad committee chair positions, this is a good way to get involved and learn how senate operates and have your voice heard more. He advises getting nominated this week to formulate your platform over the week. He thinks it's a good thing to do.

In controversial discussion, it's important to remember the importance of treating the other opinions you hear with respect. When you propose legislation, everything deserves the right to be heard, even if you're going to vote no, or if you are sure you'll vote eyes, its good to hear the details of it. So please be respectful and give everyone your attention. Please don't whisper disagreement under your breath, come up and share your opinion instead respectfully.

Also, the Yeti Yogurt social will be after this, so if you want to relax after 3 hours, come along! That's been put on by Amber, our POMCOM chair! She provided today's joke of the week. What happened to the butcher when he backed into the meat grinder? He got a little behind on his work.

---

## **VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT:**

**Michael Zangl** says at board we were efficient with the election announcements to get through. They approved the two pieces of legislation, and did several commission director positions hidings. They also received a request from Pierson Higher Education, concerning a piece of writing done 5 years ago on a task force. Pierson is writing about English and wanted to use a textbook, so they bought the rights for 500 a year, a new source of revenue. That was a cool way to spice board up a little. Come on to board on Thursdays, it's a joy!

---

## **BOARD OF DIRECTORS' REPORT:**

**The featured board member is Maxine Sugarman.**

**Maxine Sugarman** says she's the personnel director, they're doing hiring's now. There is one last application right now, its the EA coordinator, just submit a cover letter. She started in Senate, and was chair of oversight and AAA, worked for OGR, the EAC chair, and is finishing as personnel. Since your involved, come to the end of the year celebration on HUB lawn June 3rd. It'll be awesome. There will be an RSVP link tomorrow on the Senate group. She thanks the Senate.

**Shivani Changela** says that there are events, the student safety committee with texting and driving on Thursday in red square. Thursday at 4 there is an all Greek photo, that's an annual thing that happens.

**Jeff McNerney** says the provost advisory committee for students apps are open for next year. The incoming university affairs director and president will choose those.

---

## **FORUM WITH REGENTS Kristianne Blake and Kiana Scott**

**Kiana** says hello, she's the student member and happy to be here. She's going to stay out and let regent Blake take the lead, if you cant hear, hollar and we'll speak up.

**Regent Blake** has been a regent for 7 years, she's from Spokane. It's a great city. She's a UW grad, from 1975. She was in ASUW and its very interesting to listen to what you're doing. Its very different. There was no senate just a board with 7

positions. She spent her junior year on the board of control, and ran for vice president and was elected. Her boyfriend was elected president. She was VP in charge of finances, during the summer she thought as students aren't on campus, so she gave her boyfriend a raise. She learned a lesson the hard way, because the Daily found out about it. There was a front-page article. That was her learning as a leader.

[applause]

She also was on a committee to bring carpool parking on campus, they were concerned about the environment, so she got the UW to allocate on campus parking for carpoolers for 5 bucks a quarter. That was her big thing.

She came to talk to you about what's important to her as a regent. When they make a decision they take into account the impacts on current and future students, on faculty, and staff. They have a responsibility to make sure your experience is good as well as those who follow you. That's why with the financial crisis, she was part of a group of regents to reduce the amount of money from the endowment for current campus projects. They didn't want to spend away the endowment money because its there to support the university forever. They operated under the reduced pay out for 128 months but we're back to where we were at before. That's one thing that she was involved with.

The other thing is that she was invited to an ASUW event, the admin reception which was great, and she enjoyed getting to know students. She learned something, as a regent she isn't on campus so she doesn't know everything that's going on. They talked about the title 9 scholarships for the athletic department, they looked at that and was surprised. When regents look at things they are a lot higher level, so she was shocked to find out the title 9 scholarships weren't out of the athletics budget. She found out the next day they were coming from the general operating fund, and she doesn't think this is right. She thinks the athletic department should provide those scholarships. We can't with good conscious to say they're self supporting until they pay for female scholarships like they do for the male scholarships. She's typically fairly quiet at regents meetings, but this is something she is adamant about. She was adamant about the athletic department making contributions to academics before this issue came up. Athletics does a great job and the athletes impress her, but they are making money, and we need to get that money to campus. She's pushing this hard this year and we'll see fi we get action on it. They'll vote on the budget in June.

**Kiana Scott** says to reveal the way they make decisions, this came up at the admin reception, talked about at board, indicated where they need more info, and they'll spend time before June preparing to understand fully where the money is coming from and where its going, so they can be aware of issues like this.

**Kristianne Blake** asks for questions.

**Adison Richards** asks thanks her and asks as the budget comes up, what are some areas of improvement for efficiency. There was a times article yesterday about the President of Higher Ed being paid the most with the most quality in student bodies, the UW was listed as one of those. Have you seen this?

**Kristianne Blake** responds she understand, she didn't see the article, the debt low here is relatively low, so she's surprised from her knowledge. A high percentage of students here graduate without debt. She doesn't see the correlation.

For efficiency, there are a lot of things they have to do as a state institution that makes it inefficient. What they ask for is freedom from regulations when they can't get any money, but that still burdens us. There has been a good effort on campus, a lot of combined purchasing and combining of positions. She doesn't know where there is more, but she knows faculty needs to be paid more. We need to keep tuition down, and the proposed budget has as resident undergrad tuition freeze, and in order to do that you have to work on admin efficiencies, and we'll never quit working on this.

**Kiana Scott** says this year we moved to a new HR payroll system, its really useful, and eliminates shadow systems in departments everywhere, so we can look at everything in one system.

**Adison Richards** thanks her.

**Kiana Scott** says the inequality question is something they are continuing to look at, the Student debt reduction task force is constantly looking at that. They're trudging.

**Rachel Frank** asks her to speak on her view s about differential tuition.

**Kristianne Blake** believes in it, with a caveat of appropriate financial aid so it's not a barrier to people getting those degrees. There are certain degrees that cost

more to provide than others. These are areas that the state needs, and the topic is off the table, but it would be beneficial.

**Kiana Scott** doesn't support it. She says that where we are right now, she doesn't think this is the solution that we need.

**Kristianne Scott** says the BOR is divided.

**Kainen Bell** asks about allocating funding for husky promise students, by increasing funding?

She says the promise, will be budgeted to fulfill that promise.

**Kiana Scott** says we haven't approved the budget yet; right now there is a tentative budget that will cover those

**Cainen Bell** says what about dream act students, undocumented students?

**Kristianne Blake** says that's an administrative question.

**Kiana Scott** says that's the budgeting office that does that and we will receive that and say thank you.

**Marnie Brown** thanks her for coming. She asks what is the biggest issue for the Board of Regents facing UW next year?

**Kristianne Blake** says funding is a big issue for next year, we won't get more money from the state so we have to figure out how to run the institution with the money we have. Trying to get through that maze will be difficult. It's a two year budget year, we'll spend a lot of time in Olympia.

**Kiana Scott** says the most relevant issue to students is financial aid and tuition. There will be a lot of conversations in Olympia, so the more joined our voices are the more powerful they will be.

**Bruce Adsero** says you commented about the get program and differential tuition. This takes it off the table. Do you not support the GET program?

**Kristianne Blake** says the way its structured is based on the highest tuition on the state, so everyone with get units would get what the highest tuition would be

and bankrupt it. That's why we can't do dif. tuition because its pegged to the highest tuition.

**Jeff McNerney** asks what are you excited for next year?

**Kiana Scott** is excited for the new football coach. She's optimistic, but he has a lot of potential. She's stoked.

**Kristianne Blake** doesn't get excited about much. She's a CPA and an accountant, she does budgeting and numbers.

**Kiana Scott** thanks the senate. She encourages senators to reach out, and she'll send out info on the final regents meeting. For June, they get to approve the degrees for grad students.

**Isaac Prevost** thanks the regents.

---

#### **SENATE LEADERSHIP NOMINATIONS**

**Michael Zangl** says as a reminder, if you film or take pictures, now would be a good time to disclose this where it can be accessed.

**Timmy Bendis** asks if he can take selfies?

**An unidentified blogger** is going to take pictures and video, and he might post it. Michael BR on YouTube.

**Alex Feldman** is taking photos for the Daily.

**Peter Brannan** is dong a live stream R-20-39 of tonight's meeting, superuw.org.

**Isaac Prevost** says we will go down the list, you can be nominated for more than one position. If you win one, you cant run for another. That's next week. You can also be nominated next week.

He says if you lose, you can run for another position after it.

**Isaac Prevost** asks for questions.

**Brady Begin** asks before nominations, can we have the current chair or person speak to it?

**Isaac Prevost** says yes.



SPEAKER:

**Isaac Prevost** says he chairs meetings, chairs steering to set agenda and do OAs. He also handles meeting with senators to help with legislation or with the press, he also runs the entity with questions with the website or room allocations.

**Ada Waelder** nominates Evelina Vaisvilaite.

*She accepts.*

**Adison Richards** nominates Brady Begin

*He accepts.*

**Brigit Rossbach** nominates Russell Wiita.

*He accepts.*

**Nikhil Pailoor** nominates Forrest Taylor.

*He accepts.*

**Cassie McMaster** nominates KK Saha.

*She accepts.*

**Marnie Brown** nominates Jeff McNerney.

*He respectfully declines.*

VICE SPEAKER:

**Michael Zangl** says that he is parliamentarian and house of cards spoiler, if he pulls a Frank Underwood he gets to lead the meeting. He gets to serve on steering and the Senate liaison to the BOD. Any legislation passing in the senate needs to be approved by the BOD, and he advocates on Senate's behalf as well as providing any input. If you want to serve on the board and support the speaker, or throw a coup, that might be fun!

**Timmy Bendis** nominates Kevin Shotwell.

*He accepts.*

**Michael Kutz** nominates Kevin Celustka

*He accepts.*

**Ryan Roulrier** nominates sage Grinta

*He accepts.*

**Brian Price** nominates KK Saha

*She respectfully declines.*

**Yifan Li** nominates Forrest Taylor.

*He respectfully declines.*

MEMBERSHIP COORDINATOR:

**Mandy Humphries** says its the last elected paid position, she implements and enforces the membership, with attendance infractions, managing material and working with the Clerk, dong HR and the website, and anything Isaac allocates to her. She sits on steering with 15 paid hours. She's third in line for the throne.

**Isaac Prevost** likes that Underwoods is now a verb.

**Molly Smith** nominates Jessa Cameron.

*She accepts.*

**Jordan Fuzie** nominates Noelle Symanski.

*She accepts.*

**Yifan Li** nominates Katherine Sims

*She accepts.*

**Rachel Frank** is nominated, but is graduating.

AAA COMMITTEE CHAIR:

**Brigit Rossbach** says the chair chairs the committee meeting dealing with issues involving AAA, this year they had the int. student fee, they always have legislation. The chair of AAA sits on steering, which is an hour per week.

**Ian Andrews** nominates Roy Taylor.

**Michael Kutz** nominates Barrie Sugarman.

*She accepts.*

**Russell Wiita** nominates Eli McMeen

*He says sure.*

GENERAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE:

**Rachel Frank** says that you do the same thing as AAA but for a general category. They almost always have legislation, they discussed this year the animal rights one, twice, and in other years Occupy Wall Street 3 years ago.

**Adam Griffis** nominates Alex Switzer.

*He accepts.*

**Jeff McNerney** nominates Eli McMeen.

*He says sure.*

**Bryce Kolton** nominates Katelyn Fuhlman

*She accepts.*

**Katelyn Fuhlman** nominates Bryce Kolton.

*He accepts.*

**Isaac Prevost** says how nice.

**Nikhil Pailoor** is nominated, he accepts.

ON CAMPUS COMMITTEE CHAIR:

**KK Saha** says this is on campus; they deal with on campus stuff. Anything concerning implementing things on campus, they did Starbucks, and the local point resolution. They have a decent amount of legislation, and a lot of committee members have contributed. Everyone can relate to it.

**Bryce Kolton** nominates Katelyn Fuhlman.

*She accepts.*

**Alex Switzer** nominates Adam Griffis

*He accepts.*

**KK Saha** nominates Cassie McMaster.

*She accepts.*

**Nikhil Pailoor** is nominated

*He accepts.*

**Tyler Grandgeorge** nominates Timmy Bendis.

*He accepts.*

**Yifan Li** nominates Jessa Cameron.

*She respectfully declines.*

#### OFF CAMPUS COMMITTEE CHAIR

**Brady Begin** says that they handle off campus issues, and we're famously busy. They had a Greek participation resolution this year. Last year they had an anti tolls on I-5 resolution, they get legislation that other committees are too busy for. It also sits on Steering.

**Andrew Arbogast** nominates himself.

**Brian** nominates Emily Schneider

*She accepts.*

**Molly Smith** nominates Katherine Sims.

*She accepts.*

**Odin Atkinson** nominates Ryan Roulier.

He accepts.

#### OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE CHAIR

**Russell Wiita** says they don't consider legislation; the committee deals with liaison oversight and getting reports. With the passed OA, the oversight committee chair will

follow up with passed legislation and seeing what happened. They'll take a big roll on in that.

**Russell Wiita** nominates Richard Lavoie.

*He accepts.*

**Katelyn Fuhlman** nominates Bryce Kolton is nominated.

*He accepts.*

#### POMCOM CHAIR

Amber Amin says she focused on transparency, working on t-shirts, the videos, and socials.

**Molly Smith** nominates Katherine Sims.

*She accepts.*

**Katelyn Fuhlman** nominates senator Wright.

*She accepts.*

#### STYLE CHAIR

**Forrest Taylor** says that the chair stands up front, managing what happens on the Board, he's done it this year, which gives you insight to external working of steering, but also valuable behind the scenes insight to the nuts and bolts of senate. The style committee checks legislation before it comes to the floor. It's a non-legislative committee, so most work is not during committee times.

**Alex Switzer** nominates Forrest Taylor

*He accepts.*

**Adison Richards** nominates Eli McMeen.

*He declines.*

**Emma Van Inwegen** nominates Noelle Symanski.

She says sure.

**Nikhil Pailoor** is nominated.

He accepts.

**Roy Taylor** nominates Kevin Shotwell.

*He respectfully declines.*

**Isaac Prevost** says next week is elections. Come to Yeti Yogurt and network, and talk to senators about your platform. If you want to run, but aren't nominated, they'll reopen next week.

---

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

### **R-20-44: A Resolution to Increase Transgender Persons' Access to Public Spaces**

**Chelise Jacobson** is from Planned Parenthood Votes, and Ryan founded the organization We All Need to Pee. You might be familiar with gender neutral bathrooms, and they want to increase these presence in three ways, converting single stall restrooms into universal bathrooms, the goal is one universal bathroom in every project on campus, and a list available for all bathroom locations on campus.

**Nikhil Pailoor** asks what the current state of accessibility, he knows there are a lot of single stall bathrooms, how many are gender neutral?

**Ryan Karnoski** can think of a couple, there are a handful, one in Hall Health, there are semiotics of having a bathroom in intentioned space like this one and in the IMA with single stall restrooms. In Hall Health, the idea is that you're accessing medical service, and the one in the IMA is on the lower floor and requires a Husky Card so they're not super accessible. There is an abundance of binary gender restrooms on campus that could be converted.

**Chelise Jacobson** did a qualitative audit, they aren't in a lot for accessible places, and a lot were listed but did not actually exist. They would be in buildings vaguely listed. They want the Q center to maintain that list of where they are located.

**JP Underhill** asks whenever we have a new building, you want a new set of bathrooms?

**Ryan Karnoski** says the idea behind it is an accessibility issue. Single stall restrooms accessible to those with disabilities already exist, so it would just be a change of sign. The vast majority of new buildings have multiple examples, the only difference is they are gendered in a binary fashion. It wouldn't ask for anything new. In Suzzallo under the stairs, there is a full men's restroom that was low traffic, converted to a universal restroom, and it was a simple change.

**JP Underhill** asks how will you pay a contractor to change things and in the new facilities if there's already plan, will they change the whole building?

In new projects, **Chelise Jacobson** says, they already usually have one included, if they're already included it just means changing the signs. To change the signs, the UW prioritized this in 2007, so she doesn't see money being a problem.

**Ryan Karnoski** says in Title 9 with transgender representation, UW receives federal funding because of that. So if we don't prioritize this, we might be at risk of losing Title 9 funding. It's a financially feasible to do, and a risk not to adhere to it.

**Patricia Allen** wanted to say, as the Dir. of Diversity efforts, if a building doesn't have a gender-neutral space, it violates the UW's non-discrimination policy. Students assigned a gender at birth don't necessarily want to identify or express those, they can differ. To be inclusive on campus and go within the inclusive policy and not discriminate, they legally have to create spaces for gender neutral spaces.

**Nikhil Pailoor** says you mentioned the existence of a gender accessible multi-stall bathrooms. He's curious, do you feel there's a need for multi-stall access?

**Ryan Karnoski** says for multi-stall restrooms are just as easy, converting a gendered multi-stalled restrooms wont inhibit access, you will see all identities using that bathroom.

**Chelise Jacobson** says single stalled bathrooms benefit disabled people, with caretakers, parents of opposite gendered child, those who might have been sexually assaulted or special medical needs. That's why they didn't include multi-stalled restrooms.

**Roy Taylor** urges a yes vote on the legislation. The sponsors took their time and did their research. It comes down to a bathroom being a safe space.

**Rachel Frank** supports the resolution. She has amendments to offer. She suggests striking the fourth WHEREAS clause, the 6th, and the last WHEREAS clause, while they're all relevant to the resolution, having a shorter resolution with clear language would be beneficial. If you want to divide the question, go ahead.

**Rachel Frank** suggests amending the 11th whereas clause, after the inconsistencies with available university bathrooms.

Seconded.

**Chelise Jacobson** moves to divide the question.

The strikes are the 4th, 6th, and last.

**Rachel Frank** agrees with the stricken statements, but the resolution is long and could have benefitted from committees meetings. She would like to approve something concise.

In regards to the first.

*The motion carries without objection.*

The 6th.

*The motion carries without objection.*

The final whereas clause.

**Rachel Frank** speaks to her motion. She doesn't see much referring to housing, and it seemed out of place.

Objection.

**Ryan Karnoski** says that's why we added this, highlighting the issue of, this is a quote from a website alluding to how nondescript the current intention of gender neutral housing is in UW. This is followed up in the end of the resolution.

**Rachel Frank** withdraws the amendment.

**Rachel Frank's** final motion:



**Russell Wiita** says that the 7th THAT clause says the gender neutral housing on campus.... never mind.

**Rachel Frank** says the same thing as the original, it's just shorter.

*The amendment is adopted without objection.*

**Rachel Frank** moves to change this to that in the final whereas clause.

**Forrest Taylor** says that's a style thing.

**Aram Ambartsumyan** asks about the 7th THAT clause, the reasoning behind it: the original statement isn't as inclusive because it doesn't identify the specific identities.

**Chelise Jacobson** says they think the housing description is clunky, it doesn't say its for a safe space for transgender people, so they want it to be specific.

**Aram Ambartsumyan** reads the final part; his concern is that it may not be as inclusive, limiting it from all gender identities and expressions. Is that something you considered?

**Ryan Karnoski** says that male/female are transgender people, but part of why they want to change the verbiage of GSD is an acronym that isn't frequently used, he had to look it up and he lived in gender-neutral housing. Most people living there had no idea. The majority was straight, cisgender people, there was one couple and some confused international students. This was because of the use of GSD and the reason to change this was so UCSB or UCSC does a good job of using incentive housing spaces, so the idea is that anyone can live anywhere when provided by the university. With an intention for the space, with this vulnerable group, they wanted to create that intention.

**Russell Wiita** says that's the sort of the point he wanted to make. He asks if gender-neutral housing can also be for someone who doesn't fit in to transgender/nonbinary group. Would the sponsors consider reworking this to make it broader, saying anyone is welcome to apply?

**Chelise Jacobson** says that the last 5 words say that anyone is welcome to apply.

**Russell Wiita** says that's different from saying that it's 'for this purpose' which might be others who don't fit into this purpose. He doesn't understand what's wrong with the previous statement other than GSD. The current statement seems inclusive.

**Ryan Karnoski** asks if and being changed to however would be better? With an intensive space the idea is to create a safer space for a minority group. We had a coed couple that lived there, which made everyone uncomfortable. That right isn't being heeded by this language. He questions someone's intentions of someone who wanted to subvert the intentions of that space. For example, Nordheim court.

**Roseanne Mikaele** asks about safety with the restrooms. She doesn't think most people got the bathroom to harm others, what do you think about the universal restroom acting as a neon sign for those who would harm others?

**Ryan Karnoski** says this refers to single stalled restrooms. There is one multi-stalled universal restrooms, and he has never experienced any predatory people there in the years they've existed. Transgender people presenting as their assigned gender might be met with violence trying to use their identified restroom. That violence does happen, frequently, and it happens here. There are no stats for violence in universal restrooms. They act as a safe space.

**Ada Waelder** thinks if someone, she doesn't know a deterrent from perpetuating violence would be... She doesn't think that this would be a deterrent. Making others feel more comfortable and preventing violent might be more important than a myth of bathroom violence.

**Russell Wiita** moves to strike the last whereas clause the 7th THAT clause.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Russell Wiita** says that this is the only part he has reservations with. The purpose of gender-neutral housing is for trans/nonbinary/queer students, it's also for straight students. The new statement in the 7th that clause doesn't intend for the housing to be used for straight students even though the last 5 words say they could use it. This is the only part he disagrees with.

**Chelise Jacobson** says he lived in this housing and experienced roommates who had no idea what the housing was meant for. The intention is not clear and doesn't create a safe space. Instead of striking the last whereas clause, she

suggests adding allies so people know what they're getting into. They are sensitive and vulnerable and can experience hostility in housing if they don't know what they're getting into.

**Patricia Allen** says with binary genders, outside of American culture there are other genders outside of male and female, and there are communities on campus that recognize these, so that's what binary gender and cisgender, there might be those who identify with a gender not recognized by UW. That's also important to recognize.

**Timmy Bendis** moves the previous question.

**Isaac Prevost** says we vote on the amendment, and then vote on the resolution as a whole.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Timmy Bendis** agrees with the resolution. It shouldn't be this complicated. We have a whole bunch of things to do, and it's such a simple thing to do. He supports gender neutrality,

**Chelise Jacobson** says that transgenders are not gender neutral

**Russell Wiita** takes the objection, raising your voice doesn't make your opinion valid. This has proven to be less simple than many thought it would be. We should discuss it.

*The nays have it, and discussion returns.*

Division has been called.

21-51-5. The motion fails.

**Bruce Adsero** opposes striking this that clause, its an attempted solution to a problem which is the intention behind gender neutral housing was not being executed. Unless you have an alternate solution, we shouldn't shoot it down.

**Rachel Frank** supports striking this. Those should be separate resolutions. She supports striking the clauses. She reminds those that we skipped committee meetings, so of course it would take longer.

**Nikhil Pailoor** says that there would be an RCSA rep here. Can he explain the purpose of the phrase?

**Aram Abartsumyan** says that the concern is that the wording is less inclusive, limiting it to 3 groups, although a longer and more complex term, uses any gender or identity. HFS took a long time to word this to be inclusive. The list of these identities goes on and on. We need to strike these and make a separate resolution.

**Chelise Jacobson** supports adding other identities, or adding non-majority genders or non-traditional genders.

**Nikhil Pailoor** offers a friendly amendment, instead of striking..

**Isaac Prevost** says you can't add new language when striking.

**Nikhil Pailoor** offers the possibility of promoting a safer living arrangement for any student of gender or sexual minority, to make it inclusive.

**Ryan Karnoski** says that not verbatim, but this language used is almost the same in every other gender-neutral housing's statement of intention. That's where it came from.

GSD isn't a common acronym, most people use LGBTQ, but he has been queer since he was born and has never heard GSD. Maybe we could explain that a little more. Using GSD though, without explaining it, wasn't helpful.

**Alex Switzer** says we can't change it or adapt it, Alex urges a no vote, and moves to vote.

Seconded.

A voice vote is called.

*The nays have it and the amendment won't be struck.*

**Nikhil Pailoor** moves to replace transgender, non-bi, or queer with students of a gender or sexual minority.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Nikhil Pailoor** says that as he discussed with his colleague, this would be a more inclusive phrasing than we've had before. If you have to specify groups, it may detract from the overall intention of creating a safe space.

**Brady Begin** speaks to the objection, he has a friendly amendment, he thinks the best phrasing would be 'including but not limited to'. This doesn't exclude other gender identities.

**Nikhil Pailoor** takes it as friendly.

**Aram Abartsumyan** objects.

**Russell Wiita** asks if there was an objection?

**Brady Begin** has not withdrawn it.

**Brady Begin** withdraws it.

**Veronica Guenther** asks if we can change minority to under-represented.

**Forrest Taylor** says this doesn't make grammatical sense.

**Aram Abartsumyan** offers a friendly amendment to change it to any gender, sexual orientation, identity, or expression.

Seconded.  
Objection.

**Aram Abartsumyan** feels this is the most encompassing wording is the one that HFS uses currently.

**Michael Zangl** thinks that the intention for the resolution to create safe spaces for all genders, specifically, underrepresented and underserved. This amendment is necessary but he offers an amendment of underrepresented gender or sexual identity.

**Brady Begin** asks him to clarify where we are at.

**Nikhil Pailoor** offered the original amendment to say gender or sexual minorities to be more inclusive, but there are some senators interested in changing it to underrepresented groups.

**Aram Abartsumyan** withdraws his amendment.

**Michael Zangl** moves to amend the amendment to read promote a safer living arrangement for students of underrepresented genders or sexual orientations.

Seconded.

Objection.

We are encouraging HFS to ... he believes underrepresented is better than sexual minority.

**Eli McMeen** says underrepresented gets thrown around a lot, but it's unclear. Are we talking about there aren't as many people in on campus housing? Is it referring to underrepresented people on campus?

**Michael Zangl** thinks underrepresented is used because others are underrepresented in decision-making bodies of the university. We won't have full decision making...

**Michael Zangl** moves to vote.

Objection.

**Michael Zangl** thinks that he knows what's happening.

**Timmy Bendis** says underrepresented gender orientation, he understands, he's confused.

**Isaac Prevost** calls a voice vote on the motion to vote.

*The ayes have it. He calls a vote on the amendment to the amendment.*

*The ayes have it and the amendment to the amendment is adopted.*

**Alex Switzer** moves to vote on the amendment.

Seconded.

*The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted.*

**Adam Switzer** moves to vote on the bill.

Seconded.

**Ian Andrews** asks about a style thing, referencing title 11, but it should be title 9.

Reserving the right to object, should the second that clause be dependence.

**Isaac Prevost** says that grammatical things can be messaged to leadership.

A clicker vote is conducted on final page of the resolution.

*66-3-3. The resolution passes.*

---

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

**Russell** moves to suspend the rules and move to committee meetings.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Russell Wiita** says we went a lot longer than we anticipated. We have 25 minutes for committee meetings, and a long discussion on R-20-39. Sometimes things are submitted late and we don't get to them

**Britt Rossbach** takes the objection. The first piece of legislation is important to her. We decided a 15-minute time cap would be enough to give these bills a chance.

*The nays have it and first readings continues.*

R-20-45: A Resolution in Support of Pipeline Project, Dream Project, and Jumpstart

**Adison Richards** reads the resolution.

**Adison Richards** thinks the resolution is to say the students serve the kids in our community, being young and seeing high school and college students we looked up to them, and we can do some inspiring work in the lives of the kids in our community. We have the opportunity to serve kids in poverty and low income. WE can inspire them to pursue their dreams, which doesn't take all that much time. This is a great opportunity to help kids and will give us a lot back. This endorses these programs and encourages senators and their constituents.

**Michael Kutz** moves to suspend the rules, send to General Affairs, end first readings, and proceed to committee meetings.

Seconded.  
Objection.

**Michael Zangl** thanks Adison, and we have moved previously to accommodate guests, and he thinks its time to talk about what we're talking about.

**Timmy Bendis** wants to get to R-20-46.

**Isaac Prevost** says it has to be submitted 24 hours in advance.

**Isaac Prevost** calls a voice vote.

*The ayes have it and committee meetings are begun.*

**Bright Rossbach** moves to shorten committee meetings to 15 minutes.

*The motion carries without objections.*

---

#### **COMMITTEE MEETINGS:**

**Isaac Prevost** details where each committee will meet.

---

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

#### **R-20-39: A Resolution to Divest from Companies Profiting from Violations of International Law and Human Rights**

**Michael Zangl** moves to suspend the rules and adjourn at 8:45 P.M.



Seconded.

**Ryan Roulier** offers 8:30 P.M.

Accepted as friendly.

Objection.

**Michael Zangl** says we could vote down adjournment, but with only a 30 minute convo the Board would not approve it, we need to have at least an hours worth of conversation.

**Russell Wiita** wants to start talking about it and see where conversation goes. We can decided how much more time we want instead of binding us to another time.

The nays have it and adjournment time will be discussed later.

**Isaac Prevost** opens second readings. We will have lines alternating with pro and con speakers. If you're in favor, you'll be here. There will be two lines, one with senators closer to the middle, and the other side closer to the middle will also be registered student senators opposed to the resolution. If you are a community member, but not a senator, you will stand on the outside. To show you are a senator, please bring your new nametags. If you are a student, please bring your husky card; you will have priority over members of the community.

**Guest** asks if we would like to yield to a non-student?

**Isaac Prevost** says you can use your 5 minutes however you like, asking questions or differing to others.

He continues that we'll start with a pro, then con, then we'll have an opportunity for students who don't know how they will vote, to ask clarifying questions, or to make neutral amendments for style or changing a mistake. Each person will have 5-minutes. If you have 11 students on one side and 10 on the other, we'll go through all current student senators first, both sides lines with senators speaking for the first time, then students who want to speak first, then community members who want to speak first. After all of those three, we'll begin repeating people for the second times.

**Rachel Frank** says for the middle chunk, with questions, can those be asked by anybody?

**Isaac Prevost** says you don't have to be in a line, same as a grammatical amendment.

**Guest** asks what about faculty?

**Isaac Prevost** says faculty are the same as community members as they are represented in the faculty senate.

He says anytime you speak, say your name.

**Yifan Li** asks if anyone can sit down and talk?

**Isaac Prevost** says to make a statement pro/con you have to be in a line. If you are unsure, you can ask a clarifying question.

**Brigit Rossbach** give the committee report, reporting it back unfavorably 13-1-1,

**Patricia Allen** asks what discussion was had?

**Brigit Rossbach** says a lot of ideas were shared and the general discussion was unfavorable.

**Isaac Prevost** notes that a suspension of the rules has been made to limit speaking time to 2 minutes.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Isaac Prevost** calls a voice vote. The nays have it.

*Division has been called.*

*The motion has been withdrawn.*

**Roseanne Mikaele** moves to suspend the rules and cut speaking time to 3 minutes.

Seconded.

Objection.

The nays have it.

Division.

*Clicker vote: the motion fails. It needed a 2/3 majority.*

**Amira Mattar** speaks to the pro side:

**Amira Mattar** is a student at UW, she was born/raised in Seattle and she's a Palestinian. She's concerned with the universities choices of investment, coming from Bethlehem, the city is currently occupied. There is a segregation wall preventing access from vital resources and limiting Palestinians' movement. If you haven't lived it, its hard to imagine what occupation feels like. She's going to tell a story about her grandfather, he is in dire health. Caterpillar bulldozers are used to construct the illegal wall, and Israel controls medical supplies going in and out. Her grandfather is struggling to find treatment because of this. Her pursuit of a higher education should not be complicit to accepting the tolerance of this. The Palestinian people called for divestment, but it is not pro Palestine to accept this. We can't talk about this issue as two equal sides, we must acknowledge this is an occupier and an occupied. This bill is for her grandfather. The resolution is for her father who can't return to his homeland. This resolution is for the Palestinian people who couldn't be here. This is for the UW to be fearless not to be complicit in oppression. Dawgs divest.

**Jeff Mc Nerney** speaks to the cons. He is the director of UA, which would be lobbying on behalf of this if passed. He is in opposition, as he would for a resolution for opposite actions. He starts with a statement from the treasury office. Consensus from the university community is required to responsibly divest. The treasury is a steward to the funds to all students, and policies guiding these investments should not alienate investors and there is clearly no consensus. They want to maximize return and minimize risk. This doesn't lead to holdings in caterpillar. He doesn't want to damage the ASUW's credibility by supporting an emotionally charged argument. This is a time when ASUW and UW's innovation would be a step backwards. When the campus reaches consensus, that is when we should take it up again, but he urges a no vote.

**Isaac Prevost** calls for a clarifying question, or you can offer a grammatical motion.

**Katelyn Fuhlman** moves to suspend the rules and set adjournment to 8:30 P.M.

Second.

The motion carries without objection.

**Molly Smith** offers an amendment, but not a context heavy one, can she move to amend the first two paragraphs, because it's out of what's included in a resolution. She moves to remove them.

**Isaac Prevost** says this is acceptable.

Seconded.

**Katelyn Fuhlman** offers a friendly amendment. Can we add whereas before them?

**Molly Smith** doesn't accept this. It changes the meaning in it.

Peter says the RSOs that endorsed this bill are crucial statements in how broadly supported the bill is. That was the intention.

**Brady Begin** says there's formatting for a reason. He encourages sponsors to rearrange this tailored to the formatting.

**Isaac Prevost** calls a voice vote.

*The ayes have it and the clauses are struck.*

**Peter Brannan** speaks to the pros. we can get caught up in larger political questions and become distracted. He wants to talk about a company he wants to divest from. In November of 2008, in violation of cease-fire, Israel killed several Palestinians. Over the course of the following months 13 Israeli lives were lost and more than 1000 Palestinians were killed. June 4th 2009, missiles killed paramedics. Medical staff were killed in broad daylight from helicopters and drones during the operation. The bombing campaign was done with the assistance of these companies. They provided these hellfire missiles used on dense communities of impoverished individuals. They agree that politics surrounding an occupation like this is complicated, they agree this is not a diplomatic solution, but the story is one of war profiteering. This is at odds with R-18-19 and the universities commitment to global engagement and responsible

investment. A vote in favor in R-20-39 is a vote to say no to money from war, and we are profiting from these violations right now. He hopes that this complicity comes to an end and urges a yes vote.

**Brigit Rossbach** speaks to the con side. As the chair for AAA which handled this, she has had ample opportunity to consider it and encourages a no vote. Her main concern is that 29 is focusing on Caterpillar, but we are not invested in Caterpillar. It was not properly researched. Second, it specifically states that a reason to divest is from Evergreen's inability to do so, we are the Senate of UW, not Evergreen, we must represent our own students. Evergreen could withdraw their funds for a minimal fee and they have not attempted to do so. She yields to David.

**David Weingarten** introduces himself as a senior. This vote is a global movement on BDS, the two are intertwined. They've introduced anti-Israel legislation across the country, the resolution states the 3 pillars of the BDS movement. SuperUW posted a speaker Ali Abunimah. He's a leading proponent of a one state solution. Omar Barghouti is quoted saying he opposed a Jewish state in Palestine. There are other leading activists who acknowledge the aim of BDS is to bring down the state of Israel. You're voting on what these people have stated as the goal of BDS. Just the bill itself, though, consider what affect it will have on the peace process. At best it goes unnoticed, at best it hurts the peace process. It makes it more difficult for the two sides to come to the negotiating table. The president of the Palestinian... said they do not support divestment from Israel. He knows supporting BDS will make it difficult to achieve long-term peace. Why do these letters advocate for the BDS movement. It masquerades as human rights. It would be more productive to try something else. The only way to achieve peace is for both sides to come together with understanding. As a UW student and proponent of peace, he urges a no vote on R-20-39.

**Peter Brannan** says that divestment from Caterpillar precludes, meaning they won't be in the future be invested in them. Just to make sure everyone understands.

**David Weingarten** gives a POI, he prefers the bill would actually say that.

**Rachel Frank** asks a clarifying question. Does the sponsor of R-18-19, Ada speak to her intentions?

*She's not present.*

**Adam Griffis** is curious if either side has any data showing caterpillar used in the last 6 months.

**A Representative of the Pro Side** says in the past couple days a Caterpillar bulldozer has destroyed 15,000 apple and pear trees belonging to Palestinian farmers.

A POI is given: [www.coght.idf.il](http://www.coght.idf.il) you can find a lot of info is wrong, and realize that that's not a credible source.

**Isaac Prevost** says answering clarifying questions, don't add additional commentary.

POI: **Cole** asks if the Senate is committing criminal violations against the federal government? The congressional service, there are various regulations like section 8 of the export administration act, agreements or refusal to do.

**Isaac Prevost** says that this was something for the con side.

**Russell Wiita** makes a point of order, are Board Members priority speakers?

**Michael Zangl** says the BOD counts as student senators, because it's important senators know what the Board opinion is.

**Patricia Allen** says that this goes outside of her own opinion. She identifies as native and black, indigenous to this land and has experienced trauma and genocide in her communities because of her origins and spiritual beliefs. There are intersecting histories in her identity. She's an LSJ major, the main emphasis is, you don't look at the legalities for politics or finance it's not oriented around financing, financing is the tool through which we reflect our moral beliefs. Look at this through a moral perspective. What's going on is a human rights violation. She urges that you deviate from financing. She respects those against this bill to be able to bring their personal interest to this bill. She says that in the Board, it's me who represents the underrepresented communities. She would love a Middle Eastern commission to say how they feel about this. She has to speak for who she represents. Within those commissions, there's been a strong opinion against these human rights violations. She cannot vote against this because looking at the human rights violations she has to side with the underrepresented communities in this bill. She is pro human rights, and we need to emphasize that there doesn't need to be a human rights violation to find cohabitation. All communities deserve

a state and belonging, but she doesn't believe this should be anti-anything. This is only pro-human rights. She'll support this at board because of her constituents.

**Roy Taylor** thanks everyone for coming, he feels its unfortunate that ambitious resolutions divide sides. Its understandable how persona experiences make, we come from different backgrounds, and its mutual respect for histories that drive the university forward. Our goal as senators isn't to simplify issues or dictate US international relations, our goal is to draw huskies together. Israel is a friend of the US, but to vote yes on the concept of divestment is not to be anti-Israel, we should be critical of our investments. He quotes an email from **Susan**. We have heard about accountability of Israel makes Jewish **students less safe...** She is right, he agrees, but we can debate this and be sensitive to both. We would be failing those under oppression if we didn't have this conversation. However this resolution sides itself with the BDS movement, and said there was no way possible for amendment when he spoke with the sponsors. It is up to us to discuss and amend the text of the bill. Does this benefit the mission and purpose of the UW? Will the language foster at best, or have no affect on, a sense of community unity of huskies. He does not believe so. He urges senators to be open minded, and conditionally vote no, unless this resolution moves beyond targeting the Jewish community. yes we should consider where we invest, but this should bring us together rather than dividing. He urge a no vote, as he doens't think this can bring us together.

**Katelyn Fuhlman** moves to suspend the rules to go back and forth with questions. The preference should be on students, but he doesn't see the point of going down 15 cons.

Seconded.  
Objection.

**Katelyn Fuhlman** thinks a lot for the same info is being presented on the con side. She doesn't see how hearing the same side of the argument helps senators to make a decision.

**Russell Wiita** says that senators need to be able to express their opinion. If one side has more support, that's the nature of a legislative body.

A clicker vote is conducted for the suspension of the rules.

*20-49-5. The motion fails.*

**Alex Switzer** moves to extend the adjournment to 8:45.

**Rachel Frank** offers a friendly amendment offers a friendly amendment to not set an adjournment time, and not voting for adjournment.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Alex Switzer** says that there's a lot of debate on both sides, with a lot for senators from communities on both sides. We have seven minutes, and extending it repeatedly won't be beneficial. When the senate decides to adjourn, we can.

**Ryan Roulier** doesn't want to be here till 2am. He doesn't want this to drag on.

**Rachel Frank** says she doubts she'll go that long, but you can always move to adjourn.

**Isaac Prevost** calls a voice vote.

*The ayes have it.*

**Michael Zangl** knows this a long meeting, but keep the sidebar conversations down the entire time, that would help everyone to understand.

He yields his time to Monica.

**Monica Mendoza** is a student here at UW, speaking on behalf of MECHA, she wants you to look at both sides. Is this representative of both communities? We do here the opinions, but she believes that they need to hear all members speak. She's here because MECHA supports this resolution, behind the people of Palestine not against them. For too long the imperialism of the US has harmed Palestinians and Mexicans. The same companies fun the Mexican border. It's shameful the UW pays funds to Israel to continue this circle of violence. Voting yes will not create more violence, it's a call for peace, vote yes to come together in social justice.

**Adam a grad student**, profiting from human rights abuses is not something the UW community wants to be apart of. It's been an interesting process. He just wants to communicate the idea of precedent. In 1985 there was an RSO at UW that advocated for divestment from South Africa, a controversial vote, where there was not consensus. Why? What prompted students? Undergrads realized a



tiered citizenship structure was against the UW culture. They've listed HP to divest from, their controls and mechanisms are involved in Israel's identification system, and restrict movement and access, a part of occupation. OCHA in 2007 said 2.4 million people in the west bank are subject to impediments to movement. There are 99 fixed checkpoints in the West Bank, and Israeli settlers frequently bypass these. HP maintains this apparatus. In 2012, this body passed R-18-29, does HP meet that criteria? He doesn't think so.

**Rachel Frank** speaks to the cons, as a chair for GA and a 4th year senator. She was here in R-18-19. That debate was not about social responsible investing, but about setting up methods so that UW could examine the investments in the treasury. The sponsors spoke with the treasury, and the office said divestment from Israel was not fiscally or socially responsible.

**Robby** says everyone here, are in favor of peace justice and human rights. There are problems with both Israeli and Palestinian policies. Both have faced hardships, he is concerned about the plight of Palestinians. Is the resolution only about human rights or only about framing the conflict in a certain way? Their aim has been to push a one sided view. Today he asks you to see behind the rhetoric and recognize what has been brought before you. This resolution is not about human rights, but about singling out Israel and demonizing it. Who are they fooling? Look at the title, why is it that the resolution targets only one country? the sponsors have never come up to the claim that the resolution is one sided, placing the blame on Israel. The sponsors have repeatedly claimed it only divests from specific companies, but it sites BDS, which goes beyond that to boycott Israel as a whole. The sponsors have claimed they have no position on a single or two state solutions. Ali came to speak, the leading proponent of a single state solution, which does not allow the Jewish people the right to self determine. He urges senators to reject it and support a balanced dialogue to move towards reconciliation. Please reject this that will divide us further from peace. Patricia, we were in contact, and he attempted to present his side of the story, and she never listened.

**Michael Zangl** says you can't assume the sponsors of this resolution had other intentions; you can only judge what has been said or what has been written.

**Patricia Allen** said she had reached out, and she had hiring's, and was very busy. It doesn't mean she made a vain attempt She talked to students one on one, and read the argument given to board by the UCLA. She spoke on behalf of the students who came to her.

**Bruce Adsero** moves to vote.

Objection.

**Bruce Adsero** says that this leads people to speaking past each other, and he's hearing a cycle of things being said. We could go all night, but there won't be a discussion. The format doesn't lend itself to discussion. It's better to put it to a vote now. This isn't a discussion, but rather people making speeches.

**Amira Mattar** says many people who have come and prepared statements. This limits free speech and they should be free to do this.

A clicker vote is conducted.

*39-32-7. The motion fails.*

**Chrissie** yields her time to Leah.

She's a student in the school of social work, part of the struggle to put people over profits. HP contributes to this issue, reminding her of legal segregation in the past in Seattle. In 1965 Jewish people wouldn't have been able to live in certain neighborhoods. She is privileged as she is entitled to automatic citizenship in Israel as a Jew, she would receive a blue biometric ID card, she could live anywhere in Israel and in 65 percent of the West Bank. We must end this oppression. We must respond to the call of the oppressed. Jewish traditions for freedom, tradition, and social justice urge her to support this resolution. Lets pressure HP to be the socially responsible company they once were.

**Chrissie** yields to Mariel

**Mariel** is a grad student and a member of the Jewish community. She knows a lot of members of the Jewish community; she's been one of the people who started a Jewish group on campus. When the Jewish community comes out against divestment, they don't speak for her or for many Jews here. Jews for piece say that this is wrong and support BDS against companies profiting from the illegal occupation of Palestine. She lived in Israel for 3 years, and worked for a company working for medical equity there. She's seen how the system affects these populations, and she's seen people die because of it. As a Jewish person, we can stand up against oppression of Jews and Palestinians at the same time. BDS is not inherently anti-Semitic. This is for human rights, and standing up for that is a one sided movement. Please join my in support of this resolution.

**Nikhil Pailoor** speaks to the cons. He opposes the resolution for reasons stated by others. He's going to address some key points. The sponsors use social justice as a rhetoric, as Israel is the oppressor, the BDS movement is aligned with this resolution, the BDS movement is apposed to the existence of Israel as it inherently serves as an oppressor. He says that the ground is not so simple. Senators committed to a university of tolerance, we like to take a stance with those who's voices are underrepresented, but these conditions do not exist in a vacuum. We are engrained in the issues of the world, but you cannot isolate the wrongs of only one country in this conflict. You cannot claim that we cannot criticize Hamas because we are not invested in them, condemning one side in a vacuum in malice and without justification, he doesn't suggest that this was the intention, but it does justify violence on the other side as a reaction to oppression. He clarifies that the sponsor have clarified that a large number of Palestinians have been displaced, but that led tot he isolations 850,000 Jews in the Arab world. In most countries it's Jews who are oppressed. There were thousands of Jews in Saudi Arabia prior to 1947 now there are zero. It cannot be claimed that one side is unilaterally the oppressor or oppressed. They exist in a very complicated set of dynamics. If Israel were to ay down arms, he doesn't believe this would be a peaceful result to the conflict. He believes in peace and doesn't not believe this resolution moves towards that.

**Kiehl Sundt** clarifies that we give our money to these companies, there is no transition of funds from you to a company, but rather you buy it from a private investor who had it last. He's a fan of charity, when we talk about companies profiting from selling weapons to Israel, are we endorsing entities that give them weapons or does the charity of the giving justify it?

**A pro representative** met with the treasurer, these are direct..

**Kiehl Sundt** says unless its an IPO your not giving a company money by buying its stock.

**Peter Brannan** says that from his perspective, what you're asking has nothing to do with the resolution.

**Kaylene** yields her time to Katelyn.

**Katelyn** says that this is a difficult thing to do, but we're talking about what happens to people and human rights. We think about specific things that are happening, when people who are suffering ask us to do that. One company

named in this resolution, Motorola markets and sells communication products to the military in Israel, like the eagle surveillance. Settlements are built on land beyond the boarder. It's used to detect movement of Palestinians to keep them away from settlements. More land and resources are being allotted beyond the wall. The wall itself is not on internationally recognized borders. The Israeli authorities contend this is necessary to protect Israel form Palestinian suicide bombers. The wall prevents movement between Palestinian. Motorola has financial incentive, and directly profits from the occupation of Palestine. She urges divestment so long as they profit from them.

**A pro supporter** says you're not hearing the one or two state arguments on the pro-side is because this is people vs. corporations. These corporations providing missiles, jets, etc., those are the corporations. We are not invested in caterpillar. We should prevent this. Those yellow bulldozers by the IMA, those are caterpillar. Imagine them armed with missiles, 20 times as big, those are crawling over houses, imagine them in the U-District tearing down homes. It's a good thing that we are not invested in them. We have a chance to prevent investment and to prevent this from happening. A vote no allows this violence to continue. A vote yes means we are students for conscious and want peace. Next week we could be invested in a company like that.

**Senator Emily Schneider** yields to Ruth Ferguson.

**Ruth Ferguson** is in opposition to R-20-39. Naomi pace from the new Israel fund, an organization she's done work with, they called BDS a tactic that embodies the tactic that says Israel cannot and will not change itself. She is critical of Israel for many reasons and there is change that needs to happen, but she speaks against this bill because it does not provide an environment in which peace will occur. As a US citizen, her national identity is intertwined with the US. Many students see Israel as a part of their identity, signaling out Israeli... for ASUW to boycott Israel, this creates and environment where students are divided. She believes BDS sensors academic discourse. In the text the bills proponents endorse the right of return, for Palestinians to return to Israel with citizenship. If Israel took on 5 million it would remove the Jewish majority. This would end self-determination. Living in the same place in peace will not be the solution. The state of Israel was created in response to a refugee problem, the removal of Palestinian people from their homes is a similar horrific reality. The occupation of West Bank needs to end as soon as possible. Palestinians are inhibited in many ways. She advocates for a two state solution, protecting rights to self-governance, with a right to coexist with a right to livelihood. She believes continued occupation violates human rights. By denying the right to open discourse this

wont achieve a middle ground. The problem with this movement doesn't give Israel a chance to say. She will continue to fight against BDS, and she will not support this.

**Alex Switzer** says as we have heard an hour of both sides, he would be hard fought to see anyone's opinion that has changed. He moves to vote.

Seconded.

Objection.

**Alex Switzer** thinks that the opinion has not changed, and voting senators wont have their minds changed to.

**An Unidentified Senator** sees members of faculty who have taken their time to speak with us. It would be respectful to hear them.

Isaac says this requires 2/3 majority.

*42-26-7. The motion to vote does not pass.*

**Adam Griffis** asks, you talked about Motorola, Google just bought them, does that include them?

POI: They sold them.

**A Pro Representative** says they are not connected.

The motion is made to adjourn.

Objection.

**An Unidentified Senator** sees it as a very big bill that affects a lot of people. It's an hour past 8. A lot of senators have left, representation is missing, we should vote when we have more present

**Isaac Prevost** says because of elections next week, it's hard to know if we have scheduled time to discuss resolutions. He recommends voting on this at the end of discussion. If you want a final vote, it's wise to do it at this meeting.

*Someone maintains that motion.*

Objection.

**Russell Wiita** says that we won't get to this next week, and the last meeting, we're leaving an hour in for the BBQ. We will not consider legislation after tonight.

Isaac calls a voice vote on adjournment.

16-54-3.

**Roseanne Mikaele** says that she was in AAA, who voted unfavorably, it's important to have senators make an educated decision. It only happens when we have equal sides. She yields her time.

**Chelsea** says that she's a grad student in JSIS. She understands what it's like to be immobilized, starting her activism work at the U of Michigan with the colonization of the Hawaiian Islands. She wanted to get involved in social justice at UW. She got involved with a SUPER event her first summer here, and she was inspired. She spent the next 8 months learning about the truth of what was going on. She was fearful about getting involved because she ... she became a member of the group SUPER UW, connecting the struggle of the Palestinians to other marginalized groups. Gaza has been under siege by Israel since 2006. She has learned that the average age of people in Gaza is 17. Bombs falling in Gaza, children are the collateral damage. She can't be blind to what's going on. The continuation of gross inequalities. Some might say the situation is too complex to take action, but this undermines our goals as students to make critical decisions, and make a difference at global and local levels. She stands on the side of history that she thinks is right.

**Katelyn Fuhlman** asks if we can focus debate on the resolution at hand.

**Roseanne Mikaele** yields to Elizabeth.

**Elizabeth** from Evergreen, a member for Jewish voice for peace, she traveled with Rachel Corrie's parents of the girl who lost her life when she was killed by a Caterpillar bulldozer. This prevents future investment in caterpillar. The Corrie's are in undergoing a second appeal for the death of their daughter. BDS is a support of students against Israeli occupation. It's not against Israeli, Jewish people. It's against the companies profiting from this occupation. Driving in, she drove past the new stadium, behind this wall is a game changer. You're supporting the occupation.

**Adam Griffis** moves to suspend the rules and make professors a priority?

**Alex Switzer** suggests alternating.

**Rachel Frank** asks how many profs are here?

*The motion carries without objection.*

**Russell Wiita** says he's there because he's against the resolution, if you want to question the motives, its related to BDS and based off of it. BDS is anti-Israel. We shouldn't support this as an association, he wants to clarify that a vote no is not pro-Israel, its yes or no on the resolution. You don't have to vote one way other the other because you are pro-Israel or pro-Palestine, but vote no because its a bad message to send to students. He yields to professor Bernstein.

**Bernstein** says that there's something odd about this resolution, you're being asked to send this on to someone who will send it on to someone who wont do anything. They want you to vote on this because, first, the goal for the supporters is divestment.

The posters on list serves with hate directed to Israel. The resolution calls for hatred, once you vote, what happens next doesn't affect tuition or education, imagine a little change on what you're voting for. Imagine a boycott, Intel in Israel has created computer chips, used by Israeli military. If you were being asked to get rid of all computers with Intel chips, and replace them with another kind of computer. That would cost the university a lot, which would cost you a lot. If you were put in that situation, if this were going to cost you something you would be even more careful than you have been. By asking you to do something that asks you nothing, the supports are making it easy to support them in a campaign of hatred towards Israel. What could happen is that you turn into people that spread hatred against Israel. He urges a no vote against hatred, don't vote for this resolution,

**A pro supporter** asks a point of clarification, the posters put up on campus that are hateful. Can you cite those?

**Bernstein** says that one example is for Ali A. who spoke, he is well known of the one state solution and the disappearance foe Israel, and its okay if many die.

**Isaac Prevost** says that at 9:30 classrooms close in Paccar. Past 9:30 there's a chance that we will have to vacate.

**Alex Switzer** asks if we could immediately move to vote if we are kicked out? He suggests voting if we are kicked out.

Seconded.

*The motion carries and the rule is adopted.*

POI, the bill recognizes Israel in the second clause of the BDS call, it states that Arab citizens be recognized as a part of the state of Israel.

Motion to vote.

Seconded.

A clicker vote is conducted on final passage of the resolution.

*8-59-11. The resolution fails.*

**Isaac Prevost** thanks the sponsors and guest who came.

**Bryce Kolton** moves to adjourn.

Seconded.

A clicker vote is conducted on final passage of the resolution.

63-3-6. Senate is adjourned.

---

***Adjourned: 9:30 P.M.***

---

**Minutes Prepared by Kevin Celustka**  
Student Senate Clerk