

Associated Students of the University of Washington Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXX

Date: Tuesday January 16, 2024

Location: Condon 109

Called to order at: 5:04 pm

APPROVAL OF THE SENATE AGENDA

Rohini Kilaru: For those of you that are new and have not been to Senate before, could you please raise your hand? How comfortable are you all with Senate procedures? I will go over this briefly as a reminder of how things work. First off, we operate on Robert's Rules. We have a particular way of speaking. We have a couple different motions that you guys can use at any time. Some of these are privileged motions. So, for example, point of personal privilege if something's bothering you, you could interrupt anyone and get that addressed. Point of order if you think someone is breaking parliamentary procedure. Point of information if you're not sure what's happening on the floor, and you need context. Point of parliamentary inquiry, which is where you can just ask the speaker to know how to say something. We also have motions to approve legislation, which is yes for approval and no for voting down. Abstentions are when you don't want to vote on the item. We also have a motion to table, which is basically used to put a resolution on hold for either definite or indefinite period of time. It can be done either first or second readings but is typically done when the sponsor wants to do a second or updated version of the bill or there aren't presenters for the bill that week. We typically don't use this to vote on resolutions themselves because you should be using a motion to approve to do that, to actually have proper opinion. Another thing we've also been getting a lot of questions on is how I choose who goes when we're asking questions. The Speaker's list is based off of Robert's Rules. The order goes basically senators that have not spoken yet, senators that already have spoken, and then members of the public. We also have the path toward resolutions themselves. Basically, for resolutions, you basically submit it. It goes through steering and then it goes to first readings. First readings are where you ask questions, but you can't make comments. Then you pass it on to a committee. When in committee, it goes more into like review. Committee members can ask questions with sponsors of legislation, a.k.a. the people who wrote it. Then once you have it go through committee it can get passed through either favorably or disfavorably back to the floor. The chair of the committee talks about what happened in the committee. And then we go into second readings where you guys can make amendments, put forth opinions, still ask more questions if you'd like. Then it can be voted on by the Senate and then if it's approved, then it goes to the Board of Directors if it's a resolution. And if it's passed through the board. Then it's the official student opinion. But that's like the general pathway for it. I'll be making sure to emphasize stuff today as well. If you guys don't know where to access the agenda, it should be on the Senate website. If you can't find it, let us know. Do we have any questions?

Anna Xiao motions to make every motion a roll call vote except for adjournment.

Second.

No objections.

Approved [54-4-57].

Aiden Reeder motions to make the Finance and Budget Committee elections special order of the day.

Rohini Kilaru: Typically, we reserve special orders of the day for legislation.

Aiden Reeder rescinds their motion.

Mitsuki Shimomura motions to approve the Senate Agenda.

Second.

No objections.

Approved [56-0-4]

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Rohini Kilaru 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.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Rohini Kilaru: Does anyone have any announcements they would like to make?

Maya Matta: I'm the community organizer for OGR. We have a lot of great bills that we need your advocacy for. We have Huskies on the Hill on January 29th. And we're going to provide transportation and lunch and it's a great time to come and see the whole legislative process and speak with your representatives. I posted two fliers up front if you're interested.

Cayla Thames: I just wanted to announce that our commission is hosting a bracelet making event in HUB 214. Come, bring a friend. I also really want to bump the support for OGR's bills. Their team has worked tirelessly, there are tons of ASUW people in the room if you need help submitting a testimony. It's very quick, it takes less than three minutes. Or you can visit their Instagram, @asuwogr. Thank you.

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Rohini Kilaru: Thank you for coming in. If you have any questions, I have office hours on Wednesdays from 12-2 PM. Feel free to also send me emails with any questions or concerns that you may have. We will now move on to the vice speaker's report.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Andal Sridhar: Hi everyone, my office hours are updated on hours.asuw.org. Email me if you want to schedule a 1:1 meeting. I am also scheduling a legislative writing workshop meeting on Friday at 4 PM in HUB 303. Please fill out the interest form if you want to attend or have any suggestions. I hope to see you there.

MEMBERSHIP COORDINATOR'S REPORT

Amanda Pitts: Hello team, in order for your vote to count on Zoom, your name should be reflective of the Senate roster. For everyone else, if you guys could please state your names prior to speaking or asking a question, that would be fantastic for our Senate clerk.

BOARD REPORT

Andal Sridhar: During last week's board meeting, **Aliyah's** legislative directive and **Erick's** bill, a Resolution for Free and Efficient Provision of Exam Materials, passed unanimously. Congrats to both of the sponsors! Do any other board members want to add anything?

Ellis Andrews: Hi everyone, Ellis Andrews, vice president. **Jacob** and I just came back from Olympia where we testified on behalf of House Bill 2242. **Jacob** has more information to share with you all, but this is a bill supporting survivors of sexual assault and higher education institutions. So, if you could pass it on to your constituents, we really want to see a lot of pro testimony on this, so it passes the house.

Jacob Feleke: Along with that, we have seen Senate Bill 5599, which is a bill that increases eligibility for financial aid. By the way, these are not bills that are just purely for students. These also affect families. Community colleges also benefit from this. Anyone can sign pro, please just read it through. We need all the support we can get. **MJ** is working hard to lobby for y'all as students, but it takes all of us. Anyone can sign this but please take your time to read, we will send more and post it more on Instagram accounts. Thank you.

FORUMS

Rohini Kilaru: With that, we will now move on to our forum for today from the director of University of University Affairs, **Nandana Jaideep**.

Nandana Jaideep: Hi everyone, I'm Nandana, she/her pronouns. I am the Director of University Affairs. I am an Econ major with a minor in Informatics. I'm in the university honors program. I like Travis Scott and SZA. La Land is my favorite movie. I like going to arcades. Last summer, I went to India and in the winter I went to Mexico, so I really like travelling.

Moving on to what my job entails. So basically, I'm the bridge between students and admin, so I serve as an external representative for ASUW faculty and admin. So basically, lots of policy work. But I sit on a bunch of different faculty councils and when faculty makes legislation, I vote on behalf of the students. So, I basically voice their concerns. Diving deeper into what exactly bridging the gap means. I visit RSOs and come to Senate to gather student input and find out what issues concern students and what they want faculty and admin to know. And I'm also working on the university admin agenda, which is kind of like the legislative agenda that a lot of you guys already saw, but this one is specifically for university admin. So, it's a lot of stuff that can be improved internally within UW. So, look out for that and I'm obviously looking forward to hearing about all your opinions and ideas on how to improve and things you might want to add to the university agenda. And basically, like my job is to build connections with admin, UW-IT, the registrar's office and work with all of these different entities to address different issues on campus.

And as far as representing the student body, I serve on faculty and administrative councils like I said. And since there are like a million different councils, I possibly can't sit on all of them, so I appoint to a majority of

those councils and that's the main reason why I'm here today. And there's student advisory councils as well as faculty councils. And I'll talk more about each one. I also am a member of the board of directors, so I report to the board, and I vote and discuss legislation.

So currently I'm appointing all of these different committees, and the first one is the Provost Advisory Committee for Students, and this is a really cool committee and I'd encourage all of you guys to apply if you're interested. You have a direct audience with the provost and the president, and you can directly talk to them about anything that you think affects student life, concerns that you might have. It meets bi-weekly on Wednesdays from 3 to 4:30. And you also get to collaborate with GPSS and have a direct audience with their board members and kind of just have the space where you can voice your concerns to admin directly. Applications for that as well as the rest of these councils are all on volunteers assum org. The other councils on here are faculty councils. So, all the people that are on there are going to be like professors and faculty members and they make legislation depending on what exactly the committee is about, and all of these have a seat for ASUW. I would highly recommend you all to apply. And it's really important that we have appointments to these committees because you don't want faculty making legislation that affects our lives without student input.

And in terms of student advisory councils, these are specific to colleges and departments. In this you get to collaborate on like policy within the department. So, if you're a part of this department, if you're interested, please apply. It's a really cool opportunity, lots of exposure, lots of ways to work on policy with people that directly vote on it, and you also get a vote so you're basically going to be one of the stakeholders. So yeah, definitely consider it. It's also on the same website. And so, suppose you are appointed to this council. Your responsibility would basically be voting on impactful legislation, so you have a vote just like everybody else on the committee. You would represent the student body of ASUW and voice all of their concerns depending on the specific issues that the committee targets. And then you'd build connections with faculty members, which is very important, and collaborate with them on university policy. And ultimately, you'd also be working with me to meaningfully represent accurate student opinion. So hopefully me and all the other people that I appoint can collaborate and think about what exactly we want to tell faculty and make sure we're telling them what students really want them to hear.

And what can I help you with? So specifically, my position deals with an external facing position that encompasses a lot of parts of student life. So, if you really have an issue that you're super passionate about or your RSO is working on something that admin could like help solve. You could bring that to me, and I could talk to them during the Provost Advisory Committee or during my faculty councils and I could bring it up to them and we could even start working on legislation or I can even connect you with them directly if you'd like to work with certain entities. And then I can also help navigate, solve any university wide student issues. So again, if you have specific issues, I can help you navigate how you might solve them in terms of what departments you would approach, what entities within UW you would reach out to, what councils, what admin specifically. And I could also help you learn about the external roles and responsibilities of ASUW if you're interested in like learning about my position or growing within ASUW and representing them at an external level. So yeah, you can come talk to me during my office hours or desk time, which are posted on the ASUW website.

Rohini Kilaru: Does anyone have any questions for Nandana?

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Rohini Kilaru: We are doing nominations today for the Finance and Budget Committee. We have a question right here, which is how you approach creating neutral policies and allocating funds in support of student

interests? Currently, the times for this meeting are Mondays 1 to 2 PM. Does anyone have any questions? I'm looking for any nominations. I will ask again; do we have any nominations?

Jacob Feleke nominates Brandon Elliot.

Brandon Elliot accepts.

Haley Chee nominates Erick Jacobsen.

Erick Jacobsen respectfully declines.

Rohini Kilaru: I will ask three more times. We will be opening nominations again next week, along with elections. Any nominations? Any nominations? Any nominations? If you have any questions, feel free to ask us, or nominate next week.

NEW BUSINESS

Rohini Kilaru: We will move back into new business, R-30-4 A Resolution to Stand Against Terrorism and Antisemitism.docx. Steering collectively decided to have a 40-minute time period allocated to first readings on this document. If we run out of time, it stays in first readings, and we move on with the rest of the agenda. Furthermore, we are going to continue the same system as last week for questions. Senators will get 2 questions. You can ask one question, then have a follow-up after. Or you can have 2 separate questions and it'll be directed towards one of the sponsors or co-sponsors that that you wish. Sponsors and co-sponsors will get about a minute total to answer each question that you have just for the sake of time and getting everyone's questions in. And questioning is not just limited to senators. It can also be members of the public. However, I will have to prioritize senator questions just because of Robert's rules.

Mitsuki Shimomura: Hello everyone. These two brave supporters of the bill stood over an hour last week to answer your questions. We are willing to continue answering questions that are related to the interpretation. However, the structure of the is clear. It has the clearly defined action items to condemn the brutal terrorist attack by Hamas on October seventh, refuse to endorse the celebration and justification of the attack, and to substantiate disposition by the university to bolster safety and mental health resources for all students who are affected by the attack. We have amendments ready to address the concerns brought by senators, including the condemnation of antisemitism and islamophobia. Receiving these action items are the various clauses that clearly lay out the information necessary to show the brutal and unjustifiable nature of the Hamas attack. The failure to give this legislation the stage for discussion will not only damage the relationship with the Jewish and the Israeli community but also damage the future of the senate. In conclusion, I urge all senators to properly pass the bill to committee so that we can shape an opinion that serves justice.

Rohini Kilaru: We will start questioning now until 6:39.

Erick Jacobsen: I will reference things mentioned last week. Would you be open to including a THAT clause that specifies that it is not intended or should not be construed as to pass a judgement on any other elements of the state of Israel or Palestine?

Mitsuki Shimomura: The supporters and I will be open to looking at any amendments. I would like to let you know that this bill is about the October 7th attack, which should not be justified in any context.

Erick Jacobsen: Last week, you and your cosponsors brought QR codes as supplemental material. I was wondering why the material in the QR code wasn't referenced within the bill.

Mitsuki Shimomura: I believe the bill currently includes all relevant information that justifies our stance. Our references were for you to grasp the situation on campus and is not necessary for the content of the legislation when it comes to evaluating the actions.

Julia Tanner: Okay, so I would like to preface this by saying that I appreciate that you guys are willing to include the condemning of Islamophobia. I also condemn Hamas's actions on October 6th; however, would you be willing to have more of the other side of the story within this bill? Mentioning how other students, not just Jewish or Israeli students, have been impacted by this event and the following events.

Mitsuki Shimomura: We condemn islamophobia, but we do not pretend to represent Muslim students. If people who have opposing opinions want to have a bill, they can do so by submitting a new bill. I think merging the two bills that have different natures is not a good idea.

Shanzay Shabi: I think given that UW is such a diverse student body, and this is a statement on behalf of ASUW, have you guys considered speaking to more organizations on campus, and getting more representative views? Looking at this right now, its neglectful of students who have been continuously protesting for Palestine, and the continued struggle that we see there.

Mitsuki Shimomura: This bill was written following in-person discussions with groups including the Middle Eastern Student Commission. I reached out to different organizations including the Muslim Student Association. To answer your question about the protestors on campus, I think it's sad that people who have such passionate opinions are not agreeing with this bill because it leads to more constructive conversations.

Shanzay Shabi: I know that Arab Student Association consists of a large number of Palestinians and students that have been vocal about what is going on. I think that's another organization that is worth reaching out to. Looking at this bill right now, it's largely neglectful of the simultaneous islamophobia that is happening right now. I think it's necessary to include a comprehensive overview of what's going on because obviously I condemn like any terrorist attacks by Hamas. I think it's necessary to acknowledge what has been going on and continues to be happening as we speak right now.

Mitsuki Shimomura: We have already prepared an amendment addressing islamophobia.

Henry Hess: Asking about source number 4. I would urge you to deeply consider a different source when citing numbers of death in Gaza that are not coming from the IDF officials, like Al Jazeera.

Mitsuki Shimomura: I actually need to correct my information. The number 15000 is actually coming from the Gaza Ministry of Health, it's the same data source as many of the news articles that you're referencing. Israel is a rare country in the Middle East that has the protection for free speech. So, I think it's important that we have a source from a country that values free speech.

Henry Hess: So, in a quick Google search, NPR cited Gaza health officials with a 20,000 number instead of the 15 and going back to the source that you had mentioned, it does say IDF unnamed IDF official says 15,000, which completely contradicts your claim that it was a Gaza health official and not IDF. Would it be possible for you to reconsider usage of the source? It does say here, "unnamed IDF officials cited by AP says at least 15,000 Palestinians in Gaza have died," which completely contradicts your claim that it was Gaza Health Ministry and not IDF that was using those numbers used in your source.

Mitsuki Shimomura: So, my point is that the IDF approximates the number of deaths in in Gaza partially based on the information that Gaza Ministry of Health releases. I'm open to using other information sources including NPR. That you mentioned.

Rohini Kilaru: Typically, first readings are more about questioning the intent, specifically within the resolution itself. If you have questions about sources and things that sponsors would be willing to change, that would be more efficient for second readings.

Denice Melendez-Macin: I am representing the Latine Student Union. And we condemn any kind of anti-Semitism, that is not what we're about. There is such a beautiful Jewish culture, I have a lot of Jewish friends. I want to know the intent of the language used in this resolution. A lot of the language is linked to Islamophobia in the way that it is worded throughout the entire resolution. There are a lot of innocent Palestinian lives lost while sleeping, eating, and trying to survive, through the sounds of bombs and gunshots that pollute Gaza. What was the intent of this language?

Mitsuki Shimomura: Which language in the bill is Islamophobic?

Denice Melendez-Macin: "Massacre for Jewish lives lost," and then just "lost lives for Palestinians." The second WHEREAS clause compared to the seventh clause. So, in the second clause, it says deliberate massacre of unarmed civilians by Hamas and then in the seventh massacre that we already mentioned it says the immense loss of life and livelihood of the Palestinian civilians in Gaza. It is very dehumanizing.

Olivia Feldman: We appreciate that you want to bolster language that feels more adequate to describe what is happening in Palestine. We chose the wording, "deliberate massacre "because what happened on October 7th was a massacre and it was planned. What we are seeing now is a legitimate military response. This is not a deliberate massacre by the Israelis.

Denice Melendez-Macin: To confirm, you don't believe that it is a deliberate massacre on the collective punishment to the Palestinian people?

Olivia Feldman: Yes, we know that Israeli Defense forces are not deliberately killing Palestinians. It is an act of war and is saddening, but it is not a deliberate massacre. I don't believe that this connects to the bill any further.

Andrew Stanfel: So, while you've stated that the intention of this bill is clear and simple, I would appreciate some elaboration on exactly what constitutes justification of the October seventh attacks. So, you cite the copy of an email sent by the College of Education Office of Student Diversity and Inclusion, which effectively just catalogs 75 years of settler colonialism on the part of the state of israel. Does that constitute justification of the October seventh attacks to you or is that just simply historical context?

Mitsuki Shimomura: That is related to a specific WHEREAS clause regarding the violation of the university policy. I'm not going to make any comment about whether this message is a justification for terrorism or not because it's not related. This email was sent in violation of the university policy, which prohibits the use of public facilities that are given to the employees for the purpose of bringing benefits to external groups.

Andrew Stanfel: Through the lens of this bill, do you consider acknowledgement of various acts done past, present, and future by the state of Israel to be justification of October 7th?

Mitsuki Shimomura: This context can be used by certain activists to justify. I don't think it can be justified.

Olivia Feldman: Regardless of this bill, what happened on October 7th cannot be justified.

Chris Mahn: I'm concerned about what message we're sending by approving this bill. I'm grateful for including islamophobia and I understand that you are against having another bill after this. I'm worried that we are sending the message that we are caring more about the Israeli side of this conflict. Would you be open to collaborating with other senate members on creating a more comprehensive bill giving equal weight to both sides?

Mitsuki Shimomura: I will stand up for the defense of Israel always. This bill and conflict are not about Israel vs. Palestine, it's about Israel vs Hamas. It is not bad to stand on the side of Israel.

Jacob Klatzker: It should not be that hard to condemn something as brutal as what Hamas has done. There shouldn't be any reason or desire to contextualize such a brutal act.

Olivia Feldman: This bill also does not say that ASUW stands with Israel. It says that ASUW will rightfully condemn terrorism and antisemitism. Jewish students don't feel safe on this campus, we also value the condemnation of islamophobia on campus.

Chris Mahn: I'm pro everything you said regarding condemning antisemitism and Hamas attacks, but when you have a full out war, it's not just Israel vs Hamas, I do think context does matter no matter the situation. I agree with condemning the October 7th attacks obviously, it's just that I think it affects Palestinian and Middle Eastern students if it looks like we prioritize Israeli issues more. Do you understand where senate members are coming from when they wish for more weight to be given to the Palestinian side?

Mitsuki Shimomura: This is about Hamas. I do see where many students and senators are coming from. If students can condemn Hamas, it will be a good requisite in history to show that we rightfully condemned Hamas, and then add the academic discussion about the ongoing conflict.

Olivia Feldman: This is not about sides; we are not here to only stand for one side. We just want to be here as a voice for Jewish students. We do not want this to be divisive and sided and we want to create a bill that includes everyone.

Martel Naranjo: Generally, I agree with everything on the bill. Have you considered that if this bill was implemented, it could lead to higher instances of antisemitism or more conflict among students?

Mitsuki Shimomura: The Jewish students are already facing antisemitism.

Olivia Feldman: I don't want to say I'm speaking on behalf of all Jewish students; a condemnation of antisemitism shows that Jewish students are meant to be here like any other student. We are here to make Jewish students feel safer on campus. We believe that passing bills to make students feel safer is more important than sitting idly by while we are facing a 300% increase in hate against Jewish students on college campuses across the country. We are going to speak up and ask that the rest of the student body agrees that we deserve an adequate education.

Ishan Ghosh-Coutinho: Since recently, as of late December, South Africa has ploughed a lawsuit at the ICJ against Israel, alleging many counts of violation of the various international conventions and treaties. Have the sponsors considered acknowledging that lawsuit or the international support and opposition its facing?

Jacob Klatzker: What's happening in the greater levels of international law is ongoing and not decided. We don't want to make any statements, it's a reasonable request that if we pride ourselves on being academically free that we make our decisions amongst each other and not be overtly influenced by others who may have ulterior motives.

Olivia Feldman: I want to reiterate again that this bill is discussing the condemnation of terrorism on October 7th and the anti-Semitism that has existed on this campus and that has followed since those events. It is not in the scope of this bill to discuss any ongoing hearings, whether at the ICJ or other international parties.

Sydney Gall: Hi. I'm Sydney Gall. Thank you so much for presenting this bill. I really think it's so valuable and I'm really disappointed to hear a lot of these comments that that do seem to be trying to justify terrorism

with context. I hope this will clarify things for others in the room. Is there a contradiction in condemning Hamas and supporting Palestinians? Can you do both?

Mitsuki Shimomura: Yeah, so you can absolutely do both and actually the speaker of the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank did so.

Jacob Klatzker: And within the context of UW, there is absolutely no reason why we need to conflate the two. Condemning Hamas and its brutal regime here at UW sanctifies the values that we claim to hold and that doesn't need to be conflated at all with Palestinians.

Rohini Kilaru: I would like to reiterate that that would be more appropriate for second readings. Try to keep stuff connected to the legislation.

Shanzay Shabi: Going back to the intent of the document. I just wanted to ask; don't you think it's necessary to acknowledge the terrorism of the IDF as well in killing innocent civilians if this is a resolution to stand against terrorism as a whole?

Mitsuki Shimomura: We simply don't agree with you.

Jacob Klatzker: Hamas is an internationally recognized terrorist organization, whereas as we stated last at the last hearing, the israeli defense forces and the israeli government is an internationally recognized government. This is a legitimate military operation not to mention the fact that this has no bearing on the bill in mind, and we're here to discuss the Hamas terrorism, not whatever alleged terrorism you throw at the IDF. That is irrelevant to the bill.

Shanzay Shabi: Given the scope of this bill, how are you guys defining terrorism? What is the scope of terrorism? And to preface, I condemn Hamas and the attack on October 7th. I think most of us have expressed that, but this bill is putting forth the intent of just recognizing that without condemning what has been happening to the Palestinians. So, I guess my question is, how is terrorism being framed within the intent of this bill and whether you guys can recognize and consider using language that recognizes what has been happening to Palestinians and whether you can condemn those actions against the Palestinian people?

Mitsuki Shimomura: It's not relevant to the legislation because we want to condemn terrorism by Hamas.

Tareq Taqiaddin: With condemning Hamas, I find that it's extremely crucial to also condemn the IDF for the ground invasion and the bombardment of Gaza for the past almost three months. Why have you not condemned the IDF?

Olivia Feldman: We have not condemned the IDF because the ground invasion is a legitimate military operation. The Israeli government went into Gaza to bring the hostages home, and there are 136 hostages still in Gaza, some of which are American. I think it's important for us to remember that we need to be looking out for our people, our Americans, that are being held hostage. There were legitimate reasons for the ground invasion.

Tareq Taqiaddin: So is the incredible loss of life, the incredible deaths, the number of children killed, women killed, elderly killed. Is it due to the incompetence of the IDF? The far more technologically advanced military? Or is it purely due to genocidal intent? Back to the seventh clause, where you barely represent what is going on in Gaza, do you find that the Israeli military operation is due to its incompetency or is it due to its genocidal intent of the mass civilian deaths in the Gaza strip?

Jacob Klatzker: One, majority of the deaths in Gaza are due to the fact that Hamas uses its people as human shields and puts them in harm's way of the Israeli defense forces, multiple instances of them shooting at

civilians trying to go down zones. Not to mention that this disparaging number of deaths is due to the fact that Israel invested in defending its people with things like the Iron Dome and David's Sling.

Cayla Thames: A concern that continues to be expressed is the credibility and legitimacy of the sources. Largely due to the fact that source number 4, the Times of Israel, claims that 5000 of the 15000 death toll in Gaza are Hamas terrorists. There is also concern about KOMO news as a biased news source with history of inaccuracies. Then when asked why you have not considered other sources last week, such as the Gaza Ministry of Health, you stated quote, we are not going to use new sources that are under control of Hamas terrorists. How have you evaluated the legitimacy of your sources that you've used, and would you be willing to reevaluate in committee readings and update them for accuracy?

Mitsuki Shimomura: The KOMO news article includes actual testimonies from students and families attending UW. Those testimonies represent the concerns of Jewish students on campus. Regarding the Times of Israel, Israel is country that values freedom of speech unlike the regime in Gaza and it's important we take a source that is operating under freedom of speech.

Anna Xiao: This bill seems to condemn Hamas, very recently, the Israel defense minister called Turkey a de facto executive arm of Hamas and the spokesman for the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs called South Africa basically functioning as the legal arm of the Hamas terrorist organization. So, I was wondering if this bill was to also condemn Turkey and or South Africa or if you're going to make it clear that you're not going to do that?

Mitsuki Shimomura: Your question is not relevant to the legislation. This bill does not condemn South Africa or Turkey.

Olivia Feldman: We are all educated people in this room, regardless of what the branches of government say about who Hamas is, we know that Hamas is not Turkey or South Africa. Plenty of international bodies have recognized Hamas as a terrorist organization, and in the future if something needed to be added, we would be happy to add that to the bill.

Tamara Alsaied: You cannot say that this is about Israel and Hamas when the collective punishment of Palestinians is only seen as a justified military response, which are your words, not mine. The framing of your bill equates Palestinian lives as collateral damage, which constitutes Islamophobia as it feeds into the dehumanization of Arabs and Muslims. This pertains to the bill for while these words may mean nothing to you, they mean much to myself in all Arabi Muslims on campus. Additionally, the university has already condemned the attack of October 7th in the statement made by our university's president on October 9th. What is the intent of your bill if not to further demonize Palestinians? What is the reason for having a bill about October 7th when the university has condemned Hamas? Is it not to further dehumanize and demonize Arabs to make us the enemy? Wadea Al-Fayoume was stabbed 26 times for speaking Arabi. He is 20 years old and also a student. So, the rise of Islamophobia and anti-Arab rhetoric is also a real threat for Arabs and Muslims on campus. So, if this bill is about student safety, then why are we not holding Arab students to the same value as Jewish students?

Olivia Feldman: This does not mean nothing to us. This bill is very important to us, and everyone included in this bill we hold with the same regard. However, despite the president condemning the terrorist attacks, the ASUW has yet to do so. There was a student at the University of Washington, Hayim Katsman, who was killed on October 7th, whose parents have asked us to ask the student body to hold the student's life just as valuable.

Jacob Gannon: I seriously believe everyone in this room agrees that ASUW should condemn antisemitism, but when writing this legislation, did you consider whether students would view this as ASUW implicitly siding with Israel? Or do you understand now why that seems to be the case?

Mitsuki Shimomura: We are more than willing to take the side that is not Hamas. We are not here to make it a statement on the historical conflict, we are here to stand against Hamas.

Jacob Gannon: What is the intent of including the sixth source? How does that add substance that the OSDI email itself didn't provide?

Mitsuki Shimomura: That is the only publicly available article that introduces the statement from the UW spokesperson that university policy was actually violated by the employee who sent the email that I attached as an appendix.

Chellsey Hughes motions to pass R-30-4 to the General Affairs Committee.

Second.

Autumn Yi objects.

Chellsey Hughes: I made this motion because I think ASUW should be condemning both antisemitism and islamophobia. It's important for all students to feel safe to go to school.

Autumn Yi: I think this legislation belongs in On-Campus affairs.

Ishan Ghosh-Coutinho: The sponsors have multiple times pointed out they strongly feel like this is an argument for condemning anti-Semitism, particularly with a focus on anti-Semitism on campus. I would second sending this to on-campus.

Erick Jacobson: I can see either argument. I feel like the content of the bill and what it covers is not mainly focused on what happens on campus. The broad focus means that the general affairs committee may be more flexible as to dealing with it.

Jacob Anderson motions to previous question.

Second.

Rohini Kilaru: A motion to previous question is to end debate. It is non-objectionable and if it passes, we are going back to the original question, which is whether or not to send it to general affairs. This will be a two-part vote.

Denice Melendez-Macin: What happens when it is sent to general affairs?

Rohini Kilaru: Once it's sent to general affairs, committee members will discuss the bill, figure out what amendments they may want, and then present that back to the main body. It will be passed out favorably or disfavoribly. If you are in separate committees or members of the public, you can still listen in and talk. However, only voting members will be members of general affairs. General affairs committee typically focuses on legislation that is more generalized.

Amanda Pitts: So, we have 5 different committees within Senate that all deal with different pieces of legislation. So general affairs is a subsection of senate.

Approved [45-4-13].

Rohini Kilaru: Our next vote is whether we are going to send this to General Affairs or not. Yes, means that we send it to General Affairs today. If not, then we are going to continue first readings at our next senate meeting. If you abstain, it means you don't want to vote on this item.

Motion to send R-30-4 to General Affairs.

Failed [24-27-11].

Rohini Kilaru: We will be going on to our next piece of legislation for today, R-30-5. If the sponsor could come up, please.

Francisco Dojenia reads <u>R-30-5 A Resolution on the Difficulties Facing International Students and Student Health Insurance.</u>

I was eating breakfast one day and an international student came up to me to address this problem about international student health care over the summer. I worked on this with him and did some research. I spoke to the office of international student advocacy and the office of student health relations, and they were very helpful in formulating this resolution. I do plan to recommend amendments to the resolution, because there were a couple of things noted in steering. I will address that to whichever committee it goes to.

Mitsuki Shimomura: You are trying to change it from opt out to opt in?

Francisco Dojenia: No, we wish for it to remain in opt-in, it is already that way.

Mitsuki Shimomura: Why did you decide to focus on international students when there are many people who don't have insurance policies and are facing similar problems?

Francisco Dojenia: I could have looked more into overall student health insurance, but that would've prolonged research and I wanted to ensure that this specific issue that was addressed to me was addressed. I'm open to having amendments but that is not my area of expertise.

Erick Jacobsen: The first THAT clause says something about reforming the system to make it more accessible. Could you explain what that means or what that would look like?

Francisco Dojenia: The reforms are mentioned in the THAT clauses, so that is the meat of the reforms that are being advocated for within this resolution.

Aiden Reeder: For the sixth THAT clause, while I do agree with the egregious problems of the healthcare and insurance systems, it could be worded more neutrally. What is the intent behind stating that?

Francisco Dojenia: I think that comes back to what Mitsuki said in the first place, that we do have students who on campus also have difficulties with health insurance and that's the case for many people throughout the country and the state. Yeah, it can be seen in the way that we are addressing the problem rather than finding solutions, but I don't have solutions for the health care system and those aren't being addressed in this resolution, so I stuck with international student health insurance for that reason.

Haley Chee: Which committee would you want this to go to?

Francisco Dojenia: I don't have a preference.

Cayla Thames: From the international students you spoke to, do they feel that there is a deficit in counselors and personnel to support them thorough this process?

Francisco Dojenia: In the last whereas clause, it states that last quarter, when I was when I was being reached out, that they were having troubles with getting drop in hours and virtual desk hours and so, the

director of the Office of International Student Advocacy did have that problem, but if others have this problem then it's still something we need to address.

Autumn Yi motions to send R-30-5 to Off Campus.

Second.

Jacob Feleke objects.

Rohini Kilaru: I'm sorry **Jacob**, but right now with the new OA policy, you're technically not an activated senator, so I can't take that as an objection.

Mitsuki Shimomura objects.

Autumn Yi: I think this belongs in off-campus committee.

Mitsuki Shimomura: I yield my time to Jacob.

Jacob Feleke: I do strongly believe this belongs in administrative just because it works with Office of Student Life, and I would like this to be forwarded to **Denzil Suite** as well.

Erick Jacobsen motions to previous question.

Second.

Approved [49-1-7].

Motion to send R-30-5 to Off Campus.

Approved [20-13-19].

ADJOURNMENT

Autumn Yi motions to adjourn.

Second.

Approved.

Adjourned at 7:11 PM

Minutes prepared by Kiyanaz Raveshti

Senate Clerk to the ASUW Senate