



Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: 12/09/2025

Time: 9:00AM

Location: University of Washington YMCA, R.304

I. CALL TO ORDER

Speaker Scholten calls the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

II. ROLL CALL

Education Senator Chrystal Gonzales B.	TARDY//Joins at 9:06AM
Engineering & Technology Senator Eamon Challinor C.	Present
Milgard Business Senator Jayven Coppage E.	Present
Pre-Major Senate Zaid Naamat F.	Present
Social Work & Criminal Justice Senator Kailey Lawless G.	TARDY//Joins at 9:06AM
IAS: Politics Philosophy, & Public Affairs Bryce Scholten H.	Present
IAS: Science and Mathematics Joshua Barnes	Present

Members of the Public: ASUWT Advisor Conor

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Senator Naamat motions to approve the agenda; Senator Challinor seconds the motion.

4-0-1 motion passes

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Senator Naamat motions to approve the minutes; Senator Challinor seconds the motion.

3-0-2 motion passes

V. OPEN PUBLIC FORUM

- Speaker of the Senate welcomes the public and requests that if the public wish for verbatim copies of their remarks to be recorded in the official minutes to please send a copy of their remarks to the Office Manager at asuwt1@uw.edu.
- A member of the public requested their comments to be recorded verbatim:
 - “Hello, Senators. Good morning. Just want to say I’m disappointed in the way the process took place. As I spoke in last Executive meeting for those present, I did want to say the process is very flawed in itself and direct admission from the acting president Rae Watkins has been made regarding public comment and I’m only asking you here to make the right decision. Um, with that being said, I did make remarks about the case and the preliminary injunction opened up and what that would look like and reflect. And I wanted to say again, I wanted to keep things internal and not have to go about things openly and in the courts. So, as much as I’ve been transparent, I did want to say there were statements made last week, a couple days ago, um, about the transparency of the Senate and what that meant. And even the 90-day, which was quoted in the record, 90-day accountability process, which is actually 60, and I want to say on the record that never took place. It was a 5-day process from the removal um to the actual trial itself. So, I wanted to also say with regards to the ledger and what it meant, the leaking of the executive session, I wanted to say that there was direct admission as well from the vice—from the president, the current president Rae Watkins about what it meant um and where the sources cited from. And I would then want to ask senators to be mindful of what you say because you are public officials representing your schools and as well as this can and and will stay on the record in the future. So, it’s a lot of contradictions coming from what I’m hearing from the Ledger, the editor-in chief, what was being said. Um, I wanted to clarify these statements are falsifications and are grounds for defamation as well. As I’ve stated in the last Senate meeting, it’s a digital lynching, which I don’t believe is fair. And again, I’m asking you to do the right thing. I’m not asking for re-litigation. I’m asking for a proper trial in the Fifth Amendment and our due process. It’s all I’m asking for. Um, again I also

wanted to say we want full transparency and clarity, and I have not been given that and I wanted to that to reflect in the minutes as well if my minutes can be recorded verbatim possibly.

- With that also being said I think um there's also direct conflicts of interest—”
- The timer goes off, and the Speaker of the Senate states “Your time is up.”
- “and I wanted to say thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing you guys do the right thing. Thank you.”
- No further comments

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- No Unfinished Business

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- [DISCUSSION]: Consideration of ASUWT Bill #1
 - Senator Coppage shares the essential purpose of the Bill is to establish a corrective rehearing process followed by a judicial committee for impartial review.
 - Senator Naamat shares their concern that the Bill uses the word “impeachment” multiple times, which is not a process of ASUWT. “Removal of office” is the term used by ASUWT. He clarifies that he does not see this to be the biggest issue when asked.
 - Senator Coppage shares that the word impeachment was used to reflect how it was at times referred to by the Senate, in the context of the process as a whole, and Senator Scholten clarifies that they did their best to dissuade the use of “impeachment” as a term as it does not match ASUWT bylaws.
 - Senator Coppage states that the main reason for the Bill is to ensure transparency and that the procedures within ASUWT bylaws and constitution are followed alongside those from OPMA and Robert’s Rules of Order.
 - Senator Naamat requests more information about and a summary of what the judicial committee would do. He asks for clarification that if a rehearing took place, would the judicial committee end up making the choice on the retrial.
 - Senator Coppage explains the Senate would still hold the ultimate decision-making authority, the committee would be advisory only.
 - **Senator Gonzales and Senator Lawless join via Zoom at this time.**

- Senator Coppage continues that if the Bill passes and a rehearing is scheduled, the judicial committee might not be formed in time to attend, and that the rehearing could still happen since the committee will take time to form.
- Senator Naamat asks how the students for the committee would be selected. Senator Coppage states it is in the document and offers to go over the information.
- Senator Scholten asks to return to the top of the document and go through it linearly.
 - They mention, as the chair of the referred to meeting, they shared complaints that were mostly regarding lack of responses to emails, which they refer to as circumstantial. They state that ASUWT bylaws call for possible removal if one or two bylaw violations, and say that Elias had six as of his accountability meeting he had with the Director of Internal Affairs (Director Kao) within a 4-5 month time span.
 - They state there are things they are not happy about. They agree that there should have been more transparency with students, stating that they believe ASUWT should go through their internal processes, and work with the Director of Internal Affairs and the Director of Outreach and with the advisors to better communicate with students.
 - They say that, in regards to their student body, students have been understanding when the minutes and information has been shared with them and have said they should have been informed of what was happening. Senator Scholten says that their vote would not have changed.
 - They state that the hope with the internal process was to avoid increasing discomfort for the removed student, noting that all the members of ASUWT are students and they do not want to embarrass anyone or hurt other's careers. Since the stipends of the members are paid in student fees, however, it's important not to violate bylaws.
 - Senator Coppage reminds that this is not a re-litigation, Senator Scholten indicates they understand and restate their vote would still not be changed, since the six bylaw violations still took place.

- Senator Scholten notes that the hearing and the accountability process are two separate processes, indicating both the Senate and Executive boards had wished to address issues.
- Senator Naamat asks for confirmation of whether they have understood correctly in the Bill that Senator Scholten would not be able to vote in a rehearing.
- Senator Coppage replies that due to a conflict of interest, Senator Scholten would not chair the rehearing.
- Senator Naamat asks for clarification of whether Senator Scholten would be able to vote still. Senator Coppage confirms that Senator Scholten would not be able to vote.
- Senator Naamat asks what the conflict of interest is. Senator Coppage responds that Senator Scholten would not chair the rehearing since they and Senator Naamat worked on the “complaint packet” that was submitted. Senator Naamat clarifies that they are the one who motioned for the actions to take place and had asked Senator Scholten to add it to the agenda. Senator Scholten notes that for the referred-to agenda and those prior to the hiring of the Office Manager they were responsible for creating the agendas, as well as helping with a few more when assistance was needed [while the Office Manager was in-training]. They restate they did not author the complaint packet; they sent out the email with the Senate’s actions to the Executive Directors and asked for the complaints to be submitted for compilation.
- Senator Naamat says they do not see a conflict of interest for Senator Scholten. They state that the School of Social Science students, which Senator Scholten represents, would then not get a vote in this rehearing, as Senators represent students, not themselves. They also note that the majority of students they have talked to have believed this was the right decision.
- Senator Coppage states they disagree. They note that multiple students have expressed concerns about the process lacking transparency. They also state that there are possible concerns of conflict of interest due to the order of succession. Senator Scholten notes these are two separate processes, to which Senator Coppage states that this does not mean they are not related.
- Senator Scholten explains that in order for them to have benefited from this process, a long list of steps would have had to have been taken before they would have been considered for the Director of Internal

Affairs position, which they express they were not and are not interested in. They state they wanted to be a Senator due to an off-campus job and to continue their work with task forces they began last year, which is why they did not apply for the Director position.

- Senator Coppage says that despite the separate processes, it does not mean it is excluded from possibly being a conflict of interest. They state that Senator Scholten expressed interest in the position in the past. Senator Scholten replies that they thought about it for a short period, then realized it was beyond their capacity with a full load and their off-campus job. Senator Coppage replies that that decision took place after the hearing, so it still could have been a conflict of interest.
- Senator Naamat follows up, saying that Senator Coppage and he had previously spoken on the possibility of a retrial and that they had both agreed that it would take too much time.
- Senator Coppage disagrees, stating that he had said it would take time, not too much time.
- Senator Naamat presses that they also discussed together that it would take too much work from the other senators, especially in the middle of Finals. Senator Coppage says this is a mischaracterization of his words, to which Senator Naamat replies that if that is the case, they can drop the conversation but that the above stated is how they remembered it.
- Senator Scholten points out that the Bill calls for the rehearing to be held within seven calendar days and requests a raise of hands to see who would be available within this time frame, as they worry it would not be possible to get everyone together, especially considering UWT is heading into a break at the moment. Senator Coppage states they are available, and that if that timeline is the deciding factor, a motion to amend the document to a longer time period.
- Senator Gonzales comments through the Zoom, asking for a quick clarifying overview of what is being discussed. She is filled in on the proceedings. She states she would be able to make the seven-day period work.
- Senator Naamat asks for confirmation of whether Elias had the option to pick if his initial trial was held publicly or not, which Senator Coppage does not deny.
- Senator Scholten responds that they would like to work with Senator Coppage again in the future and that they agree that adding an appeal process in the future alongside ensuring more transparency would be

good to move towards. They state that no one was hoping for this outcome, however going back and starting the trial process over again will lead to a loss of time, especially as Huskies on the Hill in February is approaching. They note that it would undo a lot of the work that has already been done.

- Senator Naamat and Senator Scholten state this would nullify work done by the Senate since September 23rd.
- Senator Coppage clarifies that the nullification would be dependent on the hearing itself, and that hiring decisions that had no connection to the removal would not be nullified.
- Senator Naamat asks Senator Coppage why they voted “yay” for the removal of Elias from office, since they had fully participated in the trial and had access to all the evidence and heard his defense.
- Senator Coppage responds that retroactively they believe they should have abstained. They note it wasn’t a sudden change, and that they had contacted Chancellor Lang with their concerns regarding the process. They also note they want to address student concerns that have arisen. They ask the Senators whether they believe they followed the process properly, and if not why shouldn’t effort be made to amend that.
- Senator Naamat states that they believe all would agree that they all want to follow the best system to ensure fairness. They state that they stand by their previous decision though. Senator Coppage responds, asking if they felt all the evidence was reviewed. Senator Naamat says yes, and that they received the evidence when it was emailed out by Senator Scholten. Senator Scholten states that the complaint and defense packets were to be sent to ASUWT Advisor Conor, and that they submitted theirs on time. Senator Coppage asks again if all the information from the defense packet was available then. Senator Scholten states that they don’t think so, however it was not their responsibility to submit it. Senator Coppage then asks how can a vote be taken when not all the evidence is available. Senator Barnes states that while the defense packet was not shared, it was presented within the hearing. He states that while many items were not completed within the hearing, all were present at some point within the hearing ensuring the Senators had a comprehensive review, as all Senators were able to vote. He continues that the Senators represent all the students within their school, not themselves, and that he believes his school’s students are well represented by his actions throughout the removal process and vote for succession.

- Senator Coppage asks for clarification on whether everything was shared during the trial. Senator Barnes clarifies a comprehensive review was presented for 30 minutes. Senator Coppage asks if he is implying that they do not need to go over all the evidence, which Senator Barnes disagrees with. He states that it wasn't published, or given to Senate before or during Executive Session, and that ensuring it's delivery to them was not their responsibility. Senator Naamat clarifies that Elias was given the chance to refute the evidence and defend himself; he restates that given that information, Senator Coppage did vote in support of the removal.
- Senator Coppage restates that he believes it is the Senator's duty to review all evidence before making a vote in order to ensure transparency and follow OPMA and ASUWT bylaws.
- Senator Naamat states that it is worth noting that not every trial will be perfect, however if everyone is in agreement that it was the correct decision, that is the end of it, They state that it cannot keep going until one person is content.
- Senator Barnes recommends that amendments should be made to the Bill, specifically that they do not see a need for a judicial committee at this time.
- Senator Scholten notes that the format of the Bill is similar to the ASU Seattle formatting. They refer to the tension between ASU Seattle and ASUWT at the moment, specifically the bill they recently passed and interactions between the two campuses Executive Boards. Senator Coppage asks why this is relevant. Senator Scholten shares it's their opinion that it is not ideal to be copying them at this time. Senator Naamat notes that we govern differently, as two different campuses.
- Senator Scholten notes that the actions for the review of information referred to in the document to be taken by the committee are currently already covered within the scope of the Senate's duties or those of the Director of Internal Affairs, the Elections Chair, or the Advisors.
- Senator Scholten notes they had issues with the actions of Elias and that they did not enjoy writing the compiled findings of the evidence. They also note that the bylaws and other rules should be known by all the ASUWT members already.
- Senator Naamat notes that they do not think a judicial committee is inherently bad, and that perhaps it should exist in the future. They note that at this time, creating a committee this quickly of students who may

be unfamiliar with ASUWT and its governing documents seems odd when it is the job of the Senators to know this information and deal with items as needed.

- Senator Scholten asks how those students would be compensated. They note that a lot of students in their school are concerned with the current structure of Senate in regards to the amount of work being accomplished versus the amount the students are being paid. They note a tight budget, to which Senator Coppage asks why it could not be voluntary. Senator Scholten notes they think that there is no issue, but should be included in the document, and states that it can be difficult to get volunteers. They also ask who would be seated on the hiring committee.
- Senator Naamat also notes that there is not a lot of student government participation is not high here, so it may be difficult to convince students to volunteer for free. They note that time is valuable to students, and that taking the time to read all the necessary governing documents while not being paid might not work out well. It is noted that the process of finding students willing to do so might be time consuming. Approval of compensation is another concern raised for how long the process could take.
- Senator Coppage asks if it could be a good opportunity for criminal justice students.
- Senator Gonzales notes that they don't feel like ASUWT is stable enough at this time to add five new people and a new structure within the government. They state the focus should be on stabilizing the government in order to be able to support the students of UWT.
- Senator Coppage states this would help stabilize the situation, to which both Senator Naamat and Senator Gonzales respond at the same time, making the audio unclear.
- Senator Coppage asks for clarification regarding what needs to be caught up on at this time. Senator Scholten responds that the removal process is still being discussed ~6 weeks after the fact, and says that they do agree things need to be reviewed internally but the Senate needs to work together. They note they support establishing an appeal process, and that more transparency is needed with students. They note that conversations need to be held with students so that they know what is happening, and that changes to bylaws or the constitution should be considered. They agree with Senator Gonzales that adding more people could complicate things further. Conflicting schedules led to the delay of the trial, so they had to

do it earlier than intended. They note that they believe all the Senators should be working together to build a solution, including adding an appeal process.

- Discussion over how the information from the trial should have been communicated to students, realizing that issues with the communication have been raised and are valued.
- Senator Scholten asks if anyone [among the Senators] would be opposed to setting this on the agenda for the next meeting [in Winter quarter, Senate meetings will be held Wednesdays from 12:15-1:15pm] and working on it during the meeting.
 - No strong opposition is stated.
- Senator Lawless notes over Zoom that building the appeal process and judicial committee could be a good ideal moving forward, but it would perhaps be best to work on stabilization at this time and have those issues be considered next year. Senator Coppage disagrees, stating that this is meant to stabilize ASUWT. Senator Lawless holds their point that this would not be helpful at this time, and that it would cause a lot of retroactive work. Senator Coppage repeats his question regarding whether the trial was handled as it should have been, noting that if potential issues took place then the Senate should make the effort to amend them. Senator Lawless notes that they do not believe anything was handled improperly and that the Advisors helped oversee the process to ensure no errors occurred. They do note that they think improving the rules moving forward should take place, but that no errors occurred in the trial.
- Senator Gonzales notes that historically policy and law in the real world actions are made focusing on the future and the positive changes that can be made, retroactive actions would only occur if a major injustice occurred, which is not the case here. She notes you cannot retroactively change the constitution to change the outcomes that occurred.
- Senator Coppage asks for clarification on what changes in the constitution she is referring to. She clarifies there is no rule stating that a retrial or appeal could not occur, but states that it's a matter of determining what is best for the students, and that they followed all the steps required. She notes that the Chancellor and the legal team both agreed that there is nothing in the bylaws regarding this and that the Senate did nothing wrong.

- She clarifies that while the Senate could potentially make the changes moving forward, that going back and retroactively having a rehearing might not be in the best interest of students. She asks if Senator Coppage's student body has expressed specifically that they want this Bill, or how he came to the decision to propose it. He responds that there have been many emails and he has spoken to students who expressed concerns with the process.
- Senator Naamat notes that he has concerns with some of the emails received, noting that at least one was from someone who is no longer as UWT student. He asks how their concern would be relevant then as a non-student. Senator Coppage agrees that a non-student's concern may not be relevant, but that doesn't negate other students' concerns. Senator Naamat notes that there was not more than 10 emails received, and Senator Gonzales agrees that whole student bodies have expressed that they do not want a retrial. Senator Coppage defends that their students do however.
- Senator Challinor asks if perhaps the best steps forward would be to work towards developing an appeal process.
- Senator Scholten agrees, noting that there has been a lot of back and forth on this issue, which is not productive. They note this is an opportunity to work together collectively to make positive changes to bylaws. They note it's important to develop better communication for all actions and changes within ASUWT.
- Senator Coppage asks for clarification on how this Bill would prevent collaboration in the future. Senator Scholten notes that it doesn't, however the discussion has become rather circular. Senator Naamat notes that time is running low.
- Senator Barnes clarifies that they see the Bill as a stepping stone, in need of discussion and work, deeper than what has been accomplished in this meeting. They note it needs cross evaluation, and that while ASUWT currently has stability issues, this is a stepping stone forward. They note two paths forward: to either enact the Bill and amend it later, or to stop to think about and develop the Bill further in hopes of submitting it as ASUWT 25-26 as a whole that would address these larger issues.
- Senator Coppage notes that a motion could take place now to make ammendments on specific details if needed, as well as asking that if it is a steppingstone why not go forward with it now?

- Senator Naamat restates that the wording and details (like the dates) do not seem in alignment with the bylaws and actual events. Senator Scholten notes the hearing took place October 21st. They outline the process as it took place, Senator Coppage clarifies that the September date referred to in the document is when the first vote on the agenda starting the process took place.
- [VOTE]: Action on ASUWT Senate Bill #1
- Senator Naamat motions for a roll call vote on this matter, to deny this Bill.
- The motion fails, as a question is asked. Senator Challinor requests clarification about how splitting the Bill into two would be handled. Discussion follows; it is noted the Bill could be split into two, or a motion to amend it could take place.
- Senator Scholten notes they believe that establishing a judicial committee could take place separately from the other matters in the Bill, which Senator Coppage notes is possible, citing the other pieces as evidence of why one is needed.
- Senator Scholten notes that there will be more opportunities to discuss this matter in Winter Quarter for further discussion.
- Senator Naamat motions to deny ASUWT Senate Bill #1. Senator Lawless seconds.
- It is reclarified that this is a roll call vote to deny the Bill, and that a yay vote is to deny it, a nay vote is to pass it.
- Education Senator: Yay
- Engineering and Technology Senator: Nay
- Milgard Business Senator: Nay
- Pre-major Senator: Yay
- Criminal Justice Senator: Yay
- Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (politics/philosophy/public affairs): Yay
- Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (science/mathematics): Yay
- Confusion on the meaning of yay/nay follows.
- Senator Naamat motions to rescind. Senator Gonzales seconds.
- **Motion passes 5-0-2.**
- Senator Gonzales motions to approve the Bill, Senator Naamat seconds:
- Education Senator: Nay
- Engineering and Technology Senator: Nay

- Milgard Business Senator: Yay
- Pre-major Senator: Nay
- Criminal Justice Senator: Nay
- Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (politics/philosophy/public affairs): Nay
- Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (science/mathematics): Nay
- **Motion fails and is not adopted: 1-0-6**
- [DISCUSSION]: Interview candidate for the vacant ASUWT Commuter Senator Position
- **Discussion on whether to table the rest of the agenda items follows, it is determined to continue.**
- **L** is asked to give a 3-5 minute speech, after which Senators may ask questions.
- They are a Senior majoring in global studies.
- They make use of and rely on public transportation daily
- They are connected on campus and even though UWT was not their first choice, they feel it's been a blessing to be here.
- They wish to give back to their fellow students in their own way; their CSI job has allowed for some opportunities to do so but they want to do more
- They are active in RSOs and in Discord, highlighting their connection to different groups and students.
- They wish, in this position, to listen to the fellow commuters within the student bodies.
- Senator Barnes asks if L has a current idea of what the largest commuter student issue would be. L notes that they've heard that parking tends to be an issue they've hear often.
- Senator Coppage asks if their campus involvement leaves them with capacity to take on the duties of a Senator. They respond in the affirmative, noting that in winter they will have a fairly light workload and that with meetings being moved to Husky Hour on Wednesdays they should be able to make things work.
- Senator Scholten asks if L would be willing/able to collaborate with the Food Equity & Basic Needs Task Force, Director of Outreach, and other projects. L indicates they would definitely be willing to collaborate on these projects.
- [EXECUTIVE SESSION]: Present & Discuss candidates for both the vacant ASUWT Court 17 Senator Position and for the vacant ASUWT Commuter Senator Position

- Senator Naamat motions to not enter the executive session.
- Senator Scholten notes that the letter of interest for the Court 17 position that was to be presented in session which will not be addressed should the session not occur.
- Senator Naamat motions to table the Executive Session. Senator Coppage seconds.
- Motion passes 4-2-1.
- [VOTE]: To Interview Candidate for the vacant ASUWT Court 17 Senator Position in the next ASUWT Senate meeting
- Senator Coppage motions to table; Senator Naamat seconds.
- Motion passes 6-0-1
- [VOTE]: Hire Interviewed candidate for the ASUWT Commuter Senator Position
- Senator Naamat motions, Senator Gonzales seconds.
- Motion passes 4-0-3

Point of order: a member of the public noted that, regarding Bill #1, the rescinding of the vote occurred before the motion was carried for the vote on the Bill, so it must be redone.

- **Senator Naamat motions to vote on the action of the ASUWT Bill #1; Senator Gonzales seconds.**
- **An interruption takes place. A member of the public reads details regarding what is allowed under Robert's Rules of Order. They state that the motion to rescind was improper, and could lead to the meeting being ruled null and void and be a risk of violating RCW4230. They state there is an active case and requests Robert's Rules are followed.**
- [EXECUTIVE SESSION]: Present & discuss a candidate for the vacant ASUWT Transfer Senator position
- Senator Naamat motions to table the session; Senator Challinor seconds.
- Motion passes 4-0-3.
- [Vote]: To Interview Candidate for the vacant ASUWT Transfer Senator Position in the next AUSWT Senate meeting
- Senator Naamat motions to table; Senator Challinor seconds.

- Motion passes 3-0-4.
- [DISCUSSION]: ASUWT 2026 Legislative Session Agenda
- Senator Scholten will email it to the other senators to review.
- Senator Naamat motions to table; Senator Coppage seconds.
- Motion is adopted 6-0-1.
- [VOTE]: Approve or Revise ASUWT 2026 Legislative Session Agenda
 - Senator Coppage motions to table; Senator Naamat seconds.
 - Motion passes 6-0-1.

VIII. SENATOR UPDATES

- No updates

IX. ADVISOR UPDATES

- No updates

X. CHAIR UPDATES

- Next meeting will be first week of the quarter. Please submit agenda items soon so as not to disturb the Office Manager over break.
- Meetings will be from 12:15-1:15 PM on Wednesdays.
- Discussion/drafting of a Senate bill to amend the bylaws will occur in the Winter quarter .
- They will let the two applicants who submitted letters of interest know interviews will take place in January.
- L will be contacted to begin the hiring process.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

- Senator Naamat motions to approve the adjourn; Senator Lawless seconds the motion.
- Motion passes 6-0-1
- The meeting is adjourned at 10:29 AM.