



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Steering Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

Date

HUB 307

4:00 pm

ATTENDANCE

Erick Jacobsen (he/him), Speaker | P

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

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

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

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

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

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

N/A, GPSS Director of University Affairs | E

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

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

TBD, Director of Internal Policy | E

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

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

Brendan Chang (he/him), SAO Advisor | P

APPROVAL OF THE STEERING AGENDA

Pierce Wallbaum moves to approve

Dylan Bianchi seconds

Approved 4-0-1

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

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

SPEAKER'S REPORT

Erick Jacobsen: For the speaker's report, I don't have much to say, just that it's week 7. I think next week I'm going to want to start scheduling our final quarterly one-on-ones and potentially send out our final quarterly survey as well. So stay on the lookout.

Dylan Bianchi: Do we committee chairs have to prepare any transition documents?

Erick Jacobsen: No. That's on the next chair. I have some materials for Avery but yeah I think that's it for now.

VICE SPEAKER'S REPORT

Joseph Riggio: Senate attendance notices were sent out roughly around the afternoon. And so have people check their emails. I already had people come in my office hours for attendance, which is great. You should encourage that as well if they have an attendance notice. First of all, they need to check their email to make sure they don't have an attendance notice. But if they do, they can always come talk to me or send me proof of attendance, whether that's one of you vouching as their committee chair that they were here. Or if we haven't been having committee meetings, proof that they voted or recorded that vote, the website makes it easier for me to look at that now. So that's great. GAVEL Committee, we're trying to plan one last bonding. ~~So~~, we're also working on GAVEL Committee member transition documents. If you know people in GAVEL or you yourself are in GAVEL, please make sure to fill out those forms that I sent. Now, I'll remind everybody later too, I'll have some more information for liaisons. I'm making the liaison report due date kind of flexible, a.k.a. whenever your last meeting is, is when the... the report is due because they're wrapping up. So any liaisons that have meetings that are wrapping up for the quarter, getting them in as soon as possible is helpful because in addition to the quarterly reports, I have to do an annual report for GAVEL and I also have to do my own transition document for Vice Speaker. So I would greatly appreciate if you just remind, if you know one of your committee members is a liaison, you just tell them, hey, could you fill out your report form earlier, sooner the better, or when their last meeting is, that would be most appreciated. And that's all I have.

Deleted: So

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER'S REPORT

Julia Tanner: ~~Cool~~, so I only have things to talk about concerning bonding. So steering bonding, our bonding is going to be on Sunday, May 17th. So mark your calendars. The When2Meet said that most people can be there from like 2 to 4 seems to work for most people. So that's what I'm going to go with is 2 to 4. We can stay longer if we need to or whatever, but yeah, and then I'll just make the executive decision that'll be in the Hansee commons again just because like there's good tables there with lots of chairs. So that's for steering. And then tomorrow is the last floor bonding event of the year. So please remind your committee members that we're having that after Senate to bring a dish to share. It can be like a snack, it can be a dessert, it doesn't have to be like a dinner dish. But I'll be bringing donuts if everything goes well, and there will be like a few pizzas as well. But yeah, bring a dish, show up, have fun, and have a great week.

Deleted: Cool

ADVISOR'S REPORT

Christina Coop: I have nothing to report.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

Recess 4:05 pm

Reconvened 4:10 pm

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve both minutes

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

PROPOSALS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to proposals, R-32-16, a Resolution to Add Gluten-Free Options to Dining Halls. I believe Skylar's intention for this was to withdraw it and resubmit a new version.

Collin Saywers: And the prime sponsor would like this bill to be tabled for a week.

Erick Jacobsen: Okay. In that case, are there any motions?

Pierce Wallbaum moves to table for one week.

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 5-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to R-32-17 a Resolution in Support of Guaranteeing Transparency and Accountability and Agency Regarding AI Use and Investment. Ishaan, would you like to read your bill in full, please?

Ishaan Verma reads [R-32-17 A Resolution in Support of Guaranteeing Transparency and Agency Regarding AI Use and Investment](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions, or would you like to speak a little bit more about this bill before we go for questions?

Ishaan Verma: The one thing I would like to say is that it's very critical that this bill go through before summer, because SEIU, which is the advisors' union, is negotiating with UW Administration this summer, and one of the main points that is being brought up is AI, like particularly **Purple**.

Pierce Wallbaum: I think this is a very well written bill. I just have one question on line 228. You talk about the DPIA, can you elaborate on like what that is really, why you're asking for it, just explain it a little bit more?

Ishaan Verma: Yeah so a DPIA would kind of ensure that the University is taking to protect our data from being kind of released. That transparency is really important, like more than just the sustainability piece. I think if students are engaging with a university sponsored AI, they should know where their data can and can't go. like if the university is allowing it to go places where specifically it's allowing it to go.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions?

Joseph Riggio: Are you sticking around next year?

Ishaan Verma: yes.

Commented [JS1]: this feels wrong but I really can't figure out what the right word is

Deleted: p

Joseph Riggio: Okay so yeah, this is going to be very important. And I'm really happy that this level of detail and this level of research went into this piece of legislation because personally I can speak to the mental health side of things. We're going in a very concerning direction when it comes to, it's all correlative right now, but papers suggesting AI induced and driven psychosis drifting, as well as, you know, we know pandering with the models and these are revenue driven companies, ChatGPT, Gemini, I mean Google, or Open AI, Google, Microsoft and whatnot. And I know that when GAVEL created the strategic plan feedback, one of the things we noticed was they're very keen on development for artificial intelligence into their strategic plan. Have you talked at all with GPSS about this?

Deleted: a

Deleted: not only papers,

Commented [JS2]: the transcript did hear this as "Jothsna" for some reason

Ishaan Verma: So I'm actually going to GPSS this week. There's this, essentially this bill is also going through there.

Joseph Riggio: The same one?

Ishaan Verma: Essentially, I'm pretty sure. We're working with, I forgot who on GPSS, but we are working with people.

Joseph Riggio: Well, if it is the same bill and if they want to do a joint resolution, that is something we can do if we want to unify it a bit more. And if we both agree to push this through, that is also an option. It could also be two separate resolutions too. It depends on how quickly.

Erick Jacobsen: Where do you see how this bill plays into like the other AI bill that was introduced? I believe that was about like syllabus statements as well.

Ishaan Verma: Yeah, I thought that bill was fantastic. That one focuses more, if I'm not mistaken, on the education side. So like addressing kind of students and making sure that students are educated on the cost of their AI use. And this one is more focused toward administrative level AI use and the natural overlap there is like with syllabi and like instructors like having AI policies in their syllabus. So there is like some overlap. So I was considering like removing some things that are like pretty close, but I thought that the two bills are different enough that this warranted its own, like, I don't know, a little bit about campus, syllabus, and things like that.

Erick Jacobsen: are there any other questions or comments for the sponsor?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into General Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We'll move on now to R-32-19 a resolution in Support of Visibility Strips. Do we have a sponsor or a co-sponsor present? If not, I can read the bill.

Dylan Bianchi: Given the quantity of legislation we have and the absence of a sponsor, I move to table for one week.

Dylan Bianchi moves to table for one week

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-1

Erick Jacobsen: We'll move on to R-32-21 a Resolution to Increase Transparency in the Washington National Biomedical Research Center and Encourage Progress Towards Non-Animal Methods. Julia or Alli, would one of you like to read the bill?

Deleted: w

Julia Tanner: Okay. Just as a forewarning and content warning, this bill does include brief descriptions of animal mistreatment, so just be aware of that.

Erick Jacobsen: And if that makes you uncomfortable, you can leave the room if you'd like.

Julia Tanner reads [R-32-21 A Resolution to Increase Transparency of the Washington National Biomedical Research Center and Encourage Progress Towards Non-Animal Methods](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Alright would you like to speak a little more to this bill?

Julia Tanner: So first off, I just want to make sure that we're all on the same page that this legislation is focusing on testing on primates. So we plan to change like a little bit of the language and then that causes to just address primates because we don't want to get into the weeds of like defining what an animal is and like all that conversation. This is just like a starting point. But yeah, me and Alli, we have been researching into animal testing at UW. We were stounded at the amount of opaqueness concerning like what research is actually being done and violations as well. And so we just wanted to bring a piece of student opinion that we need more transparency in the systems.

Erick Jacobsen: Alli would you like to add to that at all?

Alli Benthien: No I think you got it. Nice job Julia.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for the sponsors?

Formatted: Font: Bold, Font color: Black, Pattern: Clear (White)

Pierce Wallbaum: On the that clauses, specifically line 147 and 154, I'm just curious why 2028 and 2035 were chosen for like a timeline?

Julia Tanner: Yeah, so Alli could add to this as well. We wanted to give a timeline that would be quick but not like, we wanted it to be structured without it being like 2050 or some crazy number that's way far out in the future. And then 2028, this was based off the fact that they are already seeing stuff on their website about these big, like, oh, we want to turn more towards non-animal methods, et cetera, et cetera. And so we thought 2028 is a doable enough timeline for them to figure this out because they're already talking about it.

Alli Benthien: Yeah so we chose 2028 to give them enough time to get a statement but not so much leeway that it would lead to this issue getting tabled, basically what Julia said. And then 2035 just allows for breeding activity to be phased out in a way that hopefully is gradual enough for the center but also is soon enough that it's not pushed to the wayside.

Abigail Appleyard: I was just on a similar timeline note. I was wondering if you knew anything about what Harvard's timeline was for like when they decided to make that transition. I know you said that part of it was, you know, the funding costs and stuff, but how long did it take them, if you know, to like make that transition?

Julia Tanner: It was a pretty quick turnaround. I'm pretty sure it mentions it in the Harvard Crimson article, which is the student led article or newspaper on campus. But it was within like a few months of when they were like, okay, we're having these issues and then they shut like they shut their doors. The closure actually shocked a lot of people, like a lot of people were not expecting it. So it definitely was not like a gradual drawn out thing. It was pretty quick.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other questions? Any comments? Are there any motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into General Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-0-2

Erick Jacobsen: Again, we may very well adjust this once we get to the floor and figure out how many pieces of legislation is in each committee. So thank you, Julia. Thank you,

Alli. With that, we will move on to R-32-22 a Resolution to Increase Visibility of the Survivors' Bill of Rights. Samir, would you like to read this bill in full please?

Samir Faruq reads [R-32-22 A Resolution to Increase Visibility of the Survivor's Bill of Rights](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Samir, would you like to add some more context on this bill?

Samir Faruq: One comment that I realized as I was reading, it's not 1 in 71 men on line 18, it's 1 in 7 men. Another thing I'm noticing as I read it is we use the acronym for SBR before we say what SBR stands for. So I can just move that up here. Yeah, this is a bill, this increases awareness of the Survivor Bill of Rights. We implemented the Survivor Bill of Rights around this time last year, and since then, it's been good existing and everything, but we were just concerned about how many students are not aware of it. Its importance in the value that it holds on campus, and we want more people to be aware of the rights that they have.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for Samir? Are there any comments?

Joseph Riggio: I'm happy to see this come to fruition. I know just from working in GAVEL Committee, I know my GAVEL members have been working closely with SARVA, and so I'm happy to see this bill finally go through Senate. So thank you.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into On-Campus Affairs

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

APPROVAL OF SENATE FLOOR AGENDA

Erick Jacobsen: It is 4:50. Perfect timing. So, we'll go straight into the approval of the floor agenda. If we could add these bills into summary of new business, that would be incredible. I don't think we'll be having committees, particularly because we have two elections tomorrow, Vice Speaker and Public Relations Officer. We will also have nominations for On-Campus Affairs and Off Campus Affairs committee chairs. We'll get to those questions in a little bit. Vice Speaker and PRO will go very similar to Speaker elections. In fact, almost exactly the same, except for the questions and the candidates. Are there any questions about the floor agenda or the election process?

Dylan Bianchi: I know it didn't exactly like work last senate meeting, but do we want to bring back the like time sensitive, not time sensitive old business stuff with the caveat of like having a specific timeline? Because we do, I think at this point we have three or four bills that meet that threshold of like, of having a specific date by which they need to be passed to be like really effective, that being the, let's see, R-32-12, just the free food alert, which we want that to be like a thing next year. R-32-05, as Joseph could correct me, but I'm saying that Health Fee MOU also has a time-sensitive component.

Joseph Riggio: I would say it's not as time sensitive anymore because it's too late to go to the Board. So it's going to be for next year. But to continue conversations on it, for GPSS to act accordingly, we should probably pass it.

Dylan Bianchi: Okay, and then my bill, Tent City 3 bill, plus Ishaan's bill if it gets out of committee. Yeah, that's my two cents.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Erick Jacobsen: Honestly, I think it might be best to just ourselves move the old business, those specific items up and then do it in like order of how they were submitted to the Senate or something, or just keep it fair and not arbitrary. And then if people want to move it around, they can. I really don't think time sensitive and not time sensitive will work because we sort of got really into the weeds on what it would mean, and then we implemented it in some capacity, but it just it was too complicated and it didn't work out. So I think we can just play it by ear. And if we want to move it up, move those bills up in the agenda for old business now, we can if there's any feedback on that.

Julia Tanner: Could we do it as a suggest edit so that senators see that we did that?

Erick Jacobsen: Sure and then someone will have to make a motion on the floor in that case. So we'll have that as suggested. Are there any other questions, comments, or thoughts on the agenda?

Jothsna Sundar: Can we get a head count on what's in committee?

Erick Jacobsen: So, on campus had none, off campus had one, AAA had two, and General Affairs had one. Let's check. So, General Affairs would have three, On campus would have one, Off Campus would have one, AAA would have two. Okay. So if we want to move that around, we can also wait till we have committees on the agenda. Seems a little bit silly to say this is going to be in General affairs and then like, whoops, we lied, but like also it feels also a little silly to make a decision about what committee it is before we can look at what committees they'll be in. Oh, AAA would have three. And General Affairs would have four. Okay, so we have a lot in a lot of committees, but we

can, again, we can redistribute later if we want to. Is that okay with everyone? Okay, are there any other questions or comments on the agenda? Or motions?

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-1

PROPOSALS II

Erick Jacobsen: No, we'll go back into proposals. And then at 5:20, we'll jump into discussion. So our next proposal is R-32-23, a Resolution in Support of Adding Caste as a Protected Category to the University of Washington Non-Discrimination and Affirmative Action Policy or Executive Order 31. Do we have a co-sponsor from that bill here? Okay. I can read it out if necessary as well, but we also do have Jenna here for R-32-24. So if we want to, Dylan?

Dylan Bianchi moves to table R-32-3 for a week

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 5-0-0

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to R-32-24, a Resolution in Support of Preventing Harassment by Anti-Abortion Protesters on UW's Campus. Jenna Lynn Miller, would you like to take it away?

Jenna Miller: Yes, please bear with me as I am trying to read with glasses that are prescription outdated. Okay, so I swear I'm literate. I'm just trying my best.

Jenna Miller reads [R-32-24 A Resolution in Support of Preventing Harassment by Anti-Abortion Protesters on UW Campus](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Would you like to speak more on this bill Jenna?

Jenna Miller: It's been a pattern that we've been seeing throughout my entire time at UW and for over 25 years. And they were actually out today. So if you saw them, I'm so sorry and that's all I have to say.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Pierce Wallbaum: Well I guess not really for the sponsor I do want to say this is a great bill. Thank you so much for writing this. I did just notice there's a couple of lines that it looks like maybe some of the first letters were bolded. If we could just fix those real quick. Other than that, this looks like a great bill.

Abigail Appleyard: I also agree that this is a great bill. Those people really are quite frustrating to me, but I was wondering if you know if there's any like rules that you know of about being filmed un-consensually because they just have those cameras on and pointed at you. It's not like, they're not filming the scenery, like they're clearly filming whoever they're trying to talk to, and I'm wondering if like that is also a way to like kind of handle this situation is by saying like, oh, you're not allowed to film these people, and you guys are clearly filming, so you need to leave. I don't know, but I think that could be something to consider as well.

Erick Jacobsen: Jenna, do you have an answer to that?

Deleted:

Jenna Miller: I don't know off the top of my head if that is something that's allowed or not allowed. I assume that they're allowed to record because it's a public campus, but if I can look into that and maybe add like a whereas clause.

Joseph Riggio: I'll just add that's complicated. Because my very brief search I mean, there's a lot on the RCWs about like privately recorded consent, but I'm not sure. Obviously, like maybe you can make an argument that it's disorderly conduct or something in that capacity. I don't like public nuisance laws, but that would be like a pathway. I'm in support of this bill. I'll start out by saying that. I do worry that I think we should pass this. But I do think for something to keep in mind, if we pass something like this, it's very real that other organizations or other groups are going to turn to this or maybe even the university for like other freedom of expression processing case using this is like, oh, ASUW doesn't mind like trying to have an or curating an opinion about a certain group of protesters. So that means we can crack down on like other types of freedom of expression and whatnot and protesting on campus, which I know is already an issue that we're facing. So I think we need to tiptoe that carefully, but other than that, yeah, thank you for bringing this. It's important.

Julia Tanner: I just had a similar sentiment to that. I am totally for this bill. It's very distressing seeing them on campus. One time I like walked past a religious group and it looked like them, and so I got super fired up, and then I was like, oh, it's just like a religious group. But I just had a question specifically about that of like, what is your plan to address those like slippery slope arguments of like, if this bill is presented, then other bills about big protests that do like want to disrupt like protesting after outside of different buildings. Yeah, so just like what is your plan to go about those questions?

Jenna Miller: So like when I was initially writing it, I wanted to make sure that it wasn't. going to infringe on students' freedom of speech in general. And that's why I have kept it to like non UW affiliated groups specifically so that those abortion protestors are not a UW affiliated group. And I also was very particular about the the actions they take towards students. So I don't believe that they should, like any group should be allowed to go like harass and chase students down, and so that's why I was kind of, I was specific with that language, and making sure that it's like not affiliated groups, and that's kind of my only argument against it, trying to keep the language specific here so that it doesn't become something that is applied in a broader, not cool context.

Dylan Bianchi: On line 93 it mentions one of the, it's one of the things that's like, "any non-UW affiliated protestors shall be given a trespassing warning by UWPD and/or banned from university premises if they ... block the entrances to classrooms." Do we know of any instances where these protestors were blocking classrooms or buildings?

Jenna Miller: I haven't found a specific instance from a student saying that they were like blocked from their class, but I know what students have been like chased away from places they want to go. So like the freedom of movement is kind of disrupted.

Pierce Wallbaum: Julia actually mostly asked my question. I was just wondering, like talking about the language and like what this kind of could lead to. The bill title is called preventing harassment by anti-abortion protestors, but then the that clauses don't even talk about them. It just says any non-UW protestors. So I was wondering what your thoughts would be if you wanted to make it more of like preventing harassment by protestors, like instead of it looking like what Joseph mentioned, like ASUW targeting a group of people or like a group of, or a type of free speech, I guess, how you feel about more just protecting students' rights to their education and, you know, their mental health. Yeah, what are your thoughts on that?

Jenna Miller: I did want to specifically call out this bill with this group with this bill because they have been here for a lot of years and there's a lot of student opinion that is we don't want them here. So I do want to be able to call them out and so that was like the initial thought behind the like title of the bill. I would be open to like making like changing the title, but I do want to keep their group somewhere in this bill because they are the reason I wrote it.

Erick Jacobsen: Jenna, do you know what the name of the group is?

Jenna Miller: I don't know. I tried to find them, but I couldn't find them online. So, no, I don't know

Erick Jacobsen: Because it could be even something as simple as like, if you want like an additional that clause, like this specific group, which has done this provably, should be given their trespass warning now. And then that way the title may still be changed to like a general thing, like to prevent harassment by non-UW affiliated protesters. Obviously, it's more wordy if we don't have a group name. but that's something to consider for committee. Maybe a name will show up.

Abigail Appleyard: That was going to be my exact question is who are these people. But food for thought, I don't know if anyone from, you know, your group would be comfortable doing this, but honestly, I would. Next time they're out there, I would just go up and ask them who they are because that is probably the only way that you're going to find out is if you lie and pretend that you're interested in knowing more about what they have to talk about. I would do it if I saw them. I saw them today, I had to go to class though. But in the future, if anyone felt comfortable doing that, that's probably the most efficient way of finding out who they actually are.

Dylan Bianchi moves to approve into Off-Campus Affairs

Julia Tanner seconds

Approved 4-0-1

DISCUSSION

Erick Jacobsen: So yeah, we'll move on to discussion. If anyone is even remotely interested in running for the on-campus chair position, you would leave the call or leave the room, that would be much appreciated. If everyone that is still here is not going to run for On-Campus Affairs, then we can discuss the question. Jothsna, can you maybe pull up the old question?

Blair Yeh: I'm sorry, I couldn't find like the old question that I answered that I wanted to use as inspo, so I don't have a question for us to discuss.

Erick Jacobsen: Jothsna found the question. Would you like to go ahead?

Jothsna Sundar: To be fair, this is the question from last year. Not Blair's election, so the question is, what experiences do you have that will help you guide legislation related to residential life, RSOs, and other aspects of campus life?

Dylan Bianchi: That sounds hunkydory.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Erick Jacobsen: Does everyone else agree that sounds hunky dory?

Formatted: Font: Bold

Abigail Appleyard: Is there like any other way that we could write it? It just seems a little bit boring. Like the way that it's written is so like, this is the job, can you do the job? Like, I don't know if there's like an aspect of on campus, I'm obviously not on that committee that we really want to dive into. Or just maybe a slightly different way of wording it that focuses more on like the overall concept and not like you work with these communities, how are you, you know, working with them? I don't know. Just feels a little bit boring to me, but like, it's fine. Also, sorry for interrupting, but I can't hear anything on Teams.

Recess 5:15

Reconvened 5:17 pm

Erick Jacobsen: What experiences and leadership skills do you have that can be applied to this position in order to guide inclusive and open discussions over legislation related to residential life, RSOs, and other aspects of campus life? What do we think? Dylan, is it hunky dory?

Dylan Bianchi: It is the hunkiest, doriest.

Erick Jacobsen: Is everyone happy with that question? Alright. Well in that case we will move on to the Off-Campus Affairs position. If you are even remotely interested in running for the Off Campus Affairs position, do you think there's any chance you will run, If you could please kindly exit the room or the Teams call. Alrighty, assuming that everyone here is not running for the off-campus Committee Chair position, let me read out the question. What experience have you had that make you passionate about off-campus affairs, and how would you encourage senators to participate in and write legislation concerning off-campus issues?

Dylan Bianchi: Could we maybe specify what typical off-campus affairs look like? I think it was a good feature of the previous question.

Blair Yeh: This is not answering Dylan's question, but I was going to say that I really like this question, and it sounds much fancier than mine

Abigail Appleyard: I honestly don't know if its worth specifying because there is so few times that off-campus is actually doing off-campus related like stuff. And obviously the question still focuses around, you know, your experience with off-campus affairs, but I think it's honestly better to leave that open to interpretation than to, like, say, it has to

do with transit, or it has to do with this and that and how do your experiences relate to like these, you know, big three things? Just because honestly, all of the committees kind of do a lot of different things, but off campus especially frequently does not have legislation that is related to our topic.

Erick Jacobsen: We could also potentially do like as a statement after that question, like off-campus affairs typically include like housing and transportation, but the off-campus affairs committee tends to focus on a wide range of issues or something. I'll go to Joseph.

Joseph Riggio: We can do what we did for like our leadership positions and just make a very brief slide, like maybe in your leadership report or just going over the types of legislation that the committee normally sees, just to give people a sense of like what happens in those committees, especially if they weren't part of them.

Erick Jacobsen: That's a good idea. I can definitely do that. And we can have a period for both, where they ask, like questions about the job description. So are we happy then without the clarification? Is it good? Oh, that's different. Okay. Never mind.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Erick Jacobsen: Well, if that's all hunky-dory, then we can move on to announcements and public comment. If there are any announcements or if anybody of the public would like to comment, now is your time.

Dylan Bianchi: If there happen to be, this is a long shot, any political science majors in the room, or people who study something related to political science. The Journal of Political Science currently has applications open for like a ton of positions. Digital writer, which is like a blog writer, assistant editor, editor, like some external facing like media and outreach positions. So if that sounds interesting to you, you can find it at uwjps.com and apply. You do not have to have previously published with us to apply. I had not published the journal before I got hired. Erick, I believe you were hired when it was founded, so you probably hadn't either. Yeah, highly encourage everyone to apply. Also, this has just been scheduled. I don't even know if we put it up on Instagram yet but in about 3 1/2 weeks, OGR is going to be hosting a housing advocacy forum from, I don't know if you guys remember that one bill from like fall quarter, the culmination that will be happening on May 29th, 3 to 4 p.m. in Savery 131.

Julia Tanner: Yeah so two things for ASUW Seattle. The Spring Show is happening this Friday. May 15th, I think it's at 5, yeah, 5 p.m. Show up. I think it's at the HUB lawn. I

wasn't asked by anyone, I'm just excited for it. And then field day is next week. It's the 22nd. It just says all day on the Instagram, but it's going to be in Denny Field, which is super cool. Yeah, show up, stay cool, all that good stuff.

Joseph Riggio: Hey y'all, so my Hall council, McMahon's Hall Council, is working with Spratlen and Oliver Hall council to have a water festival. Kind of a water fight, there'll be activities, there'll be a watermelon eating contest. That's cool. Happening on Denny Field on May 29th, so I know it's a little bit a ways out but just get it on your radars. If you have residents, you want to attend, even non-residents. It's mainly for residents, but we're not going to tell people no on this. So if you want to like throw water balloons and like have fun in the sun, there might be a slip and slide, hang out and eat watermelons, then hop on over or say hi.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements?

ADJOURNMENT

Dylan Bianchi moves to adjourn

Pierce Wallbaum seconds

Approved 4-2-0

Adjourned 5:24 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
