



## Associated Students of the University of Washington

---

Board of Directors | [Agenda](#) | Session 125

---

October 23, 2025 | Husky Union Building 303 | 5:30 PM

---

*The ASUW acknowledges the stewards of Coast Salish lands, the lands on which we currently sit, and the UW occupies. We acknowledge the original and current caretakers; Duwamish, Suquamish, Tulalip, and Muckleshoot nations and peoples.*

[Zoom Link](#) | [ASUW Board of Directors Agendas and Minutes](#) | [Captions](#)

---

### Call to Order

**Nandana** calls this meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

### Land Acknowledgement

Roll Call | 16 total. \*10 voting. 6 quorum | # present (P). # excused (E). # absent (A).

P | \*President – **Nandana Jaideep**

P | \*Vice President – **Sonal Virk**

P | Director of Personnel – **Owen Rivera**

P | Director of Finance and Budget – **Khushi Loomba**

P | Director of Communications – **Peyton Sax**

P | \*Director of Internal Policy – **Ashwin Anand**

AE | \*Director of Diversity Efforts – **Valeria Perez-Levy**

P | \*Director of University Affairs – **Kate Lawson**

P | \*Director of Programming – **Grace Clarke**

P | \*Director of Community Relations – **Jessica Phan**

P | \*Director of Campus Partnerships – **Audriana Scott**

P | \*GPSS Vice President of Internal Affairs – **Juan Mora**

P | \*Student Senate Speaker – **Erick Jacobsen**

P | Board of Directors Coordinator – **Caroline Huguely**

P | Associate Director of Student Activities – **Marshall Traverse**

P | Husky Union Building Director – **Carrie Moore**

### Public Forum

None.

### Approval of the Agenda

**Erick** motions to approve.

**Audriana** seconds.

*Agenda approved with unanimous consent. 5:31 pm.*

### Approval of the Minutes

**Peyton** motions to approve.

**Kate** seconds.

*10/16 minutes approved with unanimous consent. 5:33 pm.*

### Consent Agenda

**Nandana** passes off chairship to **Sonal**.

**Ashwin** reads Board Bill 2.06 aloud in its entirety.

**Erick** asks if the Bill needs to be taken out of the Consent Agenda to make amendments.

**Sonal** says yes.

**Erick** motions to suspend the rules and move Board Bill 2.06 to be the first item in New Business.

**Kate** seconds.

*Motion passes. 5:36 pm.*

### New Business

- [BOARD BILL 2.06 - An Act to Adjust the Appointments of the Judicial Committee](#)

**Erick** suggests the second and third “THAT” clauses to be moved to the “WHEREAS” clauses, so it’s clear that they are not enacting that they resign but instead acknowledging their planned resignations. He suggests clarifying that they are non-voting members to keep in line with the ASUW Constitution.

**Ashwin** says he will make those changes.

**Nandana** takes back chairship from **Sonal**.

**Erick** motions to enact those amendments.

**Jessica** seconds.

*Motion passes. 5:39 pm.*

**Erick** motions to approve.

**Peyton** seconds.

*Board Bill 2.06 passes unanimously. 5:39 pm.*

- [BOARD BILL 2.04 - An Act to Provide Stipends for Elections Administration Committee Poll Workers](#)

**Khushi** reads Board Bill 2.04 aloud in its entirety.

**Khushi** explains it is important for them to compensate the poll workers for ASUW elections since it will increase work capacity, which in turn will boost voter turnout.

**Erick** says \$150 for 12 poll workers, when factoring in for the benefits load, the total only comes to \$2,214. He asks why \$3,000 was the chosen amount if \$2,214 is only what is needed.

**Khushi** clarifies that she did not see this Board Bill before it was submitted and had only spoken to **Reaa** about it, so she cannot provide an exact reason. She says she thinks they should amend it to the exact amount, and they can provide the excess later, if needed.

**Erick** motions to amend the sum from \$3,000 to \$2,214, which encompasses the 150 total-hours \$1,800 stipend for 12 poll workers and 23% in benefits.

**Khushi** seconds.

*Motion passes unanimously. 5:44 pm.*

**Sonal** says this should've been implemented sooner since any volunteers working over 5 hours should've been paid. She thanks **Khushi** and **Reaa** for this initiative.

**Khushi** agrees.

**Peyton** motions to approve Board Bill 2.04.

**Khushi** seconds.

*Board Bill 2.04 passes unanimously. 5:45 pm.*

- [BOARD BILL 3.15 An Act to Fund and Collaborate with Husky Health for the Fall "Get Yourself Tested" Campaign](#)

**Nandana** reads all the "WHEREAS" clauses aloud.

**Audriana** reads all the "THAT" clauses aloud.

**Peyton** says she remembers when they did this last year, and it was very successful. She shares her support for this Bill.

**Erick** says in the line items, some funding is listed as going towards staffing tips. He asks if some of this money is going toward staff.

**Audriana** says yes, because they need to pay the staff who are administering the tests.

**Erick** asks if they can use their money for that.

**Khushi** says they should be able to.

**Nandana** clarifies that these nurses are employed full-time at Husky Health already, and Test Fest requires them to focus solely on their campaign instead of their regular shifts for some time. She explains that they are compensating them for that.

**Owen** motions to approve Board Bill 3.15.

**Kate** seconds.

*Board Bill 3.15 passes unanimously. 5:51 pm.*

**Nandana** says that this will happen in November and again in the spring.

**Jessica** asks if she can start telling the groups she liaisons to about this.

**Nandana** says yes. She adds that they should start working on the publicity of the program.

- [BOARD BILL 2.05- An Act to Amend the ASUW Personnel Policy](#)

**Owen** reads Board Bill 2.05 aloud in its entirety.

**Kate** asks for the background on why this change was made.

**Owen** says he added it for clarification since the current wording around what is classified and what is not classified as work hours is vague.

**Erick** says he personally was confused by the old wording, so he supports this change. He points out, however, the Personnel Policy linked in the Bill is not accessible to the public.

**Owen** says he will fix that.

**Peyton** asks if they are getting rid of the piece that mentions job descriptions.

**Owen** clarifies that, no, they are not getting rid of that.

**Erick** suggests changing the wording from commission to entity, since a commission is an entity.

**Sonal** explains that ASUW has commissions, and they have entities. She provides the example of Arts + Entertainment as an entity, and the Latine Student Commission as a commission.

**Erick** says he thought the classification was program and enterprise.

**Peyton** says the three different classifications are entity, enterprise, and commission.

**Erick** says the Bylaws says programs.

**Sonal** asks for someone to check that.

**Erick** says there are a lot of mentions of the word entity, but from his understanding, “entity” is a catch all term.

**Nandana** says they should standardize that.

**Erick** says he is in favor of standardizing “entity” to be the catch all term in the future.

**Peyton** asks if they change the language in this Bill then.

**Nandana** says they should leave this Bill as is but then potentially amend the Bylaws to iron out the clarification between commission and entity.

**Ashwin** clarifies if they want to standardize all programs, commissions, and enterprises to be called “entities.”

**Nandana** explains that entity should be the overarching term, but they still need to keep the three distinctions as well.

**Erick** motions to approve.

**Erick** rescinds his motion.

**Audriana** asks if confirmed by the Personnel Director and Vice President means that entities and commissions have to go through them before they do any work.

**Sonal** explains that line is meant to clarify what hours ASUW employees can log. She uses the example of a non-Senate employee helping the Senate table, even though that doesn't fall under their exact job description. She says that person could go to the PD and VP to ask if that is an hour they could log. She adds that in that situation, they would be able to log the hour since it is furthering ASUW's mission.

**Kate** asks if every time they do something that is not specifically listed in their job description, they have to get that approved by the PD and VP.

**Sonal** says **Owen** has been looking through people's logged hours, and there has been some confusion over what can be logged. She explains that the PD would reach out to that person to ask why they think it would be relevant to their job, and they can work together to make it relevant enough to log.

**Nandana** clarifies that the approval is less about them saying that something can't be logged, but rather it is about the employee having a direct way to confirm if an hour can be logged, so they aren't prosecuted for it later.

**Kate** asks what the "prosecution" that could happen later is.

**Nandana** provides an example of someone being audited for the hours they worked. She explains that the auditor could claim those hours fall outside of a job description, but the employee would be able to say that the hours were approved by the PD or VP.

**Sonal** clarifies if **Kate** was asking about the process behind an employee continuously logging hours that are not relevant to their job.

**Kate** says if someone is doing something that they believed to fall under their job description, the validation is currently to the employee. She says this change makes it seem like the validation is to the VP and PD now.

**Sonal** says if an employee is working outside of their scope, the VP and PD would tell them. She explains if there is something an employee is logging hours for that they shouldn't be, then they will be required to stop logging it. She says if an employee has accumulated a certain amount of disallowed working hours, they will need to make them up with hours they are able to log.

**Kate** says that makes sense.

**Peyton** says since these hours are being found after the fact, if there is a process that can be added, so employees don't build up too many hours to catch up on.

**Nandana** says what they currently do during orientation is let employees know that they should be working on what is listed in their job description. She says she doesn't think the VP and PD have the capacity to sit down with everyone individually and plan out what they should work on. She explains that if the task is ASUW related, there will be leeway. She says if an employee were to log hours related to work for an RSO outside of ASUW, it would be on them to make up those hours.

**Sonal** explains that the job descriptions are a guide of what hours should be logged and what the duties of their job are. She says since they check hours every week, they should be able to catch the invalid hours before they accumulate too much. She says, however, invalid logged hours are a rare occurrence, and this change is meant to provide more clarity to an employee on what they should do when they are not sure if they can log something as a part of their job.

**Owen** explains that it is not likely for someone to have to re-log 15 hours. He says the only things that employees wouldn't be able to log is stuff that falls completely outside of ASUW.

**Peyton** says she is in support of this change. She explains that the next time they update the Personnel Policy, they could add more guardrails, like one-on-one meetings, that would help employees better understand what they can log as work hours.

**Grace** agrees with **Sonal** that it may not be in the PD's and VP's capacity to check in with everyone specifically about hours. She suggests changing the language in this Bill to saying to refer to their job descriptions when they are unsure of if the hours can be logged.

**Owen** explains that when an employee complaint is filed, a meeting is held. He says that could cover the guardrails **Peyton** suggested.

**Sonal** says she likes the idea of referring to the job description, but this Bill is trying to address what an employee should do if the work they want to log is not explicitly stated in their job descriptions.

**Kate** motions to approve Board Bill 2.05.

**Ashwin** seconds.

*Board Bill 2.05 passes unanimously. 6:11 pm.*

- [BOARD BILL 2.07- An Act to Amend the ASUW Volunteers Policy](#)

**Owen** reads Board Bill 2.07 aloud in its entirety.

**Kate** explains that this doesn't work because her job description says she is required to appoint interns to go to meetings without her there. She asks if they can add an exemption for the Diversity of University Affairs position.

**Nandana** says this is only for entities, not BOD.

**Erick** says he loves this. He suggests "appointee" instead of "proxy" because the Senate has its own definition of proxy.

**Nandana** agrees.

**Erick** asks about getting approval from BOD as a whole, instead of just President and VP.

**Sonal** explains that she doesn't see why it will need to go through BOD, especially since the Volunteer Policy falls under the PD's role.

**Nandana** explains that the reasoning behind the four-intern limit is to make sure that the intern's experience isn't diminished by not having enough to do. She explains that the reason the EAC can have more than four interns is because they have demonstrated work in the past that shows that they require additional volunteers.

**Ashwin** says OGR is the same because they have also shown a demonstrated need for more than four interns.

**Peyton** says **Erick's** suggestion does help with equity issues because it eliminates the possibility of potential bias from one person. She says if the approval for more volunteers comes from all of BOD, it eliminates this concern.

**Sonal** says she understands the concern with equity, but the point is to demonstrate why the entity needs more than four volunteers. She says that it doesn't make sense to have more than four interns since there shouldn't be that much work left over after an ASUW employee's contracted hours. She says that it should be fine to only go through the PD because it shouldn't be a big conversation. She says that the demonstration for more than four volunteers should be clear.

**Owen** says **Erick's** idea is good for accountability, but going through BOD could really delay the process of entities being able to hire interns.

**Nandana** explains that making entities go through BOD for more volunteers could reduce entity autonomy as well.

**Erick** motions to approve Board Bill 2.07.

**Kate** seconds.

*Board Bill 2.07 passes unanimously. 6:20 pm.*

- [BOARD BILL 1.03 - An Act to Amend the Bylaws as Directed by SB-31-5 and Clarify Provisions Relating to the Elections Administration Committee](#)

**Erick** reads Board Bill 1.03 aloud in its entirety.

**Nandana** asks what the reason behind the alumni advisor was.

**Erick** explains that he isn't completely sure since this Senate Bill is from last year, but as he understands it, someone from ASUW could help to provide insight to current employees. He says he believes the SAO advisors are sufficient for this, but that was the language approved by both the Senate and BOD, so he didn't want to leave it out. He adds that amending this is an option.

**Sonal** explains that even though the alumni advisor is non-voting, if they had bad practices they suggest to the current employees, it could negatively affect the election season.

**Erick** says he thinks it'll be difficult to find someone.

**Nandana** says since the alumni advisor is non-voting, it will not affect quorum if they can't find anyone to fill the role.

**Peyton** says since it was approved by both Senate and BOD, they should keep it in.

**Peyton** motions to approve Board Bill 1.03.

**Audriana** seconds.

*Board Bill 1.03 passes unanimously. 6:28 pm.*

### Old Business

- [BOARD BILL 1.02 \(SB-31-6\) An Act to Address Adequate and Affordable Housing for Students and Establish Shared Campus Planning Meetings](#)

**Erick** reads the summary in Board Bill 1.02 aloud.

**Erick** explains that this was tabled last week so he and **Nandana** could talk to the sponsor, **Dylan Bianchi**, about potential amendments concerning redundancy. He explains that the Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs and the President are in charge of city-level advocacy, and this Bill's proposed committee may overlap with that. He adds that there were further concerns about the capacity of the Director of Campus Partnerships and whether or not the committees listed in the Bill would be open to having a student representative. He says **Dylan** was open to recommitment of the Bill, so these concerns can be addressed.

**Nandana** explains that she and **Dylan** met last Friday, and they discussed the problem with adding another committee to the DCP's job description. She says **Dylan** suggested hosting a forum style event with OGR instead of a new committee. She adds that she will work with **Dylan** on those new ideas, and they can bring it back to Board to amend.

**Erick** explains that he is unaware of whether or not Senate Bills can be amended in Board meetings. He says general practice is that Senate Resolutions cannot be amended in Board meetings, and they are recommitted. He explains that even though Senate Bills are different, the spirit of the Constitution suggests that they can't be amended in Board meetings. He says they should recommit.

**Nandana** says they amend the Constitution and the Elections Policies and Procedures in Board.

**Erick** points out that those documents are not coming from the Senate. He says those go through the Judicial Committee first.

**Nandana** says okay. She suggests recommitting the Bill.

**Nandana** motions to recommit Board Bill 1.02.

**Erick** seconds.

*Board Bill 1.02 recommitted unanimously. 6:32 pm.*

*Executive Session*

None.

*Funding Updates*

None.

*Discussion Items*

**Peyton** says she knows a lot of BOD members, and students in general, have received conflicting information about the Mechanical Engineering department's recent \$250 RSO fee. She says she has been thinking about different ways they can receive greater transparency on this issue without using crazy language that harms students in the process. She explains that her idea was for ASUW to submit a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request. She explains that while any student can submit a FOIA request, it has more gumption if it is submitted by an organization rather than an individual. She says, to her, this approach seems reasonable and not aggressive while also providing them with a path to find the truth behind this new fee. She says FOIA requests take a lot of effort to provide, and it could serve as a warning to other Colleges to not impose an RSO fee similar to the ME's fee.

**Nandana** explains that since the ME RSO fee was just implemented, a FOIA request wouldn't provide much information behind the usage of the fee. She asks if **Peyton** wants to see the ME department's past expenditures.

**Peyton** says she wants to see the process behind the decisions leading up to this fee.

**Nandana** asks if **Peyton** wants to see meeting minutes.

**Peyton** explains that BOD as a whole can have a conversation about what they would want to see from the FOIA request, but she wants to see the reasons for the \$250 amount, who it was approved by, and who was involved in the process behind the decision.

**Erick** asks if entire organizations can submit a FOIA request. He asks what the difference is between an individual submitting a request versus an organization submitting a request.

**Peyton** explains that the entire organization itself can't submit a request, but a member from the organization can. She explains that she wants to do this because it shows that the student government is advocating for students and trying to find answers to this problem. She adds that ASUW can release a statement to students saying that they will submit a FOIA request on students' behalf. She says this also sends out a message to other colleges showing that ASUW will advocate for more transparency for students in more tangible ways than a condemnation, for example.

**Sonal** explains it is hard to discern whether **Peyton** would be submitting this request as a student or as an employee of ASUW. She says another concern is what the end goal is with this, especially when **Nandana**, **Kate**, and herself are already discussing this with the COE about this fee. She asks how this will pose as a "threat" to other departments, when a FOIA request by itself will not change any department's processes.

**Peyton** says she doesn't want this to be framed as a threat, especially because this is public information they would be requesting to see. She says all the conflicting information around this fee from different people has led to a lot of confusion, so the end goal of the request is to see the tangible documents and emails that led to this decision. She adds that this would provide true transparency around the fee instead of different stories from administration. She explains that while this request isn't a "threat," it will show that ASUW is determined to hold colleges to a necessary standard of transparency and involve students in their future budget and decision making.

**Kate** says she appreciates the sentiment of fact finding. She explains that she doesn't want to discount the work already done by the Board to find out why this fee has been imposed. She says she is concerned that a step this drastic could harm the work they have already done.

**Erick** explains that they haven't had a chance to talk to all ME RSOs yet. He suggests trying to collect all the information before ASUW submits a FOIA request. He says when it comes to advocating for students, he sees that as a noble goal. He explains that they have demonstrated their goal by discussing this problem in Board meetings and in Senate. He says in **Nandana's** meeting with the Dean of the College of Engineering, they said they were open to adding a student or ASUW representative to their advisory council. He adds that when it comes to information gathering, he agrees with **Kate** that they should complete their work first and then see what gaps of information they are still missing.

**Nandana** says they should try and solve the contradictory information problem by having everyone in the same room at the same time, including the Provost, who is in

charge of approving fees. She explains that they should try and solve the gap in communication between the Board by attending all the same meetings instead of doing a lot of different things regarding the ME RSO fee. She says they should try to refrain from using words like “statement,” since the BOD can’t make statements without it going through the Senate. She explains that she is not opposed to doing the FOIA request, but she would want to have a good breakdown of everything specific they’d be asking to see. She adds that she wants to talk to the RSOs and let them know that they are thinking about doing this, so they are not blindsided by anything ASUW does.

**Ashwin** asks how many weeks it would take to collect all of the information **Kate**, **Erick**, and **Nandana** want to.

**Kate** explains that she has multiple meetings scheduled within the next week to get more information about this fee. She says she is meeting with two or three RSOs a week currently.

**Owen** adds that there was an email sent out by the engineering department to ME RSOs regarding the fee. He reads the following excerpt from the email:

*“Unlike the tuition revenue for the 1-credit registration, which will not produce any significant income to the department, the course fee will be administered entirely by the ME department to benefit the students and the teams who paid for it. This will be in many forms. Among them: Keeping the shops open and providing the level of support that we have always maintained. Replacing the student member fees that some clubs imposed on the members. Expenses that clubs had charged on those member fees will be reimbursable from the course fee by the ME Department. Buying supplies or outside services. This can be through orders made through ME, via PurchasePath by an authorized user in the team (preferred), or by reimbursement from a member of the team who is an authorized purchaser (to be used only for truly urgent purchases). ” Travel to competition, training, and other locations that are needed for the team (justified to, and approved by, the faculty advisor).”*

**Erick** explains that when requesting a certain amount of information, they may have to pay for that physical hard drive. He says they may not need to formally request minutes. He says asking the ME department first, not through a FOIA request, is best because it could save them time and money. He explains that he is not opposed to a FOIA request in the future, but their focus right now should be trying to get everyone in one room, including RSOs, to get full clarification.

**Carrie** explains that she has had to deal with a lot of FOIA requests. She says the Board is treating this FOIA request as a serious event, but it is a normal part of state operations. She explains that because all this information is public, any individual has

the right to ask for the information at any time for any reason. She adds that they shouldn't be worried about this being a terrible thing to do. She explains that anyone in the ME department wanting to "kneecap" or retaliate a FOIA request in any way is a fireable offence. She says the FOIA request is one piece of all the work they are doing, and it is not a substitute for meetings and personal conversations. She says that in her meeting with the ME Department, she was told conflicting information from what other people had been told. She explains that there is also software that can automatically pull the records, and a FOIA request is a normal part of a state job. She adds that the information could be valuable to have while they hold meetings with people in the ME department and with ME RSOs.

**Marshall** explains that it may take a while to get all the information, so the planned meetings can still take place and help answer questions. He explains that a FOIA request does not prevent them from doing other things; it is just another way to collect information.

**Ashwin** says if you read through the justifications provided in the ME department's email, it doesn't fully say how the \$250 covers all these cuts. He adds that they just seem like all the general reasons the department could think of.

**Peyton** says all the FOIA request would do is provide more information, and it would support their understanding as they enter these meetings with the COE and UW admin. She explains that they can include RSOs in this and explain that they can submit a request too. She explains that the ME department has given different information to SAO, RSOs, ASUW, and The Daily because of framing and what role it plays in their agenda. She says, as student leaders, they must question agendas and fact find alongside their meetings with admin. She explains that this request is to make sure they are not receiving necessary information before it's too late. She says that it shows to students, on a tangible level, that their student government is advocating for them. She adds that this isn't to discount the behind-the-scenes work the Board is doing.

**Nandana** says her only hesitation is having the request be on behalf of all of ASUW. She says she doesn't want to do anything that could jeopardize the work RSOs are doing, and she doesn't know how people would respond to this request.

**Erick** asks **Carrie** and **Marshall** how often organizations submit a request as opposed to an individual submitting a request.

**Carrie** explains that a FOIA request typically comes from an individual. She adds that if any state employee is trying to dissuade you from submitting a FOIA request, it serves as a bad sign.

**Erick** says he isn't sure that the organization aspect of this request would work. He says he is fine with **Peyton** submitting an individual request.

**Peyton** says she is trying to convey that their elected positions have power. She says that ASUW has a tag on this because they are elected by the student body to hold administration accountable. She says she isn't trying to harm anyone, but it's their duty to stand up to administration.

**Ashwin** says he understands the fact that they are elected to increase transparency for the student body. He asks if it would be more beneficial for the student engineering council to submit the FOIA request because they are directly tied to the ME department.

**Nandana** says it doesn't really matter.

**Peyton** says anyone can submit a request.

**Kate** says she isn't opposed to submitting the request. She explains, as an elected official, she is working very hard on this. She explains that her job is more insular, and she is meant to communicate with RSOs, then relay that information to faculty councils. She explains that she doesn't think it is within the capacity of her office to submit these requests without consulting constituents.

**Sonal** says they shouldn't undermine any work being done. She says they aren't scared to submit a FOIA request, but it has more to do with deciding what their end goal is in receiving this information is. She says she wants to discuss what they would do with the information they receive from the FOIA request.

**Grace** explains that she is in support of submitting a FOIA request because it is well within their right as representatives of students to do so. She adds that she is happy to coordinate any RSO communication since she has a lot of those connections. She says she is confident that a FOIA request will be one puzzle piece in the larger amount of work already being done regarding the ME RSO fee.

**Erick** agrees that he is not afraid to submit a FOIA request, but he wants to clarify what they will do with all the information they receive from a FOIA request. He asks what the effect multiple different requests from RSOs and individuals would have. He explains that he wants to meet with all RSOs and see what they want before ASUW goes forward with what they want. He explains that he wants the approach to empower people to do things instead of doing them himself.

**Nandana** explains that they can talk to RSOs and make sure that they are not stepping on their toes for what they want them to do. She says whoever wants to sign their name on to a FOIA request can, and those who do not want to sign their name on it don't have to.

**Juan** echoes figuring out what the purpose is behind making the FOIA request before they go forward with it.

**Nandana** says that they can decide the purpose after the request, since the FOIA request is just about receiving information.

**Kate** agrees that they don't need to decide their intention until they have the information from the request. She explains that defining a reason for why they made this request is more important right now.

**Owen** says compiling information that has been given to different sources is a good first step to seeing what gaps they need to fill by submitting a FOIA request.

**Peyton** explains that her goal behind this request was to visibly convey that ASUW cares and is advocating for this issue.

**Erick** asks where this statement would be posted, who would be the audience, and what their end goal would be.

**Peyton** explains that she is looking into different methods of communication since a lot of the avenues ASUW currently has are generally inaccessible to the student body. She says this request could be promoted through a social media campaign or something similar.

**Erick** says they could add a line in an all-student email saying ASUW is looking into the ME department's \$250 fee. He says he doesn't understand why the FOIA request is an important step in them being able to share that information.

**Peyton** explains that the FOIA request is ASUW showing that they are advocating for these RSOs' Constitutional right to assembly.

**Nandana** explains that they are all at a very different place for how this view this request. She says they should continue the ways they are working on this issue, and if **Peyton** would like to submit a FOIA request as an individual, she can do so.

**Erick** says he is still confused as to why they would submit this FOIA request.

**Nandana** says the FOIA request is to know what was happening in closed-door conversations regarding this ME RSO fee.

**Nandana** hands off chairship to **Sonal**.

**Sonal** explains that she met with architects today to check out the best way to use both of their ASUW 121 and 131 spaces. She says she wants to see how they can hone in on collaboration in both of the spaces. She asks if they should proceed with a potential renovation. She explains that she wants to create a functional, inspiring, and creative environment by pursuing this renovation. She suggests going to JCC and the Senate to

see how they feel about the current inclusivity and welcomeness of the ASUW office spaces. She adds that they can use this feedback to justify why they are pursuing this renovation. She asks what the number the Board feels comfortable spending. She says it is a costly, but worthwhile investment. She emphasizes that the communication behind why they are pursuing this renovation, to make ASUW office spaces more accessible and collaborative, is extremely important. She explains that they will provide transparency at every step of this renovation. She says the quotes for initial project teams are 6.8K-9.8K. She says the other option is between 3.1K-5.3K, which doesn't include the user group meetings. She explains that when they are considering this large of a renovation, they need to include these user group meetings in order to adequately explain why they are pursuing this.

**Owen** explains that a change like this will last decades, and it will help ASUW become more inclusive.

**Ashwin** clarifies if they are trying to gather groups and to gain student feedback to justify the large cost of the renovation.

**Sonal** says yes, since there is so much money that will be going into this, it is imperative that student feedback is a part of the process.

**Erick** asks if this information can be sent in the Teams chat since they are strapped for time.

**Sonal** explains she doesn't want this discussion to be rushed since it is such an important decision. She says she will share the information, but they will continue to discuss this in the future.

**Peyton** says they have been discussing this for a while, and she shares her appreciation for **Sonal's** initiative. She echoes that it is important to involve as many students as possible in this process. She says it is important for the community to create the "why" behind the renovation, instead of being told the "why."

**Nandana** shouts out **Sonal** for taking this initiative.

**Nandana** says she wants to cancel the October 30 BOD meeting so they can all attend OGR's Seattle Elections Forum. She asks if there is any time-sensitive reason to have a special meeting next week.

**Owen** says the hiring of the Frontend Developer.

**Nandana** says okay.

**Sonal** says New York Times Games will be an important discussion that will be coming next week.

**Peyton** suggests next Monday for a special meeting.

**Nandana** asks if items for a Monday meeting could not wait until Thursday.

**Peyton** says they could.

**Nandana** asks if NYT Games can wait.

**Sonal** says no.

**Erick** asks if they can put vague wording on a special meeting agenda in case they don't have an exact person chosen by the time the agenda must be submitted to OPMA.

**Nandana** says yes.

**Nandana** explains that funding pregnancy tests and plan B is an ongoing initiative they have been discussing. She says ASUW can fund pregnancy tests themselves, and they can work out a voucher system with Husky Health for Plan B. She says the pregnancy tests will be given out in ASUW offices, and to prevent people from taking too many, they can put out a few at a time.

### Announcements

**Nandana** announces that Legislative Reception RSVPs are now open. She encourages all BOD members to RSVP as soon as possible.

**Nandana** announces that Rainy Dawg Radio is hosting an RDR x OGR show featuring herself and **Kaitlyn** from OGR on October 29 at 1 pm.

### Adjournment

**Peyton** motions to adjourn.

**Audriana** seconds.

*Meeting adjourned with unanimous consent at 7:46 pm.*