



Associated Students of the University of Washington

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

October 9, 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 5:31 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**

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

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

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

P | *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**

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

Public Forum

Nyla introduces herself and explains that she is a staff writer for The Daily. She says she will be the ASUW Board of Directors beat writer this year.

Eva introduces herself and explains that she is the captioner for BOD meetings.

Nandana thanks **Eva** for the work she does.

Approval of the Agenda

Erick motions to approve.

Kate seconds.

Agenda approved with unanimous consent. 5:33 pm.

Approval of the Minutes

Ashwin motions to approve.

Audriana seconds.

6/5, 6/10, and 10/2 minutes approved unanimously. 5:34 pm.

Consent Agenda

None.

New Business

- [BOARD BILL 5.01 \(R-31-29\) A Resolution in Support of the Installation of a Dawg Prints Printer in Poplar Hall](#)

Erick reads Board Bill 5.01 aloud in its entirety.

Erick explains that this Resolution was written last year by a hall senator. He says this passed with 30 YAYS, 0 NAYS, and 7 abstentions on October 7 as a holdover from last year.

Ashwin says he can provide some insight into Poplar, since he lived there last year. He agrees that printing on West Campus is very limited, but he shares concern over the past two cases of vandalism to West Campus printers. He says with the Poplar LRC being open at all hours, he worries about future vandalism. He adds that since there is not always an employee in the LRC, he is not sure how well-monitored the printer will be.

Erick explains, in his interpretation, this printer would be more monitored than the printer in Alder Hall was. He says it would be interesting to find out if the North Campus LRC uses any methods to prevent vandalism to their printer. He says when the RCSA Director of Government Affairs, **Naomi Law**, and **Jessica** work to implement this resolution, that is a point they can consider thoroughly.

Owen adds that McMahon Hall has a printer in The 8. He says there is an employee there that makes sure students have confirmation from them to use the printer. He asks if a similar system could be implemented in the Poplar LRC.

Erick says that solution could be considered.

Audriana asks if the Poplar LRC is accessible to every student with a Husky Card or only on-campus residents.

Erick says the Poplar LRC is accessible to every student with a Husky Card.

Peyton says she noticed the Bill mentioned STF paying for the printer. She asks if this has been pitched to STF yet.

Erick explains that he is not aware of that process starting yet. He says a pitch to STF is dependent on if HFS has a printer in storage they want to use, or if they will need to purchase a new one.

Grace explains that the North Campus LRC is close enough in proximity to the Spratlen Hall RA office, allowing the RAs to oversee the printer. She suggests a similar location for the Poplar LRC printer.

Erick agrees. He explains the former Alder Hall printer was in a small, side hallway, where you could easily get away with not being seen. He says the LRC is far more open, helping to prevent cases of vandalism.

Nandana asks why they are choosing Poplar instead of Alder.

Erick says it is because of the LRC in Poplar.

Nandana clarifies if this idea has been pitched to STF or not.

Erick says, as far as he is aware, it has not been pitched yet.

Ashwin explains that the Poplar LRC is not as close to the RA office as the Spratlen LRC. He says it may also be difficult for an employee to be at the LRC at all times. He asks if there is a printer in Area 1, since they will always have an employee present.

Valeria says there is a DawgPrints printer in Area 1. She explains that you need to request to print something, and then the employee will be able to grant or deny that request.

Nandana clarifies if the intent behind this bill is to have a West Campus printer that students can use without being heavily monitored.

Erick says that is not necessarily the intention. He explains that the Poplar LRC was chosen because it's seen as more of an academic space as opposed to Area 1.

Nandana asks if there was any discussion about why Poplar would be less prone to vandalism than Alder.

Erick explains no in-depth conversations were had about that, but Poplar was chosen because it would be slightly more monitored than Alder.

Kate asks if more people live on West Campus than North Campus.

Peyton says she thinks it is about the same.

Kate explains that it makes sense to put another printer on West Campus to make it even to North Campus.

Erick says North Campus' seclusion in comparison to West Campus is generally safer for students. He explains that one of the main concerns brought up in this Bill was that West Campus residents feel unsafe walking long distances to print at night.

Peyton echoes **Erick's** point about West Campus safety. She adds that the walk to get to a printer from West Campus is about 15 minutes, so having one closer would be beneficial.

Jessica explains that it is worth implementing this idea because of how necessary an accessible printer is for all students. She explains that she would be happy to oversee the implementation of this initiative as the HFS liaison.

Sonal asks if they have plans to reinstall the Alder printer.

Erick says it is not likely. He says the Poplar LRC space is more accessible to students.

Sonal asks if the issue with the Alder printer was the lack of supervision that led to vandalism.

Erick says yes.

Grace points out that Area 1 is not free to access for all students, only on campus residents. She says the Poplar LRC is an accessible and free space for all students.

Ashwin motions to approve.

Peyton seconds.

Board Bill 5.01 approved unanimously. 5:50 pm.

Old Business

None.

Executive Session

None.

Funding Updates

None.

Discussion Items

Audriana says **Joseph Riggio**, who is spearheading the unofficial taskforce for a student health fee, has joined her today to update the Board on the progress for a student health fee. She says the proposed fee amount is \$125. She explains they determined this amount from research on other school's health fees, which range from \$100-\$200. She adds that the \$125 would be the lowest health fee amongst Big Ten

schools, and Washington State University has the highest health fee amount, \$244. She explains that this fee will be separate from SAF, since it will give them more flexibility to change the amount. She says the fee is voluntary, meaning students have the option to adopt or reject the fee through a survey. She explains, however, once the fee is adopted by students and the Board of Regents approves it, the fee will become mandatory. She says that LiveWell's marketing team is working on educational material for the fee, including a document that will detail the benefits of the fee. She adds that she wants ASUW OCOMM, RCSA, UW Circle, and the Husky Health Advisory Board to be a part of the marketing effort.

Joseph introduces himself and explains he has been spearheading the unofficial taskforce for the student health fee. He says that the \$125 fee is not a frivolous amount; it has been unanimously agreed upon by Husky Health, the UW Counseling Center, and LiveWell. He explains the Board needs to agree on the health fee's existence, its \$125 amount, and also an educational strategy. He says that students are already starting to be educated on the importance of this health fee. He explains that they are also starting to push the counterargument about what will happen if this fee doesn't exist, highlighted by the recent budget cuts to UW Medical and UW as a whole. He says he understands students will push back to a fee above \$100, but the reason he and his task force have been very passionate about this fee is because of its necessity. He explains that there is a lot of research between student mental health and academic retention, making it in UW's best interest to fund the UW Counseling Center, Husky Health, and LiveWell. He says if UW doesn't fund these things, students should come together to protect these programs, despite a \$125 increase to their tuition.

Owen asks when the BOR would make this fee mandatory if the voluntary fee is approved by students. He asks if there is an exemption for students who receive financial aid.

Joseph clarifies that, while the fee is legally called a "voluntary fee," it is not actually voluntary. He explains that students have the option to voluntarily approve the fee, but if it is approved, it becomes a mandatory tuition fee. He says that they could add financial aid breaks to the memorandum of understanding. He explains there is time for future conversations about financial aid, but right now they are trying to focus on educating students on the importance of the fee. He says they need 10% of undergraduate students and 10% of graduate students to approve the fee. He adds they are hoping to get the student survey out in November.

Kate suggests refraining from using the word "voluntary" in educational materials about the fee, since it really isn't. She agrees that the \$125 amount is reasonable, especially if health groups on campus support it.

Joseph agrees.

Ashwin asks how students will know that the fee exists.

Audriana says since the fee is separate from SAF, it will appear as a separate line item in students' tuition.

Joseph says that they are still deciding how oversight of the fee will be handled. He explains they will either have the fee be a SAF subcommittee or have a completely separate committee for the fee. He explains that if they choose to have a separate committee, then yes, the fee will appear as a separate line item in students' tuition.

Erick asks at what stage in the process that decision will be made.

Joseph says they don't know yet, but they will need an answer by the time the ASUW Joint Resolution is passed. He says whatever the JR says will directly translate into what is in the memorandum of understanding. He explains they are roughly planning for the JR to be written in Winter Quarter.

Peyton asks what services will be covered by the \$125 fee. She says she thinks the committee should be different, so students understand and clearly see that they are paying this fee.

Audriana says Husky Health has sent out surveys to see what services students want, and a large number of answers were focused on student mental health.

Joseph says the Counseling Center has international target services, their Let's Talk program could expand, and their psychiatric care services could expand. He says that student psychosis cases, while still small, are increasing at an alarming rate. He says LiveWell will be able to expand their peer health educator program, their intervention services, and host larger-scale programs and collaboration.

Peyton thanks **Joseph** for the clarification. She says with how many services this fee is going toward, the \$125 fee seems reasonable to her.

Valeria asks how the 10% of students surveyed will be representative of all student communities.

Joseph explains that **Natasha**, the Director of the UW Counseling Center, brought up a good idea for the marketing strategy. He says she suggested pairing up a student leader with someone from a health unit to reach out to RSOs, different majors, academic departments, and more to collect answers from a wide range of student communities.

Kate says, morally, she agrees with **Peyton's** idea that this should be a separate committee. She asks what the operating cost of a separate committee is, and if it would be less costly to put it under SAF. She says a separate committee could be too expensive and negate the purpose and effectiveness of the health fee.

Joseph says that is a great point. He says he will bring that point to the taskforce to discuss.

Ashwin explains that the fee would generate \$375 per student per year, making the total revenue for the fee at around \$20 million per year. He asks if it is possible to ask

entities who would receive this funding to detail and outline how exactly they will be using it.

Joseph explains that it is difficult to predict what the actual cost will be since service costs are everchanging. He says that between 2024-2025, health entities compiled information about what they could do with the money from a range of different fee prices. He says the health units are currently drafting marketing materials to help students and student leaders digest the information, including the services provided, about the health fee.

Ashwin asks if it is possible to add an info button on students' tuition so they can understand what this health fee does if it is approved.

Joseph says that is a great idea, and he will suggest it to the taskforce.

Erick says he agrees with the \$125 fee amount, especially considering how much lower it is compared to other Big Ten schools and WSU. He asks how long they anticipate the fee staying at \$125.

Joseph says if the committee is placed under SAF, the largest amount SAF would be allowed to raise the fee is 4% per year. He says if the committee is separate from SAF, the process of establishing a cap would be up to them and codified in the memorandum of understanding.

Nandana asks when they will begin surveying students.

Joseph says they are hoping to start in November.

Nandana explains that multiple student groups have been advocating to increase the 4% SAF cap, so she anticipates the percentage to increase in the coming year. She adds that if the SAF fee increases, in addition to other tuition increases and federal financial aid cuts, she is worried students will not be receptive to another tuition increase. She asks if there has been a survey that has asked students how they feel about their current health services.

Joseph says **Joel**, the Husky Health Director, has a non-utilization survey they conduct every year. He explains that a lot of the reasons students did not use health services were due to lack of awareness, insurance barriers, and confusion over what services are offered. He says **Natasha** from the UW Counseling Center and **Jen** from LiveWell have also conducted their own surveys for student experience. He says they attempted a temperature check survey last year, but only 20 students responded, making the data inconclusive. He explains they are playing a game of catch up with these health services. He says that if these services are not properly funded, student health and success will decline. He adds that there is existing research out there that suggests that good student mental health will correlate with student success. He explains, yes, this will raise tuition by \$125, but he argues it is the responsibility of the student government to look after students' well-being. He says that this health fee will not only impact current students, but future students as well. He provides the example

of how successful the U-PASS fee has been for students despite the increase it had on tuition cost, arguing the health fee could have a similar impact.

Nandana thanks **Joseph**. She says her primary concern is trying to navigate this initiative while cost barriers to higher education are increasing. She echoes **Kate's** point about operational costs, which could prevent the fee from reaching its full potential. She says the way forward may be to push for an increase in the SAF cap, increase the SAF fee, and then be more diligent about seeing what resources need that funding.

Sonal says WSU has a health fee currently set at \$244 a semester. She explains that 83% of WSU's students are on financial aid, while UW's financial aid population is only 55%. She adds that those percentages are set to decrease in the coming years, making that a major discrepancy to address. She says UW has 37,000 more students than WSU, so that may be the reason WSU's health fee is higher. She explains that the way forward should be to address these services, detail why the fee amount makes sense for these services, and promote why the fee is so vital for students' experience. She explains that she expects a lot of feedback from students to be about questioning why this fee exists when only 10% of students utilize these services. She says this fee is great in principle, but given the current climate around increasing costs, it could make students feel uneasy that they are trying to increase tuition even more.

Kate says she thinks the U-PASS works so well because it replaces a cost students would incur anyway. She says she doesn't feel it is well communicated what costs students would be saving from a health fee. She suggests a survey that shows how much students save from these UW health services as opposed to utilizing private healthcare services. She says this is fee a great idea, but she doesn't think students will understand how this will help them financially.

Nandana explains that she received data from Husky Health and UW Counseling that had data on the exact number of students they treated, but it didn't provide information on the number of students they were not able to help because of funding barriers. She says she would be more comfortable advocating for this fee if they knew the current discrepancies for these UW health services.

Joseph explains that Senate Resolution R-31-4 may clarify some of **Nandana's** questions about the discrepancy for the UW Counseling Center specifically. He explains the appendixes in that Resolution provide clarity about the current discrepancies in clinical index loads. He says that this student health fee will not impact individuals' insurance, meaning that students will not see direct insurance replacements or impacts from this. He explains what will come from this fee is a larger range of adequately funded health services, but it is not meant to act like health insurance.

Jessica explains that this fee would be important, and she sees the good intentions behind it. She says, however, that she hears so much from students questioning what the current fees are for. She says if they want to follow through on advocating for this fee, they must get clear data to display how this fee can benefit students.

Joseph says that issue will always be the paradox with health services. He explains he has never personally used a UW LiveWell or UW Counseling Center service, but for the sake of other students, it is important to fund those services regardless of his own personal utilization of them. He adds that the memorandum of understanding will have an implementation date, and they could push it back if there is a current concern with rising costs in higher education. He adds that the earliest fee could be implemented is 2027.

Erick says that **Nandana's** point about increasing SAF spurred him to do some research. He explains that SAF currently provides \$6.5 million to Husky Health, \$2.4 million to the UW Counseling Center, and \$213,000 to UW LiveWell. He says this totals \$9.1 million. He asks if this separate health fee would avoid future SAF increases.

Joseph says an overall increase in SAF fee would have a remarkably smaller impact on health services than having a separate health fee. He says that **Hailey** from SAF has told him that SAF would not lower their fee amount, but the funds currently being distributed to Husky Health, UW Counseling Center, and LiveWell would be redistributed to other health units.

Erick asks if SAF would avoid increasing their fee in that scenario.

Joseph says that it would be up to SAF.

Peyton explains if they are proposing this large of an increase to the health services' budgets, then they will need to communicate what currently exists, why this fee will help make these programs better, and why students would want this.

Joseph says all three health entity marketing teams have been looped in and are currently creating educational materials.

Erick asks if the BOD will need to formally vote on approving the \$125 fee amount.

Joseph says all the UW Policy says is that there needs to be a survey initiated that achieves 10% approval from undergraduate and graduate students, and then a Joint Resolution from ASUW and GPSS must be passed. He explains that GPSS have all been in favor of a health fee being implemented. He says that at the end of the day, if students reject the fee in the survey, then they won't have the fee. He says it is a personal preference if the Board is in support of the fee and helps with the marketing and strategy, but it is not technically required.

Erick clarifies that **Joseph** doesn't need anything except the Board's thoughts.

Joseph says that is correct.

Nandana asks who will be conducting the survey.

Joseph explains the health units are open to having the survey specialists help students create this survey. He says, right now, the taskforce's planning committee will be

drafting the survey. He explains that **Rylie**, the Finance Director for GPSS, is the taskforce's unofficial lead for the marketing of the health fee and survey.

Nandana explains that ASUW can influence SAF's distribution of funds, since the ASUW F&B Director sits on the committee, along with a Student Senate representative.

Peyton asks what the total amount generated from the fee will be.

Ashwin says around \$23 million.

Joseph says the total amount will vary because of part-time and summer quarter students, so this is just an estimation.

Peyton asks if there is an estimation of where the funds will be distributed.

Joseph says the \$125 fee amount was based off of the three health units' current SAF proportions.

Nandana asks if there will be a follow-up to eliminate these health units from still receiving funding from SAF.

Joseph says she should ask the SAF Chair, since that is a vote they will make.

Nandana asks if they are currently thinking of this fee to be a \$23 million addition to the \$9 million they currently receive from SAF.

Joseph says yes. He says SAF has communicated that they will reduce their contribution, but it is unknown if their contribution will be entirely eliminated.

Nandana asks if there are any other questions or comments.

Joseph says he thought about lobbying for increasing the SAF cap, but he has been pushing for this in this way because of the State's current financial situation. He says that he doesn't think grants for these health services funded by the State are possible. He explains that he has concerns over increasing the SAF fee to increase overall allocation, since the health units have expressed concern over that being an unreliable source of funding. He says that, while unlikely, funding could change with one SAF committee vote.

Nandana thanks **Joseph** and **Audriana** for their hard work on this.

Owen suggests having the SAF Chair, **Hailey**, join **Joseph** in another BOD discussion about the health fee.

Nandana agrees.

Erick adds that **Hailey** will be coming for a Student Senate forum soon.

Nandana says as student government leaders, it is good to know what is going on campus, even if there is something they can't necessarily do about it. She explains that a student came to her with concern over the mechanical engineering department's recent RSO fee. She explains that any student participating in a mechanical engineering RSO must now register for a 1 credit course and pay a \$250 course fee. She clarifies that any RSO with a space in the MEB or a ME advisor is considered a ME RSO. She says this impacts insurance, since these students work with dangerous equipment, but now they will not be insured unless they are in that 1 credit course paying the \$250 fee. She says this creates a huge barrier for students wanting to participate in these RSOs. She says in the future, the \$250 fee could potentially become a \$1500 tuition increase for all engineering students except for Computer Science. She says the CS department said they didn't want this fee, so they will no longer be able to use any of these resources. She says she believes this is a result of major budget cuts.

Kate clarifies that insurance is a huge part of this problem, since the school is required to insure these students if they are using dangerous equipment. She explains that the consensus she has gotten from ME students is that they would prefer this to be an optional fee rather than a blanket tuition increase for a couple of reasons. She says since some students don't want to participate in these ME RSOs, they don't want to have their tuition increased for something they won't use. She says that there are also some students who are outside the College of Engineering that participate in these RSOs. She explains if it switches to a tuition increase of COE students, these non-COE students would not have to pay any money to join, leaving COE students to unfairly cover all costs. She adds that it is unclear to her whether or not the COE is imposing this fee because of budget cuts, or just because of the higher amount of students in these RSOs causing an increase in the allocation of resources. She says these RSOs are highly important because the students that participate in them are more equipped with the skills they need, and they are statistically more likely to have better jobs in the future. She adds that because of how vital these RSOs are for their futures, students have said that they would rather pay the fee than not have these RSOs at all.

Jessica says she was asked about this fee when she was at the RSO Leadership Summit, and it shocked her. She explains that from what she gauged, these students feel like their hands are tied because of the importance of these RSOs. She says any student that isn't able to pay the \$250 is now at a disadvantage in their future careers. She says that this sets a dangerous precedent that any student who can't pay this money is not set up for a good future.

Erick adds that there is a Senate Resolution in the works regarding this issue. He explains that these students mentioned, historically, some of these RSOs have trained students to use that equipment for free. He says, to his understanding, some of these new requirements violate certain policies that would no longer classify these groups as RSOs.

Ashwin says there is no clarity for justification from the ME department over this fee. He asks if there is any way they can push against this. He asks if, in the worst case, they can keep the \$250 course fee to prevent future tuition increases.

Nandana explains that she is currently trying to gain clarification over why the ME department imposed this fee in the first place. She says she will be talking to the Dean of the COE and the Provost as soon as possible.

Kate explains that the way this was communicated to ME RSO students was through the engineering student council, which is made up of members from every single engineering RSO. She says the students on this council are often not the leaders of these RSOs. She says the fee was technically communicated, but it wasn't in the most accessible way. She adds that they can talk to the provost and potentially add this to OGR's legislative agenda if the fee was imposed due to statewide budget cuts.

Peyton says she finds this fee to be disgusting. She says that she is assuming there is reasoning behind this, but as a multi-billion-dollar institution, this problem should not be happening. She says that this is an important time to band together as students to fight against this. She says this is not okay, and as elected officials, they must advocate against this fee.

Owen asks if the tuition increase would encompass all engineering students beyond the ME department.

Kate says yes, the tuition increase will apply to everyone in the COE except for CS.

Owen says this raises a huge problem for students who don't have the extra money to spend on this.

Kate says the students that participate in these RSOs historically get better jobs. She says that students who are not able to pay for this are at a disadvantage in their future careers.

Erick says he recommended the RSOs advocate for a more robust student advisory board, since the current engineering student council seems to have a lot of institutional problems.

Grace explains that it is the Board's responsibility to advocate for that student advisory board.

Sonal explains that it is concerning that even well-funded departments are facing these kinds of issues, since it raises concerns over the problems less well-funded departments will face.

Grace says that as a student in the CAS, she has seen the firsthand effects of budget cuts. She says that she has heard from a professor that LSJ may not be able to afford a graduation ceremony.

Owen adds that there are already so many institutionalized barriers for people to enter the job force, and this fee reinforces those barriers.

Kate explains that a lot of these clubs receive corporate sponsorships, and this fee takes the burden off these corporate sponsorships and puts them on to the University, which is unethical since these corporations sit on the Board for the COE.

Nandana says it was told to her that this fee was meant to fund the salaries of the people operating in these labs. She says she isn't sure that corporate donations can cover salaries.

Kate explains that there has not been clear communication over what exactly this fee is covering.

Grace says the issue with corporate donations is that they can't be budget items, unlike a fee. She says that it is not possible for the COE to factor donations into their budget.

Kate clarifies that her point was that it is possible that the COE is trying to get rid of the sponsorship practice, or it is a desire to shift burdens into other places.

Ashwin says he is surprised that ASUW wasn't involved in or notified of the conversation about the implementation of this fee. He says they need to ensure this doesn't happen with other departments.

Nandana says she believes there is no student input legally required for tuition increases.

Ashwin says that is crazy.

Kate asks for a list of the ME RSOs working with Senate.

Erick says he will do that.

Nandana explains that the Legislative Steering Committee, chaired by **Brandon**, the Director of Legislative Affairs, plans the ASUW legislative agenda. She says they will be meeting every Wednesday from 5 pm – 6pm this quarter. She asks all BOD members to attend so they can add priorities they want to lobby for at the state-level this year.

Announcements

None.

Adjournment

Ashwin motions to adjourn.

Owen seconds.

Meeting adjourned with unanimous consent at 7:19 pm.