



Associated Students of the University of Washington

Senate Floor Minutes | Senate Session XXXII

3/10/2026

Location: HUB 250

CALL TO ORDER

5:00 pm

APPROVAL OF SENATE AGENDA

Avery Kirscht moves to approve

Corbyn Morisette seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

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.

LEADERSHIP REPORTS | Erick Jacobsen, Joseph Riggio, Julia Tanner

After Vice Speaker's report in response to the mention of the March 12th Board of Directors meeting.

Erick Jacobsen: If you cannot make the Board meeting, let me know if there's anything you'd like me to bring up. The constitutional proposal we'll be discussing is the one that we developed on the public Saturday Meeting on February 28th and if you're interested my leadership report last week had a list of all the proposed changes as well linked on it. If there's anything you'd like me to bring up I will. It is my role as your speaker and your elected representative to represent your interests and your wonderful ideas so if you have anything let me know but, again, it is an open public meeting, so you are all welcome and encouraged to attend. And even for other meetings. Attend Board meetings. It's cool.

Kathleen Esnaurrizar: I just have a point of information, if they approve the constitutional amendment that they are proposing, where does that go afterwards and what does that mean for our bill as well?

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah, so the Board of Directors can approve a constitutional amendment with insight from Judicial. Judicial has seen it. And then if the Board of Directors approves it on Thursday then it goes to the ballot and every student at UW gets to vote on it. It does not affect any other constitutional amendment proposals such as the one that was approved last year by Senate for a Senate seat on EAC or anything that might be passed before the deadline as well. There is also, the EAC has figured out basically how to address having multiple constitutional proposals. The ballot will be designed to maximize student's choice in choosing which proposals on the ballot that they'd prefer. So it does not affect for example if SB-32-4 was approved by Senate by the deadline, this would not affect that at all. And even if it wasn't approved by the deadline and it was approved after, it would go to the ballot next year and this would also not affect it. So that's what happened with a former senate bill which gave Senate a voting seat on EAC. It was approved last year but after the deadline so it's going on the ballot this year. I think that's enough time for the QR code. This is also linked in the LinkTree and the QR code is linked in the leadership reports linked in the agenda so I will move on to the PRO's report.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Erick Jacobsen: Moving on to the announcements and public comment period. If there are any announcements or if any member of the public would like to speak, now is your chance. You may line up at the mic and at the end I will also take hands.

Charisse Vales: I'm a fellow senator, also representative on behalf of the Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity. If it's a bit fuzzy, I know it's like week 10, it's dead week, but we're the main entity that protects and advocates for minority representation and the student success programs and most prominently our multicultural clubs here for the BIPOC community here on campus. So with that, we hold an annual forum with ASUW Elections and it's gonna be, I hope I have it in the slides. Thank you. This is the flyer. It is attached to our Instagrams on the right. However, it is, the forum is going to be a place for us to get to know our current ASUW candidates that are running as well as address concerns and questions and really just get more conversations going across the different pockets of student leadership at UW. It's the second week back from break, so on April 6th from 4:00 to 6:00 PM at the Kelly ECC. It's the building like behind Lander Hall, if you've never been there before. But yeah, there's an RSVP code right here as well as on these Instagrams if you need it. But I think as we're able to like engage in student voice and like opinion here on Senate floor, this forum is going to be a wonderful chance to also keep those conversations going and even like broader. So yeah, any questions come ask me after the meeting or on the e-mail on this flyer. Thanks guys

Erick Jacobsen: Yeah I'm going to keep the QR code up for a little bit. Just for the record, you can go to multiple EAC forums. It's all the same candidates, but it's not going to be the same questions.

So you can go to the DEI&B forum, you can go to Living Communities Forum and you can go to the Senate's forum and you can be the most informed voter of all time and that would be amazing.

Kaitlyn O'Connor: Hey guys I think most of you know me but I am Kaitlyn. I am the ASUW OGR Community Organizer with some legislative session updates for OGR to report. So Senate Bill 5886 concerning forged digital likeness and amending the current RCW to include that within property rights and Senate Bill 5963, which automatically qualifies students that are in the Passport to Career program for the Washington College Grant, as well as Senate Bill 5855, which bans law enforcement from wearing masks have all passed the Senate and the House, so they are on to the governor's desk. Yay. So that's all.

Erick Jacobsen: Thank you, Kaitlyn and OGR for all the hard work you've done this session.

Jess Pham: Hi, guys. My name is Jess. Grace, our Director of Programming, and I work with the UW Alumni Association this year to help recruit people to review the homecoming scholarship applications. If you don't know what those are, each year at our homecoming game, scholars are recognized. I believe there's eight this year. They just upped it and the scholars are rewarded \$5000 and recognized at the homecoming football game. And so the UAA, the UW Alumni Association is looking for about 15 volunteers to review roughly 25 applications each, and the reviewers will review 2 short essays with a word limit for each question which is 250 and then all identifying information is left out. I don't know if it's on the slides or it is in the pre meeting brief so you can open up that email in this link. Yes, but if you're interested in just helping out, this is like a great thing to do. Help out review amazing applications from exceptional students. It's an amazing opportunity. And you just have to fill out an interest form and you'll be a volunteer. And so the form is due, quote unquote, April 10th. So if you're interested, just check it out. Thanks.

Adam Ford: Hello it's Adam from Hall Caucus and I just wanted to let you know that we're still running our survey on the hall amenities. We just love to get as many responses as we can on that because there's only so much we can learn from just walking into residence halls where we don't live, so covering as many bases as we possibly can would be preferred. So let us know everything you've been thinking about and share it with some friends so that they can also tell us what they've been thinking about. Thank you.

Isaac Pasco: Hey everyone, I was kind of a jerk last week and I'm very sorry.

Addison Wooster: Y'all should join GAVEL. It's really fun and it's a great experience, and you'll learn more about ASUW than you ever thought you could know. So I just want to shout that out.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any other announcements? Any on teams? No. OK, well, I'll go grab the microphone. If you think of one between now and the time I pick up the microphone, then I'll call on you.

Erick Jacobsen: We will now move on to our forums. We have the Liaison forum and the, what's the other one? GAVEL Forum? Sorry, it's been a long day and a long quarter. So we'll start the liaison report, which is just Joseph, and then the GAVEL report will include all of the GAVEL committee. So let me move out of your way and let you present.

Joseph Riggio presents [Liaison Report](#)

In response to budget allocations

Erick Jacobsen: You can also ask me and I can provide it to you as well. I also have all of the ones that went through board if you're interested

Joseph Riggio continues presenting liaison report

Isabelle Green: So first of all congratulations to everyone who got the liaison committees. That sounds really cool for all of you. Actual question though, at what point do a lot of these committees start meeting and like how often do they like, where would I find a calendar for that? Or is there one?

Joseph Riggio: So in terms of for ASUW entity committees especially, there is no universal calendar, unfortunately. I think on the website we might be trying to develop something soon, yeah, but right now, especially with some of these committees like the U District one and the City Planning ones, they're managed outside of ASUW, especially in any university committee that is outside of ASUW has their own schedule, so that's actually a really good point. We should probably develop a resource containing all those meetings if y'all are interested. But I will say that the ones that have not convened yet, typically that would be like communication with the chair of when they want to plan to have meetings. Sometimes, like the HUB, for example, meets like once some, yeah, once a quarter, not, yeah, not once for the entire year, once per quarter, which is still only three meetings, but it's an important one. So it kind of really depends and to the point, yeah, we should definitely create a resource page for that.

Erick Jacobsen: And since we're already in talks of updating the Senate website, that's something we can consider as well. We also are talking about or planning to implement a new page that has all the liaisons that we have so that that's publicly available as well.

Corbyn Morissette: I have a question about the HUB advisory board which is at what point will the renovations in the HUB basement be complete? Is there any kind of plan for when that's going to happen?

Joseph Riggio: Is Gavin here? OK, I'm gonna just defer that question to Gavin. Maybe we can save that.

Erick Jacobsen: I can also ask Carrie, the Executive Director of the HUB, and we can get back to you on that for sure.

Dylan Bianchi: Regarding the frequency of meeting thing to clarify on the CUCAC like the city planning. One and the U District one, we're actually still trying to get back in contact with the committees and put them in contact with Kathleen and Husna. I'll take partial accountability for communication kind of dropping out there.

Kathleen Esnaurrizar: Just to add more information I'm meeting with the board this week. I'm getting to know them or just like the people that manage it. So I'll get to know more later and I'll update. I'll tell Joseph so he can put it on announcements somewhere. Thank you.

Erick Jacobsen: And this will be maybe we ask for questions right after that, but we're going to be wrapping up the questions period soon.

Radcliffe Cushman: For the judicial committee you mentioned that they had a statement for the Senate originated constitutional amendment. Do you know like what the summary of that might be?

Joseph Riggio: So that's going to be presented. I received that from the Secretary of recommendations, which is Brian Kim. That will be proposed first to the restructuring committee since that's what the bill is in. Once it's on the floor, either Erick or I can probably read that out loud.

Erick Jacobsen: We will ensure that all of Senate gets to hear everything that Judicial wants to say about it. Are there any other questions before we move on to the GAVEL report? That's the timer going off. OK, I guess there's none. We'll move on. And this is 15 minutes for the GAVEL quarterly report.

Joseph Riggio: Would the GAVEL committee please join me up front?

GAVEL committee presents [GAVEL Report](#)

Erick Jacobsen: Let's give a round of applause for our GAVEL members. GAVEL y'all may be seated, by the way. All right. Are there any questions for GAVEL?

Radcliffe Cushman: The bill that is about University Senate, I guess less like is this like looking likely it's gonna happen or is this like a pipe dream kind of kind of vibe?

Addison Wooster: I will continue to make sure that this is as realistic as possible, but I will say that as far as myself and Kate are concerned, the Faculty Senate likes the idea and is pretty pro this, you know this happening. We will see about admin, which you know kind of a usual thing that happens within GAVEL. But we are hoping that we will at least get somebody from admin so that even if this is a more informal meeting and maybe doesn't reach the heights of the bill, it will still happen in some capacity.

Erick Jacobsen: And adding on to that happening eventually, even if it takes years we will continue to advocate on it even after we are all gone from this university. I will also add the original version of University Senate was passed in 1970. Francisco can give a really good history lesson about this

idea, but this is not new whatsoever. And it's kind of been like 50 years in the making. So yes, no matter what, it will happen.

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

NEW BUSINESS

SUMMARY OF NEW BUSINESS

Erick Jacobsen: We will move on now to the summary of new business. The first one is R326, a resolution to reduce the impact of ICE on student life, sponsored by Avery Kirscht. Bill summary The University of Washington currently lacks a sufficient and public plan for potential ICE activity, which would impact students' academic and professional capabilities. This resolution seeks to fill that gap by posing solutions which would ensure student safety and access to essential legal services. This resolution also firmly establishes the opinion of the student body to be that no student should be required to prioritize their academics over their personal safety and urges the University of Washington to act in accordance with this belief. Our next, and that one was moved into the Academic and Administrative Affairs Committee. Our next item of new business is R-32-7, a resolution to advocate for the establishment of a permanent staff position for the UW Food Pantry. Bill Summary this bill aims to establish student support for the UW Food Pantry to receive funding for a permanent staff member and encourages the ASUW and GPSS SAF members to consider this need when establishing the budget for the upcoming year. And this was assigned to the Off Campus Affairs Committee and finally SB-32-4 which was assigned to the restructuring committee is a Senate bill to amend the ASUW Constitution. This is a resubmission from SB-32-2. So the restructuring committee has had some time to look at this already, but now they have formally received it and the bill summary for this is this Senate bill is to propose a series of amendments to the ASUW Constitution that shall be placed as a ballot measure for ASUW members to vote in the 2026 general election. The bill lays out the current governance structure of the ASUW and the history of ASUW constitutional reform efforts. And like I said, this went to the restructuring committee.

OLD BUSINESS I

Erick Jacobsen yields speakership to **Joseph Riggio**

Joseph Riggio: Alright this is LD-32-5. Before we begin, however, I'm going to, well, I'll call for questions, comments and motions for the entire proposal. But first I'm going to call on Jothsna because they're going to give a quick recap of what happened the previous meeting.

Jothisna Sundar: Thank you. Yes, this is just something we're gonna start doing for legislation that's been in old business for like a week or two, just to remind everyone of what we were talking about. There was a lot of discussion over the specific requirements as to how many in class hours apply to the 80 hours of work per week required by Medicare for full time, part time, and half time students. The relevant clause that was amended is from lines 43-46 and reads full time students at the University of Washington take on 12-18 credit-hours per week and part-time students at the University of Washington take on 6-11 credit-hours per week. We also had debate over specifying that immigration officials should not be allowed on college campuses without judicial warrants. The main conversation we left off on was the general trend of specifying language in this bill.

Joseph Riggio: Thank you. If you notice Erick is quickly typing up a forwarding clause, that is all grammatical amendments, so we're going to allow for that. In the meantime though, are there any questions, comments or motions?

Spencer Grubbs: I'm not going to make a motion I'm just going to make a comment. I think that if we spend too much time like nitpicking and specifying every detail of what we're legislating or of what could possibly be like advocated for, then that runs the risk of like hemming us into a box that we don't like need to be in. So that's just what I wanted to say.

Addison Wooster: Also, just as a comment, GAVEL does have kind of some similar overlaps and I can say that it is a lot more helpful when we have the room to kind of implement things as you know, situations required. So I also do encourage that we look to pass this with giving Brandon as much kind of leeway as, you know, reasonably possible.

Avery Kirscht moves to approve

Teddie Schmitt seconds

Approved 87-0-9

Applause

Joseph Riggio yields speakership to **Erick Jacobsen**

Erick Jacobsen: now we will go into committee meetings

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

On Campus Affairs

- Continued reading and discussing R-32-05 A Resolution to direct ASUW and GPSS Executives to Create the Student Health Fee Memorandum of Understanding
- Heard from sponsor Joseph Riggio
- Grammatical amendments made
- R-32-05 passed favorably (19-0-2)

- Corbyn Morisette motioned
- Madeline Steppe seconded the motion

Off Campus Affairs

Food Pantry Bill

- Specified that the food pantry outlined the budget costs in there
- Discussed the reason for the final whereas clause
- Spencer G moves to strike 39-45. Maggie seconds. 12 – 0 – 0 Motion passes
- Maggie moves to amend 54-55 to read “indicating the need for a permanent, stable position to assist in these discussions”. Spencer Seconds. 11 – 1 – 1. Motion passes
- Spencer moves to pass the bill. Justin second 12 – 0 – 0. Motion passes

General Affairs

- Committee Meeting begins at 6:04 pm
- Sarah took attendance for Teams, Pierce took in-person attendance
- No legislation assigned today, Pierce offers the option for everyone to shares their Spring Break plans
- Held discussions on what everyone was doing over Spring Break, and then something everyone is excited for during Spring Quarter!
- Pierce asks if anyone has any current resolutions that they are currently working on
- Ishaan Verma shares that they are working on some anti-AI legislation in response to UW and Purple
- Ava Wahl- idea for a bill to work to be notify students about reducing food waste, food pantry wanting to reduce food waste after campus events
- Pierce asks if anyone has questions about getting more involved in ASUW?
- Isabelle Green has a questioned, answered by Skylar Fridriksson
- Jenna Miller on Teams, shares that they are hosting Queer book club and trying to distribute the next book before Spring Break!
- Group discussion on recent book and movie reads/watches! Recommendations for Spring Break
- Committee Meeting concludes at 6:30pm

Academic and Administrative Affairs

Mailinh: What counts as verifiable ICE activity?

Aidan: Difference between unsubstantiated online reports and evidenced reports

Avery: language choice came from incident earlier this quarter where false alarm around ICE presence occurred

Mailinh: Do you want to occur anything that requires someone to verify that it is ICE before reporting?

Avery: We can't require things of private citizens

Mailinh: Guidelines for citizens?

Avery and Aidan indicate interest in an amendment to that kind

Brennan: Is there an organization that can be trusted to verify?

Aidan: Hopefully UW itself would supply an avenue to submitting these claims

Kyra: Having alleged unverified info might be useful because we can't always verify info

Aidan: we want a substantial claim to a threat occurring

Kyra: I'd just rather be safe and a little scared

Lucas: Ice intentionally not identifying themselves, informal signs have become important like Minnesota with bells

Isaac: Formatting it like 'this is what should happen locally' would be better for response times

Avery: If we call for these changes to happen before a threat is verified, university simply will not take it up

Aidan: we could define verified

Avery: spoke with Erick about letting people attend school online so they don't have to choose between attending school and being safe but there have been previous failures to get that through

Erick: the university is defining verified around ICE identifying themselves, which is not how ICE operates. What do we consider a verified response? That will shape how we act

Aidan: is it public how they do that verification?

Erick: Sally Clark, VP of safety, has been meeting with Nandana and is emphasizing not panicking

Avery: that could be a whereas clause we add to define it

Kyra: ice is not going to give any preemptive notice

Aidan: unfortunately, they have been hardline on not doing anything preemptively.

Avery: other approach to defining 'verified' is setting it as a lowest possible threshold

Isaac: is there any reason to not put up the signs preemptively?

Avery: signs would be preemptive, clauses define timelines on when university should act, only those without a timeline need a trigger attached

Brennan: does that include increasing students access to legal services? Does that have a timeline?

Avery: timeline could be added

Aidan: your amendment we can make known to the committee

Avery: we were thinking we could push timelines back to late spring quarter, summer. Discussion in steering about how we would enter spaces once doors are locked, there was some confusion there, to clarify language about how to badge in, doesn't always work like ode, doesn't want to post someone at every door. Avery provided language to replace it

Brennan: clarify don't let anyone else in

Kyra; do we know if security officers are trained to deal with ICE

Aiden: I believe so

Avery : to what extent?

Aidan: I don't know

Avery: I know SPD is focused on documenting ICE, its a bigger thing than this university, what UWPD has the power to do I'm not exactly sure. Nothing necessarily stopping us from saying how we'd like to respond

Isaac: people refusing to identify themselves are kidnapping people

Avery: overall goal of this resolution is to give some tangible plan

Kyra; I feel like if we don't have a badge or a warrant treating them like federal police we shouldn't treat them like one

Avery: we don't have that jurisdiction

Aiden: if they don't have ID they can't come

Dylan: gave five minute warning

Brennan: moves to amend all uses of spring quarter 2026 to be summer 2026

Motion passes

Mailinh: moves to amend 'Odegaard library' to 'much like one would to enter buildings after operating hours'

Motion passes

Isaac moves to approve

Brennan seconds

Favorably: 11

Unfavorable: 0

Abstain: 2

Motion passes

COMMITTEE ON ASUW RESTRUCTURING

AGENDA

- Read out the Judicial Recommendation
- Reading through the SB-32-04

DISCUSSION

- Read out the Judicial recommendations
- Teddie Q: to clarify, judicial does not like the bill but believes that it is ready for ballot voting
- A: Yes
- Radcliffe Q: Whereas clauses discussing concentration of power, but not those clauses. How would they go about doing that
- A: Unsure
- Kathleen Q: Is there a plan for the timeline that was given, as judicial did not agree with it
- A: The judicial did not agree with the constitutional amendment but did agree to the ballot question
- Julia Q: clarifying question
- Francisco Q: What was the positive negative vote
- A: there was no exact vote
- Addison Q: Are there any improvements that judicial would support to be considered in our editing process?
- A: No, look at the concerns stated and try to go off of that

ACTION ITEMS

- Read SB-32-04 before reconvening next quarter
-

OLD BUSINESS II

Erick Jacobsen: We are now back.

Madeline Steppe moves to suspend the rules and reorder old business to show R-32-05 and R-32-07 to be the first and seconds agenda items in old business

Spencer Grubbs seconds

Radcliffe Cushman objects

Madeline Steppe: SAF meets Friday, so R-32-7 needs to be approved so they can talk about it in the meeting and then, yeah, these are just important bills to get passed through.

Radcliffe Cushman: I guess I'm just objecting because I feel like the mesh screens could, might actually be able to like happen if it happens before this quarter gets out cause it's a somewhat smallish thing that I feel like allowing GAVEL to get on it faster might be helpful, but I do see the especially with the Friday meeting, I do see how 07 could go to get out now.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of debate.

Aiden Reeder: Just to clarify for SAF, Hi everyone, Aiden Reeder, I'm your guys' SAF liaison. We would be beginning discussions on how to conduct a budget deliberations on Friday, but deliberations would occur in the first two weeks of spring. So it is important that this gets out. There is some margin but I just want everyone to know that that's how this is working.

Spencer Grubbs: I'd like to push back on the mesh screens being a little issue. Like that is, I'd imagine, actually a bit more complicated because none of the windows currently do have the screens. And also like I guess money stuff is kind of time sensitive. So for that I move the previous question.

Spencer Grubbs moves the previous question

Naomi Law seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Approved by raised hand vote

Erick Jacobsen: With that, the motion passes and these items are approved at the top of the agenda. We will start with R325A resolution to direct ASUW and GPSS executives to create the Student Healthy Memorandum of Understanding. If you'd like to read the summary, then I'll call for a 5 minute recess so that everyone can read the bill in full. It is a very long one, so I don't want to tire everyone's voices and ears saying it out loud.

Joseph Riggio reads R-32-05 bill summary

Recess 6:44 pm

Reconvened 6:49 pm

Erick Jacobsen: Alrighty was that enough time for y'all to read? Thumbs up. Good great. OK, Joseph, is there any point that you would like to emphasize or summarize for the Senate?

Joseph Riggio: So here's the situation we're in because it's a complicated situation. So I do have permission from Student Life to move forward with this resolution. You might be wondering, Joseph, why the unweighted responses was a no? Well, if we separate the graduate and undergraduate responses, I want to bring attention to the first appendix. So there's overwhelming support for undergraduate responses for the creation of this. And there's overwhelmingly against for graduate students. Now GPSS is going to pass their own resolution with their opinion on what to do but if we want to move forward with an undergraduate only Student Health Fee that subsidizes costs and services and guarantees more services for undergraduates, we do have that option. So what this bill does is it's not creating the MOU, it's not creating the committee, it's not creating the health fee. It is tasking the ASUW to Board of Directors to negotiate with Student Life, the VP of Student Life, Denzil Suite, as well as other people, stakeholders and the health units to create that memorandum of understanding, which includes who is going to pay the fee. So in this case, we're proposing that undergraduates would pay what it would be used for. It would be the sponsoring administrative units, UW Counseling Center, Husky Health and LiveWell as well as any terms and conditions we want to put into that MOU, UPASS was a great inspiration. They have a lot of conditions that like if you look at the that clauses we have protect like anything that's guaranteed for all the protected characteristics under state law and even more different communities and RSOs on campus. I've had conversations with Trans Collective. I'm trying to have more conversations with the Student Veteran Life Office. The Student Health Fee Planning Committee has been working hard to ask different units of staff how this fee could benefit them, because what this would do is it would take three of the health, three of the units under SAF, there's 18 units total and move Husky Health Counseling Center and LiveWell from SAF to its own fee committee. So it would free up \$9.3 million for SAF to allocate to all those other units. There are possibilities. I'll emphasize the whereas clauses in Section 1 Line 79 these are different. I ran these by Haley Chee, who's the SAF chair. These are possibilities that SAF committee in the future could do. Now they're their own independent committee. They'll make their own decisions on what to do with that \$9.3 million. But they could partially lower the fee, like the SAF fee from 175 to how much they see fit. They the most likely option I think is 1, which is they're going to freeze the fee, meaning there's a 4% cap to SAF right now you can't raise the total fee, and this would apply for their Student Health Fee too. You can't raise a total fee beyond 4% of what that current fee. So they're sort of locked in what they can do for increases. They can decrease as much as they want, but they're locked for increases. They would agree not to or they potentially will agree to not increase their fee for a set number of years, whether that's 5,7,10, whatever it takes to balance out the amount students would pay. So the ultimate goal is to have students pay less and we don't want to impose a burden or a cost on students that isn't necessary. I will say that with an undergraduate only fee, this bill says the negotiations can't exceed \$125.00 per quarter per student. The survey data says students don't want \$125.00 per quarter per student. They want a lower amount. The lower amount that we can go to to

break even of what staff currently gives is \$100 per quarter per student, roughly. So just keep that in mind, but happy to answer any questions about it.

Erick Jacobsen: Are there any questions for the sponsor?

Aiden Reeder: This has a little bit of build up before I get to the actual question, but it is a question. So the statement of what you just made \$100 to break even with a decreased fee and only having the undergraduate population. However, the whole premise of the fact that this fee, it gives them a one time large increase for them to actually do stuff with. Otherwise they're in the exact same position as they were beforehand. So what would be the actual amount that they would charge essentially to still obtain that benefit?

Joseph Riggio: That is the whole reason as to why we're doing that \$125.00 per quarter per student. However, I will say that we're going to leave a pathway for GPSS if they want to conduct their own survey again and get student feedback and if they look at all the subsidies that undergrads are getting and all the programs that are undergrad exclusive because that would be a byproduct of this fee is the fee would only have to benefit only is required only to benefit undergraduate students. So if graduate students and professional students want to join in on this. We're going to leave a path or this bill says that we're going to leave a pathway for them to join, which would substantially increase the amount of revenue generated. That's 17,000 graduate students that would suddenly be in that pool of funding, which if it was \$100 per quarter per student or higher would be a significant amount. So hopefully like within the next two or three years they could join. But this is the situation we're in now. It's going to be marginal for now.

Justin Amaral: So you kind of answered this a little with when you were answering his question, but so the initial survey was like using numbers that would be including all the graduate students if like if they were also paying the fee, right? But so kind of my understanding is that if we go with only undergrad students paying the fee, that the fee would like the money from the fee would only benefit undergraduate students?

Joseph Riggio: Correct.

Justin Amaral: OK, so then that answers my question. Thank you.

Maggie Schoenfeldt: I had a question on the whereas clause from lines 198 to 202. It said in it that approximate, I could be understanding this wrong, but it said approximately 2.8% of respondents believe UW students struggle with their health and well-being. And I was wondering if you could elaborate on that because I would, considering the stress I see during finals week, I would assume it would be a little bit higher than 2.8%.

Joseph Riggio: So that number was, if you look at appendix C We conducted, we asked students basically what are some different reasons why you wouldn't support the \$125 per quarter. That 2.8% is this right here. Students don't need services, which was based on this point. I do not think that students at UW struggle with their mental health and well-being only 2.8% of people who filled out, the survey said that,

Erick Jacobsen: I think I see the problem. I think the bill says 2.8% think they do struggle rather than 2.8% think they do not. Yeah, that would be, I don't know. I'd accept that as grammatical.

Joseph Riggio: OK. Thank you for catching that. Sorry

Isabelle Green: I had quick question about like you're talking about having a purely undergrad fee. But looking at the like allocation of these funds, it looks like it would be going at least in part to major structural reforms, which I would argue is a good thing, but like in terms of maintaining infrastructure or updating infrastructure, but I'm not sure how that would reasonably be considered something that only benefits undergrads. That's not a point against the bill, I'm just confused on how that would work.

Joseph Riggio: So can I have a follow up clarification? So what do you mean by like structure? Do you mean like for the health units to restructure how they do their services or do you mean the structure of this fee?

Isabelle Green: Not the structure of the committee, I meant like the actual physical structures of the I'm trying to find the lines. For example, UW Recreation at a 15% increase would address deferred facility maintenance to ensure safety and functionality, and at 35% would expand student access by reducing costs to programs such as class passes, etcetera at line 73. I'm wondering how that like direction of funds is like being leveled with the idea of it being an only undergrad fee.

Joseph Riggio: So the Student Health Fee Planning Committee way back when credit to Riley from GPSS, they asked the remaining SAF units like if the health fee was proposed, we would split the three health units away from staff, which would open up \$9.3 million dollars for other units to access and we basically asked them two questions. At a 15% increase, what could your unit do with that money? At a 35% increase, what could that unit do? A very positive byproduct of creating this health fee is it frees up a lot of money for other all the other 15 units of SAF to distribute and reallocate to those units as they see fit. Now it would be the SAF committee deciding on that however, that would be a consequence of establishing this fee is that it would free up those funds. They could also potentially lower the fee as well if if they like reallocate first and let's say there's like 3 million leftover, they can reduce, the possibility is that they could reduce the fee by that much because it's surplus and they don't know what to do with it. But all of these lines 38 from 77 are the units that responded to us and what they would do with that extra funding as a consequence of this fee happening.

Erick Jacobsen: I will follow up with a question of my own because I'm not sure I fully understand either, so. If a health unit starts offering a new service, such as SANE Exams and Husky Health due to this fee passage, I think the question is about how can that only benefit undergrads? Are undergrads the only ones allowed to like do the new Services or are graduate students allowed to do it with a fee or graduate students not allowed?

Joseph Riggio: Everyone's allowed, but sort of the benefits are chiefly undergrad. So for Husky Health, like each unit's going to differ with this, right? Because each unit has their own funding

structure. The Livewell is mostly exempt from this because they mostly get SAF money, but UW Counseling Center and Husky Health might bill insurance as well and have other funding. All funding that is out, like all funding that the Student Health Fee Committee gives to health units can only be used for Undergraduate students because it's in our MOU, the governing document that those Services are to be provided for Undergraduate students. Yes, that would mean a bureaucratic rework for those health units to have graduate and undergraduate services. They can still maintain that. That's not to say they're going to cut graduates services. It means that it's going to be more costly for graduates. Graduate students as a result, to use the same Services that would have been offered for undergraduates because graduate students would have to pay more, the insurance would probably be billed more depending on the program, or there would be extra fees or whatnot associated with it. I hope that answers the question a little bit.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm not sure but I see hands. I'm gonna go to them and then I'm gonna come back to myself.

Abigail Appleyard: I just wanted to provide some context about Husky Health's provision of SANE exams as a representative student representative of the Husky Health Center. The line the, that clause 322 to 325 says that the MOU requires "that funding for the Husky Health Center be conditional on the provision of SANE exams, which are vital to Student Health and which have not been able to be provided due to a lack of adequate funding". I don't think that statement is fully accurate. I from my understanding we did used to provide those exams in our, the practitioner who was doing them was simply not booked enough. They were not utilized. And in order to keep a practitioner on, they have to be booked or you lose your skills, you learn, you lose. It's just not efficient to not have a practitioner who's not booked all the time. And that was part of the reason, I believe, for not having that on anymore. Another part of the reason is that we know the concern is that we aren't open long enough to have this be an efficient position if something happens on a Friday night and you wait until Monday morning at 8:00 AM to have this exam done. And or to even make an appointment to have this exam done. You have wasted so much critical time in getting efficient results back. Additionally, these exams take, I think upwards of two hours. That means that any exam cannot be done before 2:00 PM. So that's another two hours you know you can't do any exams past 2:00 PM. So that's another block of time that just becomes inefficient. One thought that we've had as a group is to work together to kind of improve transportation services for students so that if a student is in a crisis like this, they can have free access to getting to the emergency room and not to getting to the Health Center. And I wish that we were open all the time and that this is an efficient use of resources, but it's not. And unless we get, you know, millions of dollars more to continue running you know, to run 24/7 I don't think that conditioning this amount of funding on the provision of this one service is worth it. It won't make any sense in practice and for that reason, I just think that this clause should be struck

Abigail Appleyard moves to strike clause conditioning funding for Husky Health Center on Provision of SANE exams from line 322-325

Collin Saywers seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Detlef Gerbing: I think there's a grammatical error on line 49. I don't know if piolet is a word. It might be. I'm not 100% sure, but it might be pilot. I think enable needs an s.

Joseph Riggio: How do you spell pilot?

Erick Jacobsen: We really ask the hard hitting questions here at the ASUW Student Senate. Yeah you're almost there, Joseph.

Joseph Riggio: Yeah, I'm gonna blame Microsoft right now.

Erick Jacobsen: I'm gonna let them deal with that.

Spencer Grubbs: Were there no committee edits?

Joseph Riggio: That's a good point. Blair?

Erick Jacobsen: Can you come up to the front and present what you discussed and what the vote is? That's a usual part of the procedure. I am so sorry I forgot. And for future reference, you can point of order that it's been a long day.

Blair Yeh: The vote passed favorably. It was 19 to zero to two. And we didn't have any committee edits, but we, just the members of the On Campus Affairs Committee just asked Joseph a lot of clarifying questions about the whereas clauses and just about the bill in general.

Erick Jacobsen: Going back to the earlier question Joseph, now currently all the health units are on SAF. Every student pays that. Does that mean that so nothing that the health units provide for free, like for example one free visit to whatever. Nothing that is provided by those health services can be provided to the grad students, even if they're already offered?

Joseph Riggio: If they're already offered it is my assumption that those services will be continued to offered. It's just I can't guarantee that they will be forever offered.

ADJOURNMENT

Avery Kirscht moves to adjourn

Naomi Law seconds

Isabelle Green objects

Avery Kirscht yields.

Isabelle Green: I promise I will do my best not to not to keep you people here too long. I had one more question on the comment that was just made in regards to the maintenance of like services for the graduate students, so hence my objection.

Erick Jacobsen: We are now in a period of debate.

Spencer Grubbs: This is more to the objector If this is more for like personal information rather than like you think it would be beneficial for everybody to know, then I think that is something that could be asked directly to the sponsor like outside of the meeting. So I move the previous question.

Spencer Grubbs moves the previous question

Naomi Law seconds

Approved by raised hand vote

Adjournment vote passes 73-11-8

Adjourned 7:13 pm

Minutes Prepared by Jothsna Sundar
Clerk for the ASUW Student Senate
