



Services and Activities Fee Committee Meeting

April 4, 2025 | 1:00 PM | Husky Union Building 303

MINUTES

Call to Order

The Services and Activities Fee Committee Meeting was called to order at 1:07 PM on April 4, 2025.

Roll Call

- Present
 - ASUW: Haley Chee, Annie Chen, Khushi Loomba, Aiden Reeder, Crystal Tran
 - GPSS: Althea Rao, Alec Solemslie, Ryan Wicklund
 - Advisor: Lincoln Johnson, Kristian Wiles
- Absent
 - ASUW: Jack Prichard (Excused)
 - GPSS: T Marzetta

Approval of Agenda

The agenda for April 4, 2025, SAF Committee Meeting was approved.

Motioned by Aiden Reeder, seconded by Alec Solemslie; unanimous vote to approve the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes from the January 31, 2025, SAF Committee Meeting were approved.

Motioned by Alec Solemslie, Seconded by Aiden Reeder; unanimous approval.

Public Comment [10 minutes]

Old Business

New Business

1. Deliberations

Haley reminded the Committee she has reserved the room for as late as 7 PM but has set a soft cutoff time at 5 PM for this meeting. She then reviewed the Budget Priorities document, which was created earlier in Fall 2024, with the Committee.

Deliberations will start off going through unit by unit with the most agreement in allocated amount by the Committee. After each unit, the Committee will agree on the initially, majority-agreed amount by a vote of soft approvals (i.e. is not an official approval of the amount). Haley emphasized that Units typically don't receive less than what they were issued from the current year. The numbers proposed for each Unit will be by line item in the Excel sheet, and from there, it can all be added to reach a total amount with the corresponding percentage increase.

Haley also reminds everyone to declare a conflict of interest ahead of time if anyone on the Committee is directly involved with the Unit (e.g. a part of the advisory board, a student-paid position at the unit, etc). That way, participation in discussions can be allowed with some limitations but a person declaring a conflict of interest will not be able to vote to approve the final amount.

D-Center

The Committee agrees that the D-Center is not asking for any increases and since Units won't be receiving less than the current year's allocation by the Budget Priority document, the D-Center's proposed amount in the Excel received a soft approval. It was also agreed that the D-Center is one of the smaller units so there is no issue with maintaining the current allocation.

CAP

Mandatory wages and benefits increases are usually not negotiable. It was noted that there's a 0.27% amenity to this, a relatively small increase, and would be enough for the Unit to manage for next year. Therefore, the Committee reached a soft approval of the amount allocated in the Spreadsheet.

STLP – increase is about 0.17%

It was noted for the Committee to keep in mind that some of the Units didn't clarify exactly if the increases in wages and benefits were mandatory or not.

- As one of the top priorities on the Budget Priority document, **Alec** believed wages & benefits should at least be provided. For STLP, a highly utilized service throughout the university, there's a lot of students employed to keep up with the demand.
- The Committee agreed that mandatory wages and benefits would be approved in full, but the operational costs would have to be decreased from \$2,500 to \$1,000, largely because that increase is mostly to add in more hotspots on campus which is considered supplemental funding.
 - **Haley** also reminded the Committee that one of the priorities was not to discuss too much for amounts under \$5,000.

ECC

Haley reminded the Committee that new positions were not going to initially be considered. The Committee agreed that discussions to add new positions should wait until after the Committee has reviewed each Unit's budget and has time to compare the proposed allocation to the total available fund. If there is still remaining capacity to give out extra money, then new positions can be considered.

- Wages and benefits were agreed upon by the Committee as a soft approval. However, since the ECC demonstrated their need for the new position, the Committee agreed to temporarily give half of the requested amount on the new position line item, and a note to come back to review this.

Counseling Center

The Counseling Center included two line-items for wages and benefits: (1) mandatory and (2) market increases. While the Committee agreed to fully fund the mandatory wages and benefits increases, they were split between funding some of the market increases or none of it at all. The side that wants to fund some of the market increases are in support of the importance of the work and the reasonings that the Counseling Center gave. On the other hand, the side that doesn't want to fund the market increases emphasized that SAF doesn't have the flexibility to give more than what is necessary. The Counseling Center could find ways to supplement the market increases to offer more competitive wages. However, because there is a current need for more counselors at UW, the Committee decided to revisit the amount for the market increases.

- In regard to market increases for the Counseling Center, it was noted that all Units want to get more money so it isn't fair for SAF to prioritize one Unit over another, like a determining factor shouldn't be that one Unit's services made more of an impact on more students, because all SAF Units support different parts of the student population. In other words, quantity of students doesn't have more weight on the decision than the group of students the services are supporting.
- There was a talk about what range to set the market increases. Although the amounts were on the smaller end, so a small difference won't make much of an impact, but with the yearly 6% SAF increases, any amount increases is helpful.

HUB

Since the HUB requested the full 6% increase but their only line item was the mandatory wages and benefits, most of the Committee agreed to funding partial to not give the full 6% percentage increase. The argument given is that the HUB had other revenue such from state funding and working at a discounted price with other partners and organizations on campus. Overall, the Committee plans to revisit whether or not to fully fund the mandatory wages and benefits for the HUB.

- One discussion point was that the HUB is a larger Unit, so they have more structure and flexibility than smaller units. However, it was agreed that the size of the Unit shouldn't be one of the main determining factors against the

mandatory increases, especially since the HUB is bigger because they support many more students.

- **Lincoln** noted that there's a possibility that any unit that receives state funding could be cut down 5%-10% on their revenue due to anticipated statewide budget cuts and reallocation.

Intellectual House

The Committee agreed to fully fund wages and benefits but struggled again to fund the new position or not. Some members didn't see a point of partial funding if SAF can't fully fund the position. However, a point was made that SAF is already funding one of the positions which is like this newly added position, so the new position should be calculated in line with the increases of wages and benefit for a nominal increase of like \$3,000. The Committee made a note to revisit funding this new position.

LiveWell

It was pointed out that LiveWell used a 4% increase for the mandatory wages for future adjustments instead of the 3% increase set by the university so the proposed amount to fully fund wages and benefits was set to match the university's 3% increase. **Alec** did note that on LiveWell's budget packet that the 4% increase was for students while the 3% was for professional staff, but overall, the 1% difference is in the territory of being under \$5,000.

- There was discussion on not funding the supervisor position since the responsibilities aligned with many other student's roles within LiveWell and seems to be manageable under the graduate student who is currently filling in. SAF also is not at the capacity to fund new positions.

Overall, the Committee had mixed feelings to fully fund the wages and benefits and wanted to revisit the new supervisor position.

Motion to recess for lunch until 2:25 PM from Khushi Loomba, seconded by Annie; unanimously approved (6-0-2).

Student Publications

The Committee agreed to fully fund the wages and benefits but not for operational costs. There weren't specific examples of what falls under operational costs but from the Student Publications' budget presentation, this mostly consists of insurance, printing costs, and traveling to do news coverage for sports games. The proposed amount for operational costs considered that most of the Committee were not supportive of printing costs since there are more views and interactions on online media posts, and traveling costs felt like subsidizing student internship since some students are gaining professional training from going. This was also considering that Student Publications does have other revenues to do fundraising for travel funds.

Q-Center

The Committee agreed to fully fund wages and benefits but not fund any student merit wage increases since the positions are already being paid above \$24/hour. While there is strong advocacy for having a livable wage, this is not a consistent priority amongst all units, so the Committee didn't put fund any towards professional development line item since there seemed to be a lot of free programs and resources for this. The Q-Center also has many other sources of revenue if they wanted to supplement their professional development funding.

ASUW

ASUW's main purpose is to host programs and events on campus and therefore, they are dependent on programming costs. While it's enough to fund the student wages and benefits, ASUW cannot fulfill their mission if they don't have the money to host these programs and events.

There were many discussions on whether to fully or partially fund programming costs since ASUW has a large Reserves that they're actively trying to spend down and the Committee as a part of its priorities, is prioritizing mandatory wages and benefits increases than programming costs. **Ryan** noted that given federal and

political circumstances, student governments need to have some power and voice in their operations costs to keep serving all student communities. Events and programs also raise student morales and enrich their college experiences. **Alec** mentioned that he would be willing to fund ASUW more if the Committee also funded the HUB since similar points are being made. It would be unfair to fund ASUW more but at the sacrifice of cutting from the HUB. The Committee will revisit fully or partially funding programming costs.

GPSS

The Committee agrees on the wages and benefit increases but GPSS is another student government entity that heavily relies on programming costs to fulfill their mission. GPSS only supports graduate students which don't have as many students as ASUW, but they have gotten more involvement for GPSS than in previous years. To continue the projection of GPSS and their mission, GPSS needs programming costs to book venues for research symposiums, and outreach. Overall, the Committee agreed that the final decisions on increasing programming costs will need to be decided once the Committee revisits the HUB, ASUW, and GPSS.

Food Pantry

The consensus among the Committee is to not approve funding for new staff positions. While there were some discussions on the UW Farm service fee, it is a subsidiary of the Food Pantry's services so it should be fully funded. While the Committee can see the need for a new staff position, they'd rather see a slow ramp up of funding to implement this position but not for FY26 since SAF is not in a position to handle this capacity. There was some agreement for the merit increases for student positions.

CSF

The Committee agreed to fully fund wages and benefits but there were discussions on the operational costs and grant funds. **Ryan** gave context as a part of the STF Committee that the CSF might receive funding from them. CSF did managed to

heavily spend their Reserves this year which also was something that SAF likes to see from the Budget Priority. CSF is a grant-making unit, and they function differently than other Units. They're one of the few units that helps support student projects. Some arguments were against more funding for grants since when it comes to a tight budget, this isn't necessary for the student body and are small projects that will only affect the students doing those projects. The Committee proposed an amount with some intentions to come back to revisit this.

SLS

For similar reasons for nearly funding all student government positions, some members believed SLS should receive similar funding because of the political climate. However, **Aiden** believes the new staff attorney position is different from previous Units. They feel that out of the new positions in all the Units, they'd want to fund SLS's, especially with the political climate and to keep up with student demand. Many members agreed that the time is more important than ever for students to have access to legal help at such affordable prices. The Committee liked the idea of fully funding the position, especially with how SLS has restructured to provide more opportunities for students while simultaneously cutting off the previously paid student-internship staff.

Recreation

The Committee gave full funding towards wages and benefits but there were discussions on non-funding operational costs, similar to how the HUB has not been fully funded. As one of the larger Units, it makes sense that the wages and benefits for students are much larger since Recreation does have the largest student staff. Recreation has a lot of independence and opportunities for other sources of funding so the Committee overall came up with a proposed amount that would need to be revisited.

Husky Health

Husky Health was one of the Units that provided their self-revenue as a line item which made doing the allocating more difficult. Overall, the Committee wanted to

maintain an increase that still allowed for the subsidized first visit each quarter but also being mindful of the SAF total budget. It is important that while Husky Health has hired four new positions, their self-revenue managed to supplement some of the costs so that the overall budget proposal was under the 6% increase. This was something that SAF wants to address to next year's Units, so this doesn't happen again, but they'll let it slide since it wasn't explicitly mentioned this year.

SVL

The Committee agreed to give full funding for mandatory wages and benefits. The Committee is more in favor of supporting services than operational costs. It was reminded that the exact number of the line items doesn't directly mean the Unit is limited to spend for that amount. There was some argument to give SVL some money for traveling since SVL's total request could take advantage of the \$35,000 increase rather than the 6% increase.

SAF

The Committee agreed to fully fund all line items except for "Supplies" since it is such a small amount and is inconsequential to the operations of SAF. The stipend amount for Committee members stayed the same.

Discussion

Announcements

Lincoln gave thanks to the Committee for the insightful discussions and speed of deliberations during the meeting today. Due to the current progress of deliberations, Haley will plan on discussing and approving the capital requests for next week as well.

Haley announced that sometime in April, the Committee will be scheduled to get their headshots for the SAF website.

Haley reminded the Committee that the last day to apply for the SAF Staff roles for Organizing Director and Tech Coordinator will be happening soon.

Adjournment

The SAF Committee Meeting was called to adjourn at 4:55 PM.

Motioned to adjourn by Aiden Reeder, seconded by Khushi Loomba; unanimous vote to adjourn.