

**Legislative Steering Committee**  
**October 24, 2005, 4:00 pm**  
**HUB 304D**

**I. Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order at 4:10 pm.

**II. Roll Call**

**Present:**

Tyler Dockins, Chair

Ben Golden, Director

Lee Dunbar, ASUW Committee

Karl Smith, ASUW Board Liaison/ASUW Director of Operations

Nick Peyton, GPSS Liaison

Inigo Esteban, ASUW Senate Liaison

Ashleigh Flowers, At-Large Member

Joel Murray, At-Large Member

Hannah Lommers-Johnson, At-Large Member

Phyllis Ying, At-Large Member

Angie Wallace, At-Large Member

**Absent:**

Rene Singleton (non-voting), SAO Advisor

**Guests:**

Hala Dillsi, ASUW Director of Community Relations

**III. Approval of Agenda/Minutes**

**Ashleigh** moved to have her name changed to the correct spelling. **Tyler** seconded, without objection.

**Ben** moved to approve the minutes. Nick Seconded, without objection.

**IV. Chair's Report**

**Tyler** strongly encouraged the LSC Members to attend ASUW Senate to understand what the dialogue about the Legislative Agenda is like.

**V. Old Business**

• **Legislative Reception**

**Tyler** said that the Reception Subcommittee tasks will be handed out after the meeting, and that this may take a little more manpower than was originally thought, but that it looks like we're on track to get out the invitations this week.

• **Legislative Agenda**

**Tyler** noted that the changes that he made to the 2005-2006 Agenda are marked, but that this is still a draft. He didn't take anything out, just added comments, so feel free to throw out suggestions.

## **TUITION AND FEES**

**Lee** asked about the origin of the bullet point supporting complete student control of student fees.

**Hala** replied that it was from last year's agenda.

**Tyler** suggested that we move the second bullet point so that it's a consistent list of supports followed by opposition points.

**Nick** said that we might want to add I-601 by name to the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point.

**Joel** said that we shouldn't reference specific acts, initiatives, etc... because it can be limiting for the lobbyist.

**Ben** echoed, saying that we should maintain general language so long as specifications are outlined in the presentation of the document or the issues.

**Karl** voiced concern about the placement of the words "at least" in the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point.

**Hala** asked for elaboration on I-601.

**Nick** said that there are annual limits on General Fund state expenditure increases based on a three-year moving average of inflation and population growth, called "fiscal growth factors." The fiscal growth factors are lagged -- based on population and inflation growth in the prior three fiscal years. The spending limit is adjusted when revenues or program costs are shifted between the General Fund and other funds. When actual expenditures fall below the spending limit, future limits are based on the lower amount. This adjustment is called "re-basing."

In plain English, there is a three year rolling average based on inflation and population growth that puts a limit on spending from the general fund. Therefore, since higher education is funded from the general fund, a spending limit adversely constrains funding of the UW and financial aid for the UW.

**Ben** said that we may want to be cautious of this because legislative support of this initiative was small.

**Ashleigh** asked if the third bullet has always been in the agenda.

**Tyler** said that it has for the last two years, but that we just moved it.

## **STATE FUNDING**

**Ben** said that he wants to move the State Funding section to the top of the document because "you don't need financial aid if the state's funding your tuition."

**Joel** said (about the final bullet point) that this point was partially to ensure that there is no huge inequality in funding from department to department.

**Nick** said that as a talking point, legislators love high demand enrollment because there's a lot of money to be had.

**Ben** moved to strike the last bullet point and change the wording of the opening statement to: "The ASUW believes that increasing the level of state appropriations to higher education and to the University of Washington is critical to ensuring that the University's instructional

quality is of the highest caliber in all programs and courses of study. Specifically,”.

**Nick** seconded, without objection.

### **FINANCIAL AID**

**Ben** said that the wording of the second bullet point is awkward.

**Joel** moved to change the wording of the second bullet point to: “We support the funding and creation of loan forgiveness and repayment programs”.

**Karl** seconded, without objection.

### **MAINTAINING AND EXPANDING DIVERSITY**

**Lee** said that we should consider listing other institutions in those who benefit from the maintenance and expansion of diversity on campuses – state wide.

There was discussion about the grammar and labels used in the first bullet point.

**Karl** suggested the use of the ASUW Senate’s I-200 resolution last year in the language in this section.

There was discussion about the use of the wording “use race in college admissions”.

**Joel** asked what our main goal was because he had seen studies suggesting that the enrollment at the U is representative of the population of the State of Washington.

**Lee** said that regardless, we should still be able to take racial factors into consideration because the administration has its hands tied so much already concerning the admissions process.

**Nick** elaborated upon taking these factors into consideration and suggested that we can use the language from HB 2700 (2003-2004 biennial).

**Joel** said that we should focus on current students because that’s who the ASUW is supposed to be working for – not future or potential students.

**Ashleigh** and **Nick** refuted this.

**Ben** noted that we should keep in mind that we want to keep the document short, and added that Jamie had this language last year and was able to successfully lobby and work with it.

**Karl** moved to add a second bullet point with the language: “We support the use of race, color, ethnicity, and national origin in college admissions, keeping with the US Supreme Court opinion.”

**Hannah** seconded.

**Joel** moved to table until next week.

**Lee** seconded, without objection.

### **ACADEMICS**

**Angie** moved to amend the opening statement to read: “The ASUW strongly believes in a higher education system that offers students flexibility and choice and the potential for personal development in every area of their academic life. Specifically,”.

**Hala** seconded, without objection.

## **HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE**

**Karl** moved to amend the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read: “We support the continued and expanded recognition of domestic partnerships and measures promoting marital equality.”

**Angie** seconded, without objection.

**Karl** said that we should all research the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point and come prepared to make a decision on this point next week because it has been a historically controversial topic.

**Ben** moved to strike “reasonably priced” from the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point and change the language to read “We support requiring institutions of higher education to offer comprehensive and affordable health care coverage to all students, their spouses, domestic partners, and/or dependents.”

**Angie** seconded, without objection.

**Ben** moved to table until next week. Seconded, without objection.

**Tyler** moved to adjourn.

**Nick** seconded. With out objection.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:45