

Name	Attendance	Class
Joseph Ayalew	Present	2028
Destiney Samare	Present	2028
Esther Ma	Present	2028
Grace Beatty	Present	2028
Aidan Keesler	Present	2028
Anthony Buchfurther	Present	2027
Kevin Guo	Present	2027
Demetrius Daniel	Present	2027
Vaani Kapoor	Absent	2027
Eric Wang	Present	2027
Nefeli Abutahoun	Absent	2027
Kyle Obermeyer	Absent	2027
Simi Edeki	Absent	2026
Maya McWilliams	Absent	2026
Logan Toe	Absent	2026
Sebastian Davis	Absent	2026
Johnny Fan	Absent	2026
Logan Hansler	Absent	2026
Ben Fica	Present	2026
Chad Coen	Present	2025
Alex Weiss	Absent	2025
Odunayo (Ayo) Akinade	Present	2025
Soyoon/Sadie Moon	Absent	2025
Christopher Phillips	Present	2025

Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM.

Agenda:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of College Council Minutes
4. VisiBLE Act
5. Approval of E&R Members
6. Approval of 2025-2026 VPSO
7. Cabinet Budget Re-Approval
8. Approval of Committee on Academic Teams Budget
9. Approval of Community Service Fund Budget
10. Approval of Program Coordinating Council Budget
11. Approval of Sports Club Fund Budget
12. Phoenix Sustainability Initiative Appeal
13. Paul Douglas Institute Appeal
14. Science Olympiad Appeal
15. Approval of SGFC Allocations & Assignments
16. Adjournment

Notes:

- Approval of the Agenda
 - **Anthony:** Are we still doing line item 4?
 - **Ben:** We don't need to rubber stamp them, but they do need to be introduced.
 - **Kevin** moves to accept the agenda
 - **Anthony** seconds the motion.
 - *The agenda passes by unanimous consent (7:07 PM)*
- Approval of Last Week's Minutes
 - **Anthony** moves to amend "ROC, CCS, ACAC, and HAWK" to "RLDC and HAWC."
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (7:08 PM)*
 - **Anthony** moves to change "CSL" to "CSf"
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (7:09 PM)*
 - **Destiny** moves to pass the 5/12 minutes, as amended
 - **Esther** seconds the motion
 - *The 5/12 minutes pass by unanimous consent (7:09 PM)*
- VisiBLE Act
 - **Ben:** This means that any new changes to the bylaws, especially since we might be making bylaw changes over the summer, need to be clearly marked: anything you add should be red and underlined, and anything you remove should be blue and struck through. Any discussion?
 - **Destiny:** What would be our go-to person?
 - **Kevin:** If you want help, I'm happy to teach you.

- **Ben:** The rules are ambiguous in that way, so you can use red color/blue color text in Word.
 - **Anthony** moves to pass the VisiBLE Act
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (7:16 PM)*
- Approval of E&R Members
 - **Alex:** Alex Munoz didn't make the meeting, so we can't vote on him today, according to the bylaws.
 - **Alex:** Members for approval: Jay Love, Logan Carlson, Alex Munoz Villar, Jacob Dominguez.
 - **Alex:** Jay is coming in five minutes.
 - **Kevin:** How many do we need to approve?
 - **Elijah:** We have two right now; we need three more. If it doesn't get approved now, it'll be moved to summer.
 - **Anthony** moves to table the discussion.
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (7:18 PM)*
- Approval of 2025-2026 VPSO
 - **Ben:** Projected is the application. We're not nominating or electing him, the Finance Chair nominated him and CC needs to approve. This is the application; we can look through it.
 - **Kevin:** I don't know him. My only interaction was when he took notes at the special CC meeting. His notes were very detailed and it seemed like he put in a lot of effort. He's the best applicant by far. I support.
 - **Demetrius:** Was he the only applicant?
 - **Ben:** No, there was one other, James.
 - **Grace** moves to approve Fred Lee as the 2025–2026 VPSO.
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (7:20 PM)*
- Cabinet Budget Re-Approval
 - **Elijah:** The biggest difference is that last week, we found out we had around \$10k extra in the admin budget. We moved that \$10k to CAT. CC also increased its current funding, and the rollover is around \$1,500. Everything else is about the same, except CAT. Going into next year, we have around \$25,000. I removed the line item for the website - depending on how that goes next year, it might not be the right time.
 - **Chad:** What's the rationale behind the increase?
 - **Elijah:** I didn't realize we had an extra \$10k in rollover from two years ago. With that in mind, it didn't make sense to keep \$35k in admin. We pushed it to CAT. The Sports Club Fund was already approved; that funding is unchanged.
 - **Chad:** I'd push back on the increase going to CAT instead of SGFC or ANALL. Historically, we've disproportionately increased CAT funding over the last 5–10 years, while other funds haven't grown nearly as much. I'd like to see that money go to SGFC.
 - **Elijah:** We have more groups in CAT now.

- **Chad:** My pushback is that academic teams don't seem like the RSOs struggling most with funding.
- **Elijah:** I'd disagree. Academic teams are struggling, especially with travel and competition costs. I do see the rationale though.
- **Kevin:** If someone moves, I won't be voting since I'm a member of Moot Court. But from what I've seen, we're not reimbursed for food and are restricted by our budget. I know clubs under SGFC struggle with funding too, but that could be addressed by improving efficiency within SGFC. Some clubs were given thousands for weekly food, which could go to more essential needs. If the money goes to SGFC and ends up spent on food...
- **Elijah:** Since we messed up our scheduling, the budget has already been communicated to the RSOs. Any changes will need to be communicated as cuts.
- **Chris:** I've never been on an academic team, but my perception is they receive a lot of funding. Still, when they put together budgets, there's little waste, and there are still unmet needs. Bigger operations can cut waste. As for food, I relate to groups like College Republicans. It's their only expense and an effective one. Food's become a baseline at many clubs.
- **Anthony:** Food is important for membership. As for cutting current allocations, I don't think that would be necessary if the total is \$383,201, which is under what was given for 2024–25. I don't think cuts should factor into this.
- **Elijah:** I might've sent the wrong CAT document; that's outdated.
- **Chad:** The amount CAT requests is met at about 80%. Across SGFC, we meet around 18%. There's a huge disparity. I don't see why we should bring CAT to 90% while SGFC stays under 20%.
- **Kevin:** I love free food, but it's not a necessary expense. Everything academic teams request is essential for them to function. If we're prioritizing, necessary expenses should come first.
- **Vaani:** There are equity issues in academic teams. There are soft cost barriers, like eating out under travel, Ubers to the airport, that aren't covered. Model UN conference fees are out of their control. Cutting teams directly affects rankings. Academic teams can do a lot with this funding.
- **Demetrius:** Is the idea that academic teams travel more consistently? I was in debate last year, so I get the food expenses. But can you explain why CAT needs the money?
- **Vaani:** My understanding is that once CAT finalizes their budget, not much can be changed.
- **Alex:** We've realized we're not doing enough to track member attendance. With SGFC budgets, I hope RSOs report numbers accurately. Otherwise, they're incentivized to overstate attendance. We need RSVP tracking or more transparency in the future.
- **Chad** moves to amend the USG budget: keep Coalition of Academic Teams funding the same as 2024–25 and move the increase to SGFC via roll call vote.
- **Chris** seconds the motion.
Ben recognizes **Chad** to speak in favor and **Elijah** to speak against.
- **Chad:** There's a disproportionate amount going to CAT over SGFC. I'd rather see extra funds go to serve 350–400 RSOs rather than 5.

- **Elijah:** As a former CAT member, I paid out-of-pocket for travel. That's a barrier for low-income students. The question is where you see impact. I believe this is the best way to support students. Northwestern funds elite academic groups - we don't. That's why the increase went to CAT.
- **Ayo:** How do we know CAT will actually use the extra money to address cost barriers?
- **Elijah:** CAT's budget has a direct line item increase, which reflects that intent.
- **Anthony:** But we can't verify that because we don't have access to CAT's minutes.
- **Chad:** There are many RSOs that support FGCI students but don't get SGFC funding. It's the same disparity, just in another pool.
- Roll Call Vote
 - **Kevin:** Abstain
 - **Vaani:** No
 - **Ben:** No
 - **Esther:** Abstain
 - **Grace:** Yes
 - **Aidan:** Abstain
 - **Destiny:** Yes
 - **Chris:** Yes
 - **Ayo:** Yes
 - **Joseph:** Yes
 - **Chad:** Yes
 - **Anthony:** Yes
 - **Demetrius:** Abstain
 - *The motion passes (7:40 PM).*
- **Alex:** We've already told RSOs this is their budget. It's not even about ethics anymore; they've been informed.
- **Chad:** How did that happen?
- **Labsara:** They received a preliminary budget. After appeals, they're allowed to notify RSOs.
- **Elijah:** We assumed CC would approve since the changes were reviewed.
- **Chad:** Would a blanket cut be 2%?
- **Kevin:** That shouldn't stop us from making the right decision. If CAT already told RSOs, that's on CAT.
- **Labsara:** CAT followed the usual process. If you vote to change it, you won't be able to vote on the CAT budget tonight. There'll need to be a new process, and it'll take a few weeks.
- **Vaani:** If we restart, it'll be chaos. RSOs have to register and plan conferences. Redoing this over the summer on Zoom with a new chair will be disruptive. Cutting \$20k would hurt groups that attract students to UChicago.
- **Logan:** I'm on CAT. It wouldn't be the end of the world, but it would cause difficulty, especially since we only have an interim chair.
- **Anthony:** Some of us voted based on incorrect assumptions about the budget. Now that we've seen the real number, I move for a revote by unanimous consent.
- **Demetrius** seconds the motion.

- **Chris** objects to the motion.
- **Ben:** We will move to a roll call vote
- **Chad:** It wouldn't be the case that CAT would have to hear them all again. They would just have to revisit their allocations. They've already heard the club's spiel. We wouldn't have to have all the clubs revisit
- **Ben:** The motion is to return it to what it was and reconsider.
 - **Kevin:** Abstain
 - **Vaani:** Yes
 - **Chris:** Yes
 - **Ben:** Yes
 - **Esther:** Yes
 - **Grace:** Abstain
 - **Ayo:** Yes
 - **Aidan:** Yes
 - **Destiny:** Abstain
 - **Joseph:** Abstain
 - **Chad:** No
 - **Anthony:** Yes
 - **Demetrius:** Yes
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (7:48 PM).*
- **Demetrius** moves to pass the USG Cabinet budget as-is via roll call vote.
- **Ben** seconds the motion.
 - **Ben:** Yes
 - **Vaani:** Yes
 - **Chris:** No
 - **Grace:** Abstain
 - **Esther:** Yes
 - **Ayo:** Yes
 - **Aidan:** Yes
 - **Destiny:** Yes
 - **Joseph:** Yes
 - **Chad:** No
 - **Anthony:** Yes
 - **Demetrius:** Yes
 - *The motion passes.*
- **Anthony:** I want the record to show that we are urging this to be revisited next year to reevaluate the number.
- **Alex:** Point of order: Can we do the E&R votes since they're here?
- **Kevin** moves to return to line item four by unanimous consent.
- **Demetrius** seconds the motion
- *The motion passes (7:52 PM)*
- **Ben:** You all have access to their applications, and unless anyone is against it, we'll take a vote to approve.

- **Alex:** Considering we need to seat E&R today, I would hope this would require less discussion. These people were chosen, and you can see their applications. I'd hope you'd have fewer questions and take less time per person.
 - **Chris:** How did you get interested?
 - I previously served on CAT.
 - I also think the Elections Committee is very important to CC, and I figured it would be something I'd try out.
 - I'm a first-year and did time on the Service Fund. I actually wanted to apply coming into freshman year, but I wanted to get a feel for the election cycle on campus first.
 - **Kevin:** Can you commit to being fair and impartial? And do you know any of the other people standing here or the current members?
 - Yes.
 - Yes, and I've met Oliver briefly.
 - No
 - **Kevin** moves to approve by unanimous consent.
 - **Esther** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (8:01 PM)*
- Approval of Committee on Academic Teams Budget
 - **Ben:** We've already talked about and looked over this budget. Does anyone have any pressing questions, comments, or concerns?
 - **Anthony** moves to approve the CAT allocations for 2025-2026.
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion
 - **Chris:** Point of information: Can we describe what happened with the bridge club from one year to the next?
 - **Lasabra:** The starting number might be incorrect
 - **Anthony** withdraws his motion
 - **Anthony** moves to approve the budget.
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (8:05 PM)*
- Approval of Community Service Fund Budget
 - **Alex:** When looking at it, I realize they could have used additional guidelines. They can run contrary. A lot are not as parallel and close to SGFC, but I think for the cabinet budget, we approve as-is now.
 - **Kevin:** What is the yellow highlighting?
 - **Anthony:** I think that was just part of their form of tracking.
 - **Anthony:** There were a couple of things I have concerns about. I did email Jayda. She confirmed that CSF put in time and effort to make sure everything lines up and that she trusts that the committee made the right choices.
 - **Anthony** moves to approve CSF for 2025-2026 year.
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (8:08 PM)*
- Approval of Program Coordinating Council Budget
 - **Ben:** Is there any discussion on the PCC budget? Or anyone here on PCC?

- **Chad:** Question - I'm on the COUP board and since there was no Kuvia this past year, I believe we'll have a large amount fo rollover
 - **Ayo:** That was already discussed.
 - **Chad:** So there will be no rollover?
 - **Ayo:** There will be rollover from Kuvia, but we requested less than we wanted in consideration of that.
 - **Kevin** moves to approve the PCC budget.
 - **Destiny** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (8:10)*
- Approval of Sports Club Fund Budget
 - **Ben:** We talked about this earlier in the quarter.
 - **Alex:** Basically, this is using new funding guidelines through ANALL. The treasurers of clubs used to meet with the head of Athletics, and it led to a conflict of interest and quid pro quo; that's why you saw some budgets get extremely blown up and overfunded. They used the ANALL process this year, and we hope they return to that next year as well.
 - **Destiny** moves to approve the SCF budget.
 - **Anthony** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (8:12)*
- Phoenix Sustainability Initiative Appeal
 - Representative:
 - The structure of PSI is that we have distinct umbrellas, and each runs its own series of events. Our Environmental Education project group teaches at a local elementary school and is also planning to revive another garden club at UChicago. Our Green Partnership project hosts a series of workshops. Only 3 of 8 groups received funds. The other 5 are scrambling. If each group were considered a separate RSO, we could have qualified for more funding. We're asking for a chance to support more than just the largest 3 initiatives.
 - **Ben:** We'll take 3 minutes for questions.
 - **Kevin:** Looking at your budget requests, could you specify which numbers you're referring to? Are you looking for funding for all of the remaining categories?
 - **Rep:** The first 3 categories are essential for next year.
 - **Kevin:** So 4, 5, and 6 are the main requests?
 - **Alex:** Could you mention the difference in funding from last year to this year?
 - **Rep:** Last year, we had \$4,600, and this year we have around \$3,500, so it's a \$1,000 reduction. After budget cuts, there was a further \$500 reduction. Regarding the composting program, last fiscal year, we collaborated with USG, and around \$2,000 was allocated toward that.
 - **Labsara:** What are you trying to increase your allocation to?
 - **Rep:** Last year's \$4,600 barely got us through, and we still had to cut down programs. I think we're looking to get at least that number again.
 - **Labsara:** So you're requesting an increase to \$4,600?
 - **Rep:** Yes.
 - **Chad:** For composting or for categories 4, 5, 6?
 - **Rep:** For 4, 5, 6.

- **Chris:** What funds did PSI spend on the festival?
- **Rep:** It's under Earth Day. For this year, we didn't spend much on the festival, more on technical stuff.
- **Chris:** And how much was that?
- **Rep:** Around \$200.
- **Ben:** We'll now move to deliberations.
- **Ben:** We can give them an increase, keep it as is, or do a decrease. If needed, Chad, can I have you explain the first/second/third priority thing?
- **Chad:** Due to a lack of funding, we only looked at the first three events for every RSO. I don't necessarily think we should fund the other events because we didn't fund others beyond that for different RSOs. I will say, there was talk, when Nevin was here, about increasing the composting subsidy, and I pushed back. By that logic, the USG admin could fund anything and expect SGFC to fund it. Also, any events they got funding for through ANALL, they can't come to SGFC again for those.
- **Elijah:** We gave them about \$1,500 from the admin budget this year. Also, Green applications can be submitted twice a year. They can still apply again. And at our last meeting with Paul Alivastos, they mentioned exploring ways to compartmentalize funding for PSI. No strong answer, but something to look into.
- **Labsara:** Was it communicated to RSOs that only the top 3 were being approved?
- **Chad:** No. Historically, we've looked at the top 5. We didn't communicate that, but it was applied across all RSOs.
- **Ayo:** As a peer advisor, I told a lot of RSOs it was just the top 5. So many probably expected top 5 to drive it.
- **Kevin:** I don't think I agree with only looking at the top 3 across the board. Some RSOs consolidated a bunch of events under one category.
- **Chad:** In that case, it should've been counted as a recurring event.
- **Kevin:** Because this was the standard this year, and every club was funded using that standard, I think we should be fair, even though I don't agree. Chris, I know you asked about divestful. I don't think we should be looking at the content of what they're putting on. CC shouldn't make decisions based on content.
- **Anthony:** I want to express disinterest in the idea that just because the standard was "first 3 events" means we should treat appeals the same. Given the changes in how we allocated funds, which weren't communicated, other RSOs had the same opportunity to appeal. It's our responsibility to hear out their full appeal.
- **Ben moves to fund PSI at the same amount as allocated by SGFC this year: \$3,590.93, by roll call vote.**
- **Chris** seconds the motion.
 - **Kevin:** Yes
 - **Ben:** Abstain
 - **Chris:** Yes
 - **Anthony:** No
 - **Ayo:** No
 - **Esther:** Abstain
 - **Aidan:** Yes

- **Destiny:** No
 - **Joseph:** Abstain
 - **Chad:** Yes
 - **Demetrius:** Yes
- **Ben** casts the tie-breaking vote as Yes.
- *The motion passes (8:34 PM)*
- **Kevin:** I don't necessarily agree with a lot of the process, but for what it's worth, we should follow those processes.
- **Ayo:** Anthony made a good point that the appeals process is a different process.
- **Chad:** RSOs are also told they should rank their events in order of importance to their RSO.
- **Labsara:** Going forward, any changes to standards need to be clearly communicated.
- Paul Douglas Institute Appeal
 - **Rep:** We're asking for 110 extra dollars. PDI is a policy research institute that runs a big spring symposium. It's a marquee event, and it's very important that this event goes well and we have food and catering. It's already a very low cost per researcher. We are also disadvantaged because some of our expenses are not under the cost guide. It's especially important that we get enough money in an all. I'm just asking to get to the original 1000. We can potentially ask for more, so this marginal request doesn't represent too much of a burden. Also, the spring symposium furniture is a non-negotiable from Ida, and we need it for the venue.
 - **Chad:** So you're requesting 1000 for the local catering rather than 940. Is there a reason why you're requesting more than last year?
 - **Rep:** It was harder to get a vegetarian option. Ideally, we are willing to do alternative fundraising opportunities. Given the work we're already putting in, we want to keep things efficient. We're also pretty lean in what we're asking for per person. We're well under the 12 per person.
 - **Elijah:** If you had the option to resubmit your order, would you change it?
 - **Rep:** We didn't know that only the top 3 would be funded. But if we could count on SGFC more, we would've put the winter symposium higher up.
 - **Ben:** Fundraising in the past, and why is that burdensome this year?
 - **Rep:** We spent 5 hours calling up Hyde Park restaurants to make sponsorships. For the amount of work that was, given how pressed for time everyone was, it felt like a big strain.
 - **Alex:** Given that they already undercounted how many people were attending, if they had reported accurately, they would get more. I think we should go through SGFC guidelines for how much they would have received.
 - **Kevin:** I think the furniture request is reasonable. In general, I'm hesitant on granting money for food, and the general events for social cohesion already got 752. It's reasonable to ask them to reallocate.
 - **Alex:** Almost every single RSO has had meetings as a required item. Judging them based on meeting items is not fair. To disqualify them for something every other RSO has done is wrong.

- **Demetrius:** I think their request is very reasonable, especially if it's toward more accessible food options. Assigning the assumption to that category might not be the best. It's not a crazy ask.
 - **Alex:** I need you guys to pay attention because we are dedicating a lot of funding, and if you're voting abstain because of lack of knowledge, you're doing a disservice to the student body.
 - **Ayo:** I think we fund them for \$119.
 - **Anthony** moves to fund them for \$2109.42 for the 25-26 year.
 - **Chad** objects because he would suggest a different amount.
 - **Anthony** would not like to substitute his motion.
 - **Demetrius** seconds by roll call note.
 - **Kevin:** No
 - **Ben:** No
 - **Chris:** Yes
 - **Anthony:** Yes
 - **Ayo:** Yes
 - **Esther:** Yes
 - **Aidan:** Yes
 - **Destiny:** Yes
 - **Joseph:** Yes
 - **Chad:** No
 - **Demetrius:** Yes
 - **Motion passes (8:48 PM)**
- Science Olympiad Appeal
 - **Rep:** We're an alumni chapter of the national org of Science Olympiad. We compete at the state invitationals and other invitationals in Chicagoland and the Midwest. We are appealing our anall of 1844 because this amount is not enough for us to continue operations. We are asking for 4.5k in additional. It's critical to book spaces for meetings, the awards ceremony, and buildings within the Lab Schools where we do flight and build events. We've also developed a relationship with CPS and they want us implementing Science Olympiad in the charter school system. But we need to uphold our reputation in order to do so. The only place a lot of people can go to is UChicago. We get around 41 middle and high schools coming to our invitationals. We don't bring in a lot of money from charging schools. It's listed as an optional fee. Every year, we have a lot of teachers and public schools reaching out.
 - **Anthony:** Can you take us through your allocation and tell us the line items of what you want funded?
 - **Rep:** Line items are projected on screen.
 - **Kevin:** What are event materials?
 - **Rep:** Chemicals and official kits. Also purchases for the awards ceremony.
 - **Chris:** You got about 1800 allocated to you. Last year, what were you allocated?
 - **Rep:** Around 1000, but we had a 10k external grant. We wrote down in anall that we didn't want to spend that money, but in years before that we got around 6.7k.
 - **Chris:** With regard to last year's addition, how much of the 10k did you cut in?

- **Rep:** Around 9.9k. This is one of the only STEM-related events.
- **Kevin:** This seems like a very reasonable ask. The only thing is I might potentially object to food for volunteers. Everything else seems good, and I like that they're reaching out to CPS students.
- **Chris:** We were splitting hairs over 100 earlier, and this is a substantial increase. I think we should fund in full. It seems like a lot of this could be cut down. That's a lot of money in addition.
- **Chad:** The BSLC space rental. We asked them to come to SGFC because it's a very high cost and also variable. I think it's just something to factor in. Another thing is we don't fund awards. I think an extra 3600 from what we expect them to get from SGFC will bring them to a pretty reasonable total. They also didn't reflect their admissions ticket in the request.
- **Joseph:** What was their reasoning for the 1600 being allocated toward awards? And that changes things. For me, this is a very important club. I have family that's a part of it, and it's a big part of their life. I think it's a very good thing for other students who aren't as privileged to explore what they want to do.
- **Elijah:** For an RSO like this, I think it makes more sense for them to look at CSF. I think it's absurd to have students hold chemicals in their apartments. I just don't think they understand that they can go to CSF.
- **Lasabra:** I'm looking at their budget archive and they received 6200. That was cut down substantially, assumingly due to the 10k. Based on precedent, they've received this in the past.
- **Demetrius:** I think everything else here I would advocate for awarding. I think awards are important to kids, so I'd recommend funding that.
- **Alex:** I think we should have these go through the proper channels of SGFC and CSF. If we do fund their amount, then they can't come back. I think we give them resources to apply for more funding and look forward to the next year.
- **Ayo:** If we funded them right now, then would they even have a reason to go back? I'm also their peer advisor, so I know the year before they put on the thing that they had 10k and got their funding cut, but in previous years they get around 6000.
- **Lasabra:** So unless the line item says to go to SGFC, they cannot go to SGFC for the event. So if they don't get funding now, they can only go to SGFC for the space rental.
- **Kevin:** Can we change that? And say if they don't get funding from CSF, they can come back to SGFC?
- **Chad:** We could put that comment in there.
- **Kevin:** That's what I'm leaning toward. They should go through the proper channels, but I think the money is deserved.
- **Ben:** We could also include that as part of the motion.
- **Anthony:** I do agree with Elijah and Alex's sentiment, but I'm curious about when they would realistically know how much money they have to work with, because we're going into the summer.
- **Chad:** The event is in spring.
- **Elijah:** So they can go through in the fall.

- **Alex:** I want to respond to Ayo's part. We should have them go through CSF because that won't take away from other RSOs who were scrapped for cash.
- **Elijah:** It's not all community service. Things besides awards and food for volunteers could be funded by us.
- **Anthony** moves to extend the meeting by 20 minutes.
- **Kevin** seconds the motion.
- *The motion passes by unanimous consent (9:08 PM)*
- **Kevin** moves that they should receive \$1844.66, and if they don't receive from CSF, then they should come back to SGFC.
- **Lasabra:** I do not recommend doing that. I recommend funding them for what you want. I do not think, transitionally, that this will be kept up with. I recommend you fund them functionally.
- **Kevin** withdraws his motion.
- **Demetrius** moves to fund the amount on the screen minus the BSLC space rental (\$2,796.30).
- **Lasabra:** Is this under the assumption they go to SGFC for the space rental?
- **Demetrius:** Yes.
- **Aidan** seconds the motion.
- **Chris** objects to the motion.
- Roll Call Vote
 - **Kevin:** No
 - **Ben:** Abstain
 - **Chris:** No
 - **Esther:** No
 - **Aidan:** Yes
 - **Destiny:** No
 - **Anthony:** Abstain
 - **Ayo:** Yes
 - **Joseph:** Yes
 - **Chad:** No
 - **Demetrius:** Yes
 - *The motion fails (9:13 PM)*
- **Kevin** moves that they should receive \$1,844.66, and if they don't receive from CSF, then they should come back to SGFC.
- **Ayo:** What's the purpose?
- **Lasabra:** They can go to CSF even if...
- **Kevin:** I don't know if they will approve it.
- **Ben:** The reason is that it would be in the comment box and the chair will definitely listen to the appeal.
- **Ben:** The motion is to fund them at \$1,844.66, inserting the words go to CSF for approval, then SGFC, then CC.
- **Ben** seconds the motion.
- Roll Call Vote
 - **Kevin:** Yes

- **Ben:** Yes
 - **Chris:** Abstain
 - **Esther:** No
 - **Aidan:** No
 - **Destiny:** No
 - **Anthony:** Abstain
 - **Ayo:** No
 - **Joseph:** No
 - **Chad:** No
 - **Demetrius:** No
 - *The motion fails.*
- **Demetirius** moves to fund \$4,859.30 by roll call vote
- **Destiny** seconds the motion.
 - **Kevin:** No
 - **Ben:** No
 - **Chris:** Abstain
 - **Anthony:** Abstain
 - **Ayo:** Yes
 - **Esther:** Yes
 - **Aidan:** Yes
 - **Destiny:** Yes
 - **Joseph:** Yes
 - **Chad:** No
 - **Demetrius:** Yes
 - *The motion passes (9:17 PM).*
- **Alex:** This RSO is not in the RSO funding website because they didn't receive any funding.
- **Elijah:** They didn't submit for anall, so they're not appealing, but they're asking CC for a number.
- Approval of SGFC Allocations & Assignments
 - **AKPSI Representative:**
 - We help students and the community with professional and community developMent. We had a snafu with submitting. We thought it was submitted.
 - We want to highlight brunch with booth - breakfast foods, coffee, utensils with booth students
 - Host 2-3 speaker events per quarter
 - Case competition - need snacks and food for in-person info sessions and supplies
 - Yearly D&I conference - food, name tags, large attendance expected
 - New member recruitment info session (rush cycles) - food and utensils during info sessions
 - Very dedicated to service - CS event funding for food, art supplies, stationery, books, etc.
 - **Alex:** If you had to pick your top three, which events?

- **Rep:** Brunch with Booth, speaker series, D&I conference. Most well-known on campus and set the precedence for the club and open to the community.
- **Anthony:** How are you coming up with your food costs? Attendance is continuous but value change or dinner and snacks are listed as the same?
- **Rep:** Estimates are a bit off just because we understand we can't fully fund everything. We came up with these amounts in addition to dues. The budget we're requesting is to fund the events but also so we can put in the money we get from fundraising and dues. A lot of events are two-day events and happen multiple times.
- **Chris:** How many dues-paying members do you have?
- **Rep:** 118 members in our directory, 60 brothers actually pay their dues. National takes a portion of their dues (60%).
- **Chris:** With your expected attendance for each event, what sort of people are there besides brothers?
- **Rep:** Anyone interested in the finance and business industry. We have a lot of other people coming in from different finance RSOs or people interested in what the event is for. People from all different years and backgrounds come to these events. We tailor marketing toward second and third years. While it may seem we're just a business organization, we offer a lot of value given that we're so general.
- **Chad:** Do you have an RSO balance and will you have rollover?
- **Rep:** No, we don't have any money in Blueprint. All of our funding is third party where we collect dues.
- **Ben:** How much money is in the other account?
- **Rep:** I expect to have \$600 after we cover expenses for the quarter.
- **Chad:** I think we should send them to SGFC for all of these requests. All RSOs were notified that decisions were made weeks ago. I didn't hear from them until a week ago. I don't want to set the precedent that you can miss AnAll and then come to CC.
- **Anthony** moves to extend the meeting by 20 minutes.
- **Kevin** seconds the motion.
- *The motion passes by unanimous consent (9:34 PM).*
- **Elijah:** They texted asking if there was a way to appeal allocations and then I reached out to Chad. I was under the assumption that he received AnAll and was waiting on the decision to appeal. I don't know where the miscommunication occurred but on my end, May 8th, they were trying to figure out where their funding was. This Thursday was when they realized that they didn't get any AnAll. I was sort of stalling them because I thought it was already submitted.
- **Alex:** They weren't informed immediately after that they were given \$0.
- **Lasabra:** From my understanding they failed to submit and therefore didn't receive any notification. They put in information on the backend but it wasn't submitted.
- **Alex:** Given the precedent we did just set, I think we fund their organization as we have previously and through cost guide.
- **Chris:** How much did they request?
- **Lasabra:** Do we know why it was not submitted?
- **Alex:** It seemed like error and they told me they had their 1:1 meeting. I don't know if it was clerical error.

- **Lasabra:** You can provide some empathy depending on the circumstance. Do we want to ask them?
- **Chris:** The guy at the beginning said it was a snafu.
- **Alex:** They told me they don't know.
- **Chad:** All RSOs were notified to check their portal. At that point, they would have seen that they had no allocation.
- **Lasabra:** We received no communication from them so I would be curious as to what happened.
- **Anthony** moves to allow AKPsi 2 additional minutes of Q&A time.
- **Kevin** seconds the motion.
- *The motion passes by unanimous consent (9:39 PM).*
- **Ben:** So the question we're wondering is why it wasn't submitted. Can you give us insight?
- **Rep:** I looked into the process in the last week of WQ. I did all three steps and all of our requests show up on AKPsi's end. I think there was some error where something didn't go through and it showed up on your end.
- **Ben:** On April 25th did you get a notification that allocations had gone out?
- **Rep:** Yes, I checked immediately and saw nothing in the portal.
- **Ben:** When did you file your appeal?
- **Rep:** A few days ago because we were still confused with the process. We did a changing of boards leading up to spring break so this wasn't an easy process. It wasn't submitted on your end and was confusing because I could still see the different line items and I was just confused.
- **Kevin** moves to extend questioning.
- **Aidan** objects.
- **Kevin** withdraws.
- **Lasabra:** So I do want to say that they didn't communicate with me but there were issues with the site. That was a notable issue this year of applications getting kicked back. Other groups just caught it or were paying closer attention.
- **Chad:** As outlined, other groups reached out to me and at that point I was able to go back to the committee. That's something we'll be missing if we decide today. That's why I believe we should send them to SGFC.
- **Chris:** If we fund them now, I think we apply the standard multiplier or tell them to go to SGFC.
- **Alex:** I think what's important to note is that Katie did act when they first heard. They went through Yero and then Yero went through Elijah. They made an attempt to address but they went through a different channel.
- **Lasabra:** This was also weeks after.
- **Alex:** Given how we funded RSOs earlier today, they were deserving of the same process.
- **Demetrius:** If we funded their three most important things now, could they come to SGFC for the remainder? I think it's important to have the deliberation process but also leave them with some money.

- **Chad:** They can come to summer SGFC starting in a month. I'm always hesitant to have CC just make a decision.
- **Alex:** For quick reference, the three events their only expenses are food and the nametags. Their requests are very easy to calculate. Based on the simplicity
- **Anthony** moves to extend the meeting by 20 minutes.
- **Kevin** seconds the motion.
- *The motion passes by unanimous consent.*
- **Chad:** First we need to cost guide everything. They will still have to submit everything through the AnAll website.
- **Lasabra:** I can screenshot it and send to the email.
- **Chad** motions to fund \$0 by roll call.
- **Destiny** seconds the motion.
- Roll Call Vote
 - **Chris:** Yes
 - **Esther:** Abstain
 - **Ayo:** No
 - **Ben:** Abstain
 - **Aidan:** Yes
 - **Destiny:** Yes
 - **Kevin:** Abstain
 - **Joseph:** Yes
 - **Joseph:** No
 - **Chad:** Yes
 - **Anthony:** Abstain
 - **Demetrius:** No
 - *The motion does not pass (9:52 PM)*
- **Ayo:** Can I change my vote to abstain? Would that change things?
- **Ben:** No
- **Demetrius:** What's the difference between us funding them now and them going to Summer SGFC?
- **Ben:** Projected is number 1 in their rankings. They've requested \$1,290. Number 2 is their D&I conference, and then their Brunch with Booth where they requested \$450.
- **Ayo** moves to reconsider the last motion to give them \$0 and have them go through SGFC.
- **Alex** objects.
- **Ayo** withdraws.
- **Demetrius:** With the information that it wouldn't be a different process for them going through SGFC, I'm in favor of giving zero now and having them go through SGFC.
- **Demetrius** moves to reconsider the motion for \$0 by unanimous consent.
- **Chris** seconds the motion.
- *The motion passes (9:58 PM).*
- **Demetrius** moves to fund \$0 and have them go to Summer SGFC.
- Roll Call Vote:
 - **Ben:** Abstain

- **Chris:** Yes
- **Esther:** Yes
- **Ayo:** Yes
- **Aidan:** Yes
- **Destiny:** yes
- **Kevin:** Abstain
- **Joseph:** Abstain
- **Chad:** Yes
- **Anthony:** Abstain
- **Demetrius:** Yes
- *The motion passes (9:59 PM).*

- Annual Allocations
 - **Ben:** I trust that everyone went through with their assigned clubs. Any concerns, thoughts, or comments?
 - **Kevin:** For Out of Business, Event 1 was explicitly stated to not have occurred before. Also, Outdoor Adventure Club had a meeting called On-Campus Movie Nights that seemed recurring. Same with Pan-Asian Solidarity. They received \$1.5K out of a \$2K request, with no grant history, and said they've done no weekly meetings before. I would halve it because it's a recurring event. For Groove Theory, they funded battle prize money, which SGFC does not fund. For Delta Sigma Pi, they received more money than they were allocated last year just for pizza. I would at least cap it at last year's amount.
 - **Lasabra:** Point of inquiry - is Out of Business a new RSO?
 - **Anthony:** Point of inquiry - are those proposed revisions?
 - **Kevin:** Probably yes.
 - **Ben:** Any more discussion?
 - **Ayo:** For **South Asian Medical Student Association**, was their appeal denied?
 - **Chad:** I think it was upheld.
 - **Chad:** So if they don't get the Pritzker, they can come back.
 - **Ben:** Robert's Rules of Order allows for a voice vote. I will use that to get through this series of amendments.
 - **Kevin** moves to remove all funding for the Brunch with Booth event because it wasn't hosted prior. Decrease by \$50.
 - **Aidan** seconds the motion
 - *The motion passes (10:07 PM).*
 - **Kevin:** Outdoor Adventure Club has a weekly on-campus bonfire. SGFC didn't halve it for being recurring. I move to halve it and decrease by \$125.
 - **Chad:** For which event?
 - **Kevin:** The third one: weekly on-campus movie night. Instead of \$350, I'd give them \$225. So, \$125 for wood, \$50 for s'mores.
 - **Ben:** So what's the final number?
 - **Ben:** \$2,124.58 by unanimous consent.
 - **Alex** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes (10:10 PM).*
 - **Kevin:** Pan-Asian Society Coalition. I move to amend that to \$1,375.

- **Destiny** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes (10:11 PM).*
 - **Kevin:** Groove Theory is giving out prize money. I move to reduce their funding by \$500. Their final allocation would be \$6,202.56.
 - **Anthony** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes (10:12 PM).*
 - **Kevin:** I move to reduce Delta Sigma Pi's general chapter meeting request for pizza and cupcakes. We gave them an increase of \$1.5K for pizza. I move to reduce to the amount we granted last year for pizza and cupcakes.
 - **Chad:** What about for snacks?
 - **Kevin:** I would vote to fund everything on this list for last year's amount.
 - **Kevin moves to amend to \$4,685.28 by voice vote.**
 - **Alex** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent (10:13 PM).*
 - **Kevin:** For Philosophy Review and Classics Society, we only funded their first publication of the year.
 - **Chad:** We fund one during Annual and if they're eligible, they can get another funded later.
 - **Kevin** moves to approve the Annual as amended by unanimous consent.
 - **Esther** seconds the motion.
 - *The motion passes by unanimous consent. (10:14 PM).*
- **Kevin** moves to adjourn the meeting
 - **Anthony** seconds the motion
 - *The meeting is adjourned (10:15PM)*