

College Council Meeting 02/02/2026

Attendance:

Name	Attendance	Class
Aaron Horowitz	Present	2029
Audrey Krajewski	Present	2029
Gavin Wynn	Present	2029
Kavon Mouton	Present	2029
Logan Shim	Present	2029
Aidan Keesler	Present	2028
Destiney Samare	Present	2028
Esther Ma	Present	2028
Grace Beatty	Proxy	2028
Joseph Ayalew	Absent	2028
Demetrius Daniel	Absent	2027
Eric Wang	Present	2027
Kevin Guo (Vice Chair)	Present	2027
Kyle Obermeyer	Present	2027
Nefeli Abutahoun	Present	2027
Andrew Wang	Present	2026
Daniel Cruz Rodriguez	Present	2026
Fernando Sandoval	Present	2026
Pavlik Braverman	Present	2026
William Kimani	Present	2026

Agenda:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bjVct8S9e9cGDGh2B3HnxtFKRNaL2uJo9dbYGQKF_HQ/edit?usp=sharing

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the Agenda
4. Announcements
5. Approval of Winter Quarter Week 4 Minutes
6. Approval of SGFC Minutes
7. Introduction of An Act in Support of Expanded Access to Student Spaces
8. SGFC Appeal: Occam's Razor
9. SGFC Appeal: Dirt Red Brass Band
10. SGFC Appeal: Outdoor Adventure Club
11. Introduction to Revisions to Article VI of the Bylaws
12. Projects
13. Judicial Council Discussion
14. Adjournment
- 1.

Notes

Call to Order

- **Ben (Chair)** declared that a quorum was present

Approval of Agenda

- **Destiny** moved to approve the agenda by unanimous consent
- **Seconded by Aaron**
- No discussion or objections
- **Motion passed**

Announcements

- **Ben** reminded members to review the SGFC appeals guidelines
 - Emphasized that these guidelines govern how appeals are evaluated
 - Stated that while College Council is not strictly bound by the guidelines, there must be a clear and defensible reason for deviating from them
 - Reiterated that College Council acts as representatives of the student body

Point of Order

- **Gavin** asked whether non-College Council members are allowed to contribute during the appeal discussion period
- **Ben** stated this would be at the Chair's discretion
 - If someone has no reason to contribute or is being disruptive, they will not be

recognized

- Non-club members may speak during public discussion as long as they follow discussion guidelines

Approval of Winter Quarter Week 4 Minutes

- **Dariel** moved to approve the Winter Quarter Week 4 minutes by unanimous consent
- **Seconded by Gavin**
- No discussion or objections
- **Motion approved**

SGFC Minutes Review

- **Gavin** stated the minutes were much improved and easier to work with ● He proceeded to give comments in order, addressing specific organizations

Black Graduate Coalition

- **Gavin** noted the event was described as an annual Black History Month gala and questioned why it was not funded through annual allocation
- **Ben** explained that during annual allocations, clubs typically submit up to five events, but due to budgetary constraints, SGFC only funded the top three events which explain the reason why some events were not funded
- **Aaron** asked when it comes to budgetary constraints and only the top three, instead of the top five events being funded is that because the budget is smaller or because there are more RSOs, or is there another factor?
- **Fred** explained this was due to inflation, an increase in the number of RSOs, and student budget allocated to student government to spend hasn't been on track with the level of inflation as well as the number of events that are going on

Tennis Club

- **Gavin** noted Tennis Club described the tournament as “exceptional,” and asked: ● Whether funding would be available if they advance to the next level of the tournament ● Whether the same “exceptional” conditions would apply if they move forward

Gavin expressed concern that funding could create a difficult budget situation if SGFC/USG later has to fund a national trip

- **Ben** asked **Fred** whether Tennis Club could advance to another competition ● **Fred** stated he would need to reconfirm with CLI, but Tennis Club had been informed this would be their last competition-related funding due to changes in their constitution ○ He noted they were allowed to compete through the end of the current academic year
- **Gavin** asked for further clarification
- **Ben** explained that university policy does not allow funding a competitive recreational club when a varsity version of the sport exists, and that Tennis Club was allowed to

continue due to its long history of competition

- **Caitlin** clarified that CLI advises but does not make funding decisions; USG makes those decisions
 - Noted Tennis Club amended their bylaws
- **Gavin** said will we be in the same position if they do advance to a national tournament?

Ben asked **Caitlin to get** clarification. If the tennis club wins this competition, moves on to the next level, is SGFC planning on funding them?

- **Caitlin** stated that she could not speak to what the committee would or would not fund in the future
 - She noted that **Tennis Club is aware of cabinet's position** and has had discussions with her and the full board
 - She stated that Tennis Club has been informed that **this is the last year the activity could potentially be funded**
 - **Caitlin** explained that the primary reason the request was funded this time was because the **entrance fee had already been partially funded during annual allocations**, and the club was instructed to return to SGFC for the remaining portion
 - She added that there is no precedent for this situation, so the committee does not have guidance on whether funding would apply if the club advanced to a national tournament
- **Gavin** stated that this issue ultimately raises a question for College Council - He noted that while funding a national tournament may not be inherently problematic, approving the current request could create a precedent that commits SGFC to funding the club again if it advances to additional rounds
- **Ben** asked whether the concern was about SGFC's role in funding versus CLI's role ● **Gavin** clarified that the current funding may appear to be a \$2,000 decision, but could effectively commit SGFC to approximately \$6,000 if the club advances further, particularly for activities that may otherwise fall under CLI funding
- **Fred** stated that Tennis Club may apply for funding through the end of the academic year, but any future funding amounts would be determined by SGFC and subject to appeal, with no guarantee of continued funding beyond this year

SGFC Budget Context

- **Aaron** asked how much SGFC has available for spring quarter funding
- **Caitlin** explained:
 - Each quarter averages approximately \$65,000
 - After this meeting, approximately \$6,000 would remain for the quarter

Tango Club

- **Gavin** raised concern about a discrepancy in the Tango Club request, noting that food was requested for **80 attendees**, while ticket deductions reflected only 20 tickets ●

Caitlin explained that the club's ticketing system is based on **membership tiers** ○

Membership includes **community members, non-undergraduate affiliates, and faculty**

- Members pay **different membership fees** depending on their relationship to the club
- **Caitlin** stated that SGFC had reviewed the club's full financial history dating back to 2024 to understand this discrepancy and offered that she has a **detailed spreadsheet** documenting the breakdown
- **Gavin** clarified that this explanation implies approximately 20 non-members were expected to attend and stated that he trusted SGFC's review
- **Gavin** noted confusion in the minutes regarding why only the final event was funded
- **Caitlin** explained that:
 - The club was unable to attend the SGFC meeting
 - When a club does not attend, SGFC may either suggest an amount to College Council or defer the request
 - The final event was funded because its date was imminent and could not be deferred
 - Other events were deferred due to later dates
 - SGFC planned to meet with the club later that week regarding the deferred events

Outdoor Adventure Club (Michigan Trip)

- **Gavin** raised concern that the Michigan trip was advertised at **\$150 on Instagram**, while SGFC documentation reflected a **\$75 ticket price**
- **Caitlin** stated that SGFC **does not routinely audit RSOs' social media** and relies on information **provided directly by RSOs**
- **Ben** stated that this concern would be reserved as a first question during the appeal, rather than addressed during the minutes review

Approval of SGFC Minutes

- **Fred** moved to approve the SGFC minutes by unanimous consent
- **Seconded by Gavin**
- No discussion or objections
- **Motion passed**

Resolution Introduction (First Reading)

- **Ben** stated that this item was a **first reading only**
 - Per bylaws, resolutions must be introduced at one meeting and voted on at a subsequent meeting
- **Gavin** introduced a resolution concerning access to reservable campus spaces for non-RSO groups. He stated that he has heard from multiple parties that there are groups

who want to plan events and organize but do not have access to reservable campus spaces, as reserving student-centered spaces such as classrooms and similar campus rooms generally requires RSO status, both of which have limited and selective application windows. He explained that this resolution is intended as an opportunity for the College Council to explore expanding access to these spaces and allowing smaller or emerging groups to meet. Gavin noted that he had multiple drafting discussions with Kevin, Ben, and La Sabra and acknowledged that the current draft takes a very action-oriented approach that may need to be softened in its final language. He emphasized that Student Centers retain ultimate authority over who may reserve student-centered spaces and explained that while RSOs are currently able to reserve spaces at no cost, non-RSO groups often face high rental costs that are typically structured for large private events. He added that determining what Student Centers would be comfortable charging non-RSO groups is an unresolved question that would need further work, and stated that the resolution's final form would likely focus on expressing College Council's support for examining this issue

- **Ben** asked whether Gavin had consulted Student Centers
- **Gavin** stated that he had not yet done so
- Ben raised concern that implementing such a policy without Student Center consultation could risk **suspension of College Council's reservation privileges**
- **Dariel** asked why the resolution required a **two-thirds vote** to overturn denials - Gavin said it was to limit College Council workload and that denials should only be overturned for very clear reasons.
- Aaron said that if Gavin does talk to Student Centers, it would be important to understand why the current rules exist and what concerns led to the current policy. ● Gavin said there are flexibility concerns for the University, as well as Title IX and other compliance concerns that are handled through the formal RSO process. ● Pavlik said he was not certain what types of events people are currently unable to reserve rooms for.
- Gavin said some groups have recruited members but did not receive RSO status, so they do not have access to meeting spaces.
- Ben reiterated his concern about Student Centers policy and room reservation authority.
- Gavin said there is a limited SEF application window, which makes it difficult for groups forming mid-quarter to access space.
- Pavlik suggested a potential solution could involve limiting access temporarily or within a quarter.
- Gavin said SEF can work for some groups, but the application timing remains a barrier. ● Gavin finished with he has heard from multiple groups that they are unable to meet and wanted College Council to take a look at the issue.

Appeals Procedure Explanation

- **Ben (Chair)** outlined the appeals structure:
 - Three minutes for the appealing organization
 - Three minutes for SGFC representatives
 - Five-minute Q&A period

- Discussion period after all club representatives exit the room
- Ben stated that:
 - Discussion time is not strictly limited but is constrained by room access ending at 8:30 PM
 - A one-minute speaker limit will be enforced during discussion
 - No interruptions are permitted
 - Speakers must be recognized, even for yes/no responses
 - These rules are intended to avoid side conversations and allow accurate reporting by **The Maroon and the minute-taker**
- **Fred** suggested hearing all appeals and making decisions at the end instead of going one by one
 - The suggestion was withdrawn after discussion
- **Elijah suggested** that it is not a bad idea to propose potential allotments of money. But don't vote on it until all suggestions are from the board.
- - he reclarified his statement “ you can take motions and, and just have it on the floor and vote on them once every single group has been met. Because if you vote now on what, we can't change it later on
- **Dariel suggested** reaching a suggestion amount for all of them, and then at the end just vote on it all in one combined motion.
- **Ben** finalized the procedure:
 - Motions may be made after each appeal discussion
 - Organizations will be notified **at the end of the meeting**
 - Funding decisions may be **amended before notifications are sent**
- Ben reiterated that College Council is encouraged to follow **SGFC guidelines** to ensure transparency and avoid impropriety

Voices in Your Head Appeal

Voices in Your Head presented an appeal for funding to attend a competition and workshop conference in Boston. They stated that they requested funding for travel, lodging, attendance fees, public transportation, and meals, all of which they described as necessary to attend the event. They explained that they were allocated approximately **\$2,800** by SGFC but were not informed which specific line items were funded, only that the allocation followed the Cost Guide. They noted that in past years, SGFC typically fully funded essential attendance fees and travel costs. The group emphasized the importance of attending the event, stating that they had been rehearsing extensively and that the event provides exposure to industry professionals. They noted that the group placed **4th out of approximately 400 groups internationally** the previous year. They stated that once the attendance fee (currently discounted to **\$75 per person**, down from \$90) is paid, they would have **less than \$2,000 remaining**, leaving a significant funding gap that would be difficult to fill.

Caitlin, representing SGFC, explained that during committee discussions, there was concern about a lack of demonstrated fundraising, which typically limits funding. However, because the event was far in advance, SGFC fully funded the attendance fees. She stated that SGFC funded

travel costs under the **20% travel rule**, rather than the 50% rule, because the event was framed as a learning and educational experience rather than solely a competition. She further stated that SGFC funded **\$15 per person per day for food** and applied the 20% rule to applicable line items, after which the projected fundraising amount was subtracted. Caitlin then yielded time to **Fred**.

Fred stated that the calculations were done correctly and clarified that SGFC applied the **50% ceiling** to travel-related costs, including flights, lodging, and transit, fully funded the attendance fees, and cost-guided meals at \$15 per person per day. He explained that the final funded amount was reduced due to the projected fundraising amount, which was considered significant.

Q&A Period

- **Dariel** asked how the group calculated airfare.
 - **Voices in Your Head** explained that they searched flights departing on their travel dates and selected the cheapest times that did not conflict with class schedules.
 - **Dariel** provided a printed example of a cheaper flight option.
- **Fred** asked whether receiving less funding would cause the group to cancel the trip. - The group stated that they had already invested significant effort and would do everything possible to attend, noting that they had previously self-funded a trip to ICCA Finals when funding was not available and did not want to repeat that experience because it was expensive
- **Gavin** asked whether the group could feasibly fundraise the projected amount. - The group explained that the \$200 estimate was based on prior fundraising experience and that while multiple fundraisers could potentially cover more, they had historically struggled to raise larger amounts.
- Pavlik said recalculations drop it below \$5,000 then fundraising minimum drops (to \$250) - He said reduce flights, reduce food, and fund the fee at \$75.

Discussion

- **Kevin** stated that the correct funding amount should be **\$2,985.06**, based on applying the 50% travel ceiling, excluding food, and fully funding the \$75 per person attendance fee.
- **Gavin** stated that the correct framework was to determine whether recalculations would drop the request below \$5,000 and reduce the fundraising requirement, arguing that food, airfare, and attendance fees should be reconsidered.
- **Caitlin** clarified that SGFC does not typically allow new information beyond what is included in the original request unless amended by the organization and that the committee applies the Cost Guide as written.
- **Kevin** moved to fund Voices in Your Head **\$2,985.06**, with no funding for food, full funding of the \$75 per person attendance fee, and recalculated travel costs. ○
Seconded by Dariel
- **Fred** stated opposition to not funding food, noting that SGFC has funded meals for other

RSOs and that consistency should be maintained.

- **Pavlik** stated that the Cost Guide supports funding food at \$15 per person per day and saw no reason not to fund it.
- **Caitlin** clarified that SGFC does fund **\$15 per person per day for food on trips**, consistent with past practice.
- **Gavin** made a **substitute motion** to include food funding, resulting in an amended amount of **\$3,255.06**.
 - **Seconded by Audrey**
- The original motion passed by roll call vote (**15 yes, 1 no, 2 abstentions**). ● A final roll call vote for the final motion was held on the amended amount of **\$3,255.06**, which passed (**16 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention**).

Outcome: Voices in Your Head was **funded \$3,255.06**.

NEXT CLUB: New Orleans Trip (Dirt Red Brass Band)

Presentation

- **Dirt Red Brass Band rep** representative said they were appealing the funding for their New Orleans trip. They said SGFC referenced a 20% maximum on travel costs and \$15 per day for food, but they do not believe those guidelines were reflected in the amount they were allocated. They said that based on SGFC guidelines, their funding should be closer to approximately \$2,800. The representative said this is the only large budget request the group makes each year and that the New Orleans trip is a tradition that has existed for the past 12 years. They noted that SGFC allows up to 50% of travel costs to be funded for competitions and explained that while this trip is not an officially sanctioned competition, it is also not a vacation, as the group rehearses outdoors daily and performs on the streets each day as part of the RSO's mission. They said that even when including the amount already allocated by SGFC, their funding remains under 50% of the total trip cost. The representative concluded by asking whether any additional support could be offered and stated that the group is exploring other ways to fund the trip regardless of the outcome of the appeal.

SGFC response

- **Caitlin** said that food was cost guided at \$15 per person per day. She said transportation, including flights and trains, was funded at 20%, and that the rental car was deemed necessary by the committee due to its importance in transporting instruments. She said SGFC then subtracted the fundraising amount and noted that there may have been a multiplication error in the calculation. According to the cost guide, she said the amount should have been \$1,620, but stated she would appreciate someone double-checking the math.
- **Fred** said that 20% was applied to both lodging and train costs and that food was cost guided at \$15 per person per day. He said the remaining line items were funded in full and that the committee was somewhat generous in that they did not discount the funding

based on fundraised resources. He added that Dirt Red Brass Band was funded under a more generous standard than the other two groups.

Q and A

- **Ben** asked why this was not requested during annual allocations where they rank top events.
- **They** said they spoke with someone and they do not allow it.
- **Gavin** asked why line item 2 for train tickets only requested 8 if more people were coming.
- **They** said 2 people are not taking the train and the other two people are flying in. • **Dariel** asked why they requested public transit if they also have a rental car in New Orleans.
- **They** said there are 12 people and the rental car is mainly for transferring equipment between the Airbnb and rehearsing and performing locations.

Discussion

- **Kevin** said if they do a 20% ceiling trip inclusive of everything, it would actually be 1900, which is less than what SGFC funded.
- **Kevin** said the question is whether CC wants to uphold what SGFC gave without reducing, or consider reduction.
- **Gavin** said they have done this for 12 years, but if CC follows the rules they set forth, they should reduce the money.
- **Aiden** said they should not penalize an RSO for SGFC making a mistake. • **Gavin** said it is student body money and CC has a responsibility to distribute it responsibly and within the rules they set.
- **William** said these are not technically rules, they are guidelines, and CC should have the ability to work slightly outside the guidelines for something better for the student body.
- **Gavin** asked if people would consider funding this under the 50% rule for competitions and conferences given it is a significant experience and they are performing, not vacationing.
- **Aaron** said they need to take into account the amount of money remaining for winter quarter and the SGFC budget.

Motion and vote

- **Kevin** moved to uphold SGFC decision.
- **Esther** seconded.
- Roll call vote: 14 yes, 4 no, 0 abstentions.
- **Motion passed**

NEXT CLUB: Outdoor Adventure Club (OAC)

Presentation

- **OAC** said they run annual spring break trips that take approximately 40 to 50 students on week-long trips to national parks across the United States at an extremely low cost to students. They said these trips require a significant amount of effort and planning, and that planning for this year's trips has already begun. The representative said the SGFC allocation from the previous week represents a dramatic cut compared to the funding OAC has consistently received for more than 10 years. They stated that without this funding, OAC cannot run this year's trips, which would result in students losing a valued and longstanding part of the UChicago experience.
- The representative explained that their appeal was based on three main points.
- **Point 1: Cost Guide change after submission due to SGFC delay** - The OAC representative said the Cost Guide was changed between when they submitted their funding request and when it was actually heard. They explained that at the time of submission, the Cost Guide allowed for more funding toward travel expenses, which make up a large portion of their budget. The representative said their hearing was pushed back by a week due to SGFC capacity issues unrelated to OAC's timing or actions. Between the original hearing date and the delayed hearing, SGFC changed the guidelines to only fund 20% of travel. The representative said OAC is effectively being penalized for operational delays on SGFC's side and should not face major funding cuts based on policy changes they could not have known about when submitting their request.
- **Point 2: Order of subtraction for ticket fees**
 - The OAC representative said SGFC applied the 20% travel funding rule and then subtracted OAC's trip fees after that calculation. They argued that subtracting trip fees after applying the 20% rule does not make sense because the remaining 80% is already expected to be covered through fundraising or participant contributions. To illustrate this, the representative gave an example where a \$1,000 request with \$400 in ticket fees would result in negative funding under SGFC's logic. They stated that further details and calculations were provided in the spreadsheet submitted to Council.
- **Point 3: Proven impact and value**
 - The OAC representative said that while the Cost Guide states SGFC does not consider past allocations when reviewing future requests, OAC wanted to emphasize its proven impact at a relatively low cost. They said the club brings 40 to 50 students on week-long trips that include food, transportation, and activities, costing the University approximately \$250 to \$300 per student. They explained that this model keeps trips affordable for students and requires SGFC support to continue. The representative said OAC collected over 350 signatures, along with student testimonies, in support of the spring break trips. They stated that these

trips create lifelong friendships and memories, open access to expensive and hard-to-reach locations regardless of students' experience or socioeconomic status, and provide a sense of community for students who cannot return home during spring break. The representative concluded that losing these trips would remove an important part of the UChicago student experience.

SGFC response

- **Caitlin** said that last year OAC introduced a new event, the ski trip, and that in consideration of the spring break trips, SGFC reduced funding for the spring break trips at OAC's request. She said that this year SGFC funded approximately \$4,000 for the ski trip. Caitlin explained that OAC's event date was pushed back because RSOs have had longer explanation periods than in previous years. She said the amendment to the Cost Guide was something SGFC had been discussing since fall quarter. Caitlin stated that past precedent was to fund 50% of travel costs for competitions and that prior to the new amendment, non-competition events were funded at 33%. She also clarified that SGFC does not consider ticket sales to be fundraising, and that fundraising is defined as active efforts such as bake sales or soliciting donations, rather than pay-to-play trip fees.

Q and A

- **Gavin** asked about the Michigan trip: the request deducted \$75 per person trip fee, but Instagram advertised \$150, and asked where that difference comes from. ● **OAC rep** said they made the Instagram post after the delay and expected a decrease in funding. They realized they would probably have to charge higher prices since they got less funding
- **Gavin** asked if they recognize charging higher prices reduces the amount they would receive from SGFC.
- **OAC** said yes, but they need to cover transportation, and they offer direct financial aid and subsidize more for those students.
- **Gavin** demanded a clear answer: how much does a ticket cost.
- **OAC** said it depends on the funding they get today.
- **Dariel** asked about the Texas trip and mentioned Amtrak could cost about \$2,300 less than flying, and asked why they are flying.
- **OAC** said they chose flights because the trip is only a week and they want to maximize time doing the outdoor experience.

Discussion

- **Gavin** said three points: their claim of "low cost" is not accurate because student money is subsidizing it, the guideline change timing is acknowledged but the event is far enough in the future that rules should still apply, and proven impact is the strongest point and could justify an exception.
- **Pavlik** asked about the concern on the order of multiplication and subtraction and whether they were mistaken or right.
- **Caitlin** said they applied 20% to transportation and overnight accommodations, cost

guided food to \$15 per person, funded remaining things in full, and then subtracted ticket sales from each request.

- **Pavlik** said that still does not resolve the concern and there is a discrepancy with what the Cost Guide says.

- **Aaron** said Amtrak from Chicago to Dallas takes about 21.5 hours which is pretty long

- **Kevin** proposed using a consistent formula: a 20% ceiling to total trip cost including food, with Texas adjusted for Amtrak, and said the final calculation is 2000 more than what SGFC funded.

- **Gavin** said there is a major issue with deducting ticket fees when fees are variable and could be anything.

Kevin said he never deducted tickets.

Gavin mentioned that it should be deducted.

Motion and vote

- **Kevin** moved to fund Outdoor Adventure Club: Big Bend trip \$1,803.50, Great Sand Dunes trip \$1,955.08, and Michigan trip \$617.37.
- **William** seconded.
- Discussion was waived due to time.
- Roll call vote: it shows 12 yes and 6 abstentions
 - Motion passes

Gavin move to adjourn the meeting