

Budget Deliberations, FY 2019

02.27.2018

1. Call to Order
2. Attendance: Present: Elaine, Dan, Eliza, Julianna, Sean, Christopher, Hayley, Sam D, Bryce, Sam M, Sam B, Harry, Jonas- tardy
3. Arts Council Presentation
   1. Requesting $155
      1. Interest, food
      2. Promoting art on campus, tie arts groups together through events
      3. 19th - 24th, April
   2. Motion to approve $155
      1. Approved unanimously, Senate will vote on the 18th
4. Exec Presentation
   1. **Jonas arrives; full Committee present**
   2. Sahil and Naba requesting $25,395
   3. Main Points: Entrepreneurship, Diversity and Inclusion, Wellness, Hoya Hub
   4. See powerpoint for details
5. Deliberations
6. Adding our draft versions to combined excel document
7. Members present their drafts with justifications
8. Snarky comments have indeed been made
9. Sam B had a nice budget but she messed up on excel :(, so we had to adjust with the help of MSB students Harry and Christopher
10. Motion PASSES / Motion FAILS
    1. Specific voting record by Senator can be found [here](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1xvL2bdf52ZXGga0J7QpZA-Oi4K4c3PhP_SzIszk3bmc/edit?usp=sharing)
11. Motion to introduce Daniel Almeida from Media Board. Approved
    1. Production costs, supplies- IT infrastructure re-vamps
    2. 2019- projected to spend $21,000

1. Motion to debate $62,000 to PAAC by Dan Fain-
   1. Majority of senators put on or around that number
   2. Motion to allocate $62,000 to PAAC:
      1. Yes: 11
      2. No: 1
      3. Abstain: 0
2. Motion to debate $16,565 to CMSF by Dubke
   1. Reduced request, demonstrated financial cuts
   2. Juliana: Fund on or around $12,000 everyone is reasonably responsible, not necessarily a reason to fund in full
   3. Sam D: the expenses are to minority religions communities
   4. Eliza Lafferty question: Where did you get $12,000 estimate from?
      1. Expectation of funding from donors
   5. Sean Learner: willing to go to 16000 bc Buddhist restructure
   6. Motion to allocate CMSF $16,565:
      1. Yes: 11
      2. No: None
      3. Abstain: 1
3. Motion to discuss ABCS $245,000 by Clow
   1. Have a lot of capital investments, depleted reserves
   2. Expensive sports more so fall on players
   3. Dan Fain comes closer to average number ($234,780.23) because reducing dues is important
      1. Extra 10k would only lower dues $2, better spent elsewhere
      2. Jonas agrees, so does Sean
   4. Assistance program could grow, average dues is $64/semester
      1. Goal is $50/year
      2. Fain points out that average dues is inflated by the expensive sports
   5. Juliana Arias argues that ABCS benefits only a small part of the community, such as equestrian
      1. Dan Fain and Harry Clow state that it is difficult to remove/defund club sports from ABCS as long as they are following the rules
   6. Motion to allocate ABCS at $245,000 by Clow-
      1. Yes: 5
      2. No: 7
      3. Abstain: 0
4. Motion to discuss ABCS at $235,000 by Sam B-
   1. No additional discussion
   2. Motion to allocate ABCS $235,000
      1. Yes: 12
      2. No: 0
      3. Abstain: 0
5. Motion to fund GPB $185,000 by Les
   1. In opinion of the chair motion fails
6. Motion to discuss $10,000 to Outdoor Ed by Grande
   1. We should not subsidize their west coast trips, however it is smart to fund for gear so we will not have to fund in the future by Sam D
   2. OE is affordable and it is discussed to prospective students- Clow
   3. Motion to allocate $10,000 to Outdoor Ed
      1. Yes
      2. No
      3. Abstain
7. Motion to discuss $70,000 to Lecture Fund by Lustbader
   1. Lustbader: They’ve had around $70,000 in the years past. In their presentation they stated that with the increased funding they will bring in Barack Obama and Elon Musk; Lustbader argues that an extra $20,000 will not bring in those big names
   2. Senator Lerner states that LF is able to bring those expensive costs down.
   3. Senator Lerner reminds us all that Lecture Fund often fills the room, is fiscally conscious
   4. Chair Holshouser mentioned that they would not hit the high ticket items that Senator Lustbader mentioned as those were merely ideals
   5. Senator Fain states that LF is offering co-sponsorships, it is also the understanding of the chair that LF will sometimes partner with the University, but as a recognition of their limited financial resources
   6. Senator Lafferty explains the fiscal responsibility comes from the fact that during their meetings they have the cost of the speaker on the board
   7. By the end of 2018 they expect co-sponsorships to $17,500, will increase, and it goes up!
   8. Motion to allocate $70,000 to Lecture Fund
      1. Yes: 2
      2. No: 10
      3. Abstain: 0
8. Motion to discuss SAC at 290,000 by Senator Arias-- fails in the opinion of the Chair
9. Motion to discuss SAC at 285,000 by Senator Arias--fails in the opinion of the Chair
10. Motion to discuss Lecture Fund at 85,000 by Senator Clow--passes
    1. Lerner: Running out of money, they can do more with $90k
    2. Sam D- echoing Senator Lerner. We have big names coming in to speak and it is building our reputation, so we should increase funding than years past
    3. Dan Fain- we could always give them more money and they could do more with it. Closer to average. $5,000 could be better served elsewhere.
    4. Lustbader: To get them to the next level we don’t have that money right now
    5. Lafferty: Extra $5,000 could go a long way in growing the general body
    6. Lerner: Not trying to bring in speakers like President Obama or Elon Musk (not feasible at this point); more along the lines of Ben Shapiro and famous authors.
    7. Clow: TedX is funded by Lecture Fund and is losing University funding and will need more from LF to continue
    8. Motion to vote for 85,000 for LF
       1. Yes:7
       2. No: 5
       3. Abstain
11. Motion to Introduce the GPB at $155,000 by Clow--failed
    1. Les: GPB creates many programs for all types of students. They are on the more inclusive side. Diamante Fashion show as an example of diversity and inclusion
    2. Clow: Leadership is $4,000 in the budget
    3. Sam B: They doubled budget on event chairs
    4. Les: they need this doubling--increased events
    5. Holshouser: GPB lost $16,000 in University funding while taking on Georgetown Day; this would actually look more like a $121,00 allocation
       * 1. Do we think new programs are worth the investment?
    6. Lerner: Normally does not support big structural changes. Doubling of event chairs is not necessary
    7. Dubke: Are these requests being made such as “better yacht and more food” Has enjoyed GPB programming--were there shenanigans in this budget?
    8. Les: They really sell out a lot of their events, structural changes are creating more checks and accountability
    9. Motion to allow GPB President to speak--fails in the opinion of the Chair
    10. Fain: Structural change is referenced as the largest reason for the increase, so that is why we harp on it. Can cut down what is obviously an inflated budget
    11. Les: Georgetown Day is large undertaking, the concert also adds into this, this is an important event for the community
    12. Lafferty: inflation is coming from 26 movies a year. They are not turning people away from the movie screenings.
    13. Holshouser: Lost funding for the movies. Gives people something to do on the weekends who do not drink.
        1. Did some math and came up with: $120,000 as a new proposal.Is new programming the largest concern? If so, let us give them a trial period of
    14. Motion to vote on this allocation of $155,000 to GPB:
        1. Yes: 3
        2. No: 9
        3. Abstain: 0
    15. Motion to debate $135,000 to GPB by Les. supported by Arias
    16. No debate
    17. Motion to vote on $135,000 to GPB.
        1. Yes: 12
        2. No: 0
        3. Abstain: 0
12. Motion to discuss on $290,000 to SAC--approved
    1. Motion to allocate $290,000 to SAC
       1. Yes: 0
       2. No: 12
       3. Abstain: 0
13. Motion to debate $250,000 to SAC by Lafferty
    1. Arias believes this is too low for SAC because they serve a wide range of students.
    2. Dubke: $290,000 seems a bit large
    3. Badger: expresses support
    4. Motion to allocate $250,000 to SAC: fails with vote of Chair
       1. Yes: 6
       2. No: 6
       3. Abstain
       4. Chair: No
14. Motion to debate $275,00 to SAC by Arias
    1. Arias: many clubs they have in NCD given as great reason, also cites the many clubs they have already
    2. Grande: SAC pays these GUPD and GEMS costs when SAC groups ask to co-sponsor events with LF
    3. Motion to allocate $275,000 for SAC:
       1. Yes: 9
       2. No: 3
       3. Abstain
15. Motion to introduce CSJ for $7,520.77--Clow
    1. Boccia: Deserves to be funded in full, giving great service to the community in forms of teaching. Students are often dissuaded from service, especially in education, by the unpaid aspect of this service and must work elsewhere. Housing costs are prohibitive
    2. Holshouser: Funding housing is not necessarily what we should be doing, the SAF should not intentionally be used in the summer, should be used throughout the year.
    3. Fain: echoes the chair, maybe we should look at the groups we are supposed to fund first and then come back to these groups
    4. Grande: We are going to be doing summer programs either way, so let’s not focus on that
    5. Lustbader: We should look at school year costs, echoes chair.
    6. Lafferty: Our main goal is to fund students directly, and these students who benefit from this scholarship. In support
    7. Motion to allocate CSJ [Dept] at $7,520.77
       1. Yes: 0
       2. No: 12
       3. Abstain: 0
16. Motion to introduce Transfer Council at $7,000
    1. Lustbader: Only started running Transfer Admitted Students Day this past year, costs them $3000 and will continually rise as more transfer students are admitted at this university. Other organizations they seek funding from are “unreliable,” we have over $1 million and this seems fair
    2. Grande: Too small to be funded in full. Weekly meetings could be more cost effective such as meeting in Leo’s for food
    3. Lerner: Transfers in general are overlooked on campus. Should give special attention to them
    4. Dubke: Does not know much about situation, perhaps we can fund them more in the future
    5. Clow: They have no relationship with admissions. Transfer council is going under a lot of fluctuation. We should look into funding, maybe not the whole $7,000.
    6. Arias: Shares personal experience since she is a transfer student herself. We should support this community strongly
    7. Lustbader: Better to meet in Leo’s because it’s not as crowded and can be more personal when meeting in a smaller area
    8. Les: Fund them significantly less than what they’re asking for. Having meals at Leo’s is almost beneficial so they can better involve themselves in the Georgetown Community
    9. Arias: we need to help the transfer community, need more guidance and support otherwise they remain as an external community.
    10. Motion to allocate $7,000 to Transfer Council
        1. Yes: 3
        2. No: 9
        3. Abstain: 0
17. Motion to debate for $5,000 to Transfer Council by Lustbader
    * 1. Lustbader--this is cutting it close, a few months in the identity picks up--need a place to find a community and friends--Need that same security that the OA group provides freshmen
      2. Motion to allocate $5,000 to Transfer Council by Grande; passes on vote of Chair
         1. Yes: 6
         2. No: 6
         3. Abstain: 0
         4. Chair: Yes
18. Motion to discuss Media Board at $82,000--Fain
    1. Fain: In need of all of these increases due to the increased costs for housing, capital expenditures, and should not rely on seniors off campus
    2. Lustbader: Students bearing the cost is unfair, they provide a valuable service to the community
    3. Lerner: Strawpoll--so how many of you actually read the physical copy of printing? We should look more at decreasing their printing?
    4. Fain: Why are looking at specific funding issues? We are not qualified to run a business
    5. Holshouser: Disagrees strongly with funding Students don’t make good business decisions. Largest organizations with contracts, we should fund contracts since they have already been made. What level of input can we have about negotiating these contracts.
    6. Dubke: Do we even fund them in the future--they are a business?
    7. Fain: We need chair of media board to discuss contracts. There are print minimums to consider. Can’t speak on it. Trusts their numbers they provide
    8. Lerner: Let’s maybe recommend they decrease printing again, we should maybe even look at there?
    9. Motion to allocate $82,000 to media board: Fails on vote of Chair
       1. Yes: 6
       2. No: 6
       3. Chair: No
          1. Where is this change in barebones operations? Why is there a $30,000 increase?
19. Lerner to debate $70,000 for Media Board
    1. Lerner: Media is important, this closer to our average
    2. Motion to introduce Daniel to the floor to discuss bare bones:
       1. Unanimous consent
       2. Holshouser: so, there is this increase, what is the difference? Why is there an added 27k or so.
       3. Almeida: Will try to unpack these numbers. The adobe part of production are pretty expensive products, there is no scale. Some groups choose to pay out of pocket or acquire it in a non legal way. Some costs that are strictly related to housing. Some computers are around 10 years old and their systems are failing because they are old.
    3. Dan Fain: Reconsider around $80,000
    4. Motion to allocate $70,000 to Media Board by Dan Fain
       1. Yes: 7
       2. No: 5
       3. Abstain: 0
20. Motion by Dubke to debate CSJ-ABSO at $160,000
    1. Moreland: Does not support this, need far more, not only with ABP but also with other social justice initiatives. They have a lot of clubs under them, we should reconsider this motion at $20,000 or $15,000
    2. Dubke: Anecdotally, I sat in on a meeting and felt that they should maybe get more money?
    3. Motion to allocate $160,000 to CSJ-ABSO-
       1. Yes: 9
       2. No: 3
21. Motion by Lafferty to debate CSJ department at $10,000
    1. Lerner: Housing?
    2. Holshouser: We were disappointed with Media Board doing this
    3. Motion to allocate $10,000 to CSJ
       1. Yes: 3
       2. No: 9
       3. Abstain: 0.
22. Motion to debate CSJ at $0 by Grande
    1. Moreland: This is social justice, let us reconsider. Appeal to Jesuit Values
    2. Grande: There is already funding to these programs.
    3. Clow: This is not a continuation of DC reads, rather teaching kids during the summer to prevent learning loss
    4. Arias: Though this is for Jesuit Values, we ought to be consistent with our terms, we should not fun them for housing, or if we do fund their housing, we have to increase Media Board
    5. Les: Pathetic that a department has to ask for money. Scrounging for money, I give them $75,000 a year (reference to University fiscal choices)
    6. Motion to allocate $0 to CSJ:
       1. Yes: 8
       2. No: 4
       3. Abstain
23. Dubke, Motion to debate GUSA accounts at $12,455
    1. Remaining balance of SAF yet to be allocated
    2. Motion to allocate $12,455 to GUSA:
       1. Yes: 12
       2. No: 0
       3. Abs: 0
24. Fain: Motion to debate moving $5000 from SAC to Media Board
    1. Arias: SAC has a huge impact on students here and they need as much funding as they can get. And SAC impacts more people rather than other advisory boards.
    2. Fain: Brings us closer to our averages
    3. Motion to allocate $5,000 from SAC to Media Board
       1. Yes: 9
       2. No: 3
       3. Abs: 0
25. Lustbader motion to debate $2,000 from PAAC to TC
    1. Lustbader: ATSD costs $5,000, Transfers need community and this provides them the opportunity
    2. Badger: why was there a jump in the price?- Lustbader- there were more transfers
    3. Grande- how much impact does this transfer day actually have on transfers?
    4. Lustbader: That day is the deciding day for transfers coming here or not
    5. Holshouser: willing to give substantially less to PAAC, so he is not opposed
    6. Arias- it was the deciding day for her and many of her friends
    7. Motion to allocate $2,000 from PAAC to TC
       1. Yes: 10
       2. No: 2
       3. Abstain: 0
26. Motion from Lerner to debate $5,000 from GPB to LF
    1. Lerner: Missions are similar, provide opportunities for students to become engaged. Fiscally conscious and impact on students. LF can do a lot with $5000 and we ought to do it.
    2. Les: Everything you said about LF is exactly why you can’t take the money from GPB
    3. Les: Motion to allow GPB to speak-
       1. Unanimous consent
    4. GPB chair: only requested $95,000 for the concert
    5. Les: Judgements drawn are wrong, we ought to not move this money. No more
    6. Clow: Motion to allocate $5,000 from GPB to LF
       1. Yes: 2
       2. No: 10
27. Grande and Morehouse--joint motion to debate $7,000 from SAC to CSJ-ABSO
    1. Grande: many clubs students think are SAC organizations are actually CSJ-ABSO clubs
    2. Moreland: We often have funding requests from these groups
    3. Arias: SAC is fundamental, you could cut it $0, no one is helped. We need this level of funding, they are so detailed and conscious body. We need to fund their activities and their clubs and proposals
    4. Moreland: Cutting these groups, giving them less will negatively impact the community As well. We are looking at major events that bring the community together for completing social justice initiative
    5. Motion to allocate $7,000 from SAC to ABSO by Dubke:
       1. Yes: 11
       2. No: 1
       3. Abstain: 0
28. Motion to debate $10,000 from ABSC to SAC by Arias
    1. Fails in the opinion of the Chair
29. Motion to debate $6750 from GPB to CSJ-ABSO by Dubke
    1. Dubke: Brings them up to their budget request
    2. Les: GPB is not the place to take this money from. They have a huge demand. Do not cut their money--it would be detrimental to these students.
    3. Fain: Asks Dubke how CSJ spends their money since Dubke has sat in on the meetings
    4. Dubke: We should not cut them, we should not be cutting social justice on campus, morally cannot agree with this.
    5. Fain: It is possible they could take a more critical look at their allocations
    6. Christopher: opportunity to reduce these allocations to their average and scraping up some money from GUSA
    7. Motion rescinded
30. Motion to debate $6000 from GUSA to CSJ-ABSO
    1. Motion to vote:
       1. Yes: 11
       2. No: 1
31. Arias: Debate $3500 from Outdoor Ed to SAC
    1. Arias: They have so many clubs, they need a budget that is big enough to fund them. We need to fund them more. We have clubs in SAC for everything. Greater funding for everything.
    2. Motion fails in the opinion of the Chair
32. Holshouser: Strawpoll on current budget? \
    1. We’d pass it, 11-1-0
    2. Draft Budget produced
33. Adjourn