

Draft Budget Appeals Meeting

03.13.2019

1. Meeting called to Order
   1. Attendance: Hayley Grande, Bryce Badger, Harry Clow, Samantha Moreland, Christopher Holshouser, Sam Dubke, Sean Lerner, Eliza Lafferty, Elaine Les, Samantha Boccia, Dan Fain, Jonas Lustbader, Juliana Arias
2. Holshouser: Instructions on how meeting is to go
3. Motion to introduce CSJ-ABSO Appeal--Lerner
   1. Moreland--in favor of the appeal, the received less funding than the prior fiscal year, new clubs coming they should receive funding
   2. Holshouser: total appeal is $11,800, puts them at total of original request
   3. Fain: Understand where they are coming from and what they offer campus, not comfortable with the full appeal amount--where does the money come from. Invites us into conversation. Hard to see where do we cut $11,000 from other groups?
   4. Holshouser: Point of clarity, we can fund in part, in full, or reject
   5. Lerner: Comfortable with a $5,000 allocation
   6. Dubke: Spoke about a $10,000 investment in the future for Outdoor Ed, would be comfortable taking $5,000 from this allocation--subsidizing safety training and would sadly come at more burden to the students taking the training.
   7. Clow: Let’s talk about more appeals first
4. Motion to Introduce SAC’s appeal--Arias
   1. Arias: $275,000--as stated before and oversees many clubs on campus. Intended to support the ideals of the university and invests in other clubs. SAC is receive 20 new clubs this year and needs new funding for these clubs. Tries to be more inclusive of low income students.
   2. Senator Clow: Understands value SAC adds to the community however, another increase from last year. How do we shift money around to allocate more to SAC? One of the largest advisory boards FinApp allocated.
5. Motion to Introduce GUSA account--Lerner
   1. Holshouser: we can earmark funds in this one with more leniency
   2. Lerner: Need more for GUSA fund
   3. Clow: GUSA fund allocates money to groups who do not receive funding from their advisory boards. Not appropriate use of funding. Funding is better used in the advisory boards. GUSA fund should not be the group that allocates to groups who do not receive full funding from their advisory boards.
   4. Grande: Repeated inclusion of Rangila--is this working as a workaround fund as SAC funds them. What is the exact role of GUSA fund? BRAVE Summit--honorariums for speakers, is that not a Lecture fund job?
   5. Lerner: Should we allow LF representative to speak?
   6. Holshouser: We should let senators speak for now
   7. Dubke: Most of these allocations are to things that would have already happened without this funding. Seems as if these are not “make it or break it” funding request. Personally in favor of the decision to cut GUSA fund, not opposed to increasing GUSA as a whole, just does not see GUSA fund as the number it is requested. Comfortable raising $1070, but no more than that.
   8. Badger: A lot of cultural groups on this GUSA fund distribution. Groups are going to GUSA fund because they have no more money left from their advisory boards. We need groups like for example: ASA and other groups who might need additional funding because it allows for their programming to continue.
   9. Holshouser: Disappointed in GUSA fund this year. Has not received much information this year including minutes. Mentions this issue often, still has not been resolved. Issues with operations of GUSA fund, and the fact that it is separate from FinApp. Originally when GUSA fund was formed, half of the execs discretionary amount went to GUSA fund. Last year GUSA fund should have been $7,000 according to bylaws. Problematic when advisory boards go to GUSA fund, typically cultural groups which tend to be more expensive. We need a new group who can do that, SAC denied it. Believes everyone’s arguments are valid.
6. Motion to introduce GPB Appeal--Lerner
   1. Les: This appeal does a great job at clarifying some of the confusion that we had when allocating funding, such as structure and everything else.
   2. Lerner: Key line is under current allocation, where the actual increase is only $10,000 or so. (Clarified by Chairman Holshouser)
   3. Fain: Still sees over a $13,000 increase to GPB, does not feel they should be receiving any more funds and in fact is the group I would cut money first.
7. Lerner: Motion to reject the GPB FY19 appeal. Seconded: Dubke.
   * 1. Vote 11 Yes, 1 N 0 Abstain
8. Moreland: Back to CSJ-ABSO
   1. Moreland: is looking for $7,000 not the $5,000 mentioned earlier, would like to take from GPB, SAC, Outdoor Ed, and Transfer Council
   2. Lerner: Agrees, but not from Transfer Council
   3. Arias: Do not take money from SAC, we should be funding them more in fact or we will get more appeals
   4. Holshouser: request for concrete numbers
   5. Moreland: $2,000 from Outdoor Ed, $1,000 from ABCS or TC, $3,000 from OE, $1,000 GPB
   6. Lustbader: Take $1,000 from PAAC
   7. Arias: Comfortable with leaving ABCS as long as we enforce the next FinApp
   8. Dubke: We have taken from PAAC enough, we should not go to them as the source of funding just due to mismanagement
   9. Fain: We are going to run into a wall looking for money to move around. Would rather allocate $5,000 as opposed to $7,000
   10. Lafferty: Would it be possible to not fund TC through their part B application? It would not be possible
   11. Cohen-Derr: TC has a mission that is distinct, not meant to be a student government, is a group of people with shared common interests.
   12. Holshouser: Is there a more permanent home for TC, but not something that we can change for next fiscal year but it should be a conversation.
   13. Lafferty: The amount that we’re funding TC right now is a lot. To go from $150 from GUSA Fund to $7,000
   14. Lustbader: Very clear on what they are using the money for, as this body continues to grow, it is important to fund them. They need this money as they do not have a consistent funding source. Important to support this community that may have difficulty integrating into the community here (club culture). We should not cut them.
   15. Lafferty: Great cause, but maybe $2,000 could be cut and funding requests could go elsewhere.
   16. Dubke: Does not seem to reach a lot of students since only 4 students regularly attend events. Is comfortable with taking $2,000 from Transfer Council.
   17. Holshouser: Admitted students transfer day does bring more students to campus and is a big event for the transfer council.
   18. Lustbader: we are looking at is not the actual organization, they use the funding well, and we like where the funding is going. The size of TC is not an issue. Transfer community is significant part of Georgetown student life, and TC reaches a large group here.
9. Motion to move $2,700 from Outdoor Ed to SAC--Arias, fails
10. Motion to move $2,500 from Outdoor Ed to CSJ-ABSO-- Moreland
    1. Motion carries 11 Yes 1 No
11. Motion to move $2000 from GPB to CSJ-ABSO--Moreland
    1. Yes: 9 No: 3
12. Motion to move $1000 from TC to CSJ-ABSO--Lafferty
    1. Yes: 8, No: 4
13. Motion to reject SAC’s appeal--Fain
    1. Yes: 9, No: 3
14. Motion to move $1000 from SAC to CSJ-ABSO--Moreland, motion fails
15. Motion to move $1070 from Outdoor Ed to GUSA-- Dubke
    1. Yes: 9 No: 3
16. Motion to allow Aaron Bennett to speak on behalf of GUSA fund--Badger, fails in opinion of chair
17. Motion to move $1,000 from ABCS to TC--Lustbader
    1. Yes: 6 No: 6
    2. Chair votes: in favor
18. Motion to move $1000 from ABCS and $1000 from SAC to GPB (total of $2000)--Les
    1. Motion fails in opinion of speaker
19. Motion to close the GUSA appeal (consider it resolved)--Grande
    1. Yes: 7 No: 5
20. Motion to re-open the GUSA appeal--Badger
    1. Badger: GUSA isn’t getting enough money to allocate to GUSA Fun. This money goes to cultural groups and that’s very important.
    2. Holshouser: GUSA Fund charter passed in 2017--officially came into existence in 2010
    3. Dubke: It seems as the GUSA Fund has been used as the workaround, we should look to increasing SAC money instead of giving money to this Ad Hoc body.
    4. Holshouser: If we were to increase SAC then we would have to take from other groups which has proved to be an issue already.
    5. Boccia: Interested in what Eliza Lafferty was questioning earlier, info on groups that GUSA fund allocates money to, how many are SAC groups?
    6. Arias: The more money we give to SAC, the more groups they will fund.
    7. Badger: How can you guarantee that clubs get full funding
    8. Holshouser: what is the logical train of thought in giving money to GUSA when we know that GUSA fund is a workaround. We have to be equal across bodies we fund.
    9. Moreland: “Cultural groups” is not a great excuse as that we have cultural groups in CSJ-ABSO
    10. Lerner: GUSA Fund seems to be a bandaid, I think we should look at $10,000 for GUSA.
21. Motion by Fain for Recess
22. Call to Order
23. Continuing earlier discussion
    1. Dubke: GUSA Fund notes, but if this is a bandaid, they are not a very thorough one, and we should really look at maybe not funding them at all
    2. Lerner: would we be willing to take a percentage from advisory boards plus GBP and Lecture Fund to create $10,000 for GUSA.
    3. Fain: They are disproportionately funding groups around campus
    4. Dubke: Do we take from SAC since GUSA fund funds groups that SAC cannot fund in full. Not comfortable with that but it seems logical.
    5. Arias: What makes us think that taking money from SAC to GUSA will benefit these groups?
    6. Holshouser: clarifies Dubke’s remarks
    7. Boccia: concern is that though we see the history of where these funds go, we should discuss how GUSA Fund works
    8. Holshouser: GUSA Fund operates separate from GUSA and thus makes it hard for them to be removed--we see how well impeachment works
    9. Lafferty: Allow Aaron(Chair of GUSA fund last year) to speak in order to get all the information
    10. Holshouser: We have all the information
    11. Motion to allow Aaron Bennett to speak (Lafferty)--passes
        1. This is the only year we’ve collected information on this but less than 50% of funds went to SAC groups
        2. Anecdotally: clubs that come to us are typically annual projects, systemic issue in how we fund groups here on campus
        3. Focus on funding--are we looking at the micro level of where money is going?
        4. Lafferty: do groups that go to you look for funding from elsewhere?
           1. Answer is yes, we do make cuts, and these funding may be bandaids, but they are necessary bandaids
           2. Groups should have broader access
           3. Charter wants to be changed so it has a more tailored and specific focus
    12. Lerner: do we still want to keep the account closed?
24. Badger’s Motion to re-open GUSA
    1. Yes: 5 No: 7
    2. Stays closed
    3. CSJ-ABSO still open
25. Lafferty’s Motion to move $1,000 from TC to CSJ ABSO-- seconded
    1. Yes: 5 No: 7
26. Motion to close CSJ-ABSO appeal--Arias
    1. Yes: 6 No: 6
    2. Chair votes to break tie: closes account
27. Motion to move $2000 from ABCS to GPB
    1. Motion fails in the opinion of the chair
28. Motion to adjourn--Fain
    1. Fails
29. Motion to move $1000 from GPB to CSJ-ABSO-- Grande
    1. Yes: 5 No: 7
30. Motion to move $500 from OE and $500 from GPB to CSJ ABSO-- Grande
    1. Yes: 7 No: 5
31. Fain: Please voice your concerns, we are trying to make everyone happy
32. Badger: Get GUSA to $10,000
33. Arias: Can we move from CSJ-ABSO to GUSA fund?
34. Holshouser: Mathematically impossible that SAC gave less than half of their funding to SAC groups
35. Clow: Why do certain SAC groups go to GUSA fund?
36. Holshouser: Because they have maxxed out what SAC has offered to give them, which was tens of thousands of dollars.
37. Badger--looking at miniscule percentages from each group: $117 from ABCS, $16 from CMSF, $178 from CSJ ABSO, $75 from MB, $300 from PAAC, $131 from SAC, $425 from LF, $665 from GBP
38. Holshouser: GUSA essentially has spent almost all of its money this year over the $23000 allocation, they need more money!
39. Fain: If people think GUSA Fund is important, then you can find it in the $7,000, does not need to be from advisory board.
40. Les: More so uncomfortable taking form any other groups, with cuts from other groups we are starting to reach tangible cuts where we will see current programming cut, not just no new programming
41. Holshouser: We will write a report, so you will be able to justify the amount given to each group. Re-institute some sort of cap on the amount of travel costs. We do have several groups that have very high dollar requests that are very necessary to the functioning of the board. If they can show us how they are going to use the money then that is helpful. A guide towards what we see as this high level.
42. Motion to Adjourn--Clow
    1. Motion passes