

*Appeals and Deliberations 2019 - 2020 Session FY21*

Thursday, March 19- Sunday, March 22, 2020

Zoom, 9:00 PM

Meeting Notes

### ABCS

**Presentation**

* Our initial budget request was 270,00, we changed to 243,000. I will walk through the items changed. Our Team request we budgeted down by taking out everything that was nonessential. We prioritized safety and our mission within the club sports community. Every team must be able to compete three times, so we need to be able to fund those at a minimum. Programming was adjusted down to 1500. We absolutely have to include these programs in our budget. We lowered dues assistance as well, but we still want to ensure that everyone has financial access. We are asking for an additional amount, because this is necessary for us to help provide uniforms, equipment, safety, and access to spaces and financial matters.

**Questioning**

* Dubke: This is close to a quarter million. How does 5000 help? Where should we cut?
  + Jonsson: This is enough to fund an entire team for a year, and could allow every team to compete once more per year. Depending on each team’s needs or league requirements, this amount will go towards that. As for where it should come from, I would say that a lot of what we are requesting is bare-bones funding. We are not just requesting food to supplement meetings. This could come from a single program thrown by the programming board or SAC.
* Kleier: Do you have future plans for your member’s assistance plans? It seems counter-intuitive right now.
  + Jonsson: We have received much feedback and we're working on it right now. Equestrian realized that they had been receiving 50% of their dues assistance from us and came forward to request change for this.
* Bazail: With the closure happening, how have you prepared for FY21?
  + Jonsson: I cannot fully speak to this, but a lot of tournament cancellation costs must come from our budgets. There are still teams that want to make investments to leave for next year, but this was already budgeted in.
* Volpe: Have you spoken to personnel about using sports facilities and reducing costs?
  + Jonsson: We essentially do not pay much at all, and we use this to the best of our extents.

### CSJ-ABSO

**Presentation**

* Newman: I am the treasurer for CSJ-ABSO. We appreciate your consideration and write-up. We focus on charities not only like MAW, but other events off campus. We are essentially the only club offering these opportunities to this extent.
* Lester: We foresee adding at least 3 new groups this semester. We will need additional funding for this. THis semester, we have 5 groups who came through the process. We have some groups that we think do not fit with CSJ. We still need about 11-12000 covered. We will be working on refining our usage of funding and predict a cut that we will be monitoring very closely.
* Newman: We would like to request a revised total of 140,000, which is a 10,000 increase. We expect that we need to spend $228,000 as our total. We need the additional funding for the addition of new groups.

**Questioning**

* Bazail: On average, how many new clubs become institutionalized within CSJ? How many are rejected compared to how many are accepted?
  + Lester: We have a roll on our board designed to work with groups and examine them throughout the year to see if they fit with CSJ. They have a year and one semester to work with us. We have only had one group not make it out of NCD, so about ⅙ don’t make it.
* Nugent: Last year, GUSA gave CSJ 156,000, and the organization had a positive balance of over 100,000. What will an additional 10,000 do? How has the cancellation of this semester affected your finances?
  + Lester: ABP funds many of these events through campus Ministries as well, and the cancellation of these events will still incur costs.
  + Newman: This year, we have already taken the cut, and we have not been able to, due to the abrupt semester end, many things we were spending on now won’t happen. We have been doing better with keeping tabs on our spending this year, and with our new infrastructure to avoid expenses that we missed in the past, we have adjusted our ask for that and ask that you guys adjust our allocation accordingly.
* Hamilton: Assuming that the NCD number makes sense, I want to focus on the -20,00 for APB. What is going to happen to the remaining money in your account for this year for those programs. Why did you go for a 20,000 estimation rather than 30,000?
  + Newman: With ABP, we run an audit with them between now and our last meeting. In our original meeting, we asked for 20,000 less. Because they were overspending by 30-40,000, this is where we decided to cut down.
  + Lester: There are some trips set up that already ran, and there are domestic trips that already ran. Some groups underspent, and that money had to go to our reserves, but we are working with our advisor to see if we can reallocate.
* Volpe: Do you have any ideas about where we should take that 10,000 from?
  + Newman: We haven’t looked at the cuts made for other organizations, but looking at ourselves, we provide a place to be and a service to our students. Our organizations affect students both on campus and the greater DC area. Providing our groups with proper funding is incredibly important.
  + Lester: I do not have any specific groups that I think should be cut, but I agree with Rachel on ABSO’s stance.

### GOLD

**Presentation**

* Burke: Thank you for your time and adjustments!
* Esca: We have been allocated 5,000, and are asking for an additional 2500 in order to maintain the integrity of our program. We are focussing on ELP retention. Last year’s retention was way down as an anomaly. Our most successful year had 26 active participants. One thing they did was family structures with 4-5 mentees each. THis helps students dive in and be more hands-on. There was also a lot of off-campus bonding and experiences, both cultural and volunteer-worthy. They also had a retreat where we revealed families. We had to cut that last year, which affected retention.
* Burke: We will structure the women’s program to be more specific to the applicant’s interests. We have seen consistent amounts of applications, and we hope to reach out more to groups such as OWN IT and other women centri groups. We also saw a lot of growth in L&B that we would like to maintain.
* Esca: We have a strong alumni network with past participants in GOLD programs, who we have come in and work with us. We would like to have all students be able to work on and off campus with alumni, and we use a newsletter to stay in contact with them.
* Burke: Last year, we set our mission in stone. The GOLD Program is something that benefits not only our participants, but the DC community as a whole. We want to allocate equal amounts into L&B and ELP in order to maintain L&B, and pursue our mission.
* Esca: We have a new advisor, but she is working really hard, and a lot of responsibility comes to us as coordinators to be sure that the integrity of our groups is maintained.
* Burke: For our salaried coordinators, some coordinators worked overtime, but we will monitor our hours more closely. We foresee working more hours to restructure, and want to budget in order to be sure that we are fairly compensated.

**Questioning**

* Bazail: On the women’s leadership 2020 structure: How do you plan on working with other partners to expand the effect/ impact of this program.
  + Esca: We have reached out to the women and genders study department and some of our alumni, and we are working to look in on how we incorporate that into our program. We also are bringing in people from title IX, and implementing leadership theory.
  + Burke: We are also trying to be more present in existing sectors regarding women’s leadership.

### Break

GPB

**Presentation**

* We appreciate the initial allocation, and are happy that you recognized the-
  + \*TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES\*
* Lauto: The additional 4,924 will be used to create new events. We were previously hindered in efforts to host previously suggested events. We want to be able to host a more robust concert with more robust outside vendors. We also have increased costs as we try to limit the usage of single use plastics and transition to sustainable options.
* Arnett: Within the past week, we have not stopped our GPB work. Georgetown Day cannot meet in large groups or on campus. Alumni groups are being reached out to see if we can host smaller celebrations. These may be postponed due to efforts to cultivate groups of only less than 10 people, but funding the celebrations would help to host them. GPB is this lubs most inclusive and consistent club, hosts events that encourage diversity, and is very popular among students.
* Lauto: We realize that things are difficult with the coronavirus, but we are looking at ways to make things better for everyone here at Georgetown and across the world, and ways to enhance the concert for next year. We would be interested in getting an A-lister, or making tickets free for Freshmen. We are looking forward and doing our best to be responsible with this funding. Our total appeals ask is 149924

**Questioning**

* Nugent: Who were you planning to bring for the spring concert? How much had you budgeted? How did that compare to previous years?
  + Lauto: We were trying to get Kyle, the guy who sings ICE. The extra allocations that carry over from last year would help us get more staging. Even the 4000 increase may allow us to get a digital wall or a light stand. Even a small increase provides a more robust stage, which gives access to a better stage. We budget 80,000 for the spring concert. Upon cancellation of school, we halted contracting, and our contacts realized the severity of the situation, and as of now, things are still running smoothly.
* Bazail: Thank you for creating contingency for the lack of Georgetown Day. Could you describe some of these new events you are planning?
  + Arnett: Goat yoga was already in the works, but had to be cut because of the virus. We strive to make every year memorable and special, no matter what you are interested in. There are precedents for some of these events, such as ones that take you off campus. We thought that some opportunities to take students off campus would be valuable.
  + Plaza: These are opportunities to branch off from the events we already have, and see if new exploratory events may become signature events in the future

GUSA EXEC

**Presentation**

* Nico: Thank you for all of the valuable feedback. I am very impressed with the work everyone has been doing, from the SEF to everything else, especially during these current times. I would like to apologize for any aggression, escalation, and hostility from our last meeting. My passion came off as combative, and the last thing I would like to do is to create a rift. Now, for the budget: In its original form, it was a dream budget with everything we possibly wanted. This time, we brought forward a barebones proposal. This is what we could do with our current funding as allocated, based on estimations and precedents. We could do some line items, round tables, and host a student activist summit and fully fund SAO. However, I feel that we could do more. There was some confusion with the hammocks; these are not new; this is an agreement that was made mandatory by a previous administration, the same with TurboVote. We must pay this no matter what. We also highlighted Slack. THis allows for GUSA to be much more organized and avoid projects getting lost. It makes communicating easier, and makes this group more effective. I know that this cost sounds like it is too huge of a cost for this budget, but GUSA does need something needed to handle the entire organization. Per student, the cost is not astronomical. This allows smaller groups and caucuses to really collaborate. Moreover, Slack allows students to better push projects that are passionate about. The student activism summit helps students to be more involved with the community, so we want to be able to better fund it with catering and quality spaces to encourage attendance and learning from this program. Diversity Week has a positive impact on students of all backgrounds and helps to refine the values that we try to emphasize on campus.

**Questioning**

* Bazail: We did not know about the hammocks being a pre existing contract, but with regard to slack, are there ways that the contract with slack could be negotiated down? I realize that it is important to exec functionality, but it is like a third of the budget.
  + Nico: This cost is fixed at a dollar a day, per person. It is a large chunk of our budget, but when you think about the amount of people who are active, it becomes easier to see why the price is this amount.
* Hamilton: I am going to focus on slack as well. Everything else, to me, makes sense. My question is, have you looked at other communication platforms, like discord or groupme? Have you reached out to Slack? Has every step been taken?
  + Nico: Discord we got rid of early on, because it did not make sense and lacked overlap of sub groups the way you have in slack. The way that clubs and apps work on Slack is very helpful and much more accessible. GroupMe did not make sense for much the same reasons, and none include the abilities to check in on the progress/activity of individuals.
* Nugent: You mentioned that SLack was a multi-year contract-
  + Nico: Not slack, TurboVote
  + Bryce: THe way that slack works right now, Aleida worked in and argued down the costs, so everything above the basic costs is free. It’s about $12 per person.
  + Nugent: I am looking right here at a deal that is roughly $2.25 per person.
  + Bryce: We would be willing to look into that!
* Hamilton: I suppose we found a nice option here, but there are other programs available outside of Slack. Can you understand why we are concerned about walking into a contract that amounts to ⅓ of the budget?
  + Nico: I understand your concern, but I have been very satisfied with Slack. We will look into other options, though, and see if they can compare.

### Conclusion (3/19/2020)

* Arias: This concludes today's meeting. We will reconvene at 6:15pm EST tomorrow. These meetings are being recorded and will be posted.

## Day 2

### Lecture Fund

**Presentation**

* Sheehan: Our original request was 98,000, which was a 13,000 raise from what we received last year and was proposed this year. We need this increase to counter increases in honoraria and other costs. This will help us to maintain the integrity of our mission and club as a whole. With more funding, we will venture into speakers on subjects such as entertainment and art, who require more munding but will help us to diversify our programming
* Chandra: We have become more involved in the Georgetown community, which means that more clubs are reaching out to us to cosponsor events. They perceive us as the club to reach out to for monetary support and cosponsorship in bringing their speakers to campus. However, we cannot support all of these requests and honorarium when we cannot even handle the rising costs of our own.
* Sheehan: We also see costs of co sponsorships. When we tried to bring NoName, an artist, he requested 30,000. When the African Society of Georgetown invited their keynote speaker, they requested co sponsorship from us of 50,000, which is something we simply could not support. Last year, we received requests from 20 clubs and were able to help in part, at least, 14. We want to be able to not only help more clubs, but raise the amount of co sponsorship we are able to give.
* Chandra: “\*Reads quote\* How impactful a lecture is depends on an individual's satisfaction. The correct way to measure our impact is to reach out to the groups and see who we have impacted directly. It is important to look at the events we have hosted in the past that have filled rooms; quantitative numbers are valuable. However, bringing niche speakers who students need to see has a qualitative impact on campus. By making sure that a significant amount of our events allow students to ask questions, we bring value to campus. Lecture Fund is highlighted as a core part of Georgetown that is listed on tours. We are a core part of Georgetown, and now is the time to increase our budgetary boundaries. There are a lot of organizations that get a lot of funding, such as GPB, but the Lecture Fund is something unique to Georgetown, and it brings a special qualitative value to our campus. This boost may seem small, but this allows us to prevent our budget from staying stagnant.

**Questioning**

* Dubke: For quantitative measurements- a rough comparison is GPB, who track the amount of heads who attend their events. Why do you guys not do this?
  + Chandra: For every event that we cosponsor, there is a facebook event that tracks these. Some events are ticketed, but not all events make sense for this. In terms of numbers and metrics, this is something we can do in the future. We do have significant numbers, and even had to turn away about a hundred at Meek Mill’s event.
* Bazail: For the past three budget summits, you have requested the exact same 13,000 increase. Why is that? Is it because of the nature of your board and operations?
  + Sheehan: Our events are unpredictable and more difficult to budget for, but we know that honoraria are rising. We plan to reach out and host more underrepresented speakers, and this 13,000 would still make an effective dent in solving the lack in these groups. We are also confident in our ability to negotiate honoraria down, which is reflective of our ability to effectively handle our funding.
* Hamilton: What is happening to events that were scheduled this semester?
  + Chandra: Many events had to be cancelled, and their events will likely not be hosted over zoom. However, some have been postponed until next semester. We are still reaching out to the groups we agreed to co-sponsor with, but the situation is much the same.

### Media Board

**Presentation**

* Lee: I have with me a few other representatives from media organizations. We are requesting at minimum, our printing, equipment, and online service amounts. These dollars already include our projected revenue. I want to stress that we are not businesses, and we have every right to university funding. Our revenue should be considered a courtesy that we implement in order to not be a burden on the student activities fee. Media organizations are different from other clubs, which have a primary goal of hosting events. We produce pure content. Event-based organizations are easily tracked, but the effect of media content cannot be measured the same way. Print is not a dying industry; magazines and news articles are a healthy industry. Bossier has grown with great success. Print media on campus is not dying, but flourishing. Print media teaches skills to our students that cannot be taught anywhere else. Our printed products are works of art themselves, which cannot translate well to online. We also have many student testimonials. Bossier representatives help us to bring power to voices that would not be heard otherwise. Students do in fact read each other's works. The statements that print is dying and that students do not read each other's works are based on bad-faith arguments. Print makes news accessible immediately in ways that it is not online. On our printing contracts, we chose the least extensive plans that we could. Our plans are the cheapest options that we can get. Printing contracts establish a minimum amount of money they are willing to receive. We prioritize print above all else, and defunding it will only stagnate campus media. We did not focus on printing last time, because we wanted to stress the growth of our new clubs. Cutting our funding would be detrimental to new clubs, because they require a lot of funding to get on their feet, so it is critical that our barest needs are met. Lastly, I want to highlight the strives we have made to improve ourselves. We have made our boards more democratic, and now require each club to defend their budgets before us. We have also increased our number of board members, so that we can give attention to new clubs and make sure that they are upholding our mission. Our audit also shows financial responsibility, and we have never gone over budget.

**Questioning**

* Ziac: My problem is not with the content, it is more with the 50,000 that the hoya is printing. It said that they order a thousand copies a week. How do they know those are being read? How is that tracked? How are these numbers chosen?
  + Geraghty: We are not asking for 50,000 to cover that print cost. Our requested budget is only 28,000, but that number is how much it would cost to print weekly. We actually print 4,000 copies a week. The way our print contracts work, we cannot feasibly lob off 1,000 copies to reduce costs. Most of our copies are being picked up, and we are working with our publisher to measure the amounts that are being picked up. We count by hand the leftovers, and our numbers are feasible.
* Dubke: The past two years, we have bumped funding to fix technology, but again this year you come back claiming a need for capital investments. How much money do you need before these requests stop coming in?
  + Lee: Our priority is printing contracts, and we have many equipment based clubs. They currently have to share, and many are broken. We were not funded in full those last two years.
* Dubke: Under what budgetary line would you stop printing?
  + Lee: Since our contracts are concrete, it would end up being a conversation about which groups get to print.

### Outdoor Education

**Presentation**

* Kris: Outdoor ed is student run. We have 43 guides, which is the largest ever regarding this spring semester. We try to fund 20-30 programs per semester, as well as our GOPOP pre-O. Prior to spring break, we had 10 hiking trips and 3 ski groups. We focused on getting current student orgs outdoors. I would like to focus on our student involvement and empowerment, in that we teach them skills that we may not have had before. We offer opportunities at a relatively low cost. We purchased a van one year, but the most of our funding goes to guide training and equipment. If I use all money for training, students pay roughly $490 for their WFR training. An additional 2750 would allow us to spend perhaps a little less on equipment, but keeps the training costs down to $300. We lower our costs for certain programs so that students will feel the burden of that less, but our external amounts require us to \*
* There was a lot of talk about our financial aid. Our aid from GOPOP was a guide decision which was not mandated, but we decided it was the right thing to do. We had 6 requests 2 years ago but only 1 this year, which is a relatively low expenditure for us. All who have requested aid have received 100% of their requests. Though it is managed internally, we have always given as much as we could, which has been exactly what students have asked for. I am proud of our commitment to keeping our programs affordable.

**Questioning**

* Hamilton: You mentioned that you are student funded, but you still receive some university funding. Is there money from the university going towards GOPOP?
  + Kris: The funding from the university goes mostly to my salary and operating budget. For the most part, I can cover the costs of programs with $10-15 from students. When the group was created, WFR was not required. Now it is, and this is to a great extent, but my budget has remained the same, and I see it as appropriate to request support from student activities funding.
* Hamilton: To clarify, you are asking the University for funding for training and they are not getting it?
  + Kris: Yes. We are requesting it every year- not for free, but for a specific amount to support the training, and it does not come. I also ask for things like vans every year, and we do not receive those either. I am not meaning to single out the training program, but we are looking for any way to get funding for our necessities

### PAAC

**Presentation**

* Loria: Our appeal request is for $75,000. I want to talk about the addition of our four new dance groups. As I said, PAAC has not added a group to the NCD process in the past four years, but this year we have four. We still plan to adopt all four in the spring despite COVID-19. The average cost for per-year dance companies is $7,900. We do not expect these four groups to incur these costs right off the bat, but the costs will still be high-budget. As for tickets, our expected group expenses is 142,000. Our dance groups are an additional 29,200. Each year, we have roughly 61,000 in sales, which has come out of our request in addition to the Coke grant. Our yearly cost for ad hoc is 31,000. Our ad hoc requests are typically large and add up quickly. If allocated at 50,000, we would have to dip into our reserves by about 25,000. Overall, we would estimate another 15,000 loss from ad hoc funding for a total loss of 40,000. Our main goal is to host diverse groups to the best of our abilities. We feel that performing arts are already small enough, and we do not want to cut anything.

**Questioning**

* None

### Break

* Arias: We have a break until SAC at 7:15.
* Kleier: So for the past three years, Media Board has been positive?
  + Dubke: Yes, but I am not sure that I would trust those numbers, as they double submitted once in the past, so there may have been some confusion.
* Kleier: Last year’s allocation was specific to a dollar amount. How did you get that specific amount for FinApp allocations?
* Dubke: We cut GUSA a lot, and we divided those amounts as best as we could, even though they were small.

### SAC

**Presentation**

* We wanted to appeal by showing our proposed changes. If we were to have these cuts, we would cut each club by a percent cut. We would have to implement hard caps or implement funding tiers, which would affect bigger clubs more. The reason we addressed cultural clubs is because they are typically our largest expenditures, which also take larger ad hoc bunding. To avoid sapping funding from smaller clubs, we would be forced to implement firm caps that would force clubs to choose between important events. We know that FinApp recognizes the amount of impact that 5,000 dollars can do. The purchasing of alcohol was brought up, but that is impossible, as all funding goes through our advisors with strict guidelines. Every purchase must be directly approved by SAC. In terms of attendance, some groups may overstate their attendance or not even know it, and the biggest offenders are being addressed. We have reforms requiring clubs to send photos or headcounts, and new reforms requiring events of more than 1,000 and even random events. For some bigger events, attendance can be difficult to track, but we accept ticket sales or images of full halls. These are not perfect, but we would like to point out that other boards are not perfect either. We are working towards adjusting our issues as much as possible, but the misspending compared to the benefit of funding our clubs is miniscule. We are going to implement a reporting form for students to anonymously report poor spending. There are consequences for overspending; anime clubs got a $0 budget this semester for over spending. For hotel rooms, groups must have 4 people per room. We are confident that moving forward we will have clear communication with CSE, and we have a new system that should be able to get us data more clearly and quickly. We are considering sending a member every month to check in with FinApp. We will be sure that clubs are tying events directly to their mission statements. We will have increased requirements for every.
* Arias: Motion to take the 15 minute time period between schedule items for 10 minutes of additional presentation and then 5 for questioning.
  + Seconded, passed.
* Menz: For travel events, we plan to have groups submit EAFs way in advance so that hotel and airfare rates can be at a minimum.
* Riley: SAC works to minimize toxic club culture. We are an advisory board that has high acceptance rates and allows students to remain involved.
* Menz: We hosted thousands of events last year, and have extensive impact on campus.
* Clay: These are our proposed budgets. If we see a decline in enrollment, we would understand a percent of budgetary cuts. We would recommend prioritizing part A applicant boards that are guaranteed funding from FinApp, and these proposals reflect that cuts should not be targeted at specific groups, but as a percent from every club.
* Menz: I applied to SAC because of a facebook post, and stayed because of the inclusive communities that we build. All of the funding you give us goes directly back to the students. We welcome all students and are proud of it, and we want to make this the best experience for all Georgetown clubs and for the Georgetown brand. Thank you for the appeals process, especially in this trying time.

**Questioning**

* Dubke: I appreciate the presentation; you delivered what we asked for. You cut 90,000 from your original request What was the thought process? How can you be sure that these reforms would go through?
  + Menz: Our original request was aggressive, but based on the amount that we saw. Last year, we would have run out of funding no matter what, so we proposed reforms to curb the demand we faced. Our new request is what we think is sustainable. We received this amount last year, and we believe that this is a comfortable amount. These reforms were mostly passed today, and the rest will be discussed monday
  + Clay: We also have had meetings with CSJ to communicate these reforms.
* Hamilton: Regarding the groups, once they hit a minimum barrier, there is no quantitative barrier for club events. How will you qualitatively and quantitatively measure group events?
  + Menz: We understand that groups want to foster community, but that is why we are going to be sure that all events closely fit the clubs’ mission statements. We will more closely set caps for both clubs, individual events, and ad hoc funding. We did not set those today, because we wanted to see what amount of funding we would receive from FinApp
* Bazail: I am looking at the proposals that would result in cuts to Lecture Found, GPB, and PAAC. Since these organizations are critically underfunded, how do we justify taking a single dollar from them to give to you?
  + Clay: We understand that no advisory board has all of the money they really need. It comes down to who will suffer the most from cuts. GPB is a group that has a lot of bigger ticket events. The impact of cuts on GPB is that they may have a lower profile performer at specific events; for SAC, cuts mean that specific clubs may not be funded at all. If there is a specific board that truly needs funding, it is appropriate to take money from the others.
  + Menz: While we know our original request was large, we know that our funding being cut has specific effects,
  + Riley: Clubs like GOLD and Transfer Student groups should be getting funding from the university, so cuts may be an incentive for them to more aggressively lobby for this.
* Volpe: I have two questions. The year before last, we allocated 250,000. What happened over the course of this year that makes 50,000 so critical to have?
  + Menz: We had many groups emerge from NCD. When they emerged, they had access to $1,000. THis year, we will implement more strict tier funding systems. Clubs were able to positively take advantage of these tier bumps to grow their clubs with access to greater amounts of funding.
  + Saravan: These clubs are growing swiftly, especially with cultural clubs and current events, and big events such as Rangeela. Additionally, costs are rising, but our budgetary limits are not rising accordingly.

### Conclusion

* Arias: We will now move to a deliberations period in a new Zoom meeting.

### Deliberations

* Dubke: Motion to take a 15 minute recess.
  + Seconded, passed.
* 15 Minute Recess
  + Deliberations will start at 8:05
* Dubke: Motion to liquidate the Student Endowment fund and put it towards SAC.
  + Dubke: I do not think we have any way, realistically this year, to invest the student endowment fund. Since we are not on campus, we have no way to manage it, and the administration is not interested in helping us. We could write bylaws making sure it is implemented, and this 50,000 would bring us close to fully funding sac
  + Hamilton: Seconded.
  + Motion to consider motion, seconded.
    - Vote passed
  + Hamilton: I love the student empowerment fund, but I think we need to face that in light of the coronavirus crisis, it is problematic handling it right now. I am comfortable putting it off for one year. I am okay with waiting, as long as we put in place bylaws to make sure it happens.
  + Bazail: I am only going to oppose because I do not think that the full 50,000 should go towards SAC. Other boards have demonstrated need, and it is our responsibility to fully and thoughtfully debate every motion.
  + Motion to vote on motion by roll call
    - Seconded, passed.
* Nugent: Motion to deduct 1,500 from SAC and give it to GOLD
  + Arias: Motion to consider the motion
    - Seconded, passed
  + Nugent: I felt that the presenters yesterday brought in a lot of data and addressed our concerns. A lot of our questions were answered, and they demonstrated appropriate need for this funding, especially with their end of the year retreat being necessary for the program to be appealing.
  + Bazail: With changing politics this week, women’s empowerment on campus is very important, and building community in the face of COVID-19 is incredibly important.
  + Dai: I agree that funding GOLD is important, but I think SAC showed demonstrated need, and that we should consider taking from other allocations.
  + Hamilton: I think we should increase GOLD, SAC, and PAAC, because of their demonstrated need.
  + Volpe: I was for liquidating the 50k. From the beginning, I advocated waiting til next year to implement the funding. Whatever money we are allocating now should come from that specific 50k. I think the bulk should go to SAC, but we also had good numbers last time and should not alter them lower. I was a member of GOLD, and I would be a fan of fully funding their request.
  + Nugent: I agree with Hamilton that we should increase funding for SAC, and 50,000 was an arbitrary number. Considering we were comfortable with 50,000 less, they do not necessarily need that full amount increase, so we should not take away from other clubs. We obviously should increase SAC, but it does not have to be by that full amount.
  + Kleier: I would like to refute that we all wanted to cut SAC. I was of the opinion that we should fully fund SAC. Even with the full 50,000, we will be underfunding SAC. We should stop looking to cut SAC, and I would prefer to start allocating other areas. GPB has been consistently over budgeted. We should look to taking money from clubs that have underspent, not overspent.
  + Arias: Motion to vote on the motion by roll call
    - Seconded, passed.
    - Motion passes.
* Kleier: motion to cut from GPB by 5,000 and move that to SAC.
  + Motion to debate the motion
    - Seconded, passed
  + Kleier: In fiscal year 19, they had a large positive balance, and in the following year, we increased their budget by 5,000. THis gave them extra funding on top of their already positive amount. It makes sense to cut from GPB as they underspent 2,500 and we have to cut all clubs.
  + Dubke: You are arguing to cut a club that has been very fiscally responsible and wanting to give it to a fiscally irresponsible club; I do not think we should defund SAC, but we can’t punish good behaviour either. It is our job to bring value to our students, and GPB has brought more value to campus than every other club.
  + Hamilton: I agree with most of Sam’s points, but I disagree with the ultimate point that GPB has the most value; SAC has great value in itself. GPB also said that they need extra funding for higher tier artists or better staging; 5,000 for SAC could be an entire club that gets created or cut.
  + Bazail: I was not sold on what GPB was selling, but I will push back on an argument. There were areas for SAC to reorganize their funding. I think 253,000 is a draconian cut, but my next motion should be to set a minimum amount of funding for SAC. There are certainly places for them to move things around. We should not keep throwing money at SAC alone, but should recognize that other groups need funding as well, like PAAC.
  + Rassieur: I will be voting yes on this particular motion. I am not convinced the lighting or big names outway the utility of 1 or 2 clubs. I am also interested in the idea that SAC is not necessarily spending appropriately in the past. However, I do not think that cutting some of GPB will be necessarily seen as punishment. Additionally, I do not think last year’s SAC difficulties were related to incompetence or ill-will, but were related to unfortunate circumstances, and they should not be punished so extensively for that.
  + Nugent: This motion would bring GPB from now, to what it was at last year, and bring SAC up to what it had last year. GPB has a better track record of showing its worth in entertaining and bringing value to students. Dollar per dollar, I feel better giving money to GPB to bring entertainment to Georgetown students at little to no cost.
  + Weiss: I see the argument about rewarding or punishing, but that's not our job. Our job is to look at their needs. We have other needs right now, and can afford to take funding from GPB.
  + Dai: As for Sam’s comment on dollar impact, with marginal benefits, as we increase GPB’s funding, the dollar utility decreases. We should look at lowering GPB’s funding going forward.
  + Volpe: I will support this motion to cut GPB’s 5k and giving it to SAC, but then I would advocate taking 5k from SAC to give it to CSJ. They came back with numbers that revealed their true need, and said that they will take a cut because of their over-estimates on GPB, but they did request funding for new clubs as well, which is similar to the needs that SAC cited, and CSJ has demonstrated greater financial responsibility.
  + Kleier: As much as CSJ also needs money, they have underspent every year. I also disagree that we should cut SAC for financial irresponsibility. You are punishing a board in a way that affects many students. We should not be hurting the students when it is only 10 individuals that made these mistakes. We should not focus on this right now.
  + Arias: Motion to vote on the motion
    - Seconded, passed
      * Motion passes
* Bazail: Motion to set a minimum allocation for SAC at 280,000
  + Motion rescinded on the grounds that it could be overruled
* Dubke: Motion to fund media board at $26,839.03
  + Arias: Motion to vote on debate
    - Seconded, roll call vote needed
    - Motion fails
* Bazail: Motion to increase media board’s allocation to 80,000, and to take 5,000from CSJ abso
  + Seconded, motion fails
* Hamilton: Motion to transfer 2,000 from SAC to the GUSA exec
  + Seconded, passed
  + Arias: Motion to vote on debate
    - Passed
  + Bazail: I would argue that there was not a very compelling argument to raise their budget, and there was no proposition to pay the executive officer. This is a tight year with the budget and I wouldn’t want to take money from SAC to fund ourselves. This is already an increase from last year, and I think they can handle their needs with this amount. We need to deal with GUSA misallocations of our funds internally.
  + Nugent: I do not think they need this money, because they over budgeted for slack. Why did Hamilton choose 2,000?
    - Hamilton: I do not think we should fund Slack, but that we should discuss whether or not we should increase Slack funding.
  + Volpe: I think this is a time to make a stand on funding an Executive officer. This is a chance to say “this 2000 is for funding the executive officer” and force them to fund that position. I think all of us would prefer this amount being spent on an executive officer instead of Slack, and this is our opportunity to say that.
  + Marin-Mora: To the execs credit, you can look at how much less they have requested this round. We did not see a lot of big events proposed by the exec, which can be attributed to the fact that they have most money going into necessities and contracts, but giving money to the exec is a good way to better GUSA.
  + Bazail: I want the executive officer paid, but I don’t think that them giving this money will result in that. They are likely to spend it on internal projects. We can earmark this amount for the executive power. We can encourage more fundraising, but we need to earmark a minimum payment for the executive officer.
    - Marin-Mora: With that 2000, are you suggesting we take from the 6000, or add 2000 to be sure it goes to the executive officer?
    - Bazail: I am amenable to adding the additional amount
  + Dubke: I am still against giving money to clubs that are fiscally irresponsible, but this is not about punishing or rewarding. Printing is a dying industry, and I will show many articles proving it. Them writing hit articles against us needs to stop, and I suggest that we should cut them. Aside, I will be voting against this motion.
  + Arias: Motion to vote
    - Seconded, passed
      * Motion passes in full
* Bazail: Motion to take 2,000 from CSJ and move it towards SAC.
  + Seconded, failed.
* Hamilton: Motion to cut 5,000 from SAC and giving it to PAAc
  + Weiss: Motion to amend to 3,000
    - Hamilton: I do not accept.
  + Arias: Motion to debate
    - Seconded, passed
  + Ziac: I am in favor of this, but I am recommending people take a look at our budget now, and would prefer to stop leapfrogging money in and out of SAC so we can finish and go to bed, please.
  + Nugent: We are trying to increase PAAC by 5,000, which will be a good thing, and they cited many necessary increases. This is an opportunity to think about what clubs need and want.
  + Hamilton: I mean, PAAC does good on campus, and their argument about performing arts opportunities is moving, but we need to compare quantitative and qualitative needs. PAAC has a large qualitative benefit and has demonstrated their clear need for this funding. Additionally, they are also implementing new clubs.
  + Bazail: I am in favor of increasing PAAC, as I think they are getting shafted by the university, but my trepidation is on if we cut SAC, will they still be in a stable position next year? I think cutting CSJ will be better as they will have a surplus this year. I think CSJ can take this hit more effectively this year.
  + Rassieur: I think that PAAC can benefit from a lot, but if not taking from SAC, I think that CSJ can perhaps take a hit, we have floated cutting Media Board, but what are other places we are considering?
    - Dubke: To answer, media board.
  + Volpe: Performing arts are severely underfunded at this university, so it is important to raise what they had last year. It is really harmful to set a precedent of draining PAAC’s reserves, or they soon won’t have any, but they will be okay if we do not fully fund them. Initially, I said we should fund 280,000, and now I approve of a bit more, but I am confused as to why everyone is now so staunchly supporting SAC now, when we raised good points in previous meetings.
  + Nugent: Motion to vote
    - Dubke: seconded
      * Passed
    - Kleier: Club sports claimed that their students were underfunded, but they had extra funding. Why?
      * Nugent: They expected field renovations that did not happen in that fiscal year.
    - Rassieur: SOme of us are confused about Media Board and how their contracts work. Some people suggested that instead of cutting the amount, they could print less frequently.
      * Volpe: Yeah, I understand that they can’t change the amount they print weekly, but I was wondering if they could print biweekly instead.
      * Arias: The chair would look favorably on a motion to take a five minute recess to email Media Board
      * Weiss: So motioned
        + Seconded, passed
    - Arias: The chair would look favorably upon a motion to break the rules and allow a questioning of a representative from Media Board for 5 minutes
      * So motioned
        + Seconded, passed.
  + Rassieur: To our knowledge, it is not possible to negotiate down contracts in terms of quantity, but we were wondering if printing could be cut down to every two weeks.
    - Lee: I am not sure that this is possible. It is much easier to cut down on magazines than it is newspapers.
  + Kleier: Are you saying that a cut would impact Bossier and not the Hoya?
    - Lee: No, we are trying our best to preserve all printing equally.
  + Bazail: There has been much debate over what one additional dollar would do. What would an additional 5,000 do to help your organization through the next fiscal year?
    - Lee: Even just a few thousand would mean protecting some of our smaller organizations, but things would still be difficult.
  + Nugent: obviously other clubs outside the Hoya have smaller contracts. So you do not know whether the Hoya can get a smaller contract?
    - Lee: As far as I know, it is not possible. This is the cheapest they can go and they will not negotiate.
  + Volpe: Earlier, I had proposed an idea. I understand that the Hoya cannot limit what they print per week, but what if they printed every other week. We talked about this amongst ourselves. If you only print every other week, that limits who gets printed, but that might elevate prestige and competition. Do you have any thoughts on that?
    - Lee: If it were at all possible, I would bring it up, but they have told me it is not possible. If i had to cut from the hoya, I would cut their membership development or their equipment.
  + Hamilton: Why not just cut printing?
    - Lee: When we allocate money to our organizations, we do not tell them what to spend it on. We fund on the line items they give us. We would allocate their funding by limiting things they themselves deem less important.
  + Arias: Thank you Courtney for being here.
    - Courtney Lee exits the meeting.
  + Ziac: Motion to approve the budget
    - Dubke: Seconded
    - Arias: Please keep in mind that we can extend debate until Sunday if necessary
    - Nugent: Volpe, who said nay: What else would you do to the budget?
      * Volpe: I would increase Media Board to 80,000. We did call her back from questioning, and it is important that we show that we are not out to get them.
      * Nugent: Media Board gets funding outside of the committee, and I am not sure that 5,000 would have the desired impact regarding printing contracts. It seems logical to me to wrap up the budget as it is.
    - Ziac: I will reiterate that we are going back and forth, and this debate over minute tweaks is simply going to use up debate time and not benefit students substantially.
    - Kleier: I think that we have been making value judgements that are not ours to make. If you think that print is dying, okay; but do not take that option from other students. I did not realize until I talked to students in Bossier, but it is an important avenue to develop investigative skills and free speech, and they deserve funding in order to pursue these goals, whether or not we agree with their industry goals.
    - Hamilton: Thank you olivia for saying that. I, as an almost journalism student and podcast employee of the voice, I understand the free speech arguments and values. However, it is our job to evaluate the impact that certain organizations have on campus. I think that funding the printing for organizations such as Bossier are important in the face of larger contracts such as Hoya. We do have to make value judgements
      * Kleier: To be clear, they will cut from the smaller organizations if we cut funding. I think we can cut slightly from club sports and CMSF to give to Media Board. I think we should be into the dollars here and see where the money is spent.
    - Arias: I would second that. I think we can get deeper into each allocation.
    - Dubke: I would disagree. Personally, I would like to see 10,000 cut from Media Board and given to SAC. These are all value judgements; I think there is no way to make everyone happy. We have had good discussions before and during this process, and I do not see what good we would get out of arguing for a few more hours.
    - Bazail: I would disagree with Sam. Because we are tighter this year, we should be more scrutinous. Did we make budget decisions without knowing what Media Board was doing? Blaxa provides a unique platform. We have to be respectful of their policy. If we cut them, they well cut their clubs across the board. This will have impacts far beyond what we want, which will greatly affect these important organizations. And to go back to an earlier point that Senator Volpe brought up, I am being topsy-turvy on SAC’s allocation because I’m taking each transfer with a case-by-case analysis. It’s not that I love SAC or hate SAC or that I think that SAC is doing “God’s Work,” but I think that we need to take every organization's needs into consideration. We should take from a club that has larger reserves and has signalled interest in reducing that, and CSJ has that.
    - Salmeron-Perla: From my understanding, CSJ has large reserves. We could take from them safely.
    - Weiss: I agree with Olivia. I wonder if Chris would consider a friendly amendment to add a little to Media Board.
      * Nugent: I do not think we can amend in this format.
      * Arias: We cannot.
    - Volpe: I know I was advocating for CSJ, but I had forgotten about their large reserves. I would not look favorably upon taking from CMSF, but I approve of taking 5,000 from CSJ and giving it to Media Board.
    - Hamilton: To me, what is interesting, is no one disagrees that they should be spending less on printing. But if you removed printing costs, you would not need that much more money. Everyone is arguing that we should give more money so that we do not see negative effects on their smaller clubs. I do not know why we are going to fund what we all agree is a poor decision. I think that it is important for them to look into their choices and decide whether they should fund the Hoya or Blaxa, which advocates for student voices. That is their value decision to make, and we should not take from other clubs.
    - Kleier: regardless of whether or not we want to cut from Media Board, we should table this, so that each of us can process the budget. We can still pass it on Sunday, and I do not think that three to four hours is an effective amount of time for us to debate.
      * Volpe: When will the Senate meet on sunday?
        + Arias: At 3PM for the Senate meeting.
        + Kleier: Can we meet after?
        + Arias: Yes.
        + Volpe: I may not be able to attend
        + Arias: The bylaws say we can do it next Sunday as well.
      * Weiss: Aren;t we supposed to present this to the general body next week?
        + Arias: Not necessarily, we have until next sunday.
    - Ziac: Motion rescinded.
  + Ziac: Motion to table the budget until Sunday
    - Seconded, passed
  + Ziac: Motion to adjourn
    - Seconded, passed

### Adjournment

* Meeting was adjourned at 9:50pm

### Final Deliberations

**[Meeting was called to order at 4:30PM. Technical difficulties resulted in the first 25 minutes of this session not being taken down in writing. Please see the recording for any records between the times of 4:30PM and 4:55PM]**

* Hamilton: We should be having the discussion over whether we want to give that to SAC or to the board
* Salmeron-Perla: The disagreement seems to be about cutting GPB. I think we can cut CSJ. If we decided to cut Media Board, that money should be returned to SAC.
* Kleier: Every board needs to be cut. Cutting GPB will not significantly impact their operating costs. Media board would be significantly impacted by a decrease. A $10,000 decrease would be better than $15,00. We need to look at the impact cuts have on individual clubs.
* Bazail: I agree with Olivia. They made it very clear that they cannot change on the printing. It is the nature of their publications. We can judge their priorities, but not their character and institutions. The Hoya has been around for much longer than GUSA. I do not think that printing should be that expensive, but they have no control over that. I am gonna support what Zach said. We should see more of a cut from CSJ because of their reserve, but we should look at softening the blow that will come from this cut.
* Hamilton: Motion to divide the question
  + Seconded, passed
  + Vote
    - Motion to redistribute $2,000 from CSJ to media board, passed
    - Motion to reallocate $3,000 from GPB to media board, passed
* Hamilton: Motion to reallocate $3,000 from media board to GPB
  + Kleier: Isn't that dilatory?
  + Arias: I am not ruling it dilatory.
  + Vote to bring to debate
    - Seconded, vote by roll call fails.
* Motion to finalize the budget
  + Seconded
  + Motion to debate, seconded, passed
  + Bazail: I think that at this point we have exhausted debate on this subject. It is high time that we approve this budget and begin work on the report.
  + Dubke: I just want to draw attention to the fact that we are cutting GPB, which we agree is the best run board, while cutting those that are less well run. I am baffled, and would like a reason more than just “We had to.”
  + Arias: The way that boards are being allocated now will set precedent for how they are managed in the future.
  + Kleier: First of all, we have cut SAC. As much as GPB has impacted students, I value student leadership. Giving money to more than GPB allows for more student leadership. Additionally, GPB being cut by 3,000 does not impact it the same way it would other clubs
  + Nugent: I am very upset. We just gave more money to Media Board, who used a 25,000 for a one-time expense that they will not need. THis increase is not necessary. They have enough money for printing. I do not think a few thousand has enough impact to make a difference. I do not think we should cut GPB, because they are one of the most well-run organizations on campus. I am really disappointed in this group. If we vote no, we should reverse what we just did.
  + Dubke: I think when you go through this many funding cycles, you get your priorities mixed up. To refute Olivia’s argument that we should spread money to give more leadership opportunities, I think is flawed. You also valued student testimony over statistics. I am comfortable funding media boards at the amount they are funded ,I just don't understand why we are cutting GPB. I would argue to cut CSJ ABSO.
  + Hamilton: There are points of contention, and I am happy to vote no so that we can fix them. I think we have done a good job of evaluating funding needs, though. To adress Olivia and Sam, for the lack of testimony, the only groups that needed it were those that we significantly cut. GPB did a good job, and did not need those testimonies the same way that SAC did. SAC did an incredible job of explaining how they were going to fix the problems we had. I do not think that Media Board did what SAC did. They just said that clubs were going to print however they want, and that they would not fix that . I just wanted to defend sac for the work they have done in appeals. I would be amenable to moving money from CSJ to GPB. THis is getting tense, so remember that we are working together to help students get the best experiences out of their organizations.
  + Bazail: To refer to what Senator Dubke said about statistics; statistics do not necessarily lean in the same. However, if we are relying on statistics, 85% of Hoya copies are picked up. If we would weigh one group's statistics as a golden standard, we must do that across the board. This is not an argument against GPB’s merit, but about necessity; GPB talked about GOAT Yoga. Media board is a NECESSITY for this campus. These voices hold everyone accountable. We cannot be so flippant to their needs. These communities create space. If we want to mitigate what the chairwoman brought up about precedent, we can write that in the report. We can talk about how this is not on merit, but based on necessity, and set our own precedent. The press is here, and the public can reach out to ask questions. We are on the same team; this is the perfect time to finalize this report and move on.
  + Salmeron-Perla: Would people be opposed to someone introducing a motion to take $3,000 from CSJ and give it to GPB?
    - Kleier: Yes
  + Dubke: Motion to take $3,000 from CSJ and give it to GPB.
    - Hamilton: Second
    - Arias: We are in a motion already.
  + Rassiuer: I wouldn’t want to move to a vote without addressing GPB; many were adamant about an increase. I would be ambivalent about an increase, but would like to bring back our points about why we would cut. The way that the money is being managed does not outweigh the impact of cutting allocations on the general body of students. It is not so clear cut as saying X advisory board deserves funding because of their good management. When we asked what GPB would use the funding for, they said that they would use it to improve existing amenities and luxuries. In a perfect world, I would love to increase funding, but we need to way necessities. I am fine with finalizing the budget the way it is.
  + Ziac: I will vote the way it is. People are talking about taking money from CSJ; they are already cut by $30,000. Their funding requests have not been increased in the past few years, and they cut APB, which addresses our previous concerns with their spending. GPB is 4,000 below what they got, we cut $30,000 from CSJ, and we need to take note of how we will negatively affect organizations we are taking money from.
  + Hamilton: I think we should vote.
  + Volpe: I think Lecture Fund and GPB are funded with fundamental differences. It is much easier for GPB and Lecture Fund to be accountable for their finances than other advisory groups. I am for what Sam brought up; I thought we should take money from SAC to give to Media Board, which is why I voted against taking it from GPB. I think this is where the numbers have fallen and they will not change much. The increases in GPB are marginal; other organizations are not even being funded to fully operational capacities. What we give to GPB does not seem to be critical; other allocations are regarding what we can give to be sure things are still funded.
  + Nugent: I will be voting no. Senator Kleier and others have brought up that every board needs to be cut this year, but Media Board spent 25,000 on an anniversary, but if you factor in the fact that this is no longer necessary, their funding goes from being a 10,000 cut to essentially a 15,000 increase. We all generally agree that GPB is a well run board that deserves the same amount of funding, and we should take some from Media Board and give it to a board that needs it more.
  + Dubke: I would be comfortable with going to a vote now, and I think I will lose this vote. I have been on this board for three years, and every year Media Board writes a fire-alarm article about how they will die and how the GUSA senate hates them. They need to cut it out, and we should stop bullying us. We fund them, and if they do not want us to fund them, they can find other sources of funding. It is like, to quote Eric, “giving drugs to an addict.”
  + Kleier: It seems like you hold a grudge against them for complaining about the funding they receive. That is their right to complain. I think we are at a stalemate. I motion to vote.
    - Ziac: Second.
      * Motion passes
  + Vote to finalize the budget is tied.
    - Arias votes nay. Motion fails.
  + Dubke: Motion to move 3,000 from CSJ ABSO to GPB.
    - Arias: Motion to move to debate.
      * Fails
  + Volpe: Motion to move 3,000 from SAC to GPB.
    - Arias: Motion to debate
      * Motion ties.
        + Arias votes aye, motion passes.
    - Nugent: This is not my preferred source of reallocation, but at the end of the day, this is the amount GPB deserves. I think that taking from SAC is not detrimental considering that we were willing to fund it at 50k less last week.
    - Arias: Remember that you can take in smaller amounts from different boards.
    - Nugent: Again, something must change in order to pass this budget.
    - Rassieur: Clearly we must change something, but what good does giving this money to GPB do? They get better funding for their concerts? Considering the dire need that SAC has expressed, I do not think this will ultimately benefit the student body.
      * Volpe: Given that I introduced this, I agreed with what Harrison said, as the budget is now, GPB would have a larger percent cut from SAC. I think about the floor Bazail presented at $280k. This would bring SAC to a less than $10k cut of their original budget. The lights were what they would do if we increased them. THis is still a cut. I think we agree that SAC needs to be funded, but cannot be fully funded ,and 3k is not a huge issue for them to deal with.
      * Bazail: I do not think this has any real benefit to either side. This will change nothing on GPB’s side or on SAC’s side. As I stated before, we have a very extensive report where we record our deliberations, Lucy has typed pages of notes.
        + Arias: Please keep your statements concise.
      * Dai: I understand the impulse to give GPB more money, but a 3,000 will not make a big difference, but for SAC, that is an entire club’s worth of potential funding. I think the logic is not there.
      * Ziac: I want to reiterate what I said on Friday, that we would only end up shifting a few thousand dollars and getting caught up in squabbles. The main fight seems to be between not wanting to cut Media Board or raising GPB. I think we cut SAC a great deal by giving them most of the SEF funding. Approving this motion should help the vote to ultimately be passed.
      * Hamilton: I understand Chris where you were coming from, but I do not think it is fair to cut SAC. this budget will not pass if we do not fund GPB at 140,000. I agree with the marginal impact. I think the best place for this funding is from Media Board, but that's off the table. In my opinion, SAC should be off the table, too. I think we should talk about taking from CSJ. They have huge reserves and underspent by a ton. We should hesitate voting just to save time. This is just .3% of our budget, but it is still important.
      * Kleier: Cutting from GPB, what does that do? Cutting SAC cuts potentially 1-2 clubs. Why can we not cut GPB?
      * Salmeron-Perla: We should not defund SAC any further, as it would be detrimental to them. I am in favor of taking money from CSJ.
      * Dubke: To respond to Olivia, we were presented a graph that showed cost per head per student. When you talk about cutting 3,000 events, that is 5 or 6 events and *thousands* of experiences that you are cutting.
      * Nugent: GPB, every year that they come back to us, they talk about the events they host other than the concert. I agree with the point about SAC. It's not fair to say that because SAC has an expenditure issue, we should increase their funding. GPB keeps coming in with more and more data about where the funding will be going, and it is not just lighting.
      * Bazail: I went back to the graph Nugent referenced. The interpretation offered of this graph must be taken with a grain of salt because the numbers per student are not offered. Remember that GPB will be underspending because of cut events. I do not think that this 3,000 cut will change things. They will have plenty of resources next year to perform student involvement
        + Arias: They did give us the number of students. Please be aware that the money we do not spend this year may not carry over into next year.
        + Nugent: Will Dai be abstaining?

Dai: No

* + - * + Arias: The bylaws recommend that those with a conflict of interest recuse themselves from a vote.
        + Weiss: Motion to vote

Seconded, passed

* + - * + Vote

Arias: Reminder that those who are in a position of leadership should absolutely abstain. Given that we are at the end of the year, I am not sure when Ethics and Oversight will become involved, but they will.

* + - * + Motion is 6-5-1. The bylaws are called into question.
        + Arias: The chair will look favorably on a 10 minute recess

Volpe: So motioned.

Seconded, passed.

* + - * + Arias: Again, please abstain. I cannot enforce that, because I do not know what positions you hold. This would normally lead to repercussions and impeachment from Ethics and Oversight, but please do not take advantage of the situation at hand to abuse your power. This is the definition of the conflict of interest.
        + Hamilton: I will switch my vote to an aye in the interest of decorum and time.

The motion passes.

* + - * Motion to finalize the budget
        + Seconded, passed. Kleier votes nay.
        + Arias: Is there any debate?
        + Bazail: Call to question.

Hamilton: Seconded.

The motion must be passed by roll call.

The motion passes.

* + Arias: Thank you, FinApp, for your devotion this year. You are free from FinApp. Well, sort of.

### Public Comment

* Ad1578: Good job, everybody!

### Conclusion

* Meeting adjourned at 6:15PM.