



72nd Student Senate
Finance Committee

Date: February 4, 2020

Call to Order: 7:01

	Present	Tardy	Absent
Adamyk			X
Cohen	X		
Culver			X
England	X		
Fernsel	X		
Jungers	N/A		
Pendleton	X		
Porter	X		
Rudolph		X	
Ryan	X		

Guests: Pro-Tempore Harmon, GiGi Berrouett, Vice-Chair Lavender, Senators Sojos & Haslett, Lauren Callahan, Shelby Shoup, Danica Forestal

Approval of the Minutes: England moves to approve, Pendleton seconds, minutes from 1/28/20 are **Approved**

Announcements:

- Chair Cohen:
- Vice-Chair Porter:
- Members: England: Hello, I'm now one of your friends
- Guests: Gnanam: I fell down a hill Monday and went to urgent care, thank you to everyone who bore with me while I get better

Committee Business:

- None

Old Business:

- None

New Business:

- England moves to unlock calendar, Pendleton seconds, calendar is **Unlocked**, move to **Resolution 16**
- England moves to amend Consent Resolution 13 to read Consent Resolution 15, Ryan seconds, Amendment is **Adopted**
- Consent Resolution 15 (Sponsored by Gnanam)
 - Total of Resolution: \$ 3722
 - Questions:
 - Fernsel: Why was SJP funded more in food than requested?

- A: We round numbers up to the next dollar
 - Pendleton: What is the timeframe for the NSBE event?
 - It is all specified in the information packet, it's money for several meals for 100 attendees
 - Harmon: Is that 100 people per day or overall
 - A: Its one event, you're not supposed to leave the event
 - Harmon: How did you pick the vendors
 - A: We funded based on the SGA-approved vendors for each meal category
 - Rudolph: How was the number for NSBE reached?
 - A: Tyler Roy calculated the number, it was the cost of Moe's, Chick-Fil-A, and 4Rivers
 - Rudolph: What are the sponsors providing?
 - A: They are providing the technology used, and the prizes
- Roundtable
 - Gnanam: NSBE has reached out to other organizations to fund this event, it's not just PAC
 - England: Move to remand Take Back the Tap back to PAC, Rudolph seconds, no objections, TBtT is **Remanded**
- Motion to Approve & Second: Ryan moves to call the question, England seconds
- Vote on NSBE line-item:
 - Yes: England, Fernsel, Pendleton, Porter, Rudolph, Ryan
 - No:
 - Abstain:
- NSBE line-item does **Pass**
- England moves to approve resolution, Pendleton seconds, no objections
- Resolution is **Approved**
- Senator England moves to add Senator Sojos as a sponsor to Consent Resolution 12, Pendleton seconds, Sojos is **Added**
- Consent Resolution 12 (Sponsored by Murcia & Sojos)
 - Total of Resolution: \$ 2200
 - Questions:
 - Cohen: When you said you can't fund AirBNB's, that's in statutes, right?
 - A: Yes
 - Ryan: The minutes said College of Business is funding students?
 - A: The college funding is separate from SGA funding, the trip is open to all students
 - England: Point of Clarification, It came to my attention earlier that only College of Business students might be able to go, I contacted the chair and members of the RSO, I was told that if a College of Business student goes on the trip, the college will cover the registration fees, which non-college students will have to cover the fees themselves. This money is covering flights, which any student can use
 - Roundtable
 - England: We have to make a morality decision, if non-College of Business students go they will have to pay an additional 325 dollars for this trip, only 10 students are going on the trip, this money will not send more people
 - Sojos: Point of Clarification, Senator England said we're only giving them money for flights, and that money is open to all students
 - Berrouett: If your concern is the College of Business funding, consider that we always encourage students to approach their colleges for funding, and it is reasonable that the College of Business only wants to fund their students
 - Sojos: Point of Clarification, RTAC has not done anything wrong by approving this funding for this RSO's trip

- England: Now that we know the facts and that this funding is OK, what are everyone's opinion on this?
- Ryan: Are we funding the travel for ten students, is that locked in?
 - A: Yes, that number is pretty much set
- Ryan: What is the process for selecting students for this trip?
 - A: Essentially a first-come, first-serve scenario, with no concern to membership of the College of Business
- Rudolph: I'm in favor of this, if you're not at the top you can't work at the top and we, at a state school, are already at a disadvantage, we should support these students by providing them the opportunity to travel to this prestigious event
- England: This is an incredible opportunity; it's sharing the spotlight with students from schools like Harvard and Yale
- Callahan: Is the College of Business funding a lot of this, or is primary funding coming from this bill?
 - A: This only covers flights
- Haslett: This does not seem free and open to all students, and it doesn't seem like it's really open to students from outside the College of Business
- Gnanam: Point of Clarification, the concept of Free and Open is a lot different in RTAC than PAC, so long as everyone who applies is given the opportunity to use the SGA funding, it is considered Free and Open to the public
- Sojos: Point of Clarification, no SGA money is going to registration fees
- England: The treasurer of the RSO said that even College of Business will have to cover other expenses
- Motion to Approve & Second: Porter moves to call question, Rudolph seconds
- Vote on line-item:
 - Yes: England, Fensel, Pendleton, Porter, Rudolph, Ryan
 - No:
 - Abstain
- Line-item does **Pass**
- England moves to accept resolution, Rudolph seconds, no objections
- Resolution does **Pass**
- Bill 27 (Sponsored by Adamyk & Ready)
 - Rudolph moves to table Bill 27 due to sponsor no-show, Ryan seconds
 - Bill is **Tabled**
- Bill 28 (Sponsored by Haslett)
 - Opening: This bill is simple, it just lowers the threshold for needing a 2/3 vote on PAC and RTAC line-items from \$2000 to \$1000, the original number is arbitrary and I believe it is too high to be the threshold, this bill does not take away the power of Senate to fund RSOs a higher amount
 - Questions:
 - Cohen: How do you know the \$2000 threshold was arbitrarily decided on?
 - A: I don't know for sure, but I can't find where there was a reason for choosing it
 - England: Have you spoken to anyone about this change?
 - A: No
 - Ryan: What's the precedence for needing a 2/3 vote on anything else in Senate?
 - A: So far as I know, there's no reasoning for requiring a 2/3 vote on anything else in Senate, I thought it was easier to change this number for finance code instead of everything at once
 - Roundtable:
 - England: I was talking to Dr. Acosta the other day about the \$2000 threshold, she said the \$2000 mark used to be rarely reached, RSOs were never meant to receive that much money at once, I don't know if I want to see this number go down, stay the same,

or go up, this number was put in not to provide debate, but limit the number of RSOs getting funded this amount, I'm worried that no one was consulted about this bill, work should be done in committee

- Cohen: Be aware that this change could have far-reaching impacts on Senate
- Ryan: While I agree that it's good to talk about funding, I think that the overall impact of this bill would be to limit funding to RSOs, and I've heard that the funding boards have not run out of money in the past
- Harmon: I've heard that the threshold for needing a 2/3 vote was lowered 4 or 5 years ago from \$5000 to \$2000
- England: My worry is that lowering this number won't restrict RSOs from requesting lots of money, the funding boards, Finance, and Senate need to make harder decisions, this would just force Senate to conduct more votes, I respect Haslett's efforts to be more fiscally responsible
- Cohen: It's important to remember that Finance members shouldn't inject their opinion into PAC and RTAC meetings, it should be up to the funding boards
- Fernsel: Would it be possible to amend this to possibly read \$1500 dollar threshold and needing a 4/5 vote?
- Haslett: I would be friendly to having this amended to read that, I thought it would be easier to make this change by first lowering the threshold
- Ryan: Moving to \$1500 is even more arbitrary, if we do this change we should find a number that makes logical sense
- Rudolph: If we change this number, it will just trivialize things and will just force more votes, I have an issue that no one was consulted when this bill was written and it just sets us up for failure, if we change this number we should have more reasoning behind it
- Pendleton: Regardless of how we vote, I can't vote for this without consulting the funding board chairs
- England: Do you want to change the dollar amount of vote threshold, or both?
- Haslett: I want to do both
- Rudolph: What would be the difference between tabling this bill and voting no?
- Cohen: If we vote no, the bill fails, and it would have to be resubmitted
- Fernsel: Can we amend this bill before we table it?
- Ryan: We don't have anyone else's input on this bill
- England: If we amend this before tabling it, it might appear that Finance wants these changes when we haven't approved it
- Porter moves to table Bill 28, Ryan seconds
- Bill is **Tabled**
- Bill 29 (Sponsored by Durham & Lavender)
 - Opening: Senator Lavender, Demetrius Wynn and I have been working on this for a while, we realized this university is technically ADA compliant but it doesn't meet a higher standard, this bureau would help bring attention to accessibility issues, we are supported by the SDRC in this project, last semester we allocated \$2,500 in the budget for accessibility issues
 - Questions:
 - England: Will this be seen by IA?
 - A: Yes, it will be heard next week
 - Pendleton: How many members are on the board?
 - A: There will be 6, the bill needs to be amended
 - Cohen: What are some of the other organizations you have talked to?
 - A: Disability QTs, UOC, SDRC, Office of Accessibility
 - Cohen: What will the \$2,500 go to?
 - A: The funds will go to the highest-priority areas on campus to improve accessibility issues, the money can be transferred to the appropriate entity to fix issues

- Roundtable:
 - England: Moves to amend bill Section 910.3, Section B, Subsection 2 to change 8 to 6, Fernsel seconds, sponsor finds friendly, Amendment is **Adopted**
 - England: Point of Information: President Steinberg is wanting to do away with Bureaus, why are we introducing a new one?
 - A: This sets up the organization, it would simply be a change of title if this change does go through, we don't want to cause confusion by calling it an executive project
- Porter moves to call the question, Pendleton seconds
- Closing: This bill has been a long time coming and stems from earlier resolutions, we have been working on this for months, please do not hesitate to reach out with questions, the creation of a new bureau is not a common occurrence
- Final vote:
 - Yes: England, Fernsel, Pendleton, Ryan
 - No:
 - Abstention: Porter
- Bill does **Pass**
- Resolution 16 (Sponsored by Lavender)
 - Opening: This resolution came as a request from Dr. Acosta and Exec Branch, the ASLC didn't get the request in time and need this resolution to make a retroactive payment
 - Questions:
 - Pendleton: Has this happened in the past with the Exec Branch?
 - A: Not with the Exec Branch, but we've done retroactive payments before
 - Cohen: Is there a contact person at the ASLC?
 - A: Amy Runk
 - Ryan: What is the budget of the ASLC per semester?
 - A: I don't know, but this problem arose with the Exec Branch, not ASLC
 - First Round of Pro:
 - Ryan: The ASLC is a great place and creates a community for students, if we don't approve this resolution it only hurts the ASLC
 - First Round of Con:
 - Porter moves to call the question, Pendleton seconds
 - Closing: Thank you for hearing this, this is only a one-time event and won't happen again
 - Final vote:
 - Yes: England, Fernsel, Pendleton, Porter, Ryan
 - No:
 - Abstention:
 - Resolution does **Pass**

Confirmations and Nominees:

- None

Unfinished Business:

- None

Final Announcements:

- Cohen: Thank you, I thought the committee ran well tonight, sorry for me being distracted with people trying to find Bureau Review, remember to be attentive in committee and take care of yourself, I'm going to look into finding a bigger room in Strozier for next week
- Harmon: You guys did a great job tonight, I'm glad everyone spoke and participated

- England: People have asked me why I moved to Finance, 98 students couldn't go on trips due to Senate errors, I want to make sure that doesn't happen again, I want to make sure everyone is doing their job properly, Finance is getting a lot of flak that it doesn't deserve

Date & Time of Next Meeting: 2/11/2020 at 7PM, location TBD

Adjourned: 8:49PM