

TWENTY FOURTH CONGRESS OF GRADUATE STUDENTS



MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL SESSION
Senate Chambers Room, 316 Oglesby Union
February 29th, 2016
6:32 p.m.
Agenda



Call to Order: 6:32 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance: Ward

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT: Akinfaderin, Cavannaugh, Elwood, Garcia, Gupta, Hall, Luttrell, Miller, Peruche, Rosenthal, Sanogo, Scriven, Sharifi-Raini, Solomon, Sulentic, Uttermark, Ward, Williams

REPRESENTATIVES LEFT EARLY, EXCUSED: NONE

REPRESENTATIVES LEFT EARLY, UNEXCUSED: NONE

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT, EXCUSED: Asturizaga, Clark, Pfiefler, Wang

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT, UNEXCUSED: Ferraro, James, Lee

REPRESENTATIVE LATE, EXCUSED: NONE

REPRESENTATIVES LATE, UNEXCUSED: NONE

Reading and Approval of Minutes: Approved. Cavannaugh second.

Speaker Hall reordered the agenda to hear funding requests first. Motion approved.

Funding Requests:

- **Bill 21: Allocation to the College of Criminology and Criminal Justice Graduate Student Association**

The organization will be hosting an annual luncheon on March 31. The event will inform guests about the College of Criminology and graduate student opportunities. The organization would like to purchase food for the event. Representatives inquire the expected attendance, will there be any speakers at the event, if the organization asked their department for financial assistance and where will they order food from. **FIRST PRO:** Akinfaderin is in favor of the budget and would like to spread the word about the criminology department in hopes of increasing enrollment. **FIRST CON:** Gupta would like to have more information about how the funds will be used. Solomon agrees with Gupta and believes that the event is based on recruitment. Luttrell also agrees that and thinks that the organization should also seek funding from their department for a recruitment based event. Motion to call to question. Vote: 8-8-1. Speaker Hall votes to break the tie. **Bill 21 passes: 9-8-1, Food \$150.**

Special Introductions and Student Comments:

- **LSC-** Several members from the Law School Council expressed their opposition to the Annual Budget. The representatives provided handouts and documentation as evidence that LSC used the majority of the funds they were allocated. Representatives shared their sentiments and urged the Congress to send the Annual Budget back to the Budget committee for revision.

- MSC- Members of the Medical School also expressed their concerns about the Annual Budget. Members explained to the congress how helpful the allocation is to their council. They would like to have the annual budget amended to reflect the expenses used by MSC.

Messages from Student Government: NONE

Messages from the Office of Governmental Affairs: NONE

Report of the Budget Committee:

Deputy Speaker Uttermark, Chair of the Budget Committee, thoroughly explained the contents of the budget report and the justification for the allocation amounts. Deputy Speaker Uttermark also expressed his appreciation for the Budget committee and the parties that also assisted with the budget.

Consideration of the Annual Budget:

Representatives inquire how many graduate students are professional students, if the committee was aware of the FSU Childcare costs to students and a breakdown of the allocation to the Graduate School. Representatives also inquire the reason for the allocation discrepancy in regards to LSC's funding and a general breakdown of how the funds are allocated. **FIRST PRO:** Peruche explains that while in support of the budget, she understands the sentiments of LSC and MSC. Gupta is in favor of the allocation to the presentation and attendance grants accounts because they help a multitude of graduate students for professional conferences. Scriven is in favor of the budget and COGS increasing control of a restricted budget and hopes that the allocation does not deter the funding boards from returning to COGS for future requests. **FIRST CON:** Solomon applauds the budget committee but would like for them to go back and review the allocations and past sweeping amounts. Elwood believes there is room for improvement in the annual budget. Luttrell is not in favor of the proposed budget and would like for the committee to go back and make changes that everyone can agree upon. **SECOND PRO:** Akinfaderin explains the logic behind the budget proposal and is hesitant about making amendments to other allocations. Scriven is in favor of the allocation and would like for all parties to be mindful that the funds are for all graduate students. Akinfaderin states the importance of the grants and unallocated account to other schools and colleges outside of LSC. **SECOND CON:** Solomon points out the Law School population, and the inability to fund organizations if the budget passes and urges that the budget be sent back to the committee. Luttrell would like for the budget committee to review its proposal and provide accurate numbers to the assembly. Scriven thinks that the budget should be sent back to the committee so that the numbers can be reflected correctly but is unsure if LSC and MSC should receive a funding increase. Motion to call to question. Roll call vote. Vote results, Akinfaderin; Yes, Cavannaugh: No, Elwood: No, Garcia: No, Gupta: No, Luttrell: No, Miller: Present, Peruche: Yes, Rosenthal: Yes, Sanogo: No, Scriven: No, Sharifi-Raini: No, Solomon: No, Sulentic: No, Uttermark: Yes, Ward: No, Williams: No. **Budget Fails; 4-12-1. Sent back to the Budget Committee**

Round Table: Akinfaderin, Cavannaugh, Elwood, Garcia, Gupta, Hall, Luttrell, Miller, Peruche, Rosenthal, Sanogo, Scriven, Sharifi-Raini, Solomon, Sulentic, Ward, Williams

Adjournment: 9:36 p.m.

Next Meeting: March 21, 2016