



72<sup>nd</sup> Student Senate  
Finance Committee

Date: February 11, 2020

Call to Order: 7:14PM

	Present	Tardy	Absent
Adamyk	X		
Cohen	X		
Culver			X
England	X		
Fernsel	X		
Pendleton			X
Porter	X		
Rudolph	X		
Ryan		X	

Guests: Senators Diaz & Chabot, Chair Leckie, Pro-Temp Harmon, Carolina from IEEE, Lavon and Kira from Big Event, Makaela and Abby from Intervarsity Christian Fellowship

Approval of the Minutes: England moves to approve, Rudolph seconds, minutes from 2/04/20 are **Approved**

Announcements:

- Chair Cohen:
- Vice-Chair Porter:
- Members:
- Guests:
  - Sojos on behalf of Murcia: "Good evening finance. The sponsor of Bill 28 has not contacted me in regards to this bill. Considering it is a bill that would heavily impact my committee, I feel very disrespected in the fact that no effort was made to reach out to me. Aside from that, Bill 28 would be practically impossible to comply with. RTAC is a funding board for travel. With that being said, travel is very expensive, and expecting RSOs to be able to help subsidize the cost for students with only \$1000 is near impossible. Not only would we be taking away the opportunity for students to travel, but we would also be taking away the ability for FSU to put their name out there and bring back concepts students have learned from traveling. With this, I hope you all vote against this bill as it could really hurt the student body and hurt the mission of RTAC itself. Thank you"
  - Gnanam: I also was not contacted about bill 28.
  - Leckie: Come to Judiciary next week, we have a lot of items to discuss

Committee Business:

- None

Old Business:

- England moves to unlock calendar, Adamyk seconds, Calendar is **Unlocked**, move to **Consent Resolution 17**
- Bill 27 (Sponsored by Adamyk & Ready)
  - Opening: Bill 27 addresses a need that arose to Senator Ready and I a few weeks ago when we were amending a resolution on the floor with no debate, this falls in line with a change in Senate Rules last spring
  - Questions:
    - Cohen: Is there still a Senate Program Assistant?
      - A: It's in the process of being removed from statutes
    - Porter moves to waive rules and enter Roundtable, England seconds, enter **Roundtable**
    - Roundtable:
      - England: Why did you write in moving to pro-con debate, not a different kind of debate
        - A: I wanted to make sure that both sides had equal time to discuss the issues
      - England: I think we should allow the committee to enter a different form of debate
      - England moves to amend Section 807.6i to strike Pro/Con, and amend after "debate" to include "subject to committee's rules of procedure," Rudolph seconds, sponsor finds friendly, Amendment is **Adopted**
      - Leckie: Why didn't you change the rules of procedure to accomplish this?
        - A: The rules were already changed, this just codifies the change in statutes
      - England: Rules of procedure are superseded by statutes
      - Adamyk: This isn't a new addition in statutes, this amends previous changes
    - England moves to call the question, Ryan seconds
    - Closing: Yields
    - Final Vote:
      - Yes: Adamyk, England, Fernsel, Rudolph, Ryan
      - No:
      - Abstain: Porter
    - Bill does **Pass**
- Bill 28 (Sponsored by Haslett)
  - Opening: I was here last week with this bill and it was tabled, some people have told me they think this bill would prevent organizations from getting funds and that isn't what it does, this bill introduces checks and balances, I didn't consult the funding board chairs because that would defeat the point
  - Questions:
    - Cohen: Did you talk to Dr. Acosta
      - A: No
  - England moves to call the question, Ryan seconds, Rudolph objects, enter **Roundtable**
  - Roundtable
    - Murcia: This would not just affect the funding boards negatively but the RSOs as well, they would have trouble travelling
    - Gnanam: Senate is about collaborative efforts, we should have been consulted, A&S funds are for the benefit of the student body, this would make our jobs harder and would be to the detriment to the student body
    - Ryan: If something is under the \$2000 limit, how can something be debated
      - A: Anything on a consent resolution can be objected to and debated
    - Leckie: This reminds me of a bill from last Senate, it is logical to expect the funding board chairs to disapprove of this
    - Rudolph: Part of the debate last week were that the numbers were deemed arbitrary and we discussed that we wanted the sponsor to reach out to others and get more reasoning

for your numbers, there doesn't seem like there has been a whole lot of work done on this

- England: My thoughts can be summed up by the word Sentimentality, regardless of whether how the funding board chairs felt on this, I believe that they would want to give more than just a one word answer, but this could have been run by Jack or Dr. Acosta, I was hoping that could happen, with no discussion I can't support this
- Kapil: From an RSO's perspective, we already go through a detailed process for putting together a request, this would make it harder to request money from SGA, this bill will lead to more tabling and more RSOs getting pushed back
- Ryan: When I first read this, I thought it would make it harder for RSOs, but I think it has merits, we should table again
- Gnanam: I'm not opposed to more votes, but forcing more organizations to go before senate when PAC and RTAC have the time to sit down and discuss the funding requests
- Sojos: Considering the funding boards aren't made up of senators, the boards allow non-senators and this bill would take power away from the members and gives it to Senate
- Murcia: This would take away the voice from the non-Senate members
- Porter: This bill misses the point of there being a threshold in the first place, RSOs should not cross the threshold under normal circumstances, RTAC routinely crosses \$1000 per line item because travel is expensive
- England: I have spoken to Dr. Acosta about the \$2000 limit, RSOs should not hit the threshold and RSOs used to never hit it in the past, although I don't believe the threshold should be raised, I'm not sure it should be lowered
- Sojos: There's a rule in statutes that the boards don't necessarily have to budget in committee because there is a wide variety of requests heard
- Porter moves to call question, Ryan seconds, Rudolph objects
- Rudolph's objection
  - Opening: This has come up before in Senate, I think that the sponsor should have more time to talk with higher-ups about the bill
  - Questions:
    - Ryan: Is your reason for wanting to table about the dollar amount or the broader issue?
      - A: It's about the dollar amount, there are people who have a lot more experience who could provide guidance
  - Pro:
    -
  - Con:
    - England: I can understand not reaching out to the funding board chairs but there's been no effort to reach out to Dr. Acosta, I yield in con
    - Murcia: Echo the sentiments of senator England, it was tabled last week to reach out to others and that hasn't happened
    - Ryan: Point of Information, why was Dr. Acosta not reached out to?
      - A: In discussion last week over the bill we established that there wasn't a reason the \$2000 limit was reached, I didn't think that Dr. Acosta could provide more guidance
  - Ryan moves to call question, England seconds
  - Closing: Thank you for hearing this, if the committee wants to vote it is what it is.
  - Vote on objection:
    - Yes:
    - No: England, Porter, Rudolph, Ryan
    - Abstain: Fernsel
  - Objection does **Fail**

- Closing: What this bill does is changing what needs to be voted on, if something reaches senate at \$2000 or below all it needs is a vote and a second, I believe that lowering this number gives everyone the ability to debate, this will not decrease the number of requests heard, the boards routinely give more than \$2000, if the you don't want the Senate to vote on these things you should wonder why
- Final Vote:
  - Yes:
  - No: England, Porter, Rudolph
  - Abstain: Fernsel, Ryan
- Because of Chapter 400.5 of student body statutes, a revote is required due to excessive abstentions
- Final Vote #2
  - Yes:
  - No: England, Porter, Rudolph, Ryan
  - Abstain: Fernsel
- Bill does **Fail**

New Business:

- Consent Resolution 17 (Sponsored by Gnanam)
  - Total of Resolution: \$4992
  - Questions:
    - Rudolph: For Take Back the Tap, what was the expense for?
    - A: An inflatable for World Water Day
  - Motion to Approve & Second: England moves to call the question, Rudolph seconds
  - Vote on Big Event line-item:
    - Yes: Adamyk, England, Fernsel, Porter, Rudolph
    - No:
    - Abstain:
  - Line-item does pass
  - Final Vote:
    - Yea: England, Fernsel, Porter, Rudolph
    - No:
    - Abstain: Adamyk
  - Resolution
  
- Consent Resolution 14 (Sponsored by Murcia & Sojos)
  - Total of Resolution: \$4456
  - Questions:
    - England: Did RTAC verify that all RSOs are open to all students?
      - A: Yes
    - Ryan: What is the rule for free and open to all students?
      - A: We check that any student can join the RSO
  - England moves to waive rules and enter Roundtable, Rudolph seconds, enter **Roundtable**
  - Roundtable:
    - England: It says that Alpha Epsilon Delta charges mandatory dues, but then the info packet says the medical mission trip is funded separately from the RSO, so what is the discrepancy?
      - A: It is separate, any student, even not in the RSO, can apply to go on the trip
  - England moves to call question, Rudolph seconds
  - Final Vote:
    - Yea: England, Fernsel, Porter, Rudolph, Ryan
    - No:

- Abstain:
- Resolution does **Pass**

#### Confirmations and Nominees:

- Sneha Kapil (RTAC)
  - Opening: I currently serve as vice-chair of RTAC and I really enjoy seeing all the RSOs on campus and being able to help people, RTAC fulfills a very important role and I want to continue to serve in this role
  - Questions:
    - England: You mentioned you already are on RTAC, why are you reapplying?
      - A: My term expired
    - England: What have you learned on RTAC?
      - A: How to stretch a limited budget and be fair to all RSOs
  - Roundtable:
    -
  - England moves to forward the candidate, Adamyk seconds
  - Final Vote:
    - Yes: Adamyk, England, Fernsel, Porter, Rudolph, Ryan
    - No:
    - Abstain:
  - Candidate does **Pass**

#### Unfinished Business:

- None

#### Final Announcements:

- Cohen: We started committee 15 minutes late today, that is not ok, there are 8 members of the committee so we need 5 to start, its embarrassing when the consent resolution sponsors are here earlier than the committee members, I will talk to members about potentially being reassigned
- Ryan: I apologize for being late, I scheduled a project for today and I will make sure I'm not late again
- England: One thing I've noticed today is that we waive the rules a lot, I'm wondering if the committee would be ok with revisiting the rules and potentially amending them before the next election
- Fernsel: I found out next week I will not be here on the 26<sup>th</sup>, just to make everyone aware
- Murcia: Come out to RTAC, I want to extend the invitation to you, we meet at 6PM in the innovation hub room 113

Date, Location, and Time of Next Meeting: Monday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, Strozier room TBD

Adjourned: 8:51PM