

Minutes

GSO Special Business Meetings

April 13, 2016

Crouse-Hinds 010

5:30 pm

Special Meeting to Consider a Grant Policy Proposal, the Creation of a Childcare Committee, and a Proposal Related to Employee Health Insurance

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Sam Leitermann called the meeting to order at 5:35pm.
- II. Roll Call
 - a. The following Senators were present: David Lemon, Rajesh Kumar, Alexis Drickel, Andrew Garibaldi, John Gall, Margaret McLaughlin, Matthew Stewart, Kathleen Brousseau, Joshua Stangle, Patrick Biermann, Ryan Falkenstein-Smith, Nathan Peters, Souradeep Sinha, Peta Long, Jennifer Nair, Clara Schoonmaker, Rahul Goyal, Jonathan Erickson, Emily Baxter, Ashley O'Mara, Sheila Shahidzadeh, Jack Honeysett, Yingbian He, Diksha Shukla, Chaudhry Iftikhar, Priscilla Almendariz, Justin Freedman, and two ESF Senators from whom I failed to get their names.
 - b. The following officers were present: Can Aslan (President), Dimple Dhanani (Financial Secretary), Komal Dilshad (External Vice President), Samuel Leitermann (Internal Vice President), Jose Muller (Comptroller), and Patrick Neary (Recording Secretary)
- III. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved unanimously.
- IV. Resolution 16.04 is moved by the Grant Committee.
 - a. Points were raised about whether this might move more applications to the end of the year. The committee responded that this is unlikely, in fact students are recommended to apply early as the funding could potentially run out.
 - b. The motion carries.
- V. A motion to create a standing Childcare Committee is moved and carries.
- VI. Resolution 16.05 is moved by Can Aslan.
 - a. Points were raised about the nature of a referendum as well as potential PR moves by the university. Several notes are to be left for next year's Board.
 - b. The motion carries.
- VII. The meeting adjourned at 5:50pm.

Special Meeting to Consider the Annual Budget

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Sam Leitermann, chair, called the meeting to order at 5:50pm.
 - b. The chair summarizes the meeting's structure, purpose.
- II. The Finance Committee moves resolution 16.06, the Annual Budget.

- III. It is moved to first consider the Executive pay section.
 - a. Jose summarizes the rationale behind the executive pay and increases.
 - b. A comment is made that the Senate needs past year's numbers and should be given the percentage changes as well as the resolution itself. Jose notes this for next year's Board.
 - c. The motion to close debate on Executive pay carries.
- IV. The chair moved to service providers next, without objection.
 - a. A Senator notes that last year, the Senate considered defunding the childcare facilities. The Finance Committee notes that they felt they used funds effectively this year.
 - b. A point is raised on Outdoor Education, as they ask for "what you think is appropriate", and Finance Committee thought their expenses were effective and reasonable.
- V. The operating expenses section was reviewed without comment.
- VI. The President's benefits section was reviewed with comment on whether it was sufficient amount. The current and past Presidents stated that it was sufficient.
- VII. The other operating section was reviewed without comment.
- VIII. The Travel Grant section and stipulation was reviewed without comment.
- IX. The GSO programming section was reviewed.
 - a. Senators ask about the size of picnic budget, and the Board explained that most of it goes toward food and alcohol, and that the per-student expense is quite modest.
 - b. A point is raised about Empire Park Passes and the money spend on it and made from it, and terminology and amounts were clarified to satisfaction.
- X. Sam reviews our new method of assigning funding to student organizations. The Finance Committee recommends a minimum amount each student organization registered with the GSO will receive. They further recommend a per-student funding number that representative organizations will receive if more than the minimum, as well as a cap on this per-student payment. The recommended values are: \$58.45 per student with a \$1000 minimum allocation and a cap of \$12,000.
 - a. Inquiry raised about how organizations are named as representative. Sam notes that these orgs have clearly established through vote that they represent who they claim to.
 - b. Are there limits on the amount or type of Special Programming funding? No, there are not. Do applications have to cover single events or a series or other non-event funding situations? Jose says that all these can be applied for via Special Programming.
 - c. Dimple states that the minimum was designed to ensure orgs have some money, and that now no one has to worry about prior years' officers messing up budget submissions.
 - i. Motion to increase the minimum amount to \$2,000. This motion makes the total budget go to \$485,910.
 - ii. Biermann speaks about the Finance Committee's rationale for the \$1,000 minimum, especially in ensuring calm review of Special Programming requests in meetings throughout the year.
 - iii. There is a note made by about institutional memory (or lack thereof) and that the \$1,000 avoids new students getting screwed by inaction by previous years.

- iv. Several students note that their organizations will not have nearly enough money to operate on \$1,000.
 - v. The motion to raise the minimum fails 11-18.
 - d. A point is raised that the Special Programming process is potentially too slow for some organizations' needs, as the Senate only meets once a month. The Board notes it can approve emergency requests. Also, Special Programming is limited to one request per semester.
 - e. Concerns are raised that the current system increases budget uncertainty for orgs, but it is countered that the system simply moves the uncertainty from annual budgeting and into the Special Programming timeline.
 - f. Special Programming could run out before the end of spring semester and might affect events negatively, but Jose notes that the Finance Committee designed the current Special Programming budget around ensuring it is not exhausted.
 - g. A point is raised that several of these orgs do deserve more funding, as they represent large pools of people.
 - h. Motion to finalize the \$1,000 minimum amount carries 26-3.
 - i. ECS speaks up that their large size means that \$12,000 is not sufficient. Motion to raise max cap from \$12,000 to \$18,000.
 - i. Motion made to recalculate the per-student rate as per the spreadsheet's macro button.
 - ii. Debate made as to how this would negatively affect other organizations in the list, and that keeping the per-student number in place preserves others' budgets.
 - iii. Motion on recalculations fails. Per-student amount is left at the old level (\$58.45).
 - iv. ECS insists further that it needs \$18,000 to operate annually, due to the large number of students they represent.
 - v. Other Senators note that they can get Special Programming like others to make up moneys above the \$12,000.
 - vi. Jose notes that \$50,000 has to remain in the rollover account, although also notes that we never spend all the money allocated toward student organizations.
 - vii. The chair permits the original mover to withdrawn this motion.
 - j. Motion for the max cap to become \$15,000 and change the student number per the spreadsheet's macro, which is \$47.76.
 - i. Senators note that Special Programming applications may increase due to decreased allocations toward all orgs that are not ECS and iSGO.
 - ii. ECS emphasizes that the real per-student allocations go down for ECS due to the cap, they are simply trying to balance things out for fairness.
 - iii. Is \$40,000 in Special Programming enough to cover all the new requests? Jose says his analysis shows: yes.
 - iv. Motion fails 11-18.

- k. Motion to add a line to the budget for \$2,000 toward the clinical simulations that were approved earlier this semester and reducing the Special Programming line by the same amount.
 - i. Concern raised that this sets a bad precedent for carrying over money between fiscal years.
 - ii. It is noted that this money could come from Special Programming next year and does not need to be allocated now.
 - iii. Motion carries 16-13.
- l. Motion to close debate on this section passes unanimously.
- XI. Special Programming is reviewed, although it has been discussed previously in the student org section.
- XII. Resolution 16.06, the Annual Budget, carries 26-3.
- XIII. The meeting is adjourned at 7:41pm.

Special Meeting for Elections

- I. Sam calls the meeting to order at 7:43pm.
- II. President
 - a. Rajesh Kumar – 17 – ELECTED
 - b. Rahul Goyal – 6
- III. Internal Vice President
 - a. Can Aslan – unanimous – ELECTED
- IV. External Vice President
 - a. Dimple Dhanani – 5
 - b. Peta Long – 16 – ELECTED
- V. Comptroller
 - a. David Lemon – 19 – ELECTED
 - b. Rahul Goyal – 3
- VI. University Senators (5)
 - a. Chaudhry Azhar Iftikhar – ELECTED
 - b. Jingyuan Wang – ELECTED
 - c. Justin Freedman
 - d. Diksha Shukla – ELECTED
 - e. Rahul Goyal – ELECTED
 - f. Dimple Dhanani – ELECTED
- VII. At-Large Senators (3)
 - a. Ryan Falkenstein-Smith – ELECTED
 - b. Yingbian He – ELECTED
- VIII. The meeting is adjourned at 8:57pm.