



# Cornell University Student Assembly

## Cornell University Student Assembly

Minutes of the Thursday, March 14, 2019 Meeting  
4:47pm-6:40pm in Memorial Room, Willard Straight Hall

### I. Call to Order & Roll Call

- a. V. Devatha called the meeting to order at 6:40 pm.
- b. Roll Call:
  - i. *Present:* J. Anderson [0], D. Barbaria [0], U. Chukwukere [1], V. Devatha [0], O. Din [2.5], J. Dominguez [0], O. Egharevba [2], S. Harshvardhan [2], C. Huang [0], A. Jain [0], K. Kebbeh [1], S. Lim [0.5], N. Matolka [0], U. Mustafa [2], G. Park [1.5], I. Pavlov [0.25], E. Shapiro [0], M. Shovik [2.25], J. Sim [0], M. Stefanko [1], F. Uribe-Rheinbolt [0], K. Wondimu [0], V. Xu [0.75]
  - ii. *Absent:* M. Adeghe [0], C. Benedict [0], S. Iruvanti [1], M. Smith [0], B. Weintraub [1]

### II. Presentation from President Pollack and Vice President Lombardi

- a. Martha Pollack thanked everyone for being at the meeting, and thanked everyone who participated in Giving Day. She added that she wanted to give some updates.
  - i. M. Pollack said regarding the college admissions scandal that it is appalling and completely at odds with what they want to do at Cornell, and that one of their goals is to expand socioeconomic diversity at Cornell and to increase the sense of inclusion that they have at Cornell. She added that they have been working very hard on that, and have increased their financial aid budget. She also said that there has been a real focus on fundraising, and that they're introducing a new program to that effect. She added that that continues to be an extremely high priority for her, and that they are also attempting to hire Cornell's first enrollment manager to help with outreach and attention across all levels of socioeconomic diversity.
  - ii. M. Pollack thanked the SA for the feedback they provided to Mary Opperman and Ryan Lombardi regarding the Core Values Statement, and said that they are seeking feedback from all assemblies. She added that once they have feedback from the assemblies, they will produce a draft that reflects all the given input, as well as sessions to refine the draft. She also said that they want something that applies to all members of their community.
  - iii. M. Pollack said that the single issue that comes up the most is that of mental health, and that this is not unique to Cornell. She added that there is a nationwide sharp increase in use of mental health services, and that by the age of 24, 75% of young people will have relied on mental health services. She also said that they are taking a much broader and more holistic approach

to this, and that they will do a formal review that will launch this spring internally and an external review in the fall. She added that it will be very broad in scope and will touch on things such as how to encourage good sleep habits, since sleep is important for mental health and avoiding depression, as well as for creating new connections. She also said that it is a very high priority for them to hire a new director of CAPS.

- iv. M. Pollack said that there is a lot going on following the results of the Presidential Task Force, and that they want to hold the entire community accountable with things that faculty should do, that students should do, and so on. She added that she encourages students to look at the webpage, and detailed some of the changes that had been made. She also said that one of the biggest things they did was the addition of the Intergroup Dialogue Project (henceforth IDP) for freshmen in the fall, and that they cannot measure the impact of this program, but that they know it has led to an enormous increase in the interest of continuing the program in the future. She added that students and faculty have requested teaching and resources on how to teach more effectively in multicultural classrooms.
  - v. M. Pollack said that they have now acquired diversity and inclusion statements for incoming faculty.
  - vi. M. Pollack said that they have introduced the LGBTQ+ program house for the coming fall, and that it is already full.
  - vii. M. Pollack said that one of the most important recommendations made to her was that of modifications to the Campus Code of Conduct to strengthen the anti-harassment requirements and to make it more readable and less legalistic in the future.
  - viii. M. Pollack said that she wanted to talk about OneCornell, and that she is talking about ways of strengthening their collaborations across the Ithaca campus, as well as between the Cornell campuses so that they can take advantage of their urban-rural footprint. She added that she is moving forward with the Presidential View recommendations made earlier with regard to the one-year, five-year, and ten-year programs.
  - ix. M. Pollack said that they have a new multi-college center for immunology, as well as a new institute of politics and global affairs, which will make it easier for students to build connections with policy leaders.
- b. G. Park said that, regarding the college admissions scandal, it is disheartening as a low-income student to see that this has happened throughout the United States, and asked about the ways Cornell can further prevent that happening, particularly in the athletics department.
  - c. M. Pollack said that there is no evidence at this point that there was any wrongdoing at Cornell, and that there will be swift action if it does happen. She added that they are taking a strong look at what is happening, and that it never occurred to her to check with coaches, as an example. She also said that she thinks the questions about a fair admissions process are interesting and difficult. She added that she was at the Faculty Senate yesterday wherein she said that they don't know what could be done about people who are paying for SAT training tests, but that they could possibly have students sign something in regard to their essays that says that the work is entirely their own, but that students had a negative perspective of this despite faculty approval. She also said that the students she spoke to about it said that the line is

hard to draw regarding help with essays, and asked any student with ideas to reach out to her.

- d. G. Park said that admissions could possibly verify essay submissions with the student's English teacher.
- e. M. Pollack said that that was an interesting idea, but that since they get 51,000 applications per year it is not feasible, but is a good starting point.
- f. J. Anderson asked what Cornell's current standing is regarding the idea of eliminating SAT or ACT tests as requirements for admissions. He also asked what level of faculty involvement and academic questioning there will be regarding mental health review.
- g. M. Pollack said that she is going to punt on the first question because they are waiting to bring in an enrollment manager to rethink everything regarding admissions. She added that she used to say and firmly believe that the more information there was, the better, as long as the information is contextualized, but that she is currently in the mode where she is rethinking everything.
- h. R. Lombardi said that regarding mental health, the first part will be an internal group to analyze campus cultural issues, and that they have just asked folks to co-chair that, and that one of the co-chairs was an academic dean, such that when reviewers come to campus, they can give some thoughts on these approaches.
- i. M. Shovik said that regarding M. Pollack's response to Cornell Students for Justice in Palestine (henceforth SJP), M. Pollack said that the endowment is not political. She asked, if their investments were invested on one side of the conflict, if there wouldn't be interest in keeping it neutral.
- j. M. Pollack said that Cornell has an endowment, and that the board feels strongly that their role is to impact the world through their research but not as a political entity, with which she agrees. She added that they don't make political decisions with the endowment, and that the endowment is to advance their goal. She also said that most of the endowment is invested by other investors who are moving things in and out all the time, and that they have set a very high standard for divestment.
- k. M. Stefanko asked if there has been any discussion of eliminating considerations like legacy and donations.
- l. M. Pollack said that legacy is a very nuanced issue, and that she encourages everyone to get a hold of the transcripts from the Harvard case. She added that, regarding legacy admissions, she thinks that if someone truly believed that if they were taking away from Cornell's diversity, she would have a real problem because one of her goals is to increase diversity of all kinds. She asked if they are giving a tip up to legacy admissions, is it necessarily the case that they are taking away from others. She also said that when she is on the road and speaks to young alumni of color, she hears disappointment from them that they would possibly stop considering legacy now that Cornell finally has a diverse student body, and so legacy isn't always helping the wealthy majority. She added that the answer is not obvious and everyone is right to ask about it, but that it is a more nuanced issue that they need to think about.
- m. V. Xu said that she is glad to hear that diversity and inclusion is one of M. Pollack's priorities, and asked if the structures being put in place, such as the new LGBTQ+ program house, would separate people from the rest of the community.
- n. M. Pollack said that she said last night that one of the most important things a person can do at Cornell is to take advantage of the diversity here, and that she doesn't understand what it's like to be an African-American or someone with a

mobile disability, but that she does know what it's like to be a woman in tech when there were none, and that she knows that there is merit to a space where a person can be around other people like them. She added that there is something valuable about that space and that's what this housing provides, and that if a person goes there and never interacts with anyone else, that would be a waste.

- o. R. Lombardi said that they have a proud history of providing different types of housing and that stems from the fact that everyone comes to Cornell with different identities and different levels of development of those identities. He added that giving them these options is very important, even if not everyone with those identities is taking up those opportunities, and that it's an opportunity for a portion of the population who needs to find that space on campus.
- p. A. Jain asked if they have any ideas regarding international students, the travel ban, and the decreasing numbers of international students on all campuses.
- q. M. Pollack said that she will have to give an abbreviated answer, and that these similar issues to racial or gender issues. She added that regarding the numbers, they can advocate and work with legislators, and that they are constantly sharing ideas and best practices and having people work with legislators to ensure that these crazy regulations don't get passed.

### **III. Middle States Accreditation**

- a. The representatives of Middle States Accreditation made their presentation, and asked for questions from Assembly members.
- b. There were no questions.

### **IV. Open Microphone**

- a. No speakers at the open microphone.

### **V. Business of the Day I**

- a. Resolution 28: Amendment to the Spring 2019 Election Rules
  - i. V. Devatha said that he would entertain a motion to table this resolution until next week.
  - ii. Motion to table – **tabled**.
  - iii. V. Devatha said that, since neither representative of Resolution 30 is present at this time, they will move into Resolution 33.
  - iv. N. Matolka began setting up for the presentation of Resolution 33.
  - v. V. Devatha said that they will move into Resolution 32 while Resolution 33 is set up.
- b. Resolution 32: Reorganizing the Student Assembly Budget by Shifting Funds and Supporting the Summer Experience Grant
  - i. I. Pavlov said that this resolution is about shifting funds to the Summer Experience Grant (henceforth SEG), which is projected to have a big increase in applications this year, and that there were 200 applications last year wherein not everyone could receive funding. She added that this gives students funds to pursue a summer experience that doesn't receive any actual funding, and that FARC is giving about \$44,000 this year for the grant, but that a lot more would be helpful, and that this would give them an additional \$10,000 from the reserve.

- ii. E. Shapiro said that, at the end of last fall, the Assembly allocated \$0.87 per student for this specific purpose, and that this resolution just shifts the money over.
- iii. There was a motion to vote.
  - 1. There was a dissent.
  - 2. The motion to vote was **withdrawn**.
- iv. S. Lim asked if the total fund for the summer would be \$12,600.
- v. I. Pavlov replied in the affirmative.
- vi. S. Lim asked if it was true that someone could get a maximum of \$3,000 except for Arts & Sciences students, who could get a maximum of \$5,000.
- vii. I. Pavlov said that she doesn't believe that this is the case.
- viii. S. Lim asked a question.
- ix. I. Pavlov said that this would only be part of the fund, and that this can cover four or more students.
- x. E. Shapiro said that this isn't going directly into the fund for this year, but that it would go into an endowment to invest in the future.
- xi. Motion to vote on Resolution 32 – **approved** 18-0-1.

## **VI. New Business**

- a. Resolution 33: Establishing the Student Health Advisory Committee Bylaws
  - i. N. Matolka and Chelsea Kiely presented the general structure of the committee.
  - ii. V. Devatha asked a question.
  - iii. N. Matolka said that there will be a new structure wherein SHBAC will be required to have 4 to 6 SA voting members, and that there is currently some confusion regarding SHBAC's structure, so they will now have 5 or 6 voting members going to SHBAC meetings, and then a designated member to come to Steering Committee meetings.
  - iv. V. Devatha said that they'll need to restructure the bylaws to include Health & Wellness.
  - v. N. Matolka said that that is already in the language.
  - vi. V. Devatha said that the committee chair makes appointments for each subcommittee.
  - vii. N. Matolka said that the idea is that the consensus was that it'll be internally selected, and that the committees are allowed to make appointments, but that the SHAC chair will have the final say.
  - viii. V. Devatha asked what is expected from the SHAC chair.
  - ix. N. Matolka said that they are expected to go to every single subcommittee meeting, they would be the facilitator between committee chairs and Cornell Health, as well as the administration, and that they would make sure everyone is being held accountable.
  - x. V. Devatha asked if this would be logistically reasonable, since there are five subcommittees.
  - xi. N. Matolka said that this could be addressed in the future, but that he thinks it would be reasonable at this time, since most of the subcommittees only meet once per month.
  - xii. Matt Battaglia said that SHBAC is a joint committee with the GPSA, and asked a question in regard to that structure as it relates to SHAC.

- xiii. J. Anderson said that Ekarina Winarto has been contacted, and that the GPSA will be updating its bylaws omnibus style, so they've decided to deal with their governing documents in their way, and that the GPSA has had their own process, so they will do it in their own way.
- xiv. V. Devatha said that at this current moment, it looks like they haven't staffed anyone which is their problem, and so it looks like undergraduate students will have most of the voting power until the GPSA staffs them.
- xv. N. Matolka said that they do offer a very different viewpoint, but that the onus is on the GPSA.
- xvi. K. Kebbeh asked if there will be three SA representatives per committee or across all committees.
- xvii. N. Matolka said that there will be at least three members on at least three committees.
- xviii. K. Kebbeh asked how many would be on SHAC.
- xix. N. Matolka said that it is different than they initially thought, and that everyone can attend the Steering Committee, but it will be run by the co-chair.
- xx. Motion to table Resolution 32 – **tabled**.

## **VII. Business of the Day II**

- a. Resolution 30: Approval of Amendments to the Student Activities Funding Commission (SAFC) Funding Guidelines
  - i. Michael Jeong asked if V. Devatha wanted him to go through the changes to the guidelines.
  - ii. V. Devatha replied in the affirmative.
  - iii. M. Jeong obliged.
  - iv. V. Devatha asked if there were any topics or sections that were hotly contested outside of the subjectivity portion.
  - v. M. Jeong asked if that would include changes they chose not to make.
  - vi. V. Devatha replied in the affirmative.
  - vii. M. Jeong said that a lot of the changes that they are making this time around were because they had to deny some groups because of the lack of clarity of some things, and that a lot of their changes are just making things more clear. He added that they technically do allow local events to have disposable utensils, and they considered the environmental impact of allowing disposable utensils for everyone, so they decided not to include that language so that those who know they can allocate for plastic utensils can still do so, but not everyone will do it.
  - viii. G. Park asked what the purpose of the language regarding occurrences before fall semester and after spring semester in the annual adjustment of tiers is.
  - ix. M. Jeong said that SAFC's tiers are by academic semester, and that an organization is in the same tier for fall and spring, so they cannot change an organization's tier after the fall semester. He added that if the SA would want to change the system, it would have to be after spring, but before the fall when they reallocate groups into their tiers, and that any change would have to be approved by the SA before they make the changes.
  - x. G. Park asked if this meant before the fall semester.

- xi. M. Jeong replied in the affirmative.
- xii. G. Park asked if this meant that M. Jeong is trying to not surprise the SA by doing this.
- xiii. M. Jeong replied in the affirmative.
- xiv. G. Park asked, should the SA were to make a change the day before the start of the semester, if that would be enough time for SAFC.
- xv. M. Jeong said that they put people into tiers by an Excel sheet, and so if they meet their criteria for moving up they automatically move up a tier, so they would have to have the tier system change before that happens. He added that the day before the start of the semester could not happen because they run the numbers a month in advance.
- xvi. G. Park said that this language is therefore somewhat confusing and loose, and that it might be better if they specify a certain number of weeks in advance.
- xvii. M. Jeong said that that is why they specify June 30<sup>th</sup> on the last line, and they will probably be thinking of changing the tier system during the semester, and once they decide they want to change something, they will notify the SA President and VP of Finance, and that if there are no objections by June 30<sup>th</sup>, they will make the change and run with it a month before fall semester starts.
- xviii. J. Sim asked if there were any considerations with SAFC's use of plastic utensils as it relates to environmental sustainability.
- xix. M. Jeong said that one of their friends involved with sustainability gave him some suggestions, and that it was a little too late to fix things, but that if there is time later in the semester for another round of these, he would like to make more changes, such as limitations on the amount of paper and quartercards that can be printed, and maybe not allow groups to get plastic utensils.
- xx. J. Sim said that they recently discussed SA funding and environmental sustainability, and that there is a service called Dishtruck that brings dishes in and takes them away. He added that they might not propose Dishtruck to all groups, but that it is a thing that can happen.
- xxi. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt asked a question.
- xxii. M. Jeong said that the organization in question changed their treasurer, so they were not registered by the due date of the budget, and so they were zero-funded. He added that it's tough because it's not always the same groups, and that people do learn from their mistakes and SAFC deals with so many groups that do follow the roles, and that at some point they do need to draw the line. He also said that if they give exceptions to everyone and give everyone extensions, they'll be running out of money, and wherever they put the deadline, there will always be groups that fall through the cracks, and that they don't want to make it more lenient as of right now.
- xxiii. F. Uribe-Rheinbolt asked if they would be willing to add something such as a 24-hour extension for groups who are not registered.
- xxiv. M. Jeong said that their strict deadline at this time is for the three signatures and for the group registration, and that anyone missing documentation is given a ten-day extension. He added that they decided not to be lenient on this, and that it's something that they think they shouldn't just suddenly be lenient on.

- xxv. Discussion continued in this regard.
- xxvi. S. Lim said that this looks pretty daunting for a new club, and asked a question.
- xxvii. M. Jeong said that he figures that some SA members have been involved with the SAFC process, and that it is daunting, and that he completely messed up the first budget he made, but that people do get the hang of it. He added that they have increased the number of help sessions for Tiers 4 through 6, and that they tell those groups in those tiers that the meetings are mandatory despite them not being mandatory, since they've seen improvement from the groups that go to the help sessions. He also said that they get around 100 representatives of groups on each of the three days, and that SAFC is currently offering the most help it can give, and that they've seen a really good turnout for the office hours that they've added. He added that they're trying their best to give more help, and that they've also introduced a SAFC liaison process for those organizations that get zero-funded and want the help of a liaison.
- xxviii. S. Lim asked if SAFC intends to add guidance for groups that duplicate in the budget process.
- xxix. M. Jeong said that such an endeavor would be up to the registration office, and that they are very lenient on who is made a club. He added that they don't have time to check duplicates, and that they made FORC for a reason.
- xxx. O. Din said that he wants to have a tangential discussion with this, and that a big issue that a lot of organizations run into is that of advisor signatures. He added that a lot of organizations get zeroed out because their advisors aren't involved in the process and the organization gets zeroed, and that he is thinking of one or two ideas that he will move to amend for, such that they can discuss them. He also said that the first idea would be to make it so that the advisor has an extended deadline for their signature relative to the due date of the budget, and the other would be to change the advisor's power to be veto power rather than consent power. He added that this would ensure that in cases where advisors are very negligent in regard to their club, the club would not necessarily have to get the advisor to sign off on it.
- xxxi. M. Jeong said that he spoke to O. Din about this, and that he spoke to his co-chair and Terry Ector about the possibility of veto power, and that they are very strongly against it. He added that they value the faculty and adult oversight that is associated with the budget process in its current form, rather than just students, and that they think it is a necessary facet of it. He also said that the possibility of moving the deadline is controversial because at every single help session, SAFC tells every single group to reach out to their advisor now, and that they offer so much help to these organizations to make sure that they know their stuff. He added that if they extend the deadline, there will still be those groups that miss the extended deadline, and that he had an advisor yelling at him that they would be lenient in the real world, but that he would say that in the real world, people have to meet deadlines. He also said that he would be open to a possible 24-hour extension exclusively for the advisor, and that they had 48 groups zero-funded due to missing or late signatures, but that only 10 groups to his memory had missing signatures from the advisor. He added that this wouldn't affect too many groups, but



that those groups that are affected do come to the SA because their advisors get very angry.

- xxxii. V. Devatha said that he is in agreement with M. Jeong regarding the veto option, but that he disagrees with the sentiment regarding the extended deadline, and that the marketing for it does not have to be an extended deadline for the advisor, but rather a shorter deadline for everyone else. He added that students are students, and they like to push everything to the last minute, and that that is the reality. He also said that students can get ahold of each other rather easily, but that this is not the case for the actual advisor, and that if an individual were to submit the budget the day that it is due, it would be unlikely that the advisor would get to it on time. He added that he thinks that for that reason, it would make sense to have an extended deadline for the advisor, and that they could move the student deadline forward, rather than the other way around.
- xxxiii. J. Anderson said that he disagrees with the possibility of moving the deadline up, and that students shouldn't have to bear the burden of the apathy of an advisor. He added that he is in favor of O. Din's plan to push the deadline for advisors back, and that they shouldn't make this harder on students. He also said that he likes O. Din's plan of pushing it back a week, and that it achieves the same purpose, and that he thinks that it would prevent a lot of situations such as when the advisor says that they signed the budget but the signature didn't actually go through. He added that now proactive and less proactive groups both have an extra week to go through the process.
- xxxiv. M. Jeong said that, from a logistical standpoint, an extension of a week cannot happen, and that budgets are due on the Friday of the third week of school, and that SAFC looks at all 560 budgets the following Monday. He added that if they all agree with the idea that they want an advisor to look over the budget, then there is no reason for them to be looking and allocating for a budget missing an advisor's signature, and that the biggest extension they could give would be before the Monday they look at the budgets. He also said that by the time they look at the budgets on Monday, they need to have all of the signatures, and that it would make their jobs significantly harder because it would be another thing to look at, and that giving advisors an extension would ruin their process. He added that he can explain the details for anyone who wants to hear them if they have time.
- xxxv. An assembly member asked if a 24-hour extension would be okay despite what M. Jeong just said.
- xxxvi. M. Jeong replied in the affirmative, and said that 24 hours is probably the maximum allowable extension.
- xxxvii. V. Devatha said that he doesn't think that that makes sense, and that M. Jeong is phrasing it that SAFC doesn't look at all the budgets because some of them are cut out because of missing signatures, but that the logistical issue he is therefore hearing is that they would have an additional hundred budgets to look at.
- xxxviii. M. Jeong said that they used to take five or six hours to look at the budgets on Monday, and that in their current system, they take the time over the weekend to weed out every organization that signed or submitted the budget late, such that they are already weeded out.

- xxxix. V. Devatha said that that makes sense, but that the bigger picture should be to fund as many organizations as they can, and that they should still maximize the opportunity to give all organizations that funding.
- xl. M. Jeong said that, with that logic, he would extend the deadline for everyone, but that they have deadlines in place so that they fund everyone for the right reason, and that they want to fund as much as possible which is why they have office hours and other methods of assistance, but questioned to what extent they should have that process. He added that with that logic, they would give extensions to everyone, which cannot happen.
- xli. E. Shapiro asked if the budget tells SAFC online if it is complete.
- xlii. M. Jeong said that they go through it line by line.
- xliii. E. Shapiro said that there is only a limited amount of money, and that he thinks that it would possibly be dangerous for this to happen going into a byline year, and that he thinks that they should do this and fund more organizations, but that if this changed now, they don't know what will happen in byline funding.
- xliv. V. Devatha said that they could also pass this with the stipulation that it goes into effect after byline funding is over.
- xlv. M. Jeong said that they ran the numbers, and that if everyone asked for their tier cap, they would have spent \$2.1 million this year, and that they only get \$1.3 million, and that people spend 75% of their cap on average. He added that last fall and spring, SAFC allocated \$1.5 million, which is more than they received, and that more leniency and more money given out is more money that they don't have. He also said that he expressed his concerns to the Appropriations Committee (henceforth AppsCom), and that his job is to make sure everyone is given the money that they need, but that they don't have all the money. He added that every year, they give out more money, and so they don't have enough money, so they would be going over their budget. He also said that this is a cold hard fact that he wants everyone to realize, and that that shouldn't stop them from wanting to give out more money, but that at this rate it should be taken into consideration.
- xlvi. G. Park said that she gets that deadlines can naturally weed out 100 organizations every term, and that she really has to say that she disagrees with the logic that the more organizations they accept, the more money they have to give out, and that it is better to have more organizations, and to compromise with them to receive less money instead of the natural weed-out process. She added that she does not know the logistics of how allocation happens.
- xlvii. M. Jeong said that G. Park's sentiment is one that he agrees with, but they cannot do that.
- xlviii. G. Park asked if there is a floor.
- xlix. M. Jeong replied in the negative, and said that there might be a Tier 1 organization that asked for \$50, and that if everyone asked for 100% of their tier cap, that would be \$2.1 million, but that not all of that gets spent. He added that they are trying to change the tier system, and that before and after the changes, they would still be handing out \$1.5 million dollars considering that 74% of every organization's cap was given out.

- l. G. Park asked why funding below the budget and accepting as many organizations as possible have to be mutually exclusive, and asked why SAFC cannot be lenient and fund more organizations, and still give out funds without overspending.
- li. V. Devatha said that this conversation should happen offline.
- lii. S. Lim said that she wanted to voice her agreement with J. Anderson, G. Park, and O. Din, in that there should be an extended period for advisors. She added that she thinks that a 72-hour extension would be reasonable, and that it would make it easier for students to get funding and have fewer appeals cases.
- liii. M. Adeghe said that she was going to agree with a lot of the sentiments, and asked if the Monday session to go over the budgets is set in stone, and whether they could do it on a day other than Monday.
- liv. M. Jeong said that they technically could do it on a day other than Monday, and that he does not speak for SAFC or its history, but that when budgets are submitted, they typically want to give groups their allocations as soon as possible. He added that this is called the initial budget allocation, and that following that time, they give ten days for necessary additional documentation, but that the initial allocation has to be given out ASAP. He also said that he does not know if the timing is written anywhere.
- lv. M. Adeghe said that M. Jeong has been talking a lot about the 74%, and asked if they were to accept the 100 budgets missing an advisor signature if SAFC couldn't move the funding down to 70% to accommodate more people.
- lvi. M. Jeong said that the 74% isn't up to him or anybody on SAFC, and that the percentage is the amount of money that organizations are asking for. He added that if everyone asked for everything they could ask for, they would be asking for \$2.1 million, and that the 74% is not a number he is in control of.
- lvii. M. Adeghe said that her point is that they are asking for 75%, and asked if they always fund groups at the total that they ask for, or could they fund them at less than that.
- lviii. M. Jeong said that SAFC is not subjective, and that if they follow the guidelines, they give them everything they ask for, and that they cannot give them less than that just because they have less money.
- lix. S. Harshvardhan asked if it would be possible to have applications due Thursday, and then advisor signatures due Friday.
- lx. V. Devatha said that he is quickly going to play devil's advocate, and asked what would happen if budgets are not approved by their advisors and so the budget isn't approved at all. He also asked if M. Jeong wants advisors to be participatory in the budget process.
- lxi. M. Jeong said that this is a sentiment that T. Ector has, as well as everyone in SAFC, in that they believe that college students need some degree of oversight from some adult, and that he thinks that this is the bare minimum that they could ask for. He added that he spoke to D. Barbaria earlier, and that they thought that zero-funding groups was too mean for missing signatures, so they thought about the possibility of an opportunity to give a zero-funded group part of their budget, such as 20-30%, which is still sizeable for some groups. He also said that they ran the numbers, and such

an endeavor would be impossible, and that all the leftover money goes to special projects which they are offering again this semester, but that they do not have the money for changing zero-funding.

- lxii. V. Devatha said that they also need to answer the question of what is to be done if an advisor says no to a budget.
- lxiii. O. Din said that in terms of recourse for changing the process, he thinks that the point of this would not be for those advisors invested enough to say no to a budget, but for uninvested advisors. He added that he has been the treasurer of two SAFC organizations, and their advisor has never been involved with it.
- lxiv. Discussion continued in this regard.
- lxv. E. Shapiro moved to table the resolution, and said that this clearly needs to be talked about more offline.
- lxvi. Discussion continued regarding whether amendments were actually proposed or just referenced, whether the resolution should be tabled, and whether the resolution needs to be passed now.
- lxvii. Motion to table Resolution 30 – tabled.

### **VIII. Adjournment**

- a. V. Devatha adjourned the meeting at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

*John Hannan*

Clerk of the Assembly