

**Budget Committee Meeting (April 1st 2019)**

**Members Present: Dina Rosin, Frederick Qin, Connor Bloom, Avi Gupta, Andrew Wissinger, Chandler Koon, Max Dawson, Bryan Carlen, Sobe Uwajeh, Raina Kim**

1. **Approving stipends for officers**

Dina: Maya has suggestions for Spring stipend allocations

* Added to ASCMC budget committee folder
* The folder has been shared with the committee

In the past years, stipends are generally given semesterly

This year, stipends will be given in half per semester

Will go through the suggestions one by one and approve the stipends then raise a straw poll to make sure general approval then raise motion

Max is worried about DAC and CO chair

* Josh admitted that he did not do a good job and did not put much time in it

Last time we did not fund DAC in full because he didn’t serve a full term

Few things to consider:

* People come into positions with general expectations for stipend
* Low income students may rely on stipends
* When a job wasn’t “well done” was it lack of organization? We don’t know the nuances
* Issue of new board allocating old board stipends was never brought up, which was the fault of that board

Historically there is always a couple of people who don’t necessarily fully do their job

* There is an expectation of receiving full stipends, but we should not assume that we fully fund for all

Old stipends don’t represent /acknowledge low income students as much as new stipends

* No one had the idea of relying on the stipend due to limited amounts
* New stipends represent that better
* We should be hyper cognizant if were were to set a precedent of fully funding

Stipends have drastically changed

* Current levels are never enough for ppl who work a lot

If we’re giving everyone full stipends that’s devaluing work of ppl who do put in a lot of work

Q: Why did maya think we shouldn’t dock josh’s stipend?

* Fall stipends did not reflect job performance

Job performance is so arbitrary

* We need new operating procedures
* ex) Miss x y z meetings, 5% docked
* Did they do fair enough amount of what constitution stipulates
* There should be a concrete set of metrics

Stipends for the last board should be decided by last board (old budget committee) and sent to them before spring break

* Majority of us don’t know how people performed
* Uncomfortable having this convo bc except for a few members in the room everyone else is not aware of how ppl did

Stipends should be rewarded for efforts than results

* Uncomfortable to judge the performance of board members from last semester
* Uncomfortable to lower the suggestion of the former president

Q: Did Maya submit reasonings? -- No

* Maya provided general recommendations that are on the document, which is the following:

“\*Based on previous discussions on 2018-2019 Budget Committee, it is my responsibility to reflect the general recommendations of all members. The rhetoric was that the Comptroller position did not take the opportunity to actively work within their role. Some outside factors could have been Devon was on paternity leave and it being hard to form a good audit without him.

The recommendation is that every other position on board should receive their full stipend as several members went above and beyond in their role especially the last few weeks when we were faced with hard adversities and needed student leaders to step up.”

Reservations about giving everyone full stipend

* Reasoning for Caroline: did not take the opportunity to actively participate / fully do the job according to the Constitution
* Arbitrary assignment of stipend

It is fair to say she put in at least 10 hours of work (this plus 10 hours of exec meetings at minimum wage is full stipend)

In that logic, we should fund everyone not cut

Stipends when people do not put in the efforts should be reflected in the new constitution

CFO: As someone who worked closely with the previous comptroller, do not agree on the amount of time previous Comptroller put in

Could have been lack of descriptions that failed to give her a full understanding of her responsibility

New stipends will give us the ability to reflect the efforts of officers

Hourly wage is not a good measure of determining the work put in by different positions

Last board had a discussion about the amount of work put in

* In light of events that occurred last semester, everyone felt that they deserved the stipends

President is inclined to go with Maya’s suggestions

* Only question lies in DAC and Comptroller
* DAC did his job even though he was not a good one
* Comptroller did not fulfill the job even though CFO/others provided tremendous support

If committee decides to go with Maya’s suggestion, Chandler’s point of last board being the ones deciding last board’s performance should be acknowledged

* Maya alone is a limited point of view on performance

This board is not in the position to measure how much worth previous board’s work is

Q: General board vote to decide our stipends at the end of this year?

* Left it open to either option in new constitution

Was this concern about performance directly brought up to the person?

* What if someone is relying on stipends ex) paying rent?
* What if she did not have an understanding that she was doing a bad job?
* Was she fully cognizant of the fact that she should have done a better job?

→ CFO: abundantly made clear, did not meaningfully change

In the fall, everyone was fully funded except for Josh bc he joined late

Even after warning, Comptroller did not do the job

Still questionable if we should dock her stipends

Go back to the point that we should dock more

We are not the board that worked with them

Q: So why is it that we are deciding this?

* They just did not get around to discuss

Q: What is preventing them from holding a meeting now?

* They are not the current board

There are 4 officers who fulfilled the bare minimum of the job based on Senate attendance

Regarding Senate, attendance was never spoken/ taken

* Constitutionally obliged to attend
* If this committee is aware, we should take this into account
* Given that we are aware we should come up with new rules concerning attendance

As of right now, we only have two people worked in the past committee (present in the meeting), CFO and pro-temp

CFO: concerns about CO chair’s allocations

* CFO and CO chair work closely together
* Found it hard to communicate with club leaders through the previous CO chair

Going back to the idea of “bare minimum work”, CO chair has a much higher bare minimum compared to other positions

* But still don’t know how she performed

At this point we should vote on comptroller / and see if we can approve the rest of the decisions

* No background knowledge

Room in board is a precedent

Bryan: Motion to move in fund every position in full

Seconded by Fredrick

Yes:3 No:2 Abstain:3

Motion passed

\*Senators on budget committee cannot vote

Sobe: Motion to fund to maya’s recommendations

Seconded by Chandler

Yes:2 no: 2 abstensions: 4

Motion did not pass

**2. Club funding**

Max and Dina made decisions/ had a conversation about club funding

* What is overall mission? What should we fund for clubs and orgs?
* In general mission is more inclusivity + building community
* What is in line with that mission is really important

5C budgeting committee sent out a survey

* Cmc said yes to a lot of things
* Gives us a room to reject later on

*T shirt funding*

* Should we provide funding for T-shirts purchased by clubs and dorms?
* If we are trying to fund events not open to all student body, worth having a convo

*Printing*

Q: Never funded printing in the past?

Us saying yes doesn’t mean we can’t change it to no in the future

Equipment: we have them and we have to store

* ASPC stores equipment for other 5c clubs

Nothing in constitution or non profit law about equipment

Q: Why does tshirts not fall into property issue?

* Could potentially subsidize
* Cannot let people just take shirts home bc that’s ascmc property

Printing flyers or tsl-style printing?

In regards with TSL they had more revenue through websites than printing

* They are essentially pulling money off of 5C student governments

Constitutional provision that we cannot fund alcohol with student fees, need profit to buy

* Keep alcohol purchase within CMC as much as possible

If we are funding for 5C clubs, we should be able to fund cmc (but not necessarily other way around)

Groups that can buy alcohol:

* Senior Class President & VPSA (Encapsulate all parties)

Q: How is pomona funding their alcohol?

* ASPC has sources of profit like coop

*Back to printing issue*

* Environmental factors
* Shouldn’t fund certain organizations (ex: news) due to massive potential conflicts

Funding printing is wasting money when you can easily do it on a computer

* Every student has email

A lot of concern has to do with printing more than we need

* We can regulate the amount by saying: You are printing too much, lower your printing budget

Mckenna Palooza: harder to publicize without flyers because private Facebook event

If we say yes, we can still decline

This pertains to what we can theoretically fund based on bylaws

Straw poll on printing

Yes:8

Allow for the funding of printing

*Equipment*

Distinction between equipment and apparel

* Equipment: Related to job/ function as uniform ex) advocates t-shirts
* Apparel: Clubs purchase, you can take home and become yours
* Anything that we buy has been a precedent that we store, meaning they are ASCMC property

Is ASPC good with storing equipment?

* Roughly do the same thing for CMC
* Assumed that they have a good system

We should have a more structured system

Straw poll: no one opposed

Allow the possibility of funding equipment

*Apparel*

Yes we should fund: we have done in the past

SIF had apparel that was funded by ASCMC

* Q: Are you sure it was funded by ASCMC? Heard it was done with alumni donations

There is good reason not to do dorms bc not enough budget for it

If we are not allowing dorms, weird to let clubs do it

We can limit % of club budget that goes towards apparel

What are we trying to promote? Do T-shirts fall under the category of community building?

→ bigger conversation for values we promote

It is illegal..

* Bc apparel is property: if we buy them with ascmc funds then they become our property
* Repeatedly raised concern
* If there is a legal way, maybe rebudget
* Experiences more valuable than apparel in terms of what student government should be funding
* Not fair to spend student body money on exclusive apparel

We need to have a conversation about funding exclusive clubs

Main concern is to figure out law on the subject, if not we can’t have a discussion on it

* Table this conversation about apparel

Marked it as TBD on budget hearing survey

Funding events involving speakers is a political campaign / political messaging

* Any lobbying or paying political campaign or movements cannot be done
* Cannot fund money that goes to politics
* Same goes for students going to national conventions ($ goes to PACs)
* Not worth a risk of getting sued
* Can instead subsidize food at the meeting but not the speakers themselves

Apolitical / nonpolitical speakers wouldn’t fall into the umbrella? There are precedents of bringing speakers in in the past

Should we tell Pomona?  
- Send Hans an email with reasonings behind

Should we fund one-time events?

* Is there any way to hold them accountable that they hold those events?
* Need a lot more oversight about how they are spending money
  + This falls under CO chair

If clubs don’t show up to the club hearing, cannot fund them

* Still can be funded by senate / general discretion
* Usually poor organization on behalf of the club
* Usually 2-3 out of all clubs don’t show up
* Only requirement this year: one person from club coming must be present

Should we fund exclusive clubs that do not accept everyone like SIF?

* Should we have oversight over application process?
* What if clubs need extra funds?

SIF is exclusive bc huge presence on campus

* A lot have membership requirements: should differentiate
* MUN had a huge budget, now we don’t fund (not just because of that though)

Professional clubs are for CMC students with vested interest

* Are there ways to instead of just cutting budget, ask/provide suggestions
  + Other ppl to have an opportunity to get involved?

CO chair: as a club liaison were supposed to sit in meetings, but SIF did not allow the club liaisons to sit in the meetings

ASCMC does not have a say in how they pick who they want (yet)

* Potentially just could pick their friends
* Some of the clubs pick people directly / ppl are left out

Are they picking ppl objectively?

Can we have access to budget for clubs?

By definition of exclusive club, cannot just get benefits by walking in

* It is a factor to consider, but we should not just lower the budget

We should have some conversation or say in hiring process: really affecting the process

CFO can work with D&I to make sure the hiring / application process is fair

Acceptable for board/ leadership, but maybe a requirement for us funding a club is that everyone can be involved

A lot of the times the same people going to the meetings of affinity groups

* Meetings are open to general public but SIF doesn’t
* No purpose in opening it up to general public

Mock trial: can have the main people competing but also have a sub team

What control is appropriate over hiring process?

Will have a meeting with Vince to have a conversation about hiring fairly

* Maybe we will stipulate all organizations do that

Everyone from CMC should have an opportunity to learn these pre-professional/transferable skills

Tough to enforce an “open event”

* clubs/orgs can just buy cookies for one event and be done

Affinity groups should not have a role to educate the student body?

* Going into this discussion we should acknowledge tension btw clubs & affinity groups
* Shouldn’t enforce an open meeting if affinity groups do not feel that it is the best way to approach their agenda
* Affinity groups do not have a responsibility to educate student body
* With affinity groups, must have a different conversation
* CO chair will send a report to D&I chair and address the issue above

Important that ASCMC offers a platform from which if they choose to affinity groups can be a larger presence on campus or be more visible

What should we require in terms of selectivity? What should we fund?

* As for affinity groups, are they currently having open events?
* Yes, but some are more exclusive than the others

Distinction btw mentorship / general groups

* Will be a meeting with DOS to differentiate between mentorship and general events as a social group (DOS may fund mentorship)
* Should the events be open to other groups?

Hiring workshop / Meeting for hiring

* Only required to fund groups that hire

Selective clubs should hold events for all student body

To mandate that clubs contact vince about hiring process

* Under CO authority constitutionally to set requirements

There should be a component that everyone could be involved

Would be harder to enforce: expect some grumbling

Some clubs cannot function with so many members

* Some form of acceptance/application process is required

We can also limit funding on the basis of the exclusivity

Must have a convo with club leaders

* Generally reluctant to do public events bc low turnout

How soon do you plan to for DI committee to meet with club chairs?

* Probably start next year

We could just vote to amend constitution in effect immediately (only precedent that we can’t)

* Concerns of abusing power
* Move affinity groups under D&I

Kamara and Avi can do affinity group budgeting together

Only real budgetary change: D&I to govern the budgeting

Having events open to people that didn’t get in the organizations is the best solution

Sobe: Motion to adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 7:33PM
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