



Student Association Board of Finance

Emergency Meeting Minutes

October 7, 2019 – 9 PM

The HUB SORC Table

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

II. Approval of the Minutes

1. Motion to Approve- Howard
2. Second- Daquial

III. Public Comment

1. None

IV. Chairs' Report

1. Samuel Salazar, Chairman of the Board of Finance
 - i. One Drive contains everything. We are working on the MyInvolvement page—all documents will be public & the approved budget is posted.
 - ii. Liaison assignments will be made soon
 - iii. We will have weekly meetings because we have a lot on our plate
 - iv. Financial Whistleblower Policy – I will receive any and all complaints (anonymous or not) and communicate it with the board
 1. Howard- elaborate
 - a. We don't have a whistleblower policy. Only ethics subcommittee in regard to finance.
 2. Howard – Can they go to ethics?
 - a. Yes, but we will have a form pursuant to our bylaws
 3. Howard- Do you foresee another subcommittee?

- a. No, it is our job to investigate. More like a forum for student groups or SA employees to contact us about anything seen as incorrect (can be anonymous).
- b. We will discuss this with Comptroller Kelley as he also sees student groups

- 2. Molly Donelan, Vice-Chairwoman of the Board of Finance
 - i. Make sure you communicate all absences to us
 - ii. Daquial- What is our policy?
 - iii. Salazar- 2 unexcused consecutively, 4 unexcused for the semester is grounds for impeachment

V. **New Business**

- 1. S.1920 – XXX
 - i. Affordable Testing Act
 - 1. Sevor and Daquial- invited to speak on this
 - ii. Salazar- The Board approves all financial policy
 - iii. Sevor- Our budget includes 25k for Affordable Testing line, post-resolution passing to do so. This bill makes sure there are guidelines for the Comptroller/ Academic Affairs Director to carry out this resolution
 - iv. Daquial- motion to add Sen. Courtnee Denton as cosponsor
 - 1. Second- Howard
 - v. Sevor- thanks to the cosponsors, please ask any questions you may have
 - vi. Daquial- The conversation by Rules Committee was not about whether the program should exist. It was about the bylaw language.
 - vii. Howard- Asking for transcript?
 - viii. Yes, notarized. 3.25 requirement because we want to make sure applicants can actually make it into the school at which they're applying. It is treated like a scholarship.
 - ix. Howard- Student groups can't give to scholarships, but this is different?
 - x. Sevor- Think Purple & Gold.. That is a scholarship. SA can make these disbursements because we are student government. This is about students having opportunities outside of their undergraduate studies.
 - xi. Primary point off contact: Director of Academic Affairs. Senate point of contact: Constituent Relations

- xii. Continues to explain bill language
- xiii. Zhang – 523.1.4.2.4 - We should define “timely manner”
 - 1. Sevor – BoF amend to say within 5 business days?
 - 2. Howard – This is the timeline from when they submit on my involvement?
 - 3. Sevor- Talking specifically about that bylaw?
 - 4. Howard- Yes
 - 5. Sevor- From when the committee has voted on it
 - 6. Zhang – 3 weeks in 523.1.4.2.2
 - 7. Sevor- willing to change for expedience
 - 8. Carty- Our bylaw requires us to pay a financial manager. How can we bring another expense to the table? We are supposed to have more staff
- xiv. Amendments:
 - 1. Zhang- 523.1.4.1.4 “the effective and proper marketing of this act” We should be more specific about the Marketing Director’s Responsibilities
 - 2. Kelly- more efficient to use SGA director
 - 3. Are we amending this?
 - 4. Zhang- Motion to change Marketing Director to SGA director
 - a. Second- Howard
 - b. NO OBJECTIONS
 - 5. Kelly- in conjunction with SA Senate?
 - a. Zhang- Motion - SGA director in conjunction with Student Association Senate
 - b. Daquial- Second
 - c. Sevor- want to amend it to add listserv
 - d. Howard- Motion to add listserv requirement to that clause
 - i. Second- Daquial
 - 6. Zhang 4.2.2 - three weeks is too short for a scholarship
 - a. Kelly- I think a month is good. This will be popular, and we don’t know the workload of Academic Affairs director
 - b. Howard- three weeks is fine. Good timeline.
 - c. Zhang- motion to amend to 6 weeks (dies due to no second)
 - 7. Kelly- Can we have insight of what Academic Affairs director does?

- a. Zhang- Last year I was assoc. Dir. Of AA. Had to plan events, it is a lot to keep track of. This financial matter is huge- 3 weeks is way too short.
 - b. Carty- 3 weeks is not enough, it doesn't follow what the University takes. How long does the application need to be out?
 - c. Howard- We have a MyInvolvement form. Each time a student submits, that's when their 3 weeks starts. I don't see that as a problem
8. Donelan- Motion to strike 523.1.3.3
- a. Simon- Second
 - b. Daquial- Objection. Don't think SA senate should vote on something that benefits them in such a direct matter.
 - c. Howard yields time to Sevor- Agrees, it becomes problematic especially if they are voting on it. Constituent Relations & Academic Affairs will deliberate on it, so clarify that they cannot receive it
 - d. Zhang- For P&G, SA staff were able to receive it. Can we redact the names from the applications?
 - e. Howard- I am for striking it because we have an appropriations bill that students who will benefit from it will abstain from the vote. If they are in the committee, they will need to step out
 - f. Howard yield time to Carty- All SA members are student activity fee members, and they aren't compensated. All legislation impacts students, so why pick and choose? We are all students. To exclude people is not fair.
 - g. Howard- agrees with Carty. I abstained from vote on Appropriations stipend. If someone is involved or has conflict, they can abstain. We are all students.
 - h. Howard yields time to Kelley- It would be smart to modify it. Constituent Relations and AA will not be eligible. We should strike the members that can impact the program.
 - i. Donelan- withdraws main motion
9. Howard- Motion to add "cats and dogs" to the language

- a. Donelan – Second
 - b. Daquial – objection
 - c. Carty- This would violate the Constitution because it would exclude students
 - d. Howard- Can't we have these people abstain?
Yield to Sevor
 - e. Sevor- the only person who will know applicant names is Academic Affairs director & Comptroller who will make disbursement
 - f. Howard- All 4 members would know it is them
 - g. Kelley- Can we add “if the Academic Affairs director identifies a member of the Constituent Relations committee, the ethics committee would have to be involved
 - h. Zhang yields time to Carty- We need to not just use the ethics committee. This should be a new committee- maybe judicial member, external member. Roundtable discussion on whether it is ethical
 - i. Salazar – motion to suspend rules for 5 minutes to discuss how we will amend the section
 - j. Howard- rescinds motion
10. Howard- Motion to change the language of the clause to exclude Academic Affairs department
- a. Daquial – Second
11. Carty – timeline for leaving application open?
- a. Sevor- Program starts Spring Semester and goes on for the academic year.

xv. Debate:

- 1. Zhang - I really do not believe 3 weeks is enough time. Too much to do in too little time. AA is a student at the end of the day. There is a reason why other scholarships take more than three weeks
- 2. Howard- I think 3 weeks is enough time. We have been trying to implement this for a long time
- 3. Daquial- There are also not a lot of weeks in the school year. 6 weeks is halfway through the spring semester. If it turns out they didn't meet the deadline, this would have been all for nothing
- 4. Zhang- Can we establish 3 weeks after the deadline?

5. Howard- 3 weeks is more than enough time
6. Kelley- I don't think it is enough. What if during the first week they get 100 applications? They only work 10 hours a week. Maybe senate can approve the timeline? It just simply is not enough time because this will be a very popular program
7. Bonitz- The problem with extending the deadline is that there are only certain days when the test is offered. That puts pressure on the student, financially and time-wise.
8. Howard- People need to plan these tests out in advance. Can we come to a middle ground?
9. Zhang yields time to Carty- Academic Affairs and IT director have lowest retention rate. This needs to be considered. They can apply in fall and get it in the Spring. What if a student fails?
10. Sevor- The timeline should be extended after hearing your points. I am ok w/ amending this to a compromise timeline
11. Zhang- Maybe do applications on a rolling basis?
12. Howard- there are only certain dates you can take the exam
13. Daquial- please make your points as short as possible, I have an exam due tonight
14. Salazar – calls for a vote.
15. **Vote: 4-1-2**

2. S.1920 - YYY

- i. Salazar- respectfully declines stipend due to scheduling conflict that prevents him from completing 10 hour requirement. Wants to transfer BoF Chair stipend to Civic Action programming because SA should encourage students to be involved in government
- ii. No questions
- iii. Debate points:
 1. Howard- I think it is a great idea because they need the money
 2. Donelan- formally thanks Salazar
- iv. Howard-motion to vote
 1. Zhang – Second
- v. **Vote: 5-0-2**

3. Budgetary Timeline

i. Question

1. Zhang- Motion to amend budget packet submission live date to 12/7 (Motion fails)
 - a. Carty- Question-what about a week before we come back?
 - b. Salazar- the board will not check it. We just need to advertise it.
 - c. Howard- point of information- We want to be here for this, we will have a presentation on this. It will be fresh in their minds.
2. Zhang- Is there a way to make the presentation available on our page?
 - a. Salazar - Yes, we will promotive it
3. Carty- Students work over the breaks and get most of their things done then. It is overwhelming to only have 2 weeks.
 - a. Howard- point of info- suggest to the chair that the form is available after our last meeting in December. But then they can submit it starting 1/27
 - b. Salazar- We shouldn't change these dates
 - c. Kelley- I made these in accordance with the academic calendar. They will be able to make their packets together and it will be more than enough time

ii. Howard – Motion to Debate

1. Zhang – Second

- a. Salazar- The form will be live, but they can't submit until after our mandatory presentation. We are sticking with the budget request template
- b. Howard- Total costs, list events and expenditures line by line

iii. Passes unanimously

4. Comptroller Review

- i. Salazar – we will make a form for student groups to rate the comptroller's performance
- ii. Howard- We are required to do this?
 1. Salazar- Yes, cites bylaw.

- iii. Kelly- I enforce rules and have to say no to a lot of people. The survey seems unfair. Can we use a different method?
 - 1. Howard- Survey might be unfair, let's do annual review?
 - 2. Carty- We should have more specific questions if you have a survey, because students can place blame for problems that aren't his/ours.
 - 3. Salazar- Survey will not be the sole method. We are only considering the responses. If the Board sees it as more reasonable to do so another way, we may decide to do so.
 - 4. Howard- It is totally unnecessary. Students have personal problems.
 - 5. Salazar- we will find a way to assess this next week. This is just a conversation
 - 6. Zhang- Whenever you give someone an outlet to complain, they will
 - 7. Howard- motion to move out of comptroller review

VI. Closing Roll and Adjournment

- 1. Howard- Motion to adjourn
 - i. Zhang - Second