

Fall 9-4-2014

## Appropriations and Audits Meeting Minutes 09-04-2014

Senate Committee on Appropriations and Audits

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/sg\\_leg\\_pubs](https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/sg_leg_pubs)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Scholar Commons Citation

Senate Committee on Appropriations and Audits, "Appropriations and Audits Meeting Minutes 09-04-2014" (2014). *Legislative Branch Publications*. 928.  
[https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/sg\\_leg\\_pubs/928](https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/sg_leg_pubs/928)

This Senate Committee Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Government at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in Legislative Branch Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@usf.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@usf.edu).



University of South Florida  
Student Government Fifty-Fifth Student Senate

Committee on Appropriations and Audits  
FALL SESSION  
September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014

---

**Call to Order by Chairman Chris Johnson at 11:07 A.M.**

**First Roll Call**

Present: Chris Johnson, Anika Hasan, Samuel Shiflett, Trang Luong, Briana Ramirez, Nicholas Gigante, Aladdin Hiba, Abdool Aziz, Andrew Johnson

Gallery: Gregory Berkowitz, Masha Galchenko, Zachary Kuiper, Mitchell Fratesi

Absent: None.

C. Johnson: All right, 11:07, I'm calling this meeting to order. First item on the agenda is roll call. I am present. Vice Chairman Hasan.

A. Hasan: Here.

C. Johnson: Senator Shiflett.

Shiflett: Here.

C. Johnson: Senator Luong.

Luong: Here.

C. Johnson: Senator Ramirez.

Ramirez: Present.

C. Johnson: Senator Nick Gigante.

Gigante: Here.

C. Johnson: Senator Hiba.

Hiba: Present.

C. Johnson: And Pro Tempore Aziz.

Aziz: Here.

C. Johnson: All right, it didn't want to go through... It went through. Excellent. We have 8 people present here today. Are there any additions or deletions that we want to make to the agenda?

**Additions/Deletions:**

C. Johnson: Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: I suggest putting SOPs after introduction, so you guys have it out of the way for the whole semester.

C. Johnson: Can I get a motion to add SOPs agenda after instruction? Senator Hasan:

A. Hasan: So moved.

C. Johnson: Any objections? Any other additions or deletions to make to the agenda? Senator Shiflett.

Shiflett: The Senate and I move to approve the agenda as it stands.

C. Johnson: Any objections? Excellent. Moving on. We are going to have approval of the minutes. Do we have up to date minutes of all the summer sessions? All the summer minutes?

Aziz: All minutes I've received are the ones that I've sent you for those. The few.

C. Johnson: Well, let's go ahead and—I didn't send those out—so let's go ahead and table that to next Senate. Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: Motion to postpone minutes.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections to postponing approval of the minutes? Seeing none. We'll take care of that next week. Moving to open forum.

## **Open Forum:**

C. Johnson: Good morning. It is still morning. Again, I'm sorry for being late. I had a class get out a few minutes later than I'd hoped to, so I just had to (inaudible) the attendance right now. But thank you very much everyone for being here. In the gallery, we do have a couple extra people. We have Chief of Staff Berkowitz.

???: (inaudible), Associate Director of Business.

C. Johnson: Excellent.

Fratesi: Mitch Fratesi, Director of SGCS.

C. Johnson: Thank you, Mitch.

Kuiper: Zach Kuiper, Director of Bulls Radio.

???: (inaudible)

Galchenko: Masha Galchenko, Business Office.

???: (inaudible), and that's Business Office.

C. Johnson: Thank you so much for being here today. Any other points that anyone wants to make in Open Forum? Seeing none, we're going to move into New Business.

## **New Business:**

C. Johnson: First off, thank you very much again—thank you for coming here. It's really cool to see some new faces. Anika, it's cool seeing you back. But everyone else, I've liked working with you in the Senate and I'm going to like working with you in the Committee. We have a bunch of stuff to do and if you saw my e-mail—and Anika, I know we're having a hard time with your e-mail—but if you saw my e-mail, I explicitly said that we're probably not going to get to everything today. We have a couple really important items to get to, like the new positions. After that, we're just going to basically play it by ear and see how much we get to. If we don't get to everything, that's okay. We can table for next week. With that, I do want to go ahead. There's a presentation. I want to go ahead and present it down here, during introduction to the Interim Budget process because the first three things that we go over are not going to have anything to do with our Interim Budget process. We're

going to get to that in a bit. First things first, I want to go ahead and do this presentation of SOPs. Thank you, by the way, Pro Tempore Aziz, for cleaning up some of these (inaudible). (clicking) Is this the other document?

Aziz: No, this is the right one.

C. Johnson: Okay.

Aziz: No, the other one is the correct one.

C. Johnson: The other one's the correct one?

Aziz: Yeah, but... There you go. Get out of the view. Go back. Click on the third thing. No?

C. Johnson: This thing?

Aziz: I think "view." There you go.

C. Johnson: Standard Operating Procedures, 2014-2015.

Aziz: Pretty much in SenEx, for all the Committees who tried to standardize their procedures so they all have similar language and for all the funding Committees—Special Funding Appropriations—to have similar language. So the highlighted are the things that were added in from SenEx and passed, and it's up to the Committee to just pass it so we can put it on the website. You guys can adopt it.

C. Johnson: Which I can go line by line over each of the additions.

Aziz: If you'd like.

C. Johnson: (reading) "Should (inaudible) the governing documents of Student Government, procedures should be ratified, ratified right there, ratification clause, (inaudible) this document two-thirds ..." Okay, we changed the definition of quorum, is that right?

Aziz: Just adding—it said just the majority, so you (inaudible) plus one.

C. Johnson: Okay.

Aziz: Because we changed the definition of (inaudible), too. (inaudible) majority is, now it's two-thirds. So it's more clear.

C. Johnson: Excluding the chair, all right.

Aziz: Yeah.

C. Johnson: This is an important one. To-do sheet from last semester. I'm sorry, Zach, did you send me an e-mail?

Kuiper: Yes.

C. Johnson: Okay. I didn't mean to just... I'll pull it up in a second. So really it looks like the biggest additions that were made to the SOPs are basically the new procedures of all the quorum. Again, last summer we had a big issue with that. So basically this semester, I really need from each of you guys is that if there's going to be an issue with quorum, I really need to get an e-mail from you 24 hours in advance. So by Wednesday at 11, saying you know, what's going on, why you might be missing, or what not. Okay? If we don't get an excused absence, then we're not going to be quorum, we're not going to be able to do business, and we're going to have the same constant (inaudible) effect that we had over the summer. Okay? So thankfully only Anika and I really had to experience that because it was not very fun. But, we're not going to have it this semester so there's nothing to worry about.

Aziz: All the Committees have similar language in all their SOPs, so if you're in another Committee, you'll the same changes.

C. Johnson: So with that, if there's no objections, I'll take a motion to approve the SOPs. Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: Move to approve the SOPs.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections to that motion? Seeing none, we're going to go down to the new positions. Our statutes say that new positions in Student Government need to go through us and it's kind of vaguely defined, but essentially there's two new positions that haven't been approved by our Committee for a while now because we've been having issues either meeting quorum and then if we do meet quorum, we just don't have enough people to really talk about it so I've been uncomfortable passing it forward without more discussion about it. So basically what I had in mind,

I had Greg send me kind of a brief... I talked to Zach and Mitchell probably a month and a half ago about the new positions. Since then, a lot's happened and I had Greg send me kind of a brief overview of the positions again. What I'd like though, maybe, if you guys want to, you can each speak for two or three minutes about what these new positions are just to give the Committee kind of a brief understanding. So if that's all right with you, I'll take a motion to enter into a moderated caucus, three minutes speaking time, for our guest speakers. Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: I move to enter a moderated caucus of... How many speakers are there?

C. Johnson: There's going to be two, but we'll just do one at a time. So we'll say one speaker, three minutes long, three minutes speaking time, and a question-answer period afterwards if we feel it necessary.

A. Hasan: So moved.

C. Johnson: Any objections? Seeing none, Mitchell, would you like to go first?

Fratesi: Absolutely. If you can't find them, I have physical copies right here.

Aziz: You can just type in his name, if you want.

C. Johnson: I received the documents from Greg, very recently. Here we go. With that, Mitchell, you have three minutes for the forum.

Fratesi: I'm Mitch, I'm Director of SGCS. If you're not familiar with it, it's the agency that runs the computer lab downstairs. In our past, we used to do a lot more technology-based services and part of that was because we were completely separated from IT, but in the past two years Information Technology at USF has pretty much taken over complete control of the computer lab. As far as the printing services go, as far as the integration of the lab itself, the computer system, it's all IT-based. We used to have a liaison that would speak specifically for IT and have every sort of communication delegated to them, specifically, and this was years and years ago. We had several director positions within the agency. Currently, there's only two director positions—myself and my Associate Director of Business. She's responsible for the staff, specifically, dealing with scheduling and any issues they may have, and I do every other thing in regards to the overall maintenance and running of the computer lab. Right now, we're trying to bring that Director of Technology position back, which would enable us to do a lot more things as far as future initiatives and just day-to-day operations

would just be—not so much relief for myself, but things I wouldn't even be able to look into because I'm just not versed enough in the technology realm—we'd have someone specifically as a go-to to speak with IT. If you look at the general responsibilities, it'd be Technical Advisor to me, a Liaison to SGCS, and USF IT. It'd speak to Ricoh Services, which is our printing system. Maintain the inventory of technical equipment specifically, and basically just maintain the physical structure of the computer systems, and make sure that there's not going to ever be an issue that I, personally, couldn't overcome just because I'm not capable as far as technology goes.

C. Johnson: One more minute.

Fratesi: So right now, we're not asking for more money. We have money in our budget for this position. We'd just reallocate funding from Computer Systems positions into another Assistant Director position. So all we're doing is moving money around within an allocated section of our budget. And that's all I'm asking for you guys to approve. Any questions?

C. Johnson: Really quickly, what we'll do is let's go ahead and enter into a three-minute question-answer period, thirty minute speaking time for questions and response.

Aziz: Thirty minutes?

C. Johnson: Thirty seconds. Do I have a motion for that?

A. Hasan: So moved.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? Seeing none. Senator?

A. Hasan: So the roles and responsibilities you just stated, would they require 20 hours a week?

Fratesi: Not necessarily. That's the max. It would be up to them, assuming they can fulfill the position responsibilities with that. Generally, when we had our Assistant Directors, they have no issue working that. I would make sure that the person we hired is capable of working that many hours a week.

C. Johnson: Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: Is your lab managed by—is the (inaudible) one managed by central IT, or do you guys do it yourself?

Fratesi: Central IT. So any time there's updates and stuff—and I mean, you guys, I don't think you've ever worked with IT before, but they're not the best at communicating with us when stuff happens. I don't know if you were (inaudible) on that. We're just looking for someone that could be like the go-to guy, that could just walk into the office and be like, "Hey, by the way, they're doing an update." Just because simply they don't communicate that to me regularly.

C. Johnson: Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: Do you have the Excel sheet with the budget?

Fratesi: I don't have it here, but he can pull it up if he has access to it.

Aziz: So they can see the cost of what you're converting to the different position?

Fratesi: Okay, yes. Can you access the... I don't think he can get to it.

Aziz: (navigating) 55, ASRC, 13-14, Submitted, Student Government, Agencies, SGCS, and Enable Editing. Payroll. And you can see what he's...

Fratesi: So right now, we have money allocated for 18 Computer Systems working 20 hours. Right now we have 12 to 13—we're in between that right now—not all of them working 20 hours. So we have more than enough room to move this around. So what we'd essentially do is just add an Assistant Director position, pay rate is what, \$8.55 at 20 hours a week, and we would change that number from 18 to 16.

Aziz: So do 16 there. (clicking) And put in 2. See the number is still under what he was given.

Fratesi: Realistically, it's not the same position. It's going to be an Assistant Director and it's a different pay rate, so \$8.55, not \$8.85, but this is just kind of to show you guys we're still going to be within the limits that we've been allotted. Any other questions?

C. Johnson: Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: Motion to end question-answer period.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? Seeing none, we're going to go ahead... We still need to do a vote for this.

Aziz: Discussion?

C. Johnson: Okay, we can do a discussion period. Motion for a three-minute discussion period with thirty second speaking time for speakers. Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: So moved.

C. Johnson: Any objections?

Fratesi: Do we need to leave the room?

Aziz: Usually.

A. Hasan: Usually, yes.

C. Johnson: All right, three minutes. Who's got some points to make? Shiflett?

Shiflett: I do exactly what he's describing for the Help Desk, like managing the Ricoh printers and the supplies. So long as he's going to have them doing other SGCS roles or lowering their hours enough that—because it doesn't take that much time, but one of the responsibilities he listed was that they could also assume the role of an SGCS person down there—then I'm fine with it. They're not asking for more money, they're just asking to reallocate these responsibilities. At that Help Desk, we did exactly what he's described and we took it from all the managers doing it and just me doing it instead. So I can understand where he's coming from in wanting it to be this way.

C. Johnson: Hasan?

A. Hasan: I feel like it is reasonable, because before they would have staff and Student Assistants would not be able to work with a lot of tech issues, dealing with the printers and what not? So I feel like adding an Associate Director brings a balance and they would need less help from the IT. And the person would be a very good liaison.

C. Johnson: Shiflett?

Shiflett: And we don't service those printers at all, we have to put a thing in for Ricoh, they have a maintenance contract.

C. Johnson: All right.

Shiflett: So the person who does it wouldn't inherently need to be very tech-savvy, but they do need to have some level of understanding of how tiered-top desk systems work and what not.

C. Johnson: Okay. Masha?

Galchenko: Something Anika said, the computer lab does not have any of the staff. There's no full-time employees in there. It's all staffed by students. So this would be a student and all the other people that are working there are students.

C. Johnson: Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: When I said—I meant Student Assistants by staff—I mean, basically that an Associate Director would be a more tech-savvy student, I guess. Right?

Shiflett: To an extent. I mean, you don't need a ridiculous level of it. But they're just shifting their own money around for another position so I don't see a huge problem with it.

C. Johnson: Briana, then Trang, Aladdin?

Ramirez: I have a question—about the money—we allocate them the money?

A. Hasan: No, it's already out there.

C. Johnson: No, it's already allocated.

Ramirez: It's already allocated? So what are they giving...

C. Johnson: Essentially what they're doing is—our statutes say that if an agency with the Student Government wants to make a new position, we have to approve that new position. This situation is pretty clean, because they're not asking for more money for that position. They want to take what they already have and allocate it to something differently. We just have to approve...

Ramirez: Yes, I'm saying, I guess—where are they taking that money from? Other positions?

C. Johnson: Yes, we gave them a little over 92...

Aziz: I'll explain.

C. Johnson: Yes, please.

Aziz: So in ASRC, we gave them money for 18 staff—the Front Desk people in the Computer Lab, for one Director, Associate Director—so what they're doing is they're not going to hire two staff people, and using that money to hire another Associate Director. So that keeps them under their \$140,000 they got allocated.

Ramirez: So without those two, they saw that they're probably not going to need two extra staff, and that's going to be okay?

A. Hasan: He said that they have like 12 Student Assistants.

Ramirez: Okay.

Aziz: So I guess for you as a Committee, figure out if there's a need for it, to create a position to begin with. And then...

C. Johnson: Chief of Staff Berkowitz?

Berkowitz: I just want to remind everyone that within Payroll Budgets, we actually give what's called Flexible Spending, so as long as SGCS remains within the per-hour rate, they can actually use that (inaudible) however they wanted to. So if you don't approve the position, they can still come back and say, "Okay, we'll increase one of our Computer Assistant's hours and give them that responsibility" without actually creating a new title. I just wanted to point that out to everyone. Also, if an executive branch also wanted to create a new position, you'd also have to approve that as well, so it's not just agencies. It's all positions.

C. Johnson: All right, Senator Hiba?

Hiba: I feel like we can try to understand their situation, but they understand their own situation better than we can attempt. And if they're taking money from their own positions, I could say perhaps they could find a Student Assistant to work this position for free, but obviously if they thought they could do that, they would have done it and not tried to remove funding from other parts of their own system.

C. Johnson: With that, our three minutes are up. We can extend the discussion or we can move into voting procedures. Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: Move into voting procedures.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? It's just a simple majority to get it.

Aziz: Wait, what's the... Go back to the job description. So it's \$8.55 for 20 hours. Go back to the Excel sheet.

???: He said that it's been checked.

A. Hasan: It's 15-20.

Aziz: So Masha, would they have to know what amount they're allocating? Or just the position?

Galchenko: They're creating the position, it's just a matter of a position itself. As far as the pay rate and the hours and the weeks, that's what they need to approve. That will come up to a certain amount. But yeah, they need to have a structure for that, for this position.

Aziz: So does it matter that the numbers are kind of different?

Galchenko: Huh?

Aziz: Does it matter that the pay rate's different here from the job description? Or is it okay?

C. Johnson: Shiflett?

Galchenko: Well, the pay rate goes with the approved (inaudible) pay rate. So if they change from that point, then they have to go with what the approved one was.

Berkowitz: He also said they were just going to add an Assistant Director, not an Associate Director, so the Assistant would only have \$8.55 from what I understood from what he said. Because there's no Assistant Director field on there but if you look at the job title, I believe it's titled Assistant Director. So I think we just did that for an estimate there. I think he said they were going to add that line.

C. Johnson: Which is what it said, yes.

Galchenko: Then you guys on the pay rate scales for students (inaudible) the same thing.

Berkowitz: So we did that for the executive branch, but agencies is kind of like their own entity, so not necessarily. I don't have it in front of me, but the job's like \$8.55 (inaudible) the week, so that's the correct one on the job description, it's just that the changes for the pay rate actually came after

ASRC, so when they did the ASRC, the Associate-Assistant was the same. But then afterwards, when (inaudible) came in, they changed it. So that's why there's some differences in the title position.

C. Johnson: But this is correct?

Berkowitz: This is correct, yes.

Aziz: Can you go back to the spreadsheet? If you just put 1 for the Assistant Director, and put like \$8.55, so they'll know the amount, and change the pay rate.

A. Hasan: Oh, that's Associate.

Aziz: Yeah. He can change the label on it, just for the Committee.

Berkowitz: And the reason for the change was that before the Associate-Assistant was the same rate, but then when (inaudible) got together, they changed it, for HR purposes.

Aziz: So that's the amount you would put—\$6,840.

C. Johnson: Out of what they...

Gigante: Yes, it's still a good chunk below.

Aziz: So that would be the amount. Pretty much.

A. Hasan: But don't they already have an Assistant? Oh, this is the original one?

C. Johnson: Yes, this up here is...

Aziz: This is what you're approving. So you can see.

C. Johnson: Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: Move into voting procedure.

C. Johnson: Any objections? Seeing none, let's do a show of hands. All in favor of passing as is, as presented to us.

Aziz: We should probably roll call. For positions.

C. Johnson: Okay. Scratch that. We're going to move into Roll Call voting procedures. Vice Chairman Hasan.

A. Hasan: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Luong?

Luong: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Ramirez?

Ramirez: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Gigante?

Gigante: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Yes.

C. Johnson: All right, so unanimous vote. With that, can someone bring them back in, please? I want to get the next item...

A. Hasan: Do we have (inaudible) today?

Aziz: Yes.

A. Hasan: I didn't get an agenda from him, either.

Aziz: Today is...

A. Hasan: Oh, it shows in (inaudible). I had no idea.

Aziz: Is your e-mail that one, too?

A. Hasan: I know, my e-mail works with everything else, I just don't know why it's (inaudible). Could you forward it to me?

C. Johnson: So we did just go ahead and pass it as you presented it, okay

Fratesi: Awesome. Thank you very much.

C. Johnson: The next thing on the agenda is going to be the exact same process with Bulls Radio. It is a different position, they're not asking for the same position, it's a different title, though. But I'd like to go ahead and enter a... First I'm going to pull up the actual thing really fast. Can I get a motion to enter a three-minute moderated caucus with three minutes speaking time, Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: So moved.

C. Johnson: Any objections? All right, seeing none, you have the floor, Zach.

Kuiper: All right. Thanks for giving me a little bit of your time today. To be honest, I would not be able to tell you in three minutes all the reasons why we need this position. Chris Johnson has sat down with me and knows all of my concerns up to about a month and a half ago, so I'm just going to tell you what's happened since then. He's already heard about the equipment loss, and the new—at that point—non-signed negotiations with WUSF, which has since been signed. One big thing that came of that was that the general manager of WUSF, (inaudible), put actually in the contract that we have to have a single point of contact for technical assistance because one of the big things in the contract is them providing their technical engineers over to help maintenance equipment, help us (inaudible) the radio station within our five-year plan going forward of becoming a more professional radio station. She's very graciously, essentially, put some engineers aside that will come over basically any time to work with us. But they need somebody that is right there that knows the equipment just as well as I do—or as they do. Obviously not just as much, but a little bit close. That way we don't have to call them for everything. We're not having to call them for every time a wire's loose, we're not having to call them every time we have a question about why a speaker's going out, anything like that. That being said, also Bulls Radio has over \$100,000 worth of equipment, very expensive, very technical equipment down in our storerooms that whenever it's time to pull something out, you know, we have to essentially walk around the office like, "Hey, who's used this before? Who knows this? Oh, nobody here?" We have to call back to, you know, three generations ago and hope they pick up the phone and they have to explain this, you know, what it is, this piece

of equipment, because some of our very specialized radio equipment, I'd like to get someone who would essentially learn all of that equipment and we wouldn't have to do that anymore. They would take inventory of our stock, keep accountable, so nothing walks away like the over \$300 worth of Beats by Dre headphones that have walked away over the summer, before my tenure here. Because there was no accountability inventory. Also that being said, with all the new equipment that we've gotten recently with the new (inaudible) systems and all the new stuff that we had to replace when WNMF contract ended and the WUSF contract started. Essentially, I have a business guy that is not working as a business person right now. We need this position actually more than we need his position, right now, because of the fact that we're still working with IT. We've migrated from a physical server to the Cloud server and we're having to adjust our stream thusly, and move the podcasting system over and we're developing a new website. We're going to be doing a mobile app and tons of other different things. So essentially, he's not doing his job, he's having to do the technical job. And then do the business job on his own time, because he's got a limited number of hours for work. That being said, we do not have the budget for this, this will have to be coming out of unallocated funds, so that's the hard part. But I can tell you, I can very much assure you, that we would use it. It would be a good investment and we need it. There's a bunch of money already in Bulls Radio, please help make this investment worthwhile.

C. Johnson: We can either continue this moderated caucus or we can move into a question-answer period. Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Motion to enter a question-answer period.

C. Johnson: All right, three minutes long, thirty second speaking time for questions or responses. Any objections? Seeing none, any questions?

Hiba: You said the IT department was not willing to work with you if you didn't have this position?

Kuiper: No, no, the IT department has been working with us quite a bit and will continue to work with us. WUSF, when they signed the contract, wanted to actually put in the contract that we would have a Technical Associate that would deal with their engineers. However, while this was being approved over the summer, I didn't want to seem presumptuous so I had to reword it to "single point of contact for technical abilities." So essentially what it is, is that as long as we have our own engineer, we don't have to call her engineers all the time. She really wants to be very helpful to us,

but, you know, like over the weekend when our stream went down, we had to call one of their engineers during the weekend. And he was very helpful, but we need to have somebody that we don't have to do that.

C. Johnson: Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: So how much are we paying WUSF for those services?

Kuiper: Well, we are paying \$30,000 a year for the services and she's been very helpful. They come over and they've spent over 12 hours in our studio one day installing new equipment and getting our situation right. And the engineer Dustin Hapley has never been like, "Hey, don't call me." It's just that one of the things is, is that we have just a loose power cable or something like that that needs to be fixed or something small that needs it, I don't want to have to call a professional engineer for a radio station and abuse that privilege. I want this to be a long-running relationship and don't want to abuse it.

C. Johnson: Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: So part of the agreement is do we pay the engineers to fix things for Bulls Radio?

Kuiper: It's not specifically laid out, it's just that the money we were paying them is for guidance, internships, helping us grow into a more professional radio station, exposure, we're on one of their channels. It's not specifically laid out that we are specifically paying for engineering services, it's just in there, lumped in, with a bunch of other things.

C. Johnson: Can I have a motion to extend the question-answer period by another three minutes?  
Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Motion to extend question-answer period by three minutes.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? Seeing none, are there any more questions? Senator Luong?

Luong: You mentioned that you get lost in the transition between generations, now are you thinking to provide a task to a right-hand (inaudible) central (inaudible)?

Kuiper: Yes. I would have them... Coming from a military background, whenever we had a lot of big turnover, we had a lot of big binders that were SOPs and SOGs for doing certain things. Like

something as simple as setting up a tailgate, I had to track down four people just to tell me exactly where it was, who I needed to talk to, blah blah blah. I would love to have like I had in the military a binder essentially that's like, for somebody new has to step in and tailgate, it tells you step-by-step. That would help us quite a bit. The technical side would basically have everything labeled, and then have them so even somebody who's not a Technical Director would be able to take it off the shelf and be like, "Oh, okay this is how I do it. This is what I need it for."

C. Johnson: Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Do you intend to create this kind of binder for future generations?

Kuiper: It's something that I would like to. It'd be obviously on my list of things to do, which is extensive currently. Right now we're working on getting an actual radio station running, so after that's done, then yes, this would be... I think it's the right thing to do and it's the most efficient and best way to keep continuity.

C. Johnson: Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: This is more of a general question, so anybody can answer. Is this going to be something for just this year or like you would (inaudible) this position?

Kuiper: I would expect it to continue.

C. Johnson: Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: Did you change the hours from 20 hours to 25 in this most recent...?

Kuiper: No, I didn't change it. If you actually pull up the one that is in your e-mail, it still says 20.

Shiflett: I believe I just pulled this one up. What's your last name?

Kuiper: K-U-I-P-E-R.

???: Right here? (clicking)

Kuiper: Yes. It's the same thing, it's just for some reason it changed in the last one.

???: So this is the correct one, though?

Kuiper: Yes. So I would like it to be 20 hours a week. I honestly have more work for them than 20 hours a week, but I take what I can get, so...

C. Johnson: All right, Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: What's the total for the year for this, if anyone knows?

(inaudible)

???: This is the position talked about right here, right?

Kuiper: Correct.

???: So this number right there?

(inaudible)

A. Hasan: \$6,498.

Shiflett: Does that include the 35% or whatever it is for fringe benefits?

Aziz: Only full-time positions get...

A. Hasan: No, no, that's like over 30 hours.

C. Johnson: If there's no more questions, we can enter a discussion period. I'm sorry, Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: Have you guys explored still using Payroll Reserve to cover the...?

Kuiper: Well, as it stands right now, Payroll Reserve's probably going to be touchy. Being that, for example, we did 25 events in 10 days last week, all of my DJs went over, including the one I just fired. So, I mean... I wouldn't touch Payroll Reserves right now, the way that it's looking. We're trying to be more relevant, so we're doing more events, and we're going to obviously need those funds to cover that.

Aziz: And all those people are hired except for the...?

Kuiper: Except for the programming coordinator—the sports person has just been hired today, was just offered the job today—programming coordinator was the last one to be hired.

C. Johnson: Any other questions? Seeing none, I'll take a motion to move into discussion period.  
Senator Hiba?

Hiba: So moved.

C. Johnson: Any objections? All right, would you guys mind leaving so we can...?

Kuiper: No, thanks for your time.

A. Johnson: You want me to go too, or no?

???: No, you can stay.

C. Johnson: Oh, I apologize, just for the record, Attorney General Alex Johnson entered into the room a few minutes ago. My conversation with Zach was very impressionable. Zach has a lot of really big ideas and part of that is... Bulls Radio has an item mislocation problem. They have lost a lot of things. And there really is no system in place to prevent that. A big thing of this position, which, you know, I'm not a technical specialist so I can't truly appreciate the technical aspect of this position, but a really big thing about this is having someone on hand to help inventory the items that Bulls Radio has so that in the future we don't have to keep giving them money for things that were stolen. And that's a really important part of the job, which no one really asked him about, but I did really want to make that clear to the Committee. Pro Tempore Aziz?

Aziz: I was going to say, most of the issues about inventory and that can be solved through management. You don't really need a separate person just to be like the check-in and check-out. I've been to Bulls Radio (inaudible) throughout the summer to see that they can solve their own issues with themselves, through better management of themselves.

Ramirez: You're saying that they don't need this person?

Aziz: Yes. So also, in ASRC, they brought up the same position and through hours of discussions, it was still determined it wasn't needed because of the work load of what they do. Because the radio station is mostly automated throughout the day, and the work load is not there to justify an additional person, considering the hours that they have.

C. Johnson: Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: I look at this and I think a lot of what he says makes sense, because they pay this external a lot of money to WUSF for technology help and what-not, right?

Aziz: In the previous year, the contract is they pay the engineer to fix the engineering things that are wrong. You're literally paying a person to do what you want to hire a person to do.

A. Hasan: Exactly, in my opinion, it makes more sense for the Business Director or, say, the Media Director to do it, because they would...

Aziz: It would make logical sense for the Director to do it.

C. Johnson: Well, there is the aspect, and I will get into all of it once we (inaudible)...

A. Hasan: And there is also the aspect of them expanding, so I don't know how does that limit the equation?

C. Johnson: Long term strategy it's not really our job to evaluate if we think Bulls Radio should expand or not expand, but what we can say is that he did bring up a point how the service they've been using with whatever organization...

Aziz: It was WMNF, now it's WUSF.

C. Johnson: But they require a signed-on person, a single individual to do this.

Aziz: We can bring up the contract and see if it's in there.

C. Johnson: We absolutely can if we want to table it to the end. You know, also just from my personal experience working with the other gentleman down there, Joseph, it's... They do—they're very much overstretched on hours, that's another thing, too. Berkowitz?

Berkowitz: I want to bring up—so, I believe that approving the position is actually separate from providing the allocation for it. So, maybe if you all agree with the position but you don't agree with the money, approve the position and put it on them to figure out how they want to pay for it. Because someone's going to have to do it. Right? Then if there's concerns about the money allocation, table that to a different time. That's just the point, or suggestion, I'm going to throw out there.

C. Johnson: The only line... Attorney General Johnson?

A. Johnson: I was just going to bring up, do we have an accurate count of what is actually left in their Payroll line, because say the Auditor General hasn't been hired yet even though we allocated for a specific amount of money, so there's actually leftover monies from that position, are there leftover monies from each position and what is some of that? Because maybe that could also recoup the amount that they're asking for.

C. Johnson: That's a good question. But let's do this—it was Shiflett, Hiba, and then Ramirez.

Shiflett: Just speaking from a technical aspect, you don't want to rely on an engineer that's not in-house to do that for you. I can understand that you are paying them somewhat for it, but you don't want someone that you have to call and wait for them to get there, especially if you're trying to project yourself as a more professional group. You want that fixed as soon as possible. And then the other thing is, it's easy to say that they can manage their own inventory, but as Greg brought up, it's a lot easier said than done and if they are stretched as thin as they say they are, I think they do need this. And it's not just a matter of they're only managing inventory, if they're going to be that technical, you're getting a bargain at the rate that you're asking to pay him here, as for someone that has that technical knowledge and will be able to do what they're asking.

C. Johnson: Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Well, regarding inventory, start with—I feel like they can do the inventory in the afternoon if they wanted to. They don't need to hire a position for it. If they really need to, we can have a Senate workshop pre-inventory everything that they have. Then whenever some new equipment comes in, they put it in on the spot. Regarding engineering, you would assume—you would expect—that people working with Bulls Radio to have at least a little bit of knowledge with wires and engineering on their own system. So they don't need to hire—they don't need to call WUSF every time they have a little engineering problem. And having an engineer on hand isn't going to change that. If they need, if they have a big problem, they're going to need qualified engineers.

Johnson: Senator Ramirez?

Ramirez: Well, I was just going to say, too, that I agree with him, and instead of bringing this new technology assistant in, why can't we—when they have their job summary for all these other positions—why can't they add in maybe to have someone who is technology suitable for this job?

C. Johnson: So in effect, instead of having a new position that is this catch-all, deals with inventory, deals with engineering, you basically do better hiring in the future where the new positions take on different aspects of this job. They kind of (inaudible) the position?

Ramirez: Yes, plus if so, because of all the hours that they're working, maybe some money, whoever I guess gets that position where they are also technology suitable, then maybe they will get more in pay. And then I guess my other question was, they said that if they decided to hire this new person, that it would come from unallocated money? What does that mean? What is unallocated money?

Aziz: Unallocated is when... Well, this is the ASRC budget, so you know ASRC because next week is where you do the \$14 million, so it's the money that's unspent from the previous fiscal year.

Ramirez: Okay.

Galchenko: Why are they doing unallocated rather than Interim? I don't understand that piece. This is not going to make (inaudible).

Aziz: I think that's what they're requesting.

Galchenko: This is not going to break the bank as far as the Interim is concerned, so I don't understand why... I mean, usually (inaudible) Agencies, if they have a small thing like this, that they need budget for, they would come out of Interim money, not unallocated cash.

C. Johnson: Well, my understanding about the process for adding new positions to agencies is that there really isn't any explicit way to go about it. I mean, if they just wanted to get another... What do they do, do they present a bill to us and say, "Hey, we want another \$6,498 for a new position"? You know, do they need to come in here and say, "Hey, we need to first ask for a position, and then we can present our own budget bill"? You know, that's the process that needs to be taken? That's how it's been done in the past?

Berkowitz: I mean, logically, just because (inaudible) has to approve the position first, it would make sense to get the position approved before they asked for money for the position. So, (inaudible) yes. They need to get the position approved first.

C. Johnson: All right, let's do... One, two, three, four...

Aziz: Usually, new positions are reserved for ASRC. When you present it to ASRC, and ASRC debated and rejected it, and it's usually for the ASRC process for the new positions, not usually mid-year.

A. Hasan: Um, could you...

Galchenko: If you do need to do mid-year, it comes through in the (inaudible) Committee.

Aziz: (inaudible) Yeah.

A. Hasan: One question is, do you have exactly the argument on why ASRC rejected it? And I see where everyone's saying that this position is not that necessary but we can approve the position and leave it up to them to get it from unallocated money or pay it on reserve, and possibly decrease the amount of hours for this Director. In place of giving them 20, let's put 10 hours.

C. Johnson: Well, I almost want to say to Zach—you know, look, pending on the decision of the Committee by vote, we're not going to give you the position. We want you to document how your organization actually suffers over the next semester at the lack of this position, and then you can bring that evidence to the ASRC and have a solid case by which you can... I mean. (inaudible, laughter) That way I won't be the one to tell Zach...

Aziz: In a better way. I understand what you're saying, it makes sense to pretty much see, to document the need to justify the position because you're requesting more money, which usually that happens in ASRC. Which makes sense, what you're saying.

A. Hasan: And I feel like the inventory and tech support they're talking for, if they can have—I bet a bunch of these positions were hired later than they were supposed to. And they have quite a good Payroll Reserve, so let's tell them, "How are you going to fund for it and what's the actual need for it?" Instead of giving them 20—you give them 10. Basically this person's going to do inventory and say, small tech stuff, so 10 hours should be fine for that.

C. Johnson: First off, let's do this. It's ten 'til, and we have a ton of things to go over. We haven't even touched how we do Interim process, okay... I very much think that we need to have them document the need for this position, although I feel like half of the position is something that isn't the Director of Technology. I feel like half of the position is dealing with an inventory problem, which is not necessarily what I would feel like is under the (inaudible) of a technology specialist.

A. Hasan: I feel like the Assistant Director of Business should be doing inventory, right?

C. Johnson: I very much feel like we should enter into a vote and say let's go ahead and approve the position, but as far as the funding goes, you'll need to make a very good case for why you want all the funding for a job that basically looks like it can be split up between several other positions. Berkowitz?

Berkowitz: It doesn't apply—I know everyone keeps saying the hours, the hours, the hours—so even though you give him 10 hours, if they have it in their budget, they can increase the hours if they want to. So they can't restrain the hours because of the flexible spending we give them, so we can't affect that. That's what (inaudible). I guess also one thing about the hiring, it's for the wage that we're giving someone, if you are to find someone who can do the media, the program part, and the technology part, very few people are varied (inaudible) that can do both parts, so just keep that in mind. I'm just (inaudible) all the time, Committees.

C. Johnson: One more point. Ramirez?

Ramirez: Oh no, I was going to also ask that—I don't know what Payroll Reserves is?

A. Hasan: It's if people go over hours.

C. Johnson: Yes, so, basically the idea is that if someone—they have to have a certain amount of money throughout the year where if people do overtime, well, where are they going to get that money from? If we don't allocate for that, then no one's going to work overtime to deal with (inaudible) situations.

Ramirez: Oh, okay.

C. Johnson: Hiba, did you have one other point, then?

Hiba: Yes. I remember from when we were hiring the Director for this position, and I assume he's hiring people to go into that position, he's telling us about how he worked as a radio operator in the military, he's good at learning things, he learned—he operated—many different parts of the radio system himself, personally, so seeing as how that's how he judges himself, how we judge him, and how he, I assume, judges the people that he hires for Bulls Radio, I think that there should be enough technical expertise to go around for them not to need to hire anyone else.

C. Johnson: I really want to go ahead and move into a voting procedure on the approval of the position, not necessarily the allocation of the funding, but the approval of the position. We'll go ahead and do another Roll Call, but we'll start with Senator Hasan?

A. Hasan: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Shiflett?

Shiflett: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Trang?

Luong: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Ramirez?

Ramirez: Yes.

C. Johnson: Senator Gigante?

Gigante: Yes.

C. Johnson: So it's a unanimous vote so if someone can bring him back in, please? And we'll have the conversation afterwards about how we're going to approach the funding. We approved it as you requested.

Kuiper: I appreciate it.

C. Johnson: We need to have a conversation afterwards, okay?

Kuiper: Okay, after this?

C. Johnson: I'll contact you later on in the day.

Kuiper: All right.

Berkowitz: (inaudible) I'll send it to you.

Kuiper: Anything else?

C. Johnson: You're good. Thank you, Zach.

Kuiper: Thanks for your time.

C. Johnson: So this is what we need to do, okay? I went ahead and said that we have until 12:30 today to do business, because I expected us to go over. I want to go ahead and talk about the Interim Budget process. We need to amend these three. That's something we have to do today. It's not as much as say, looking at a new one, but we have to do these today. And then we'll just go ahead and start looking at some of these other ones. This is from a couple years back, and this is what I used at the beginning of the Summer Semester, so double check that.

Luong: I just have a comment, I know that it's a little late (inaudible) I have to leave soon, because I have class right after.

C. Johnson: That's fine, we'll go ahead and do the... Is it like three minutes? Okay. This is what we'll do. It's really hard to just give a presentation about this, it's something you have to learn while going along, okay? In essence, Interim funding is the process by which an organization gets money if they are either brand new and were not around to access annual funding, or if they're an older organization but they did not apply for annual funding. In the first scenario, we have to work with the organizations one on one, basically explain to them the process. In the second scenario, the organizations typically know what's going on and we usually dock—we don't usually—we *do* dock them 25% of their request as a penalty. The process as a whole, the way it works, is that after an organization contacts us, contacts me through my work e-mail, we sit down, we have a face to face meeting, whether it's in person or on Skype, and we go over the details of their Interim Budget request, which more or less looks like this. They're going to have exactly what their club is, a description of their club, and their total requests are going to be right here. They're then going to break down their request project by project. A project—we say it's a “project,” not an “event” because a project does not necessarily have to happen on a single day. Now, if you request T-shirts throughout the year, that's a project, right? But if an event takes place over several days, we can't fund that, because that is listed as “several events.” Right, if you have to leave and then come back the next day and the event's still going on, it's no longer just one event. It's two events. But basically what happens is that we sit down with the organization, we talk to them about the standards that are

in place—and we're going to be going over those standards as we look through Interim Budget requests—and then after we talk about the standards, I make recommendations to them, I sent them the notes I took during the meeting, they make those revisions if they want to, if they want to get the money that they want to get, and then after we basically go back and forth a couple times, I present this to the Committee for you guys to look at. We're going to talk about each of the projects. Most of the times, I'm going to have recommendations up already so it kind of expedites the process. But then after we get the stuff to Committee, if we vote it to go forward, it's going to be put in a legislative presentation like we did last Tuesday night. It's going to be presented to the Senate, the Senate votes it into existence. We're going to pass it on. Andy's going to sign it. (inaudible)'s going to sign it. And then it's in the Business Office's hands. All right? Kind of concurrently, at the same time, the Judiciary and Ethics Committee, chaired by Kristen Truong, views the organization's constitution, and their job—her job, basically—is to make sure that they are not breaking any statutes just by existing. You know, if they discriminate based on members, or something like that, collect dues. So with that in mind, that's basically Interim process. It is a very complicated thing, so it's okay to have a lot of questions. But if you do have any questions, feel free to ask them. So what I'd like to do is just basically look at the three shorter ones really quickly, the ones that we've already kind of looked at in the past, and we will then proceed with the next step.

A. Hasan: Do you want me to (inaudible)?

C. Johnson: This is the Microsoft (inaudible) Network.

A. Hasan: Of the thing we went to last week.

C. Johnson: Yes. Ah, we have a paper copy... That we were copying down notes on. Which is in my desk. Which I need to go get.

A. Hasan: I could try talking about it.

C. Johnson: Yes, please go ahead and do that really fast, I'm going to have to excuse myself for one minute.

A. Hasan: Okay, so we went over Microsoft (inaudible) Network last week and I and Chris were even talking about it before. They are an organization which is dedicated to teaching students about different technologies, so they have a bunch of stuff going on. They teach students how to do

programming, they have all these gaming competitions and what not, stuff I'm not very savvy about, but let's go through this. So, a bunch of their events—why they were not completely funded was because they asked for events which would be a four-part series or a three-part series. We're allowed to do only eight events over the academic year, for every semester, and so for example in their first one, it's a four-part series. It would be held in four days. One of the main reasons why we originally planned to zero fund it is because as it's a four-day event, funding it would mean basically funding for four events. So (inaudible) in those notes, which are over there. I went on (inaudible) first we made recommendations which were one day—for example, the programming competition which is an all-day event, which would last 10 to 6 in the afternoon, and the purpose is to challenge attendance with questions and test their problem-solving skills, and the team that solves the most problems will win. They would serve breakfast and lunch and what not. So, they said that 60 people are attending—(inaudible), you asked a question on whether you know whether these 60 people are going to attend or not, right? They make a prediction and it's up to them to get those 60 people through marketing, but if for some reason they do not meet that 60, and they spend less on one event, they can use that money on their other events in the academic year.

Ramirez: I have a question—so, if they—yes, they're going to use that money for something else, but does it come back to us in the end and are we going to see that that money wasn't used so that next time they have this same event, we will see that?

A. Hasan: Yes.

Ramirez: Okay.

A. Hasan: Our standards are for regular events, for food we give them \$2 per head, and for banquets—which can be like two—

C. Johnson: Yes, we have one a semester.

A. Hasan: One each semester, that's \$3 per head. So for the first event, 60 people, 60 to 2, it's like \$120. That's a recommendation I'm making and it's up to standard and up to you guys to change or not.

C. Johnson: Actually, instead of going detail by detail with this one, Senator Ramirez, Hasan, and I sat down last week and we went line by line over this budget. The only thing we didn't do was

approve it because we didn't have enough people and we wanted to wait for the rest of the Committee to see it.

A. Hasan: Could you add on the recommendations then and zero fund the ones which we weren't doing?

C. Johnson: Yes.

A. Hasan: So this was zero funded because this was the four-day event and basically funding that means we're going to fund something which is going to go on for four days and that means funding four events.

Ramirez: You couldn't do just one day?

A. Hasan: We did that, later.

C. Johnson: Later events that were four days, we did fund one day of them, but the problem is that this one just from the time frame basically we weren't going to be able to get around to having Senate to vote on this request.

A. Hasan: Because it was September 1<sup>st</sup>. So this one we gave them \$50.00 because we have standards for utensils, where we do \$50.00, then we do \$25.00, we have \$20.00, \$15.00, \$10.00, \$5.00, and then after that we zero fund whenever they ask for utensils. For the first event, we did \$50.00 for utensils, and \$120.00 for food. For second it was like (inaudible)—did we fund that?

C. Johnson: Does everyone understand why we did \$120.00 for food? Two times, \$2.00 a head? Trang, if you have to go, it's understandable but thank you very much for showing up. We're going to have a bunch of stuff next week too, but it's okay. It's just going to be a very high-work Committee. If you guys didn't get that implicitly already. The (inaudible) series, we wanted to go ahead and we're funding...

A. Hasan: One.

C. Johnson: Yes, we're funding one of those again.

A. Hasan: So, this is a two-part, too, as it's going to be two days, so basically we're funding for one day. Whatever they're asking—\$60.00 to \$120.00—it should be \$60.00 because we're doing one part. Are we dividing \$25.00 again?

C. Johnson: I think we said we were, yes. Senator Hiba?

Hiba: (inaudible) Isn't this where you would give them just for the first day and then they would reuse it for the second day?

C. Johnson: Right. The idea is that with utensils, you would do—first off, let me backtrack. To answer this question directly, we can't give you materials if you're going to use them over two days because then we're subsidizing an event that takes place over two days. We can give you half of what you want if it's a two-day event, because then we're just giving you materials for one day. And if the organization happens to use those materials they've already spent money on, on the second day, it's outside of our control. All we can say is—hey, we need to fund you for what's within our standards, which is the one day. Did you have a question, too?

Ramirez: For also the standards thing. I know there was a whole problem with the Chocolatiers and how they said that they thought they could get \$7.00 a head for food—what—I don't understand where that's coming from if it says that and what our policy says?

A. Hasan: Our constitution says we can do a maximum of \$7.00.

Aziz: Not constitution, Titleate.

A. Hasan: Titleate, sorry.

(inaudible)

Aziz: Well, it says that they can spend up to \$7.00, but the standard is we'll allocate them to \$2.00 per head.

C. Johnson: Right, and...

Ramirez: So there's two different policies?

C. Johnson: Well, no, it's...

Shiflett: The maximum is not the same as the standard.

C. Johnson: Exactly. So the maximum—we can—theoretically, if we had an infinite bucket of money, we could give every organization \$7.00 a head. Right, but because we're allocated \$150,000, essentially, we can only set the standard for all organizations that we only do \$2.00 a head, \$3.00 for a banquet, with the idea being that if we gave \$7.00 a head for every organization, there'd be no more money left in the bucket. Right?

A. Hasan: (inaudible) the second event was still funded. The second one.

C. Johnson: This is the first one.

A. Hasan: Oh, this one. It was zero funded. This one's going to be funded.

C. Johnson: We did that because of the number of events.

A. Hasan: This one's zero funded.

C. Johnson: So we went ahead and zero funded this event because after we finished allocating for the other events, they maxed out at eight. So we had to go—this is a more near one, so we figured we'd rather zero fund this one than zero fund one that they might want to have later on in the semester.

A. Hasan: The other one is \$70.00.

C. Johnson: Robotica?

A. Hasan: No, (inaudible).

Ramirez: When you choose to zero fund that event, so they have to somehow come up with the money or they don't have the—or they decide not to have the event?

A. Hasan: If they want, they can have it still with their own money.

C. Johnson: Yes, but again that's something else really important, too. An organization doesn't have to ask us to do something. It's not like that at all. Our job is to subsidize requests if they have them. But it's not like every event that an organization has, has to be registered through Student Government.

A. Hasan: So for this, for the Raspberry Pie Band, they asked for—it's \$70.00, but it's a two-part series. It was going to be two days. So we're basically funding one day, so we divided \$140.00, which would be the original allocation divided by two, and \$25.00 which is what we would have given them theoretically for materials. But that's divided by 2 as well—so, 12.5. And Unity Workshop is basically, again, \$30.00-\$260.00, and \$20.00 for utensils. It's \$25.00 and then it's \$20.00. And we didn't do this, did we? Robotica?

C. Johnson: Robotica, yes, we did one day of that.

A. Hasan: Yes, okay, so Robotica we do one day of that, so \$70.00 and \$7.00 a head—do you guys have any questions?

C. Johnson: Please, Hiba?

Hiba: Why do student organizations continue to put forth two day events knowing they're not going to get funded for the second day?

C. Johnson: Because organizations sometimes have a different interpretation of our standards than I do. Unfortunately, the standards that we've used so far with the other organizations that have come to Committee that I've met with has been you only get money for one day events. Shiflett?

Shiflett: I was just going to comment on that. Unfortunately for this organization in particular, a lot of that is unavoidable because these are particularly industry-standardized workshops where you go for a day, you learn, and then they give you something to do before the next one. It's just the nature of how programming works. If they teach you to do something, or theories, you have to practice them before you can move on otherwise you're not going to understand what you're doing next. And, unfortunately for them, how we developed our standards just doesn't allow that even though that's industry standards for programming and computer science.

C. Johnson: All right, cool. These next two events... We're funding...

A. Hasan: Were we doing this?

C. Johnson: The Game Maker Workshop? Yeah, we're funding one day of that, which would be \$60.00...

A. Hasan: No, we're not.

C. Johnson: No, we're not? We're not doing Game Maker? Never mind. Sorry. Thank you.

A. Hasan: We're doing Programming.

C. Johnson: We are doing Programming, okay. We also are recommending—(clicking) sorry—that's on January 31<sup>st</sup>, right? We're recommending that we do the full allocation for the Programming Competition. Basically, you can read the description, it's a cool event where people of different programming backgrounds come together and have a friendly competition. There's no prize. It's not like you get a money prize or a certificate or anything like that, you just get recognition within the programming community. Recommend that we do a full funding of that, which would mean \$2.00 a head for food and then \$10.00 for utensils is the next step on that staggered list for utensil allocations.

A. Hasan: What we have next is the (inaudible) Workshop, which is kind of like a four-part workshop. We're just funding for one-fourth of that, so that comes to \$90.00 and materials—\$5.00 divided by 4 is \$1.25.

C. Johnson: So we're funding for one-fourth of this?

A. Hasan: Yes, one-fourth.

C. Johnson: And we said 140 divided by 4, times 2?

A. Hasan: Yes.

C. Johnson: So half of that would be \$70.00, is that it?

A. Hasan: Oh wait, 140...9. My math... (inaudible)

C. Johnson: Okay, we want to do \$2.00 a head for a fourth of the people they want to bring.

A. Hasan: Yes, that's \$70.00.

Shiflett: \$35.00.

C. Johnson: \$35.00. Thank you. Which means, if they want to bring—that means we would allocate \$70.00 because that's 35 times 2. Right?

A. Hasan: No, it's 140 people.

C. Johnson: 140 people.

A. Hasan: That divided by 2 is...

Shiflett: (inaudible)

C. Johnson: Divided by 2 is 70, half of that is 35, then we would do \$2.00 a head. So that would be 35 people times \$2.00 a head, so \$70.00. (clicking, inaudible) Materials, what did we allocate for the Connect Workshop?

A. Hasan: \$1.25.

C. Johnson: 1.25?

A. Hasan: 5 divided by 4.

C. Johnson: 5 divided by 4... Man. They're going to love seeing that on their budget. The reason we're doing that is because at this point we'd be allocating \$5.00, but it's a four-part event, so we have to give them a fourth of that.

A. Hasan: Our next one we're zero-funding. It's four parts.

C. Johnson: We're (inaudible) too many events?

A. Hasan: And the last two we're doing. So this Windows (inaudible) Workshop is basically they're getting representatives from Windows 8, they're going to teach the people in a workshop on how to do apps for that. They're asking for speaker fees, drinks, and food. When they ask for \$30.00, we went ahead and gave them \$30.00 for speaker fees because it's not that big of an amount for speaker fees, right? For food, that's \$70.00, into 2 that's \$140.00. That's our recommendation.

C. Johnson: \$70.00 to 2. It's a two-part event, right?

A. Hasan: We're doing one.

C. Johnson: The Windows Phone Workshop?

A. Hasan: Oh yeah, so we should cut that by half.

C. Johnson: So we're going to do \$70.00, that's right. Because we're saying half the people are going to be there if it's two days, so 35 times 2 would be \$70.00.

A. Hasan: And the other one, we keep \$30.00 because it's speaker fees.

C. Johnson: Well, speaker fees take place over two days, so we should only fund half of it. We should do \$15.00.

A. Hasan: Okay.

C. Johnson: All right, Soup (inaudible) Banquet—it's their end of year event. They want to have... We can't fund them full for food because they're asking for... Well—

A. Hasan: No, we can...

C. Johnson: No, we can fund them full for food because—when I sat down with the organization, again, you know, banquets are \$3.00 a head, when they sent in their revised request, they only (inaudible) for \$400.00 instead of \$450.00. But since it's less than the maximum we can allot, we recommend just going for full allocation for that. And then as far as materials go, what are we allocating for that?

A. Hasan: Nothing.

C. Johnson: Zeroes, because no utensils. We can't allocate for utensils anymore. And they didn't ask for anything else as far as utensils go.

Ramirez: (leaving) Sorry.

C. Johnson: No, take it easy, Briana. Thank you very much. Samuel, do you have class now?

Shiflett: I can be late. It's not a big deal.

C. Johnson: Okay, so with that, I know we kind of rushed through that, but we'd already looked at this in the Committee before it—do you guys have any objections to passing the budget requests as is?

???: Should I abstain, since I'll be going there a significant majority of the time?

A. Hasan: No, unless you're like a board member.

C. Johnson: Let me rephrase that really quick—can I have a motion to pass the budget request?  
Senator Hiba?

Hiba: I motion to pass the revision request as is.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? Seeing none, we have passed that. Thank God.

Galchenko: (inaudible) state on the record, you can leave for class if you have a class, and you have to leave for class...

Shiflett: Okay.

C. Johnson: Thank you, Masha.

Gigante: Is there a maximum material budget, or food or anything, per organization?

C. Johnson: Is there a maximum material budget for food...

A. Hasan: No.

C. Johnson: No, no, it's basically requests. That's a good question. Next up on the agenda, the other two are really quick to go over. (inaudible) Power, we just need to change one event. That was from the...

A. Hasan: What we went (inaudible) and sat the other day.

C. Johnson: Right. And what was that one thing? That was the...

A. Hasan: It was allocation...

(inaudible; multiple voices)

C. Johnson: 100, 200...

Gigante: It said \$115.00 instead of \$140.00, for food, I think, something like that.

C. Johnson: \$50.00, \$450.00, 100 for 200. 100 for 100, this right here. So that was just a mistake on my part, I'll take the fall for that. I'm going to go ahead and put \$200.00 in right here.

A. Hasan: Was there another error here?

C. Johnson: I don't believe so.

Shiflett: There was one that we thought was an error, but it wasn't.

A. Hasan: Oh, no.

C. Johnson: So with that, let me just double check... I increased it by \$100.00, can I have a motion to pass the request as is? Senator Gigante?

Gigante: Sure, pass it as it is.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? Seeing none, thank you very much. Next item on the agenda are the Chocolatiers. The Chocolatiers are finally giving this to us today. We've had a really difficult time getting ahold of them, but we've... This is—we're probably going to need a lot of time to finish this one up and then move on to the next—er, to one of the other projects. So, it's End of the Year, one; Not So Guilty, two; WOW, three; Fall Banquet, four; Was It You?, five; A Piece is Worth a Thousand Words, six; Choco-lot, seven; (inaudible), eight. Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Two of those are in the past.

C. Johnson: Right. Which is part of the issue, is about two weeks ago, they sent in a revised budget request, asking for \$7.00 a head, and I was going to bring it to the Committee, but I was like are you sure you want me to bring this to the Committee, I can't—you know—and we weren't able to even address a Committee because of the lack of quorum. And then after the meeting, I said look, we weren't able to address it, I really don't want to bring this to Committee because you guys are going to receive a lot less than what you're expecting. So they resubmitted another revised request. The first two events we're going to have to zero fund. But the next events—sorry—they're asking, for A Piece is Worth a Thousand Words... The idea with this is that it's a synthesis of art and fashion event. They're kind of ambiguous on how exactly they wanted to do that, but basically they want a lot of chocolate, and they wanted people with really cool wardrobes to show up and eat chocolate with them. That was the idea of the event. They had advertised it as a cool, you know, come try out the Chocolatiers Club kind of event, and it sounds like pretty fun to check out. But they're asking for the basic number of food, \$2.00 a head, recommended that, and then as far as materials go, they're asking for utensils, which would be \$50.00 right off the bat. So we could fully fund this event right here. Was It You?—this is a Halloween event. Which makes sense, because you eat chocolate

on Halloween. The idea is that they're doing a mystery, like "who done it" kind of murder dinner thing. It seems like a pretty cool event. They had a similar event put on last year, they had a really good attendance for it. They actually underestimated with the idea for their attendance thinking that not as many people would want to come out this year. They didn't really give an explanation for that, but they apparently had like 100 people show up last year. But they're asking for \$2.00 a head, which would be \$100.00, and as far as materials go, they're asking for utensils—which we can do \$25.00 of—but they're also asking for festive decorations, so Halloween decorations. And we have to kind of decide if we want to do that. Essentially, what they'd be asking for is \$105.00 for Halloween decorations. So, you know, I don't know, it's up to you guys, if you feel like that's a lot of money or not a lot of money. Personally, I don't think I could justify spending \$105.00 on Halloween decorations, but... You know, it's a standard. This is the first explicitly Halloween event that we've had, so if we want to we can go ahead and set the precedent during this event. Hasan?

A. Hasan: I have no idea. I mean, Masha, what are the best (inaudible) for this?

C. Johnson: For Halloween decorations?

Galchenko: Well, they can decorate however they wish to do. It's the matter of whether the event is applicable to the organization's mission or not. This is what you have to decide. And then if you do, if they want to do the decorations, then for any of the other events, they can do Halloween decorations or Christmas decorations or whatever it is that they want to do, it's just a matter of whether they want to do decorations or not want to do decorations for the events.

C. Johnson: Hiba?

Hiba: I know you can get things like streamers for 3 for \$1.00 if you look for a good price, if you buy in bulk. \$105.00 is a bit too much for decoration, in my opinion. But it might be like in the ballpark of \$70.00 or \$80.00.

C. Johnson: I was going to say we actually go ahead and maybe set this standard for \$25.00 for a subsidy, personally. And with the idea that we can start applying that to holiday decorations as a standard to use later on. So—is there any objection to \$25.00 of that, setting that precedent? So we'll do \$25.00 for that and another \$25.00 for the utensils, which would be \$50.00. Not \$502.00.

(clicking) As far as Chocolatiers Club's Fall Banquet goes, they're asking for \$2.00 a head for the event because they didn't think that—they're asking for \$2.00 a head for the event, but they could

have asked for \$3.00 but they didn't. So if you want to, we can go ahead and allocate the full amount. We can allocate up to that amount. So we'll do that. As far as the materials go, they're asking for utensils, basically. There's not a special—it's not for a holiday, it's not—they're not really asking for art supplies, they're asking for balloons and ribbon. But they're not really asking for anything...

A. Hasan: Could we give them \$5.00 for that?

C. Johnson: For balloons and ribbons? Would you guys feel... If we give them \$5.00 for balloons and ribbons, is that enough of a subsidy worth throwing out?

Shiflett: You can get a lot of balloons for \$5.

Aziz: You can get balloons free in (inaudible).

Galchenko: No, you have to buy balloons—you can get helium for free.

Aziz: Yeah, balloons are pretty inexpensive.

C. Johnson: So do we give them \$5.00 for balloons? Is that what we're saying?

Gigante: Sure.

Aziz: If you give them balloons, you have to give all orgs balloons.

C. Johnson: If they explicitly ask for balloons.

Gigante: And ribbon. Don't forget that.

C. Johnson: And ribbon.

Aziz: (inaudible) for balloons.

A. Hasan: \$5.00.

Gigante: They called chocolate a material, so that's awesome.

C. Johnson: They are asking for chocolate as a material, but I eat chocolate, so, it's in the food category for me. Is there—if we want to, we can set a balloon and ribbon precedent now also, where if an organization explicitly asks for balloons and ribbons for said balloons, we can allocate \$15.00

combined and now on in the future we can always go for \$15.00. Is that too much? Should we do \$10.00? \$10.00 for balloon and ribbon? \$5.00 for balloon and ribbon.

Shiflett/Gigante (inaudible): Yes.

C. Johnson: If we're really feeling \$5.00 is the standard. All right. The standard has now been set.

A. Hasan: And utensils?

Shiflett: And (inaudible) or utensils?

C. Johnson: Yes, thank you.

A. Hasan: \$25.00.

C. Johnson: Thank you very much. Their WOW event—this is similar to an event they wanted to put on, but because of dates they weren't able to. Essentially what they want to do is have another chocolate party. And eat chocolate, with people. Which is kind of the gist of all their events, but it's pretty cool. They're asking for \$2.00 a head for food, which is totally within our standards, again, so we can do that. As far as material goes, they're asking for utensils. And that's about it. (inaudible) So, we can go ahead and allocate the \$15.00 and that's what's next for utensils. If no one else sees another thing we need to allocate in there... The Not So Guilty Pleasure. This is one of their new events. Okay, yes, this is their medicinal chocolate event. Basically, they wanted to once again have chocolate and use it in a cool new way. They want \$2.00 a head for this event, which is fine. But as far as the materials go...

A. Hasan: Zero fund.

C. Johnson: Zero fund? Well, they'll get utensils, so that's \$10.00.

A. Hasan: Oh, \$10.00.

C. Johnson: But the thing is that, the idea of this event is that chocolate—whereas in other events, it's an edible thing—in this event, it has medicinal qualities and they were wondering if we could put that as materials costs for this. And my understanding is that we're not allowed to subsidize medicinal products. So... I'm going to go ahead and recommend that we just go ahead and just do \$10.00 for utensils. And last but not least—is that right? Yes—last but not least as far as their... In

this event, they're asking for \$75.00... 75 a head... 75 people times 3 a head, so actually \$220.00. So we can go ahead and subsidize the full amount for that. As far as the materials go, they're asking for utensils again, and we can give them \$5.00, and that's about it. Are there any objections to...

Gigante: They spelled "chocolate" wrong.

C. Johnson: Yes.

Aziz: They also spelled "sandwiches" wrong.

C. Johnson: Yes, but it's okay. It's a friendly typo. This is how much they asked for—\$2,294.00, we're recommending \$1,049.40. Are there any objections to passing the budget request as is? Seeing none, we're going to go ahead and mail that. Now, this is what we can do, okay? Next week's agenda, you guys—this is what I really want, okay? Anika, you've obviously done this stuff before. Hiba and Nick... (inaudible) Sorry. They're both, you guys are both new. But because you guys now have a marginal more amount of experience than other people, what I really want to do is over the course of the week, I'm going to actually e-mail you each a request and I want you to kind of (inaudible) them and make your own recommendations. If you have questions, go ahead and e-mail them back to me. But something I really want to start this semester is that people other than myself are talking in front of the Senate when we give these legislative presentations, which means sitting down with you guys. Okay? I'm going to go ahead and do that, and Anika, I'm going to e-mail you probably two. Because I'm a (inaudible). Other than that, I'll go ahead and accept a motion to table the next part of the new Interim Budget requests until—for old business next meeting.

A. Hasan: (inaudible)

Aziz: (inaudible) meeting?

C. Johnson: Senator Hiba?

A. Hasan: It (inaudible) my sister's. (inaudible) He gave him ... this is like ... big one. (all inaudible)

Hiba: If you were to assign (inaudible) amount of (inaudible) to me, would I talk to the organization and work with them on their budget?

C. Johnson: Nope.

Hiba: Would I be able to if I wanted to?

C. Johnson: You can, absolutely you can. But it needs to be done by next Thursday.

Hiba: Next Thursday.

C. Johnson: But let's do this, we'll go ahead and talk about that after Committee, but is there any objection to moving on to Announcements and tabling what we have right now?

A. Hasan: Ramirez sent us, in the beginning of summer, a bunch of our previous standards—do you want me to send this over to them?

C. Johnson: What I'll do is I'll forward the very nice new SOPs that we have, and then I'll find... Yes, actually, go ahead and forward that to me, and then what I'll do is when I send out all the stuff to each individual Senator, we'll do that, okay? But just so we're clear, that wasn't an objection. Do I hear a motion to move on to Announcements? Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Motion to move on to Announcements.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections? Seeing none.

### **Announcements:**

C. Johnson: The last item I really want to talk about as far as Announcements go, you know... Last semester, there was a quantity of people involved, but it was also kind of the quality of the Senators—I didn't do a very good job helping people with this process and I really want some feedback from you guys on how we do. So please feel free to shoot me an e-mail and ask me any questions, critique me in any way on how we're doing this, and starting next Tuesday, we'd really like to get it so that probably Anika and I present the three that we just did, but then that new Senators in my Committee each present their own Interim Budget requests. Okay? With that, if there's no other questions, no other announcements—Senator Hiba?

Hiba: Motion to adjourn at 12:30 P.M.

C. Johnson: Are there any objections to adjourning at 12:30 P.M.? Seeing none, the meeting is adjourned.

**Meeting adjourned at: 12:30 P.M.**

*Transcribed by Senate Committee Transcriber Jerico Lenk.*