SUFAC D-Day Minutes

February 19, 2022, 9:00 AM

~~Omaha Beach, Normandy, German-Occupied France~~

1965 Room, UWGB

1. Call to Order
   1. Meeting was called to order at 9:12
2. Roll Call
3. Recognition of Guests
4. Approval of Agenda
   1. Motion to approve the agenda
      1. So moved: Riley
      2. Seconded: Zach
      3. Move to amend to add after item 6 two items which are vice chancellors’ budget and capital maintenance
         1. Seconded: Aidan
         2. Agenda is amended
            1. All those in favor of passing the agenda

Agenda is approved

1. Reports
   1. SUFAC Exec
      1. Painting club for $296, Phoenix catholic $350, pre-dental for $130
      2. Prepping for today, got food, let’s have a good meeting
2. Action Items
   1. Consider approval of student organization budget requests equal to or greater than $4,000 at time of presentation to SUFAC
      1. Chi Alpha
         1. Motion to approve chi alpha in full
            1. So moved: Riley
            2. Seconded: Aidan
            3. Discussion:

Committed looks good within guidelines

Travel: Looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve chi alphas budget in full.

11-0-0

* + 1. Bowling Club
       1. Motion to approve the bowling club in full $6,100
          1. So moved: JD
          2. Seconded: Zack

Committed: Looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to pass the bowling club budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Black Student Union
       1. Motion to approve the black student union budget in full for $10,750
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: Isaac
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food asking for an exception to the maximum amount for found for Soul food dinner and Kwanza

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote for the approval of the BSU budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Ultimate Frisbee Club
       1. Motion to approve the ultimate frisbee club budget in full for $5, 059.02
          1. So moved: Aidan
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote in favor of approving the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. CRU
       1. Motion to approve the budget for CRU in full for $16,000.04
          1. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food

Make a motion to strike beginning of year party and to amend pizza outreach to $150

Seconded: Harrison

Vote to strike it

11-0-0

Travel over the $7000 max for SUFAC contribution.

Tristan: We acknowledge that this budget was over because of the amount of people going on the trip.

Riley: I am in favor. Orgs should not be punished for being large. If we weren’t to grant this it is not over the $50 per person per day guideline. Only expensive because how many people are going.

JD: Did they list how much their membership is

It is 50

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget for $15,804

11-0-0

* + 1. Ballroom Dance
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for 7,885.20
          1. So moved: Aidan
          2. Seconded: Zach
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good withing guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Anime Club
       1. Motion to approve the Anime Club budget in full for $5,908.54
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Brendan
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

JD: are DVD included in the media guideline

That is the media equipment you are thinking of

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. SASU
       1. Motion to approve SASU budget in full for $11,115.38
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: Riley
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Motion to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Hip Hop
       1. Motion to approve hip hop budget in full for $3,945.01
          1. So moved: Aidan
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within

Harrison: Did we ask them to not fund the Ashwaubenon competition because it is brown county?

That cost is registration only not for travel

* + - * 1. Roll call vote

11-0-0

* + 1. Athletes in Action
       1. Motion to approve budget in full for $6,118.36
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Tristan the discussion was whether editable bibles should be put under committed. This does fall under committed items.

Has this been brought up that they bought something that was editable before?

John: I think some SUFAC’s have rules that we will provide the book to our member, and it is remaining with the member has been efficient by some and not all SUFAC’s. It is your call. Once they write in it there is no sense it is staying in the org.

Riley: I think that bibles for writing in are fine and that counts as a consumable thing. It doesn’t make sense to keep that in the org and if I remember these bibles are not long lasting if they were to stay.

JD: if they were consumable, it would be supply and expense

Is anyone opposed to this being an S&E item

Contractual looks good

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Motion to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Psi Chi
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $8,164.35
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Zach
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual

The research workshop is not a work shop it is for the creation of individual posters

Harrison: Motion to strike program one

Seconded: Isaac

Vote to strike item 1 from the contractual section

11-0-0

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Motion to approve the budget in full for the amended amount for $6,414.35

11-0-0

* + 1. MSU
       1. Motion to approve MSU budget in full for $9,359.44
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Approve budget in full

10-0-1

* + 1. Muslim Students Association
       1. MSA does not have an itemized list we do not have enough information to rule on this. If you strike that it is not there you have to do that for SGA
       2. Motion to approve the budget for $8,239.01
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food

Riley: They never gave us an itemized list. SGA hasn’t given us a list either, so we need to figure out if we are fine with getting rid of the itemized list requirement despite having that requirement for other orgs.

Harrison: If we were to not allow this can they approve this for contingency.

I think it is the responsibility of those orgs to follow guidelines and submit the itemized list.

Riley: for the point of being consistent and harping on those, I think we should follow that, but it should be removed when going over guidelines

John: If you are contemplating guidelines we could change that here. If you know that going to change next year you could just change that here.

Harrison: Given the information Id like to say it is fine to approve both of them. If we will change the guidelines any way and we aren’t’ bound we could just approve it because it is food going to students.

Riley: I don’t like the itemized list requirement.

Tristan: You need to know how many people are going, allergies, and planning that for next year is an issue the menu is changing, and the options are against state guidelines to they take a lot of thought

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Motion to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Phoenix Students for Life
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $4,538.34
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Isaac
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

JD: Are the rights to a movie actually contractual

John: yes

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. CEO
       1. Tristan I am the treasurer, so I yield the gavel to Riley.
       2. Motion to approve the CEO budget in full for $2,395.02
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: Zach
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Food looks good with guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget inf full.

10-0-0

* + 1. SGA
       1. Motion to approve SGA budget in full for $55,843.40
          1. So moved: JD
          2. Seconded: Riley
          3. Discussion

Salaries looks good within guidelines

Contractual: breaks guidelines but is okay.

Food. There is not itemized list but follow in line with what we granted for MSU

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget in full with all exceptions granted

11-0-0

* + 1. ESP GSO
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $4,299.87
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guideline

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote for approval of the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Student Association of Management
       1. Move to strike this to the packaged section of budget approvals
          1. Before the time to present we worked them down to under 4,000
          2. Seconded: JD
          3. Voice vote to strike Students association of Management

Motion passes

* + 1. Ski and Snowboard Club
       1. Motion to approve the agenda in full for $7,212.60
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: Zach
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guideline

Travel looks good withing guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote

11-0-0

* + 1. Intertribal Student Council
       1. Motion to approve budget in full for $11,625.42
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: JD
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

That is not funding of faculty instructions, so it does not break

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Roll call vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. ASA
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $3,329.00
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: Riley
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual

Riley: This is now good within guidelines, but these two things are food charges and are directly related to food, so I removed them. I told them I removed them, and they never got back to me.

Food

This is not within guidelines they are exceeding the limit for closed events.

You must be a due paying member of ASA to attend this, and we do not fund things like that

JD: Specifically with program one?

Riley: We should give them at least $150

Riley: Motion to strike the spring social and change lunch to $150

Seconded: Harriosn

Discussion: This is a closed event and we do not fund closed events over $150

Role call vote to strike item 3 and amend program one to 150

11-0-0

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the amended budget for $1,889

11-0-0

* + 1. Personal Financial Planning Association
       1. Motion to approve in full for $3,990.55
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: JD
          3. Discussion

Tristan: The budget you were presented has significantly changed, so I have been working on a budget that reflects the student org leadership. We worked it below $4000, and I made a recommendation to ask for things on contingency. We struck everything for food except for the fall recruitment.

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Alternate Theatre
       1. Motion to approve budget in full for $6,912.54
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Leaders Igniting Transformation
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $2,750.00
          1. So moved: Zach
          2. Seconded: JD
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Dance Team
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $9,421.12
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Committed ruled poms were not apparel

Looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. DECA
       1. Motion to approve in full for $5026.26
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: Zach
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Sheepshead Review
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $10,200
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: Brendan

Committed

Harrison: It is not in guidelines but as discussed in the past if we don’t fund this, students won’t have the opportunity to do this.

This is the only expense for their organization

* + - 1. Vote to approve the budget in full
         1. 11-0-0
    1. Habitat for Humanity
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $7,376.36
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

10-0-1

10-minute recess

JD motions to take a 10-minute recess

Riley seconds

* 1. Riley motion to amend the agenda to add a letter item above b to be to consider separately for approval for the following: Pinky swear, tri beta, PsychHD, Circle K, and Campus Cupboard.

Seconded by Isaac.

* + 1. Pinky Swear Pack
       1. Motion to approve pinky swear for $2,895
       2. So moved: Riley
       3. Second: Harrison
       4. Discussion
          1. Tristan: They are trying to host a fundraiser called cancer is messy. They want to buy supplies and that money will be donated to charity. If you go to food and at the bottom of program five mess fest is. They have no expected revenue. If I remember correctly they came in and talked about fundraiser guidelines and were aware that money will be reimbursed to SUFAC. I think this is a formatting issue. I would like to motion to add an expected revenue so SUFAC can be reimbursed.

So moved: Riley

Seconded: Aidan

Discussion

Kara: Any money they raise would go to SUFAC and then anything else they keep?

Yes, SUFAC is reimbursed 2 weeks after the event

If they don’t pay us back they get holds.

It doesn’t seem like they will raise this much money by selling apples.

Riley: I am inclined to get rid of the program entirely I don’t see them making $1300 in apple sales. I appreciate the scope, but it is highly ambitious

Harrison: Riley’s point is well made I think it would be better if we had consistent communication. I would not want to saddle them with the debt that they might not be able to pay back.

Tristan: If we did approve this, we email every org and give results I would think since we amend that they are supposed to reimburse SUFAC for the full amount and they can decide what they want to do.

Harrison: In order to make sure they know this, I think it would be better to request this on contingency that way they don’t end up in debt

Riley: This does not preclude this from happening, but it is just a safe guard.

Harrison: As far as asking them to ask on contingency, will that cause headaches for you guys?

No

Vote down this motion because it was to add the revenue.

Motion fails

Riley: Make amendment to strike the item of the $1295

Seconded: Harriosn

Vote to amend

11-0-0

* + - * 1. Vote to approve in full for $1,600

11-0-0

* + 1. Tri Beta
       1. Motion to approve Tri Beta budget in full.
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Brendan
          3. Discussion

Food

Closed event for the org for over $150. Org has not responded

Harriosn: this is in line with what we talked about for ASA. Given what we voted

Riley: Amend the budget from $260 to $150 to bring it within guidelines

Seconded: Aidan

Being consistent with guidelines and we are doing this to bring it within guidelines

Vote to amend their budget from $260 to $150

11-0-0

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget for $2,318.00

11-0-0

* + 1. PsychHD
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $3,907.34
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Travel

Tristan: The total for per person per day is over $50. We tried to communicate with the org, and they have not responded.

Formula was updated and is now within guidelines

Committed looks good within guidelines

Contractual looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

* + - 1. Motion to approve in full
         1. 11-0-0
    1. Circle K
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $3,445.65
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

Committed looks good within guidelines

Food looks good within guidelines

Travel looks good within guidelines

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

10-0-1

* + 1. Campus Cupboard
       1. Motion to approve budget in full for $2,350.00
          1. So moved: Zach
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Committed is over the $2,000 limit

They are buying canned foods so they can give those back to the students

Harriosn: Campus cupboard is a unique org that it is not intended to benefit members but the student body as a whole. Anyone can go in and get these goods, so it seems to be central to their org and this is still a relatively small request compared to other org request. Despite that it violates guidelines it can be explained and understood so I would be in favor

Riley: I agree entirely with Harrison

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

9-0-2

Riley moves to enter into a five-minute break

Seconded by Harriosn

* 1. Consider approval of student org budget requests not mentioned above but above $500, to be considered omnibus: A2Z-$, American Fisheries, American Marketing Association, APICS, Art Agency, ASCE, Aspiring Educators, Campus Cupboard, Circle K, CLAS, CNAfME, College Diabetes Network, Engineering Club, Curling Club, Ducks Unlimited, Dungeon Delvers, First Gen Phoenix, Fishing Club, Green Bay Audubon, German Club, Jazz Society, Model EU, MTG, Philosophy Club, Phoenix Soccer Club, Pinky Swear, PRSSA, PsycHD, Rocket Club, RPG Club, SAGA, SAM, Sigma Tau Delta, Tribeta, UESA, Vets4Vets
     1. Tristan makes a motion to package the budgets below 4000 but above 500. These have been reviewed thoroughly by Riley and I. Amendments have been made to make sure they are within guidelines.
        1. A2Z- $850, American Fisheries -$2300, American Marketing Association- $2,980, APICS- $1200, Art Agency- $2,850, ASCE- $3592.39, Aspiring Educators- $2,142, CLAS- $2618.60, CNAfME- $3,356.81, College Diabetes Network- $1,255, Curling Club- $3,113, Ducks Unlimited- $1,315, Dungeon Delvers- $540.38, Engineering Club- $3,956.67, First Gen Phoenix- $1,800, Fishing Club- $3,1176.67, Green Bay Audubon- $2884.01, German club- $2,860.01, Jazz Society- $3,200, Magic the Gathering- $510, Model EU- $3,600.07, Philosophy Club- $1,675, Soccer Club- $2,480, PRSSA- $2327.20, Rocket club- $1838.70, RPG Club- 650, SAGA- $3,612.21, Sigma Tau Delta- $2,595, UESA- $704.45, Vets for Vets- $1,740, Women in Tech- $555.99
           1. So moved: Riley
           2. Seconded: Aidan

SAM was missed and it is for $2583.60

Move to amend to included SAM

Seconded: JD

Motion is amended

JD: I appreciate the work of the chair and vice char

This was mostly Tristan I defer all credit to him

* + - * 1. Vote to approve all of the packaged budgets.

11-0-0

* 1. Consider approval of allocable non-student org budget requests
     1. Childcare Fund
        1. He made the argument not to collect for the childcare
        2. Entertain a motion to not collect for the childcare
           1. So moved: JD
           2. Seconded: Brendan
           3. Vote: 9-0-2
     2. Sustainability Fund
        1. The environmental affairs chair presented arguing to collect the full amount for $18,200 to fund future projects that will improve the environmental sustainability of our campus.
        2. Motion to approve to collect the funds
           1. So moved: Riley
           2. Seconded: JD
           3. I appreciate the character of this fund it is entirely withing the preview of the students. The admin can’t tell us what to use it on. Anything they want over $5000 they have to come to us to ask us to use it.
           4. Harrison: In reference to JD’s last comments, I agree and I think SGA and this committee should look at what we want to pursue and see how much it costs and see how we can use this money.
           5. Tristan: Add a section for the letter and address that we would like to see short- and long-term purchases.

Riley: I don’t think we should do that because the chancellor can’t tell us how to use this money.

* + - * 1. Vote to collect the $18,200 for the sustainability fund

9-0-2

* 1. Consider approval of non-allocable auxiliary budget requests
     1. UREC
        1. Motion to approve the UREC budget for $857,932
           1. So moved: Aidan
           2. Seconded: Zach
           3. Discussion

JD: My biggest point is always marketing, and they do a fantastic job of doing this. They do an excellent job, so I am in favor.

Harrison: I do hope that in the future we can ask them for better itemized list and usage data. We can work on that after D-day since this is where the largest portion of the money goes. This applies to all auxiliary budgets. We should still support the budgets because they provide to students

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

10-0-1

* + 1. Kress Maintenance
       1. Motion to approve Kress Maintenance budget in full for $428,376
          1. So moved: Brendan
          2. Seconded: Harriosn
          3. Discussion

Riley: We should keep the lights on and the floors swabbed so I appreciate this budget and they are increasing it because of a pay plan mostly. I like when people make more money than they used to.

John: That is not the same number that was provided on the spreadsheet.

This is what they showed us and in the spreadsheet

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Counseling
       1. Motion to approve the budget request for $398,392.
          1. So moved: Riley
          2. Seconded: Harrison
          3. Discussion

JD: In favor of expanding in the future that won’t affect this

Harrison: I’d like to see more data and more things we can work on in the future

Riley: I think we should appreciate they are probably wary to raise it because SUFAC might not approve, so if we voice our support to raise it will help in the future.

Harrison: I have had a little discussion with Amy that they would like to continue to raise this but put in place the current plan before they see if they need more.

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget

11-0-0

* + 1. Health Services
       1. Motion to approve the health services budget in full for $408,364
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Tristan: You see a very barebones budget because this is through a third-party contract with Prevea

Riley: The contract is set up to automatically take into account the FTE. It is based on student population

Harrison: This a budget I expect less itemization, but I would like more data usage. I think we should approve but look for more in the future.

* + - * 1. Vote to approve in full

11-0-0

* + 1. Student Life
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $972,125
          1. So moved: Isaac
          2. Seconded: Zach
          3. Discussion

JD: Great advertising and a great hit among students and GTP events. More usage data but I know they are working on it.

Harrison: I’d like to see more data this year we should approve it anyway.

Riley: I would like to see more progress made with how much we pay our student workers. The budget we go over soon is at $12 but disappointed this one hasn’t reached $12

Tristan: The raise to $12 is just in the dean of student’s office

Harrison: The university is at $10. We would like to see more. That is something we can put in the note to the chancellor. I think we want student to work these jobs because it will give the best returns to students on the investments

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the budget in full

11-0-0

* + 1. University Union
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $1,290,124
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: Aidan
          3. Discussion

Harrison: I want to see more data and higher wages and we should still approve the budget.

Riley: I would also like to see higher student wages.

JD: Union is encompassing space for all students they do great programing with student engagement

Harrison: Use of the union for commuter student and I’d like to see this space more suited for them because that is the one space they can use, and they don’t get much use out of the rest of the seg fee.

Kara: How would it become a reality to have higher wagers

No, we cannot amend these budgets we can advise and say we would like to see more.

Harrison: SGA will be looking more acutely at these issues. SGA role is to advocate and SUFAC is to advise. I would like to see SGA work on this issue and work with student workers to see how we can support them further.

Brendan: What are local wages and what do those look like.

Kwik trip was the private sector comparison, and they are at 14. McDonalds over 18 is 13-14. Walmart is around 15 an hour. Talking about local wages if these are all 3-5 it is more effective to go work at other places. We want to encourage students to work on campus because it is the best option.

Isaac: Are these places understaffed?

Tristan: The union is hiring. It is my impression that across the board are short staffed to finding way to incentives people to stay on campus and get a job has a lot of perks. People are willing to sacrifice flexibility to make a little more. To solve those issue that would happen

JD: One point is that they employ international students because they can either work on campus or work not at all

Harrison: Workers in the US, right now especially, have more bargaining power in attaining flexibility and that pertain to the private sector to the flexibility that the union offers, and I know people who have jobs off campus are able to have the flexibility that the outside jobs are offering. I think the flexibility of campus jobs is good, but it doesn’t give us the same advantage now that it has in the past

Isaac: Based on the information I have I am not in favor of making a statement of saying we want the wages increase. I am in favor, but I am hesitant about how that goes about.

Tristan: There are estimates to adjust minimum wage to $12 would cost the budget to $80,000 roughly. What we can do we cannot amend this budget; we approve it in full for not approve the 2% increase. Any decision we make can be override. We can try to get <att in here and start the conversation.

Harrison: The board of regents is the only people that can override the decisions. The 80,000 is just for the union alone and not the other student wages. As they mentioned other jobs not funded by the Suf are below 10. I would be in favor of making the recommendation that wages should be higher. Is that SUFAC role or student governments job.

That is dependent on what the resolution is passed as from the senate

Riley: I would like to amend the main motion to add an addition to approving to add in our letter that we support the increase of student wages across the board

Seconded: Harrison

Eliza: I know one of the issues that was brought up was that tuition was going to increase if wages increase. If students were surveyed they would vote in favor to have tuition increase if they got paid more.

Harrison: Look at having a minimum wage that is tied to attendance than rather then is being raised in bits and pieces but that is a longer discussion for student government to bring up.

JD: We do a broad spectrum in our letter, but I want SGA to work on a discussion.

Tristan: The letter is drafted and then approved by student government and then passed on, put a section that the student government puts in a request in.

Isaac: I vote no but I want to move forward with student government moving forward with it.

Vote to approve the amendment to put in the letter that we want to see a broad increase in student wages to the motion

10-1-0

* + - * 1. Motion to vote to approve the budget in full

This includes the amended part that puts the directive into the letter

Vote: 11-0-0

* + 1. Transit
       1. Motion to approve the budget in full for $12,000
          1. So moved: Harrison
          2. Seconded: JD
          3. Discussion

Harrison: I want more data, but we should approve this budget anyway.

Riley: I think this is the one that we don’t need more data on. They said how many people use the bus program. We know that because of covid the use of the transit system has gone down.

Harrison: They came to student government as well so maybe I have things mixed up.

We did approve the pilot program.

I want data on that.

JD: A lot of the material on campus is out of data and spots are out of service and I would like adjustments to make that accurate and higher advertising that there are bus passes available.

Tristan: They have increased the advertising and it is part of orientation, but you are thrown a lot of things so the fact that you have a free bus pass is not something many care about because they all have cars.

JD: The bus stop at Studio Art and housing are not in service. The only one is at the library

Harrison: I think this is something student government should look into more. I personally haven’t experienced a lot of advertising and I wouldn’t know if I wasn’t in SGA. There is an opportunity and SGA should look into this.

JD: With advertising you are going to use your car and not the bus. I think more advertising to students who don’t have a bus pass.

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the transportation budget in full

11-0-0

1. Motion to enter a 5-minute recess. Seconded by JD
   * 1. Vice Chancellor for Inclusivity and Student Affairs
        1. Motion to approve the budget request in full for $68,304
           1. So moved: Riley
           2. Seconded: JD
           3. Discussion:

Harrison: To clarify it says 69,000 but the request is lower

He wanted to keep this flat, so he is pulling the remaining out of cash reserves.

JD: This has the highest student wage.

Tristan: Majority of this budget goes to paying their student employees and this is the highest student wage.

Harrison: It is still not competitive for private sectors. So, hopefully we can get other employees higher

* + - * 1. Vote to approve

9-0-2

* + 1. Pride Center
       1. Motion to approve the Pride center budget in full for $53,542.00
          1. Seconded: Harrison
          2. Discussion

Harrison: This is a budget I’d like to see more allocated to in the future. I’d like a bit more data collection, but a lot of people use this resource, so they have a difference in scale than other auxiliaries. I think I’d like to see more funding and opportunities.

JD: Great service no complaints but more data usage.

Riley: This is almost entirely one person’s salary. Basically, what you are saying is that you want to give them a raise. The pride center is primarily funded by a grant.

JD: They do publish a book towards the end of the year to see accomplishments

Tristan: It has expanded to other locations and even the Kress

Harrison: I do think that salary should be raised. In general, the people who work at this institution are underpaid and I want to see better pay not just for student workers. Even for our administration and faculty positions. Some are not comparable, that is a larger issue that is not for SUFAC or even student government to solve. Our institution is underfunded and that leads to the inability to provide the best possible value and service to the student’s dollar.

Riley: I would add that we have approved a motion that we support the pay increases across the board.

* + - * 1. Vote to approve in full

8-0-3

* + 1. Pep Band
       1. Motion to approve pep band in full for $64,268
          1. Seconded: Harrison
          2. Discussion

Harrison: This is the best budget we’ve seen they have an awesome itemized list. They told us exactly where the money was going and almost all was for student pay for going to games and playing. Nearly all pay is for student personnel. I am pleased to vote in favor for how wonderful it is.

JD: It is a great example of our musicians on campus. The only usage data I can think of is from athletics.

Harrison: I think there is usage data they tell us how many games they go to. It would be cool to see the attendance but that is not for pep band.

Tristan: They are starting a new drumline so usage data on where they are performing. You could pay for and have the drumline come out and play

* + - * 1. Vote to approve the pep band budget in full

8-0-3

Motion to break into a 30-minute recess for lunch

So moved: Riley

Seconded: JD

* + 1. Cheerleading
       1. Harrison: I spoke against creating this auxiliary and my reason have changed. I am still not convinced but the main thing that I did discuss was accountability. I thought it would be more accountable under athletics but that is not true. If we were interested having cheerleading it should be under an auxiliary. The motion is should we have cheerleading.
       2. Riley: I remain kind of opposed to funding it at all. If it is to be funded it would be best as an auxiliary but not under the umbrella of athletics. Similar to pep band under the purview of the music department.
       3. Harriosn make a motion to approve the UWGB cheerleading auxiliary for 20,000 in full
          1. Second: JD
          2. Discussion

H: amend in order to request that this auxiliary be overseen by a department that is not athletics. I think it should be as with pep band overseen by someone not in athletics

Seconded: Riley

Harrison: My reasoning is if cheer remains under athletics it would be appropriate to be under athletics but since we are creating a separate auxiliary it should be separate and in charge by someone one else. The head person should not have to report to athletics.

Riley: Athletics as we know is not the most transparent. The itemize it but I think we would get a budget more pep band if it was overseen by academic staff instead of athletics department

Tanisha: I feel like with cheer a lot of their success depends on the Packers, and we haven’t seen any interest in it. I don’t think it would do well if.

Harrison: We do have to have a cheer team to work with the parkers in the first place. The dance team could not do it because they don’t have insurance. If we don’t fund cheer the packers can never ask for them to come back. It is not like pep band where the money goes directly to students. Money isn’t going to students; the students are volunteers, and the money is going to equipment and coaches and insurance. I wish we have more information. There is significant student interest. I want claims to be backed up with numbers. Significant student interest can mean anything. While I appreciate that alumni want it to exist they are paying or performing. I think Tanisha’s claim is valid and I would love to have more discussion, but we have to make a decision.

Riley: They just stop doing and it cheer still existed. This program is not dissolved and then they stopped, the Packers just stopped doing it. I feel unwilling to approve this.

Brenda: I don’t see why cheer is contingent on the Packers because it is under potential revenue so why does it have to be considered for creating the auxiliary. It is something that will come into play later.

Riley: There point was to argue that it can sustain itself, but I’m not convinced that it can.

Harrison: I don’t see consideration of the dance team who is currently performing. What happens to the dance team if cheer was there? Does that org dissolve.

Tristan: The dance team supplements the cheerleaders. They each do their own things. Dance does not have insurance. The dance team still performs if cheer exists or not.

Harrison: They presented this as having potential of bringing in $1000 in revenue, if you add it up it is $21,000. Are the packers interested and they don’t have that information? We have to decide if we are in favor of funding it without that.

Tristan: First we need to agree if we should fund cheerleading at all. I think that that is the first step.

Aidan: I see both sides and it is fair to say the Packers depends on a lot if we should grant the money but there is a possibility of bringing in revenue and d1 schools should have cheerleading. I am leaning towards granting them the money.

Kara: The biggest different between the dance team and the cheer team the insurance. Would dance be able get that insurance.

Riley: They aren’t covered because we don’t have insurance for student orgs. It is a possibility but as of now no.

Tristan: if we want to look at a program to get insurance for student orgs that would require a lot of research and inquiry.

Cheer has existed but they want it to be its own separate auxiliary. In the past the full-time cheer coach was operating on a 3000 salary which is low, so they want to make it separate and pay someone more. Make them a standalone entity

Harrison: We are discussing an amendment to put this under a different amendment. This is what this discussion should be about

Isaac: Going to the amendment I can see one negative with moving cheerleading. It looks like the athletics department has a relationship with Packers and it could be difficult for the relationship to we could be giving up that relationship. It might make cheer less effective

Harrison: there is no reason the athletics department can’t assist, and I think it would be important if the Packers were involved with more than just athletics. It would be great for them to engage with our student body in other ways.. I think this is an advantage to put it under a different umbrella

JD: Was the previous cheer team under athletics. I don’t know how I would feel about pulling the rug out from under them.

Riley: That’s what happened with pep band, and we are fine with pep band to being an autonomous group.

Harrison: from the discussion we had that forming partnerships with the rest of the school is the biggest concern and athletics would agree and this would work with that. Getting students to engage in other programs. This is a way to start building a bridge and a partnership.

Isaac: I can see that in a way encouraging athletics to work with the rest of the school so based off what he said I would be in favor.

Harrison: The amend the motion to authorize the cheerleading auxiliary for the full amount under the umbrella of a different program. The athletics program should remain separate from cheerleading as pep band is separate

Brendan: Our power in discussion is this just complete discretion

With this one Harrison and I and Ted met with the chancellor and his cabinet, and we discussed that SUFAC doesn’t have veto power over individual line items but regarding cheerleading they were open to our recommendation because it is new. We might have a little more sway in this.

Riley: This is proposing a new creation of an auxillary so we have a bit more say so

Harrison: if this is unacceptable to athletics then they can talk to the chancellor and resolve that, and the chancellor can make his own comments. We could appeal but we shouldn’t if leadership wants to go a different way, the end result is that creating a new actually under a people already run an auxiliary doesn’t make sense. I strongly believe this is the best way to do this

* + - * 1. Riley: This is not voting on the proposal it is on the amendment.
        2. Harrison: given we don’t know how people will vote; I think roll call is the best

Vote to amend the main motion

10-1-0

* + - * 1. Riley: I am opposed to cheer in general. I think that we could mention in our letter if it is overridden we should ask that this be under the heading of not athletics, but I still do not support the establishment of this auxiliary

Harrison: We do not have data and that puts us in a difficult situation. Our situation should be made on accurate data and asking in the fullest capacity that they can. I do think there was a failing of the athletics department of the interest. I am conflicted because I know there are students that will benefit. I would vote yes under the assumption that everyone presented in good faith, but it is a difficult situation. We should recognize that in the future that we need more information to make these decisions.

Brendan: I would be voting for cheerleading because I think I give admin and athletics more discretion than most people. I think that a vote in favor should not assume that Green Bay Packers will be involved at least in the short term. It should be considered by itself.

Riley: I would like to reiterate a point that was made that the analogy makes sense and they perform at games. Pep band budget is almost exclusively for students and none of this is going towards students. I don’t think I’d be in favor even if we did pay students

Harrison: This is a process we have gone through in terms of trying to correct all of our issues with this budget in 3 weeks and it makes it difficult and if were to vote no is there a process we could more information and then vote later or is this it

Riley: this is it

Aidan: I would argue that this is going to the students with uniforms and opportunities to perform. They aren’t getting paid, but they are getting the chance to perform

Riley: I am still unconvince the uniforms are for cheerleaders not students. I understand what you’re saying. I still don’t see that benefit being $20,000

Eliza: I know we talked about having more of a presence and that supports this we should support programs that help athletics

Riley: I don’t think that the student body cares about athletics and that is evident by. I don’t think adding cheerleaders to athletics events will bring more interest.

Harrison: What I’ve heard about cheerleaders at Packer’s games is that they can’t do over the head lifts any which is the point of the insurance. If the purpose of making the dance team can’t do this because they don’t have insurance, cheer can’t do stunts anyway. I get that they need insurance to perform for the Packers. I see Riley’s point and he is a very smart individual. Is there a need for this program compared to the programs we already have?

Tristan: The difference between cheer and dance if we gave dance insurance we have to give every other student org insurance as well.

Kara: The dance team wouldn’t need insurance if the Packers worked with the dance team.

Tristan: Being on the field needs insurance

Harrison: It is required for over the head stunts and to just be there at all. I feel pressure to vote yes because the athletics department believes this is the way to move forward and I wish I had more information.

Isaac: I don’t think the packers would bring a team that doesn’t have insurance. If the dance team did get insurance and they were able to do tricks they would need a new coach and the recruitment would be different, I don’t think that would be good in any way.

Riley: I was handed a note that said ignore Packers. The debate is to not provide cheerleaders to the Packers. They are not who we run out athletic events for.

Aidan: The insurance is for all basketball games, so they need it either way.

Riley: The insurance is to do stunts anywhere.

Riley: I am in favor of an org insurance policy. It wouldn’t be that expensive.

Kara: What is the student benefit of having a cheerleading team and a dance team. What does the cheer team do that dance team doesn’t?

Riley: They would provide excellent stunts that the dance team can’t. Is that really worth $20,000. I don’t think so.

Harrison: Given the information and Riley’s point of stunts not being worth $20,000 I am leaning no.

JD: Assuming that dance team is there and whether or not the athletes benefit from the cheers I don’t know if I support that. I feel $20,000 is not to major and I would feel comfortable approving it. We are funding initial costs and it would go down.

That is not how auxiliaries work. We have to keep the seg fee flat. It is unlikely this number will go down.

Riley: I have received that these students explicitly came here to be cheerleaders. We might see a benefit more than just $20,000, but I don’t agree with that argument.

Vote to approve the creation of cheerleading as a new auxiliary under a different purview other than athletics for $20,000

Motion does not pass 5-6-0

Motion to enter a 5-minute recess

* + 1. Athletics
       1. Harrison: I want to make a motion to approve the athletics budget in for full
          1. Seconded: JD
          2. Harrison: As with cheer, I am disappointed by the lack of strong data to support the claims. My own research including calling the ticketing office reveals the claims may not be true in terms of student usage. I have a duty to share my interest in being an overfunded d3 program may not be as attainable as I thought. D3 may not be an advantage and talking about that is not SUFAC’s role, that is for SGA to collaborate with athletics. I can see their argument based. I am concerned about the equitability students are paying a significant amount. It is the largest portion of the seg fee the rate of return needs to be examined and that can be looked at after today. I have never questioned the value to student athletes, and I don’t think that student athletes are living a sheltered or pampered life. We are attempting to compete with less than schools that have more. I have a desire to have success with athletics, I thought looking at a different program might be a way to do that. I have been presented that may not be true. I want more information, but in a meeting, it has been explained that this is a form of investment.
          3. Riley: I believe I have had my mind changed. We met with the chancellor before our senate meeting, and he was candid, and he has a very optimistic outlook on the university and that outlook in its optimism is rooted in concern for students generally. Not in prestige and a good athletics program, but it might be a part of that. I think primarily the existent of D1 at our school maintains some level of attractiveness to grow this university. This university was intended to be much larger, but he is convinced we are on a path to be someone large. A well-resourced d1 program is indispensable to achieving that. What we have is a well-managed, for the money that we have, going towards a D1 program. Some of these numbers need to be elaborated, especially the travel line item. I don’t think that is an impediment to approving it. I am in favor of this budget
          4. JD: There are a couple line items that I have questions about. Other than that, I have the same thoughts. We could be on track to becoming a bigger school. I am still very mixed.
          5. Harrison: Every auxiliary I want to see more data especially from this program. Looking at the numbers led to this discussion. There were claims made that I don’t know where they came from. I pulled numbers from 19-20 season and those numbers didn’t match to the current attendance. More data and proof that it is engaging more students. The Sufs role is to not invest in the university it is to benefit students to have a college experience and it should be paying for an athletics experience. The other funding is more aligned with the chancellor’s vision of growth though D1. I wish we had more money to pull from and to make it more competitive in terms of funding against our peers. I wish there was more money to make this program as successful as it can be. SUFAC doesn’t have that kind of money. We need about five mil more to reach the average. This is a result and if we were to start this earlier and talk about how this is going to support that, we could get a lot more satisfying answer. I think the possibility is there.
          6. Tristan: One of the things we discussed was that we would like to see the auxiliary budge released in the beginning of the year so we have a substantial amount of time to decided so we can provide the committee with a more complete picture. In the future that is what we will do. We will see them in the first or second week. Those wont’ be reviewed necessarily but next year we can change up the process and we know how we can change it.
          7. JD: Can you pull up slide 5. The suf is not the only funding that athletics is getting they get 6 mil in revenue and 6 mil in expenditures roughly. I appreciate that we are not there only funding source, but they should up their game on other funding if we up there funding as well.
          8. Riley: I will expand by saying most of their budget here is scholarships and tuition waivers. None of that is paid for by seg fees. That is important because we maintain the actual costs of running the program and I am content with that. I’m glad we aren’t funding scholarships
       2. Vote to approve the athletics budget in full
          1. 11-0-0
    2. Vice chancellor request for 120,000
       1. These should have been talked about Thursday. Has had an allocable contingency request that has been renewed twice. He is allowed to ask for it every two years. We talked about this in the fall, so we were aware. Approving this requires a ¾ vote. Any unspent money comes back to SUFAC and that’s why he doesn’t want it to be a non-allocable. Currently they are at $77,000 of the $120,000 they were granted a year ago. It is being spent on jumpstart program and interns in mesa and more student worker money. You can take me as a sub speaking as the vice chancellor and move to approve or approve it contingent of him coming in to describing it. We should go ahead and act.
    3. Capital maintenance
       1. Allocable contingency request for $50,000 to do emergency things for capital equipment. They want to move on getting it fixed before having to wait a week to get you guys to see them. This will be maintained by the vice-chancellor. Both requests by Dr. King.
       2. Riley: Motion to approve the vice chancellor for inclusivity and student affairs request for $120,000 and the capital maintenance request for $50,000
          1. Seconded: Harrison
          2. Discussion

Harrison: Amend that request that it will be contingent that the vice chancellor will appear at the meeting

Seconded: JD

Riley: I am opposed. What we have here is pretty set.

Kara: I feel good about the maintenance request, but I want to hear him talk about the other request.

Harrison: I would love to not have to meet but we should have to investigate, and we should hear the request because $120,000 is a big request. We voted things down that costs a lot less.

Kara: Could we do a virtual thing.

Harrison: He just sends us his materials and we can get a vote by email

Riley: not allowed

Brenden: I would like to echo the sentiment for more information for the request of $120,000

Riley: I think we will end up meeting next week Thursday because there is a contingency

Harrison: We talked about the $120,00 but I am curious why the maintenance is under Dr. King.

Tristan: It really doesn’t matter a whole lot

Riley: I think Paul Pinkston made this

Tristan: I think the argument to make this was made by him. It would make sense if he was in charge of this.

Vote to approve the amendment to the main motion which would require Dr. King to come in and discuss the budget

Motion is amended

Motion to approve both of the budgets in full contingent upon he comes in next Thursday and we get to ask him questions

11-0-0

1. Move to amend the agenda to add municipal services for $67,000
   1. So moved: Riley
   2. Seconded: JD
   3. Motion passes agenda is amended
   4. Approve the collection of municipal services
      1. So moved: JD
      2. Seconded: Harrison
      3. Discussion
         1. This is designed to pay for fire and safety cost. Regardless, it is unavoidable cost and more or less a fixed cost. Passes along from the municipal area to us for maintaining services on campus.
      4. Vote to approve in full of $67,000
         1. 11-0-0
   5. Consider setting the Segregated University Fee for the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay for the fiscal year of 2022-23
      1. We have $318,500 to student organizations
      2. Anything you approved is on here. I put cheer down to a line called to reserves. I am doing that because the chancellor can decide to put that back in. If the chancellor wants to put that back in it would affect the Seg fee. I manipulated that number $1,575.12. This is flat and has been the same for the last few years. You are giving your consent that the seg fees remains at $1575.12
      3. Motion to
         1. So moved: Riley
         2. Seconded: Isaac
            1. Riley: I like when it stays the same
         3. Vote to approve the seg fee for the 22-23 year for $1,575.12
            1. 11-0-0
2. Adjournment
   1. Motion to adjourn the meeting
      1. So moved: JD
      2. Seconded: Riley
      3. Meeting is adjourned