

UNIVERSITY OF THE  
**PACIFIC**  
McGeorge School of Law



## **EXECUTIVE BOARD**

### **ONLINE MEETING MINUTES**

---

**Meeting Date:** Wednesday, July 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013

**Meeting Location:** None; Vote by E-mail

**Approval:** Wednesday, August 28, 2013

**Recorded By:** Selena Farnesi

## 1 ATTENDANCE

Name	Title (Candidate Positions)	Organization	Present
Mario Walther	President		Yes
Jared Christensen	Evening VP		Yes
Mirwais Haider	Day VP		Yes
Jaqueline Logan	Treasurer		Yes
Selena Farnesi	Secretary		Yes
Monika Troike	Representative at Large		Yes
<b><i>Quorum Required (4/6) - Quorum Satisfied (6/6)</i></b>			

## 2 AGENDA

- **Action Item: SBA Funding Policy**
  - Executive Board considered whether changes made to the SBA funding policy, specifically the addition of “start up funds,” was appropriate
  - Selena Farnesi posed a series of questions regarding the funding policy in general, as recorded below
  - Mario Walther and Jacqueline Logan answered Selena Farnesi’s questions, as recorded below
  - The questions and answers were as follows:
    - Are the “start up funds” able to be used for a purpose outside other funding requests?
      - A: Yes, a club is allowed to use start up funding for any purposes consistent with the CSO Handbook. Typically clubs apply start up funds for first meeting/recruiting purposes. (ie. pizza at first meeting to attract attendance, funds towards recruiting bbq, etc.)
    - What does “actively program on campus” in terms of start up funds mean?
      - A: Actively program is referencing recruitment, as this is what those funds have primarily been directed towards
    - Does receiving start up funds limit your ability to apply for other funds throughout the year?
      - A: No. However, if you don't submit a funding request for an event that was clearly known at the time that we asked for priority funding; August 1, we will take that into consideration in reviewing the funding request.
    - What does it mean to automatically approve funds “at a rate of up to 50%” – not approving in full seems contrary to

automatically approving, am I misunderstanding this?

- A: I see your issue with the language and it can be revised. Last year it was automatic at a rate of 40%. The up to 50 percent, is to allow us the flexibility to increase from our hard-line 40 percent of last year. Funding in full and lax leadership is what put SBA in the red 3 years ago. Only through partial funding and conservative policies have we been able to overcome that issue. The idea here is to lean towards the original 40 if it appears, considering the nature and number of funding requests will exhaust funding and to allow us to increase to 50 if we can easily cover that. We will have a better idea of what a reasonable estimate of total club funding will be after the August 1 deadline.
- Is there a process for alerting CSOs that their requests have been approved?
  - A: The Treasurer will notify the person responsible for submitting the funding request letting them know what the board has decided.
- What are the penalties for not returning an “SBA Funding Follow-Up Form” in you have received a grant of more than \$250.00?
  - A: There isn't one, as this is new a new policy to encourage clubs to report back to the Treasurer and help them reflect on the event. We simply don't have the resources to track people down after the fact. However, CSO's would be wise to complete this in such circumstances; it is in their interest to maintain a healthy relationship with the Board. Jacqueline thought this would be a good way to help clubs plan large events more effectively and I support her thoughts here. I think it will be good to see how this works out but don't feel we should tie a specific penalty to not completing the form.
- Can a club submit an unlimited number of funding requests? Or is there a cap by dollar amount of number of events? If a club can indeed submit as many requests as possible, does the board consider how many requests they've made in evaluating whether they should be granted funds under an additional request?
  - A: Yes they can. CSOs have been put on notice that SBA and the administration is encouraging co-sponsorship, we want an active campus but don't want too many events or duplicate events. We will take into account the history of funding requests for each CSO. Considering

that, there is no perfect equation. Some clubs are more active than others, some have larger membership, some have larger campus-wide events, and others don't.

- Mirwais Haider comments that the funding policy as amended appears to be consistent with his experience seeking funding requests as well as consistent with the information that has been presented to clubs and other on campus organizations
- Jared Christensen suggests that the funding policy be passed as soon as possible in consideration of the August 1<sup>st</sup> due date set by the amendments, so that clubs have as much time as possible to request funds per the new policy

**MOTION by Jared Christensen: Move to adopted the funding policy as amended.  
Second by Monika Troike**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title (Candidate Positions)</b>	<b>Vote</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Mario Walther	President	Yes	
Jared Christensen	Evening VP	Yes	
Mirwais Haider	Day VP	Yes	
Jaqueline Logan	Treasurer	Yes	
Selena Farnesi	Secretary	Yes	Expressed concern for the policy's clarity and formality.
Monika Troike	Representative at Large	Yes	

**3 MEETING END**

Meeting Schedule End: N/A

Meeting Actual End: 10:59PM

**4 POST MEETING ACTION ITEMS**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Follow up with administration to plan a training for clubs on the new policy	Monika Troike	N/A
Update SBA representative on policy changes	Mario Walther	N/A

## **5 NEXT MEETING**

Next Meeting: Undecided