

University of Chicago Student Government

Student Government Finance Committee

February 26, 2026

Summary:

RSO Name	Event	Requested	Recommended
City Step	Spring showcase	\$247.90	Denied.
Euphony Journal	Issue printing	\$1200	Funded \$1200 in full.
Firebird	Issue printing	\$2,638.27	Funded \$2338.37 after calculations.
Taiwanese Student Association	Small club event (lantern-making)	\$44.50	Funded \$44.50 in full.
Peruvian Student Association	Conference	\$2450	Denied for resubmission.
UChicago Space Program	Conference	\$2,630	Denied.
Latino Medical Student Association	Regional conference	\$2444.19	\$569.18

Attendance:

Name	Attendance
Caitlin Mooney	Present
Liya Luk	Present
Cambron Bice	Present
Andy Lin	Present
Grace Cheng	Absent
Addison Marshall	Present
Grace Beatty	Present
Kevin Guo	Present

Carsten Chow	Absent
Leonardo Quai	Present
Fred Lee	Present
Nikolai (Nick) Kopaliani	Present

City Step

Presentation

- Spring showcase
- Budget they are showing now is only a portion of what they want to request from SGFC
- Want programs and other things for show

Q & A

- *Kevin* asks if the people in attendance will generally be people from the community.
 - *Presenter:* Yes.
- *Caitlin* asks if they have requested to CSF.
 - *Presenter:* We will be in their upcoming meeting, they don't meet as often as you guys so it didn't align perfectly with the timelines. We will be submitting separate line items to CSF as well as doing some internal fundraising and applying to a grant from our national organization.
- *Caitlin* inquires why they applied to SGFC.
 - *Presenter:* We are not expecting CSF to be able to cover the full cost of the event, so we are not submitting the same budget to both.
- *Kevin* asks if there is overlap between the line items.
 - *Presenter:* No, I have portioned it out.
- *Fred* asks for clarification on the specific things they are requesting funding for under the more general categories.
 - *Presenter:* We do costumes for the kids, which are usually custom-printed t-shirts, this will be requested from CSF. There are some costs regarding the venue, these will also be part of CSF.
- *Fred* asks when they are planning to ask for the national funding.
 - *Presenter:* That is an ongoing conversation, the current administration has not been very kind to overall funding, so some promises have been walked back on, but we are a priority as a new chapter. We will hopefully know in the next couple of weeks.

Deliberation

- *Kevin* explains that they funded their last event because it would take place before CSF met, but this time the event takes place after CSF meets.
- *Caitlin* asks *Fred* if he is familiar enough with the CSF guidelines to say that parts of this event wouldn't be funded.
 - *Fred* responds that they are all fundable
- ***Kevin* moves to deny on the basis that this event can be funded through CSF, noting the possibility of reconsideration given CSF doesn't fund in full, in which case they could come back to SGFC for the remaining funding**

- **A second**
- **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

Euphony Journal

Presentation

- Requesting \$1200 to print Spring 2026 issue
- Same cost as every year, and this is the primary activity of the RSO

Q & A

- *No questions are had.*

Deliberation

- Caitlin notes that the RSO was told via AnnAls to come back to SGFC to print this specific issue
- **A motion to fund in full \$1200**
 - **A second**
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

Discussion on Cost Guide

- *Caitlin* asks everyone to look at the changes she has written up to amend the cost guide, clarifying that the changes she has written up from last week's meeting wouldn't have affected any RSO that has come in yet this meeting.
- *Kevin* says he knows SGFC made the change in Autumn that funding from other sources don't count as fundraising, but wonders if there is a way to incentivize clubs to request funding from other sources.
 - *Caitlin* notes she has talked about this with Gavin, Pavlik, and Liya that day. She elaborates on a possible policy stating that RSOs have to go to their other organization first.
 - *Kevin* says he thinks this can all be done in the same breadth of either incentivizing ticket sales and/or incentivizing requesting funding from other places.
 - *Caitlin* wants to circle back on this.
- *Caitlin* inquires if people accept the changes she made for the time being.
- **Liya motions to approve all changes made to the cost guide.**
 - **A second**
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

Firebird

Presentation

- Funding for issue 5
- Physical issue is crucial, has doubled viewership every year, main product of all of their teams
- Have tried fundraising: \$100 in account through bakesale, tried selling the issues but they are expensive to make

Q & A

- *Kevin* asks how they decide on the number of copies to print
 - *Presenter:* We have reduced that every time to reduce cost. The first time we produced 400 because we got a lot of funding, they have released 140 copies this time. We wanted

each of our 80 members to get a copy and then a feasible number to make an impact on campus through distribution.

- *Andy* inquires if they have explored different vendors.
 - *Presenter:* Grace Printing is the standard vendor for UChicago.
- *Liya* asks if the \$161.63 funding from other sources is from the bake sale
 - *Presenter:* Yes.
- *Grace* asks if they know why each print costs as much as it does.
 - *Presenter:* It does vary depending on the page count, this one is slightly larger. It's a perfect bound book, the outside cover is a certain kind of printing, it is kind of necessary for the page count we have. There's a lot of art on each page with high definition ink, which is just costly.

Deliberations

- *Fred* and members clarify that they spent \$2000 this year printing one issue.
- *Kevin* adds that Grace Printing seems to be valid because that is also the supplier UChicago uses on other magazines.
- *Caitlin* explains that she moved the money from the bakesale into donations.
 - *Kevin* asks if that money should be undeducted then.
- *Caitlin* notes that this is what they were talking about today with Gavin about two to impose fundraising deductions. She explains that there are two ways they have done it historically, and they have only done it one of the ways this year. One way is if they were supposed to raise 10% and they only raised 5.8% we still multiply it by ten to get the amount that SGFC would fund given their fundraising.
 - *Fred* says that another possibility is that if the magazine can be printed next Spring, why not ask them to fundraise the rest of the money.
- *Caitlin* elaborates from speaking with Firebird that they have an additional \$300 from other issues they have sold, bringing their fundraising total to \$461. This should be deducted from the total cost of \$2800.
- **Liya motions to fund \$2338.37 on the basis that they have fundraised \$161 and an additional \$300**
 - **There is a second**
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

Taiwanese Student Association

Presentation

- Hosting a small-scale event to celebrate Chinese New Year
- Hands-on activity - lantern-making

Q & A

- *No questions are had.*

Deliberations

- *Kevin* notes that based on past presidents this is not a giveaway.
- **A motion to fund in full.**
 - **A second**
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

Peruvian Student Association

Presentation

- Requesting \$2,450 for large Conference
- Funding is \$1,250 to help cover food, with remaining money being allocated to guest accommodation.
- Have received \$2000 and \$1200 in funding that has helped cover transformation for confirmed guests.

Q & A

- *Liya* asks about the quantity of seven for the two-night accommodation.
 - *Presenter*: We have seven speakers in total. Three are coming from Peru.
- *Fred* asks the presenter to break down the transport for the three speakers coming from Peru and the other four speakers.
 - *Presenter*: Normally how we calculate the price is that \$1000 is typically the cost for the plane ticket.
- *Kevin* asks if club has any screenshots of the itinerary and pricing
 - *Presenter*: I do not have it right now, but could submit it
- *Caitlin* notes that SGFC does need this and it is stated on Blueprint and on the request form they submit.
- *Fred* asks when they expect people to fly in.
 - *Presenter*: The conference is in the morning so we expect them to come the night before and then stay one more night.
- *Kevin* inquires if SGFC were to defer the request while they submit itineraries if that would work
 - *Presenter*: I think we still have time. We have already bought some of the tickets.
- *Fred* asks if they could raise another \$300 from fundraising
 - *Presenter*: I think we could, right now we are doing a raffle. We have around \$360 funded, and we still have a lot to go.
- *Caitlin* then inquires about the \$2000 figure listed under raffle.
 - *Presenter*: That is what we expect to get from the raffle.

Deliberations

- *Fred* recommends that SGFC asks them to raise \$362.50 more dollars to fit the 25% fundraising minimum. As well as figure out the actual cost of the transport.
- *Caitlin* states that they also contradicted what they had said in their submission regarding transport to and from the airport.
- *Cambren* notes that on the website SGFC does not have a meeting next week, so they couldn't be deferred.
- *Caitlin* asks if people want to meet next week.
 - *Members are generally ok with this. They wonder if CC would be ok approving those minutes as they would not be meeting during Reading Period, and believe this would be fine.*
- *Caitlin* suggests they defer them and then if CC won't approve their minutes as they may not be meeting, she can send out a form where members can decide on an amount before Monday.
- *Kevin* suggests operating under the assumption that everything is fine with CC, and then if that turns out to be otherwise then SGFC can accommodate.

- **Addi motions to deny this request on the basis that they didn't meet the fundraising percentage and that they didn't have the correct documents needed, to be re-evaluated later.**
 - **Nick second is had**
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously.**

Discussion on the Space Program

- *Fred* says he supports whatever Kevin has said.
 - *Kevin* explains he no longer feels the same, noting *Caitlin's* note about telling them to come back to SGFC regarding housing and transportation.
- *Liya* says she does not support funding \$0 for this.
- *Caitlin* notes the email she sent with their breakdown of everything - everything was ear-marked for something. The RSO also said they would need another tens of thousands of dollars to complete their project. The donations are also noted as \$1000, \$1000, \$1165 - these are grants and scholarships.
- *General discussion about the STAMPS Scholarship*
 - *Kevin* explains that if a person is getting a grant, and they choose to apply the grant to the RSO, that is similar to receiving funds from an outside organization, which is tantamount to fundraising.
 - *General discussion on donations and if they are considered fundraising, as well as donations vs. member contributions.*
 - *Fred* compares this amount to if the two people going on the trip decided to buy \$1165 tickets. He is very sure that this is ticketing, it doesn't matter how the member got the money.
 - *Other members express their belief that this is member contributions.*
 - *Kevin* believes that member contributions must be dues.
 - *Let the record note that donations fall under fundraising, and ticket sales do not.*
 - *Caitlin* believes the distinction is a voluntary bestowing of money vs. obligatory.
 - ***Kevin* motions to change the verbiage in fundraising to be "ticket sales including mandatory member contributions" rather than "ticket sales including member contributions"**
 - **A second**
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**
 - *Liya* believes the STAMPS scholarship should not be counted as tickets, members agree.
- *Discussion on the Quad Conference, which members agree is UChicago specific.*
- *Discussion on whether career advancement is another funding body of the institution - members agree*
- *General note on the club contribution being from SGFC, so it is not really club contribution*
- *Kevin* asks if the total trip amount is looked at for fundraising contributions
 - *Caitlin* explains the total cost is considered in regards to fundraising.
- *Liya* notes that this is their fourth request of the quarter, so they do regardless want a 25% fundraising minimum or a 33% minimum based on that the event is over \$10k.
- *Caitlin* asks people to debate two issues: the current imposition of total cost not fundraised as deduction vs. percentage of amount requested + fundraising
 - There are two issues: if they don't hit our fundraising minimum, what are we going to do?

1. We impose the percent that they didn't fund
 2. The maximum they could fund if they hit their fundraising mark $(1 - x)$, divided by the amount they have fundraised, essentially scaling proportionately based on the amount they are supposed to hit
- *Caitlin* explains that with the second way, if they didn't do any fundraising at all, they could potentially get into the negatives.
 - *Fred* conducts calculations and presents them on board, while members speak on the math
 - Someone notes that they were given money in AnnAll for registration and they used it for something else.
 - *Caitlin* explains to members how the first option penalizes RSOs more heavily in some cases.
 - *Grace* notes that she is also fine punishing clubs proportionally to how much they failed to fundraise.
 - *Caitlin* explains that the way they have been doing is proportional, but it is applied to the total cost, which most of the time isn't the total they would fund considering other funding sources.
 - *Fred* thinks it should still be applied to the total cost to incentivize them not to overinflate their budget.
 - *Kevin* agrees with this as long as RSOs are at the same time incentivized to find funding through outside sources.
 - *Fred* believes the incentive is that when RSOs get less money they figure it out
 - *Grace* inquires about when this doesn't work out for clubs because they only have one request per quarter and then change leadership.
 - *Caitlin* notes they are supposed to go to training on these concepts and they are available to ask Caitlin questions about this.
 - *Grace* emphasizes that an incentive has to change the behavior of clubs in looking for outside funding, but if they continue to be unsuccessful at it then the system is not working.
 - *Discussion in regards to the conference fee and the AnnAll amount.*
 - *Fred* summarizes: if you think SGFC should fund the registration fee, you can fund in full vs. if you think SGFC should not fund the registration fee, you can fund the amount calculated
 - *Grace* believes they should not fund the registration fee, as they had already funded that.
 - *Fred* takes note of the standard regarding funding from other sources, which would imply that UCSP should be funded \$0. He asks if SGFC wants to subtract funding from other sources when there is a cap.
 - *Caitlin* explains that they have not wanted to because it is already in part funded from UChicago bodies and/or student life fees.
 - *Kevin* answers that he wouldn't want to subtract in that case, because the cap is there so that RSOs would look for funding from other sources.
 - *General discussion about outside funding bodies.*
 - *Kevin* notes that the goal is to maximize the total amount of funding available to RSOs.
 - *Liya* notes that it is not fair that some RSOs have access to outside funding bodies that others do.
 - Members agree to discuss further, but wish to follow past precedent.
 - *Liya* notes again that some RSOs are expected to cover the entire rest of the amount themselves, and that isn't equitable.

- Kevin summarizes that they need to come up with a way that both minimizes inequities to other RSOs while incentivizing people with those sources to go to those other sources.
- *Members express general consensus of agreeing with Caitlin, to be further discussed next meeting*
- *Caitlin* notes after the meeting that the first two days of the conference occur during Reading Period; she emails and the motion reaches quorum asynchronously, and Caitlin emails the RSO of the update Friday in the late afternoon when quorum is reached. As the email comes in regarding their full appeal, Caitlin emphasizes to the RSO representative (who is different from the RSO representative she has been emailing) that the basis of funding \$0 is based on the ineligibility of SGFC funding requests that take place during Reading Period. The second RSO representative notes that this is included in their full appeal. The full appeal was submitted before 8 pm.
- **In regards to the asynchronous vote:**
- ***Liya* motions to amend UCSP and fund \$0 on the basis that the event occurs during two days of the Reading Period.**
 - **Seconded by *Grace***
 - **Motion passes with 5 voting in favor**

Discussion on Latino Medical Student Association

- *Fred* notes that their fundraising came from Pritzker and therefore wouldn't count as fundraising.
- *Members go back and forth conducting calculations, staying in line with conditions set last meeting on what would and wouldn't be funded.*
- ***Liya* motions to fund \$569.18 based on the fact that items 1-6 are cost-guided and subtracting \$660 and \$310.42**
 - **A second by *Addi***
 - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

On the topic of RSOs that fail auditing

- *Caitlin* explains that three RSOs have failed auditing, and they do not currently have a discipline system in writing. These clubs are people that have used part of their SGFC funding to pay for transportation, have funded giveaways against the instruction of SGFC, spending SGFC money where they know they cannot, etc. Caitlin explains a proposition that at the first offense they get a strike, at the second they get an additional strike and cannot request again for the rest of the quarter and the following quarter.
- *Grace* proposes to extend the amount of time that they cannot request funding for, because many RSOs don't host enough events for the system mentioned by Caitlin.
- *Caitlin* proposes enforcing an online module for clubs that fail auditing for both the first and second strike.
 - *Grace* wonders if people would actually listen to it.
 - *Caitlin* says she can make the module very specific in its questions.
- *Addison* supports *Grace* by elaborating that failing auditing is uncommon, and therefore it should not have a two strike system in place, but rather more serious consequences.
 - *Grace* agrees, highlighting how some clubs arrive so prepared for meetings while others do not. She believes those that fail auditing should have one strike and then a longer time without being able to request funds.

- Kevin notes he thinks it depends on the severity of the violation.
- *Fred* proposes deferring this discussion and getting Cabinet opinion
 - *Some members suggest that Cabinet may not provide enough insight.*
- *Kevin* asks for further description of the severity of failed auditing this far.
 - *Caitlin* explains that one RSO was denied funding for a line item and then continued to spend SGFC money on it, another one used some SGFC funds for something that they didn't request.
- *Members have general deliberation on how many strikes they want to have, what they want the punishment to be for each strike, and how long they should be restricted from requesting funds. They also discuss imposing deadlines on submitting self-audits. They consider speaking to Cabinet and other funding committees.*