

**University of Chicago Student Government**

Student Government Finance Committee

March 5th, 2026

Summary:

RSO Name	Event	Requested	Recommended
Arab Student Association	Harvard Conference	\$22464.16	Partially funding \$7113.07
Medusa	Album Production	\$7100	Denied.
Minorities in Public Policy	MiPPs Gala	\$13220.50	Denied and deferred for resubmission.
Peruvian Students Association	Speaker event: Peru 2026 Forum	\$1953	Funded in full: \$1953
Undergraduate Law Magazine	Spring Issue Printing	\$2492	Funded in full: \$2492

Attendance:

Name	Attendance
Caitlin Mooney	Present
Liya Luk	Proxy (By Fred)
Cambron Bice	Present
Andy Lin	Present
Grace Cheng	Present
Addison Marshall	Absent
Grace Beatty	Present
Kevin Guo	Present
Carsten Chow	Absent
Leonardo Quai	Absent

Fred Lee	Present
Nikolai (Nick) Kopaliani	Present

### **Arab Student Association**

#### **Presentation**

- Requesting funding for National conference
- Last year they took SGFC funding to take nine people
- Food, transportation, and conference registration will be covered by attendants
- They are asking for funding for flights and accommodation

#### **Q & A**

- *Fred* asks if they tried to fundraise
  - *Presenter*: We couldn't fundraise but we are trying to make them cover some of the cost as much as possible
- *Caitlin* asks if they would consider being heard after break and fundraising in the mean time
  - *Presenter*: I would prefer not because flights are getting more expensive. They prefer to receive a decision today and then make up the difference if needed.
- *Fred* asks if they would take less people if they received less funding than anticipated
  - *Presenter*: Yes, I think we would first prioritize those that are going to present posters and cover their flights.
- *Kevin* asks if they are planning to make attendants share a room
  - *Presenter*: This specific hostel is just the room.

#### **Deliberation**

- *Kevin* notes the request seems to be reasonable.
- *Fred* thinks their request should be deterred so they can fundraise.
- *Kevin* believes that if ASA wants a decision today, they can have their decision today. He proposes standardizing the 50%, applying the complex cap and deducting fundraising. *Kevin* notes through their spreadsheet that it seems like a quarter of students will definitely go even if they don't receive funding.
- *Members do math on the board and deliberate on how math should be done for the partial funding.*
- *Kevin* speaks on the idea that when flights are only half funded, that inherently forces the RSO to make up that money elsewhere.
- *Caitlin* proposes cost-guiding the entire amount they requested and using that figure.
- *Members do math according to this suggestion.*
- *Fred* notes his only issue is that technically this math wouldn't be funding many items 3, 4, 5, 6, on the list.
- *Kevin* notes his issue is that they are subtracting money from a different place than where ASA said they wanted it subtracted from. A cap on travel means that by definition people have to pay the rest out of pocket. ASA said they wanted money to be subtracted from food, transportation, and the conference tickets, but their math is subtracting it from the overall cost of travel.
- *Fred* asks if he is implying SGFC do the budgeting in favor of ASA

- *Kevin confirms.*
- *Members deliberate on three mathematical funding options on the board, many express a preference for option 3.*
- *Grace B. notes her only doubt is that option 3 is the most technically complex and it can be difficult for clubs to understand the funding they are given based on this math, but makes the most logical sense and is most in alignment with the Cost Guide.*
- *Kevin notes option 1 is both most predictable and less complex but leaves them with the least amount of money and is not according to the spirit of the Cost Guide.*
- **Someone motions for partial funding according to value calculated through option 3.**
  - **Someone seconds**
  - **5 in favor, Fred as proxy against, motion passes**
- *Members note tension between Fred voting in Liya's spirit or according to personal opinions and those of Cabinet.*

*As noted on the whiteboard:*

1)

When the fundraising percentage of 33% is applied to total cost of event (\$22464.16) and is subtracted from the proposed halved overnight accommodations and plane expenses (\$11232.08), the resulting proposal for funding is \$3818.

2)

When the fundraising percentage of 33% is applied to the halved cost of overnight accommodations and plane expenses (\$11232.08), the proposal for funding is \$7525. This would not follow past precedent nor the spirit of the Cost Guide in the calculation of the fundraising percentage.

3)

fundraising penalty (pen): 33% of requested amount (\$22464.16) = \$7,413.17

cost-guided amount for entire request:

food: 30 ppl x 3 days x \$15 = \$1350

ground transportation: \$0

conference fees: \$2,100

housing + plane (funded at 50%): \$11232.08

sum across above proposals (prop sum): \$14682.08

(prop sum) - (pen) - (SGFC AnnAls funding of 155.84) = \$7413.07

## **Medusa**

### **Presentation**

- Still trying to fund their album
- Fundraised \$1150
- Instead of using UChicago alumni who would've had to be flown out as the recording engineer, they found a DePaul contact who would do it for the same price but wouldn't have to be flown out

### **Q & A**

- *Fred* asks for a reminder of the three different actors and who they were.
  - *Presenter*: One person is for editing and recording, another is for mixing, and mastering.
- *Kevin* asks about the RSO account balance and where the remaining \$400 will be used.
  - *Presenter*: We are hoping it will go to this.
- *Kevin* asks if the presenter knows how much they received from SGFC last time they requested funding for a similar project.
  - *Presenter*: I think it was about \$5000, I can check on Blueprint.
- *Kevin* asks how membership into the club is determined.
  - *Presenter*: It is audition based.
- *Caitlin* asks if this would be considered an event.
  - *Presenter*: No.
- *Cambron* finds that the last time they did an Album was 2023 (2022-2023 school year), with a transaction of \$4252.90.
  - *Presenter*: That must have been it.

### **Deliberation**

- *Fred* notes that it has not been 4 years but 3 school years since their last album.
- *Caitlin* explains that SGFC funds 50% every four years for an album recording in accordance with the cost guide.
- ***Andy* moves to reject funding on the basis that it has not been four years since their last album.**
  - **Seconded by *Nick***
  - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

### **Minorities in Public Policy**

#### **Presentation**

- Seeking \$13220.50 in funding for their gala
- Event is free for everyone, anyone can come
- Main cost is venue and catering
- Overall venue cost is \$9,064, location rental is \$2,500, table and chairs are \$694, equipment rental is \$450, AV equipment is \$300, catering for 150 people is \$4800, security is \$320,
- Decorations are \$1545, linens are \$315, flowers \$690, additional signage is \$40, additional decor is \$500
- Overall food and beverage will be \$1200, and catering comes directly from the venue
- Music and DJ will be \$700
- Photographer \$250

#### **Q & A**

- *Caitlin* notes that some items presented are different from those submitted. The total cost is \$4300 according to what has been submitted.
  - *Presenter*: The issue is that when we had submitted this we had gotten an initial quote from the venue. It seems like all the items for the majority are there, the monetary amounts are different.
- *Fred* notes that it seems there was an issue in adding up the line items. He notes adding up the line items produces a sum around ten thousand.

- *Caitlin* asks if SGFC should interpret what the presenter is saying as the correct amount. *Grace B.* asks if the new amounts are the most updated estimate.
  - *Presenter:* This is the most updated amount. We had estimated based on last year's costs, now we have finalized things for this event.
- *Grace B.* asks about contracts.
  - *Presenter:* Yes we signed last week, people are fully hired.
- *Kevin* asks about the payment.
  - *Presenter:* We already sent the deposit from our RSO reserve of around \$1000.
- *Kevin* notes alumni engagement and asks if alumni are projected to attend.
  - *Presenter:* They are, and we are also giving out three alumni awards. We have an RSVP of 20 alumni right now. We have 53 RSVPs right now, and we have not published the RSVP yet. We will publicize the event in April.
- *Caitlin* asks if RSO had MiPPsgiving this year.
  - *Presenter:* We did.
- *Fred* asks if the bar has mocktails.
  - *Presenter:* No, you have to give an ID and there will be wristbands. Security guards will check ID. Alcohol is not on this allocation.
- *Grace C.* Asks if the security guards are a necessary payment
  - *Presenter:* Yes because the venue is on a street that has a lot of traffic and last year we did have a lot of people who aren't involved with UChicago come in and it caused a safety issue that got out of hand. Our officers and senior members will be helping out but can't be at the door all day.
- *Grace C.* Asks if the DJ is in relation to UChicago.
  - *Presenter:* I'm pretty sure he is a student's friend but does not attend UChicago himself.
- *Grace C.* asks presenter to talk about the purpose of the photographer
  - *Presenter:* We take pictures for our archives. It is the only alumni and student event and there are awards so we want to make sure we spotlight that in photos. It is also the only chance to get a full community photo. We use these photos in recruiting to follow. This is the only event we photograph.
- *Fred* asks if this event is happening regardless of funding of SGFC.
  - *Presenter:* We have been creating a fundraising plan because that is necessary given what we have in our account regardless of funding.

### **Deliberation**

- *Kevin* asks if the \$1000 that was already paid out should be deducted and when it should be subtracted.
- *Fred* notes that everything below additional entertainment should not be funded. He also notes the bar stuff should not be funded.
  - *Caitlin* explains that the bar can be used by anybody, those that are underage can order other drinks. *Grace B.* notes that the bar has been previously funded for another event.
- *Members agree with funding equipment rental, chairs and tables, and AV Equipment. Food was cost guided to \$1200. Security cost guided to \$320. All decor cost guided to \$50. Bar stuff funded \$401.50, beverages not included. No music and DJ, no additional rentals. Photographers can be funded for \$250, no photo booth. This results in \$3990.50. Fundraising is not subtracted, but a penalty needs to be applied.*

- *Fred* notes they need to fundraise \$4365
- ***Fred* motions to fund \$0.**
  - **A second.**
  - **3:3, motion fails with tie-breaking vote of Chair siding with opposition**
- *More discussion is had regarding what can be done to aid the request.*

*Caitlin leaves room to ask MiPPs representative if they would prefer a decision now or if, given the change in information, the RSO would like time to fundraise prior to a decision by the committee. MiPPs representative asks for a deferral.*

- ***Kevin* moves to deny and defer for resubmission**
  - ***Grace B.* seconds**
  - **All are in favor, motion passes unanimously**

### **Peruvian Students Association**

#### **Presentation**

- Seeking \$1953 in funding
- Event in Harris
- Seeking money for flights and accommodation of speakers, food, and cultural show dance

#### **Q & A**

- *Grace C.* asks about the coffee breaks.
  - *Presenter:* Food for between panels. This is an all-day event.
- *Fred* asks about line items 5, 6, 7.
  - *Presenter:* Those are the flights for our speakers that come domestically from the U.S. They are organized internationally and domestically.
- *Fred* asks about local transport listed.
  - *Presenter:* Yes those are for speakers arriving. We saw that SGFC sometimes funds \$120 per speaker, we would appreciate it because these are more senior speakers. These are like Ubers from the airport. The domestic flights would be morning Ubers, the later flights would be afternoon Ubers.
- *Fred* asks if the Peruvian artists are going to be hired to put on the show.
  - *Presenter:* Yes they are being hired. They are not affiliated with the university but they have performed here before.

#### **Deliberation**

- *Kevin* notes that if the Ubers are removed, everything else seems cost-guided.
  - *Caitlin* states that is covered by fundraising, they have \$2300 in fundraising. She believes the minimum amount SGFC would fund is the total amount requested.
- *Fred* notes their total of \$10523, they are supposed to fundraise \$3472. They didn't fund 33% of it. He notes the penalty is \$1172.59
  - *Submission is revised: presenter confirms the removal of on-ground transportation from the budget request.*
  - The new total is \$9683, new fundraising minimum is \$2420.75
- ***Andy* motions to fund in full (\$1953) on the basis that if everything was cost-guided, and upon clarification they removed their request for the Uber, and the fundraising penalty was**

**imposed of \$120.75, the amount would be greater than the total requested from the funding body.**

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

### **Undergraduate Law Magazine**

#### **Presentation**

- Spring issue
- Requesting \$2492, includes printing and shipping costs

#### **Q & A**

- No questions are had

#### **Deliberations**

- **Motion to fund in full**
  - **Second by Grace C.**
  - **4:2:0**
  - **Motion passes**

### **On the Topic of Progressive Fundraising**

- *Fred* believes the percentages need to be raised if progressive fundraising is to be imposed (likened by committee to tax progressive fundraising).
- *Caitlin* proposes 10%, 25%, 50%.
- *Fred* proposes 10%, 25%, 33%, 50%
- *Kevin* proposes 10%, 33%, 50%
- *Caitlin* states SGFC would have to be really clear with RSOs that this change is being made, as they would have to fundraise a different amount, even if the difference is small or nonexistent.
- *Kevin* notes that this is a bigger conversation with RSOs.
- *Caitlin* suggests implementing this change over the summer for next year, and members generally agree.
- *Conversation is tabled.*

### **On the Topic of Calculating the Fundraising Minimum**

- *Caitlin* believes the fundraising percentage should applied to the total cost of the event, minus the total funding from other sources, minus tickets. This is the figure you would apply the percentage to, as it incentivizes getting funding from additional sources and ticket sales.
- *Math is done on board and members watch calculated propositions.*
- *Members generally agree and Caitlin will write the verbiage.*

### **On the Topic of Outside Funding and Tickets**

- There has been some dissent in College Council regarding this topic.
- *Caitlin* summarizes: SGFC won't fund over the maximum of what would be cost guided if they came to our committee first. Generally, the monetary amount that they would have from any

funding body based on SGFC calculations would not increase based on how many funding committees they appeal to.

- *Kevin* believes SGFC should incentivize going to other funding committees in some way.
- *Fred* says SGFC could just go back to consider them fundraising
- *Caitlin* explains that some people don't believe this process is fair, but smaller/cultural RSOs can have little access to other UChicago funding bodies, and that is why the current policy was imposed by the committee.
- *Kevin* notes that he agrees with this sentiment, but still wishes there was a way to incentivize other RSOs to search for outside funding.
- *Caitlin* proposes allowing ticketing as fundraising for RSOs that have no access to another funding body. She also suggests offering more support to RSO leaders regarding where they could get outside grants from and how to negotiate with these funding bodies.
- *Cambron* also mentions encouraging alumni donations.
- *Caitlin* asks members if they see the issue she is presenting and inquires if people would want to address it.
- *Caitlin* will write something up formally, and will have people vote on it in the Google form because she wants it in the cost guide as soon as possible.
- *Discussion is Tabled until after break.*

#### **On the Topic of Penalties for Fundraising Minimums**

- *Caitlin* explains historically that SGFC would take the amount they decided to fund minus the gap of the amount they were supposed to fundraise and what they already fundraised.
- *Members generally do not see anything wrong with this.*
- *Caitlin* will write this up formally articulating this in the Cost Guide for transparency of current standing proceedings.

#### **On the Topic of Penalties for Failed Audits**

- *Kevin* believes the first strike should be a penalty of nine weeks, and the second strike should be a penalty for the rest of the year.
- *Grace B.* expresses that she believes the penalty needs to be harsh and that leniency should not be built into the first strike because of honest mistakes. She emphasizes how clear SGFC is in their communications and websites about rules and expectations.
- *Kevin* proposes having a set amount of time, like a penalty that can bleed into the next year in order to complete the whole term.
- *Members express an understanding that the organization as a whole must be punished, rather than the individual who made the mistake. Members agree on the set penalty being three months from the date of the infraction.*
- *Fred* highlights honest mistakes again and case-by-case discretion.
  - *Caitlin* reminds that discretion is built into the audit assessment process, and that discretion allows for certain cases of genuine mistakes not to fail.
- *Grace C.* inquires about the intersection between having a strike and requesting for AnnAll.
  - *Grace B.* strongly believes that an RSO with a strike shouldn't be able to request AnnAll during that time. She says they can participate but schedule their request for after the strike is over.

- *Kevin* highlights implications of a club not receiving funding for an entire year. He believes they should still do AnnAll, he feels that school-year requests are more of a privilege
  - *Fred* affirms that no funding for a year is essentially a death sentence. He believes that the first strike should be less severe, and the second one should be severe.
- *Grace B.* emphasizes again the intentionality of these failed audits and her preferences for strict punishments. She also says cases can be appealed when needed.
- *Cambron* advises that this conversation be tabled for a more appropriate time, and suggests that this specific issue should be not of an opinion, but based on sound logic such that it withstands the test of time.
- *Discussion is tabled to a later date, as it is not an urgent discussion until the end of the spring quarter.*