

STUDENT ASSOCIATION MEETING
State University of New York, College at Geneseo



Student Association meetings are Wednesdays at 6:15 pm in the College Union Hunt Room. All are welcome to attend.

MINUTES #16, Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Page Business Meeting Agenda
Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of Minutes

Updates

Old Business

41-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$2,800.00 from Budget Increases, Account 1099 to Women's Ice Hockey, Account 1417 to provide additional practice time.
Second of Two Readings

42-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$1,500.00 from Budget Increases, Account 1099 to Crew Club, Account 1402 to cover the increase in cost for trailering boats.
Second of Two Readings

43-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$100.00 from Budget Increases Account 1099 to SA Programs, Account 1002 to create a start-up budget for Peace Action.
Second of Two Readings

New Business

44-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$990.00 from Budget Increases, Account 1099 to Geneseo Area Gaming Group, Account 1922 to provide funding for the Magic Draft Event.
First of Two Readings

45-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE approve the fundraising request for People for Animal Welfare, Account 1907 to sell bracelets until May 2013 in order to raise money to support the club and meet the projected income line.
First and Only Reading

46-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$539.00 from Permanent Equipment, Account 2000 to SA Tech, Account 1004 to purchase a Gx7 Power Amplifier.
First of Two Readings

47-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE approve the fundraising request for the Inter-Residence Council, Account 1201 to collect donations for the American Red Cross during the Mr. Geneseo event on Dec. 2nd.
First and Only Reading

Open Discussion.
Adjournment

Executive Committee

President:	Carly Annable
Vice-President:	Justin Shapiro
Directors:	
Academic Affairs:	Dara Gell
Business Affairs:	Casey Howard
Inter-Residence Affairs:	Silvia Roma
Public Relations:	Forrest Regan
Student Affairs:	Sadie Baker
Student Programming:	Matt Bower
Advisor:	Patty Hamilton-Rodgers

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Dir. of SA Programs,	
Personnel & Finances:	Kate Rebban
Administrative Assistant:	Nancy Chirico
Graphics Coordinator:	Kristen Fuest
Service Manager:	Dianne Krenzer

Call to Order: 6:16 pm

Approval of the Agenda: Passes 7-0-0.

Approval of the Minutes: Minutes amended in “Old Business” under reading 40-1213 from “re-illiterate” to “reiterate”. Passes 7-0-0.

Updates

President, Carly Annable updates: During the past few weeks, I’ve done a lot of dealing with the new resource allocation model, which Jim Milroy is more than kind enough to explain after this. But that’s pretty much what I’ve been doing. Back checking and trying to get more information on the entire scenario, which is a lot more time consuming than I’m making it sound.

Vice-President, Justin Shapiro updates: Number one, SOFI Task Force meeting went really well. We had a good turnout. The next meeting will be on Monday, December 10 at 7:00 pm. The room is huge, so if you’re interested, email me at savp@geneseo.edu. Second of all, I’ll be meeting with Dr. Bonfiglio on December 11th. Study Day, is fast approaching. Also, for Clubs Sports meetings, uniform proposals are due by December 1, so please get those into me by December 1.

Director of Business Affairs, Casey Howard updates: I have the application out for the SA Finance Advisory Committee that I’m starting. Basically, it will work with the budget hearings that we will be having in the spring with every club. Hopefully, by starting a little earlier, the people that will be with me will know more about the budget hearings than the hearing committee usually does. By training them now, they will be more familiar with the financial policies so that they can best advocate how the student mandatory activity fees will go. If you’re interested in applying for the Finance Advisor Committee, you can access that at tinyurl.com/safinance. It’s not a hard application. It’s basically an interest form. I’m looking for six to seven members to be on the committee. I met with Becky Lewis, who does Study Abroad. SA awarded \$5,000.00 to be given out in scholarship money to apply for study abroad programs. Last year, we awarded \$4,000.00 for the summer and fall semester and on Monday, Becky and I met to arrange \$1,000.00 for the spring. So definitely be on the lookout for those; we’ll be doing them for the following summer and in the fall. It’s a cool opportunity for you guys. Last night, I attended along with Forrest and Carly, a presentation by Brian Hutzley, who is Vice Chancellor and CFO for the SUNY Central Programs for all state schools, which Mr. James Milroy will talk about later.

Director of Inter-Residence Affairs, Silvia Roma updates: IRC has two really awesome events coming up this weekend on Sunday. From 12:30 to 3:00 pm, on Sunday, December 2, we will have an event called “Network Your Way to an Opportunity Today”. This will be in Struges Auditorium. There will be a professional photographer coming in to take headshots. This is really important, to have professional headshots, for resumes and professional networking sites. We will be giving out “Thank You” notes, fancy pens, and resume paper. There will be food and you can get GOLD credit for this workshop. It’s called “Who Knows You: Speed Networking on the Clock”. This counts for Bronze or Emerald credit. So please go to gold.geneseo.edu to sign up. Our second event that will go from 4:00 to 6:00 pm in Sturges Auditorium is “Mr. Geneseo”. It’s going to be a lot of fun. Finally, if you are a club or organization that wants to participate in Holiday Jubilee, the deadline for that is Wednesday, November 28th.

Director of Public Relations, Forrest Regan updates: The dates for the elections in the spring, which will include the referendum and SA Exec elections, is March 11th to the 13th, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. I hope all of you vote “yes” to the referendum and vote an increase to the Student Activity Fee. Also, all of our positions will be up for election, so start thinking about that now.

Director of Academic Affairs, Dara Gell updates: AAC is holding open elections for the vice-chair position. Our current vice-chair Lena, is going to Groningen next semester, so we need somebody to fill her position. We will be holding open elections next Tuesday, December 4. Our meetings are 7:00 pm on Tuesdays in this room, so you would have to be available at that time. Your responsibilities would be to help run a professional recognition ceremony with the Center of Teaching and Learning, to help run a College Bowl, which is like a team trivia thing, and to be an all-around helpful member of the AAC e-board. If you are interested in running or have any questions, email saaac. If you decide to run, I need a really brief letter of intent with the reasons as to why you want to run, any experiences and qualifications including leadership, and anything you want us to know. Then come to our meeting next week and we’ll hopefully elect you. So any questions on that, email saaac. AAC has a twitter. It is [@aacsunygeneseo](https://twitter.com/aacsunygeneseo). Follow us. The Monologue Workshop is on Thursday. *Welles Report* was released. If you look around anywhere in the school, you can find one and it’s very interesting. Finally, please fill out your SOFIs. They’re super important and they’re available now.

Director of Student Affairs, Sadie Baker updates: Japanese Culture Club is having their dinner this Saturday at 5:30 pm. It’s \$6.00 for students and will be held in the Union Ballroom. On Saturday at 6:00 pm, the Kwanza Dinner will be held by Black Student Union. That will be \$3.00 and will be held at the Interfaith Center. Finally, this Thursday, Bhangra is having Mela in the Union. It will incorporate Indian food, dance, and singing. That will be from 6:00 to 9:00 pm tomorrow and will cost \$3.00.

Director of Student Programming, Matt Bower updates: Last night was “Give a Damn!” by Amnesty International and AC Contemporary Forum. A documentary was shown about a group of people who lived off of \$1.25 a day. After that, they spoke for an hour about poverty and activism. It was a really fantastic event so thank you to everyone who came out. This weekend, we have one of the biggest events of the semester put on by Activities Commission. On Sunday, we will be hosting members of the Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra in Wadsworth at 7:00 pm. It will be led by Cicely Parnas, who is an award-winning and up-and-coming cellist. They will also be playing with a great number of Geneseo faculty. It is going to be a very unique experience and guaranteed to be one of the best shows this semester. I highly recommend it. It’s \$6.00 for students and that’s \$25.00 cheaper than the average RPO ticket so it’s a really great deal. Next Friday, we are showing “Ted” at 10:00 pm in the Ballroom. Lastly, the freshmen class will be hosting the Midnight Breakfast at RJ on Monday, December 10. That event is going to be movie themed this year, so if you come dressed up as a character, you will have the chance to win a prize.

Kate Rebban, Director of SA Programs, Personnel, & Finances updates: No updates.

Patty Hamilton-Rodgers, SA Executive Committee Advisor updates: No updates.

Open Updates

Dara: Motion to suspend Robert’s rule.

Justin: Second.

Carly: Second by Justin. Jim you have the floor.

Jim: I met with Brian Hutzley, from SUNY, and this is Brian’s presentation that he gave to business officers back on October 30th. This is the second iteration of the model that they did. I guess the third iteration was shared with the Student Association last night and not shared with the business officers, which is sort of keeping with SUNY, we often hear things from the faculty senate and from the Student Association, but they haven’t shared with us yet. My purpose here is to talk about the resource allocation model, a model that I had strong feelings about given the fact that I am the Vice President of the Administration of Finance here, but my feelings aren’t to be your feelings. So I only thought it was fair to show this presentation so that you can formulate your own opinions on these things. This is sort of rare for me. I’m usually a stream-of-consciousness presenter, but if you see some of the sheets that I’ve passed out, this stuff is not stream-of-consciousness material. It’s really kind of dense and complicated. But at the end of the day, it affects you. It is your money. So let me go through Brian’s model here. So to start the model, what’s being allocated? I mean, I think you all know that SUNY Geneseo, and all SUNY schools, have literally nine different budgets. We have the State Budget, the Reimbursable Budget, which is the budget you take fees from, like the health fee, the transportation fee, the athletic fee. Those go into various IFR budgets. We have the DIFR budget which pays for room and board, so anyone staying in the dorms is paying for DIFR budget, which is the Dormitory Income Fund Reimbursable Budget. Then we have the SUTRA budget which primarily oversees academic programs and the summer program. So what we’re talking about today and what the Resource Model addresses is only the State Purpose Budget. There are two forms of revenue, two sources of revenue, that fund the State Purpose Budget and those are your commission dollars and the state tax dollars. So we get money from the state and then your commission dollars. In the State Purpose Budget are the main instructions for the College budget. It includes all the academic affairs, all the professors are paid out of there, all the other expenditures like supplies, services that the college buys are paid for out of that budget. So what’s being allocated by the budget? The total budget, is \$3.7 billion, minus \$1.4 billion for fringe benefits, minus \$1.4 billion for tuition which is not allocated by the model because it stays on the campuses. There is also some for university system wide programs which accounts for another minus \$165.3 million. So it’s \$787.2 million being allocated through this budget process. If you look at those sheets that I passed out, the very first column, not under 2013, you should see that it should come down to that number of \$787.2 million. So, why are they doing the new allocation model? There are several reasons. The current allocation model is broken, two of the major components are outdated, considering the cost of instruction and ability level. Distribution of cuts was not done consistently creating allocations that have not addressed strategy as admission enrollment changes over time. Those two statements I agree with completely. The current allocation model is broken. There is something wrong with the current allocation model. And the reason is this. The current allocation model is called BAP, the Budget Allocation Process. The model worked really well when the state was giving us increased money every year or at least keeping our allocations flat. Well, we got into 2007-2008 and we started getting cut. We got cut every year in a row for four years. The allocation methodology doesn’t work when you’re trying to allocate cuts. What happen is that when they were trying to use the model, some campuses were getting huge cuts, other campuses weren’t getting cut so much, some were getting increases and it just wasn’t a fair way to distribute cuts. So they tried using these different scenarios every year. So in year one, they came out and said this model isn’t going to work so let’s try it with Scenario A. But that didn’t work, so let’s try Scenario B. And well, that didn’t work, so let’s try Scenario C. Well, by last year, we did that every single year, trying to come up with new scenarios, putting plugs into the new formula to protect campuses that were getting hurt and to take money from campuses that were getting benefitted, and by last year, we all went up to Scenario J by the time we got to an agreement. It was iteration after iteration after iteration. So the model wasn’t working and it wasn’t a question that we needed a new model. The question is what kind of model. And here are more reasons from the system. Limited resources are supposed to be allocated to meet instructional need, the acknowledging SUNYs to be meet broad missions, establishing an intelligent tool for allocating, SUNY is nimble and able to adapt in the face of a changing educational fiscal environment. You know, they’re selling the model, buy it if you want. The prior model is outdated. I said that. It’s based on SUNY Centric Direct Instructional Expenditures, old costs estimated and factored down. The model costs were set in 2003. Overall costs of education has increased by 29% since then. And they give an example down here. If you enrolled in a business

school back in 2003, the cost and value of the education in the business school was thought to be \$1706.00. In the current model, when they've updated it with new data, they say that the actual annual cost is closer to \$4100.00. Funded enrollment was also frozen at the 2008 levels and enrollment has grown by 8% since that time. So, the principles of the model. They say it's to optimize the system's limited resources, it's responsive to the strategic goals adopted by the chancellor, it acknowledges campus differences, it's sensitive to each campus and campus retention maybe, it's professional, its data driven, and this is the part that I have a real problem with, it's predictable and useful for long term planning. I'll get to that point in a little bit. Just a point to keep in mind about the new model, the new model is primarily an enrollment based model. Really, 88% of the money allocated by this formula is allocated based on enrollment. And these are the model components: cost and enrollment, research, academic mission adjustments, geographic differential. There used to be a lot more of these things. There used to be a small campus adjustment, there was utilities adjustments, and so on. The new model really just has these components and the most important component is the first one, the cost of enrollment. Like I said, 88% that is be distributed is being distributed by enrollment. So how is this tool different? It's data driven. It adopts what they call nationally updated normal external costs. There was a lot of crabbing about this among the institution research people as to where the numbers came from, who produced them, are they verifiable, and it's a useless argument to have. At the end of the day, those are the numbers they're going to use. We can argue about the cost of instruction all we want and the numbers they developed. They use what are known as CIP codes, and I don't even know what they stand for. There are 99 of these codes. Does anybody know what they stand for?

Carly: I think it's Cost of Institutional Programming.

Jim: There you go, see, smarter people than me. I also probably should have pointed out that I'm a Geneseo graduate. So if you get to be really old like me, someday you can explain this stuff to groups of people, I wouldn't recommend it. It's mind-numbing. So, like I said, we can crab about that, where these numbers are accurate and whatnot but there are 99 of these codes. They say that this is a "fair share" approach. State support is not going to be distributed equitable based on discipline, and level mix, while accounting for variances in tuition and revenue by level. That's a big sentence and what it means is this: They went through the cost of instruction in each of the categories of instructions for each of the institutions for each sector. So there is the Research sector like UB and Stony Brook, Binghamton, and Albany. Then there is the Comprehensive sector that we're a member of. And then there is the Tech sector like Alfred Tech and a few schools like that. What they did was they went through each of these codes and determined how much it costs to educate, let's say a business student, in each of these sectors. In some of the examples they give you, the cost are the same or different to certain degrees. But, let me tell you, if you look at some of these CIP codes, they're just outrageous. One of them is a public administration student. It costs \$7,000.00 to educate that student in a center, \$6,000.00 to educate that student in a Technical College, but at a comprehensive college, it costs only \$5,500.00. In some of the categories, everybody gets more money than a Comprehensive College and I can't wrap my head around why that would be. I understand why, in some cases, the Research Centers would be more, because you've got bigger institutions with bigger costs but you also have high paid faculty who at many times aren't teaching. They're doing research so they have to hire teaching assistants to teach the class so the cost of the class is of course more. Some of those prices don't make sense but like I said, at the end of the day, it's not a fight worth having because to dig down through all that data, we'd all be dead by the time we agreed on those numbers. So, how is this tool different? It focuses on enrollment and cost as the main drivers, as I said before 88% is driven by that. It moves away from all the lousy distributions that we did over the years. Geographic costs are still acknowledged in the model but now it's based on contractual costs. If you're a state employee and you work in the state, you get a geographic differential in your paycheck. Now the small campus adjustments, of which Geneseo used to be one is eliminated. But transition funding is going to be made available to support campuses over a three year period. Transition funding means that once you cut people's state support, there are some campuses that just can't operate. They would have such deficits that they would need to make cuts that the overall campus would be affected and wouldn't be able to survive. So they're going to make transition funding available to help colleges over a 3 year period. And my favorite topic, shared services, is going to provide additional offsets that we're going to be able to reinvest into your education. This is the data on enrollment. The red line is actual enrollment and the blue line is funded enrollment. And you see that if you base it all off enrollment and you don't update your enrollment, some colleges that significantly increase enrollment are going to hurt. These are just some of the things that have happened. There has been differential impact of all those Scenarios A through J that I talked about. What has been the impact of the new tool? The last two years has seen major transformational impacts on how SUNY operates. Maintenance of effort provides protection through stable tax support, rational tuition provides a predictable long term resource allocation tool, and matches the tuition in the state support. What's happening here at Geneseo and you'll see if you look at those charts a little closer, is with this model, tuition will go up so the receipts of the college is going to go up, but state tax dollar support go down. To me, maintenance of effort in the way that the rational tuition bill, in my opinion, was sold to students was that all the tuition that you pay, the \$300.00 increase, all of it was going to stay on your campus. And in fact, the tuition revenue does stay on campus, but the state tax support goes down. Meaning that all those dollars that you're paying are not all going to the benefit of enhancing education. Some of that money is being taken back. Well if you remember the years of the cuts, which started in 2007 and 2008, SUNY is an institution, and all the campuses crabbled to the state that if you raise tuition, which they did significantly one of those years, but the campuses don't get to keep any of it, than that's just a disingenuous way for students to fund other operating costs of the state. So your tuition went up but SUNY didn't get any of that money. So the argument that SUNY made to the state was you're balancing your budget on the backs of our students, and students aren't getting any benefit for it. That's what this model does. SUNY is doing it to the detriments of the comprehensive and technical colleges, and who benefits? The Research centers. Because they're not doing it to the extent that the state did. They're not taking it for dollar for dollar. But they are taking some of the money from tuition and moving it to other places. So this is how the allocation tool is going to be implemented. They are going to take 30% of the cut next year in 2013-2014, they're going to take 30% of the cut in 2014-2015, and the remaining 40% will be taken in 2015-2016. This says that it's implemented 100% in 2016-2017, but the fact is that in

2015-2016, the 100% hits. These are the effects of the tools. Let me make this point too. The tool hasn't been finalized. It hasn't been passed by the Board of Trustees. It was supposed to go to the Finance Committee a couple of Wednesdays ago and the Board of Trustees a couple Thursdays ago. What happened was that the Finance Committee didn't pass either of the resolutions that SUNY brought to the finance committee which meant that the board couldn't pass the whole thing which meant that the finance committee had to table the two resolutions that SUNY brought to them. And the two things that SUNY had brought to them were two things that were undecided which are: how are you going to fund the research component and what of out-of-state students? Should out-of-state students be out of the formula or part of the formula? And those two distinct decisions were not made by the Finance Committee so the Board didn't go. But as of the 10/30 model, the way it works, there is an overall increase of state support of 1.8%, 3 campuses went up, with the largest increasing by 11%, there was a decrease to five campuses, primarily the hospitals, and the largest decrease was 18.6%. In the Comprehensives, our sector, there was an overall decrease of 4%, that's \$7.1 million. Three campuses went up. Ten campuses decreased, and we were one of those. In the Tech Center, there was an overall decrease in state support of 4.3% as seen in the differential of the campuses. So what's happening is that the Techs are getting cut, the Comps are getting cut, and the Research Centers are getting an increase. This is the total impact so that it adds to zero. The total downward adjustments match the total upward adjustments. This isn't rocket science. There will be transitional funding. Short term and long term plans are required to get it. Campuses have to submit plans demonstrating need. Transitional funding recommendations are available to only certain campuses based on Mission Review Meeting. The sheet I passed out has two iterations of the model in it. The first iteration of the model, we get cut \$690,000.00. In the second iteration of the model, we get cut \$600,000.00 in the final year when it's all rolled up. In the model that Brian talked to SA about last night, we get cut \$688,000.00 and the heading says it includes transitional funding, which means we're probably on the hook for some transitional funding and I don't see any change in the model. But then again you only get the last sheet so it's kind of hard to see what they're doing there. And this is going to support all the great things that the system is going to do. According to the system, what's the alternative? Outdated information will provide funding, unfair, and not conducive for the health of the fiscal long term. Without change, there will be disconnect with rational tuition and so on. And they go through various background reiteration of what we said before. This is the point I was making before. You see under the old model, 55% was allocated on the basis of enrollment and now it's 88%. So their argument is that state support and tuition are now tied because they are both now headcount based, enrollment based. So if your tuition goes up because you have 5,000 students, you should get state support based on the fact that you have 5,000 students. The problem with that is that if you decided not to grow, if you were one of the colleges that made a conscious decision not to increase enrollment for that period because you cared about things like student-faculty ratio, class size, full time faculty teaching students, you're negatively impacted by this model. Only the places that grew benefited from this model. Then when they say that in the long term the model is predictable and you're able to plan, to me is just a ridiculous statement because how can I plan if I don't know what everybody else in the system is doing? There are 62 campuses out there.

Malcolm: 64.

Jim: 64. Thank you. They added like Alaska and Hawaii last time I checked right? I always thought of Malcolm like, "keep the facts straight"; I'm the stream-of-consciousness, he's the fact checker. So anyways, is everybody familiar with SUNY 2020 where all those students competed for grants and they had to put together plans about what they would do with the money if they got it. We had to do the same and put forth a plan about how we would use the money from the state. Well, UB's plan involves an enrollment increase of 10,000 students. Stony Brook's involves an increase in 2,000 students. Binghamton has a 1,200 student increase in theirs. There are small campuses that the system has said cannot maintain themselves because they have less than 5,000 students, which seems to be the minimum threshold to maintain a sustainable campus. You need at least 5,000 students to provide revenue for operation, so some of the smaller campuses have to increase enrollment over the three years transition in order to remain viable. So how do I plan if I know that our goal is to stay small, to not increase beyond 5,200 students, to try and keep our student-faculty ratio as low as we can get it, by using the new tuition to hire more faculty and drop the student-faculty ratio down, how do I plan if I don't know what everyone else is going to do? I have no plan or ability to predict what's going to happen next year and the year after that and for future years are going to be on state support if everybody else is growing and I'm staying flat. I can tell it's going down. I don't know by how much. And this is how they got input from everybody. We asked you, we asked you again, we asked you again, you didn't say anything, in their view you gave tacit support, and you know, we commented on all these things, but at some point they don't even give you the numbers. The fact that they asked for your opinion, you responded but they don't really care anyways, is sort of how this all works. I'll send this PowerPoint to Carly and everybody could have it if you want to look through it. In this stuff, none of that really matters anymore. That sheet I passed out to you. That's the new model. It's an allocation based model. So what happens? These things that I passed around, there should be copies of, there's more of you than the copies I made, so share. What it shows, in the first column, is what we got, the current year, and the current state support. In 2012-2013, we got \$23,032.8 million. Under the 8/31 model, we were going to get \$11,342.3 million and in the current model it went up to \$11,432.7 million. Instead of getting cut \$690,000 on reiteration one, we got cut at \$600,000. Then under reiteration two, the sheet shows the cut of \$688,000 in state support. If you cut to the chase all the way on the last page, you see that the final year is the complete impact of the cut state support. And maybe if you put it in thousands of dollars, it doesn't sound like a lot of money, but it's to faculty lines is what it is. To put it in context, you can hire 12 faculty members with \$600,000 dollars. Then if you look at the very last page, if you look at the change from 2013, you'll see that the state support to Geneseo is down \$600,000. One million which is a 5% reduction. In the Comprehensive sector, of which we are a member, got cut 3.9%. The hospitals got cut 7.3%, the Research Centers went up 7.9%, and the Tech Colleges go down 4.25%. The very last page.

Carly: If anyone wants a copy, Casey's handing them out if anyone wants one. It's the most up to date thing we have right now. These numbers are not finalized. They're definitely predicting what the final numbers might look like but they're not finalized.

Jim: Now, let me just make one more point about this. Look at Total Financial Plan, where you see that we go up 9.9%? Total Financial Plan, as I said before, has two sources of revenue in the allocation model. Your tuition dollars and your state tax dollars

support. So Total Financial Plan means both of those together. As you all know, tuition is going up \$300.00 a year for each of the next three years. That gives us, according to this analysis, about \$1.6 million dollars a year. So when you take the total of those numbers, the \$4.8 million and subtract the \$600,000, you get what our financial plan is increased which is \$4.2 million dollars. The college, however, will only net \$3 million of that \$4.2 million. And the reason is because under the Rational Tuition Plan, we have to fund the TAP reprimand over the TAP maximum of \$5,000.00. So as the tuition goes over \$5,000.00, the college has to pay for everybody that's getting TAP and everybody that's getting full TAP, the full cost, we need to add \$300.00 to our TAP funding. That costs us \$400,000.00 a year. The model shows full retention of the tuition dollars which we don't get to retain and shows us what our cut will be and says, look, what are you complaining about, you're growing up \$4.2 million. But the fact is, your tuition is going up \$4.8 million, they're taking \$600,000.00 of it in state support, and putting it in the research centers. You look at the very last page, and take a look at a place like UB. UB is going to get a \$13 million increase in state support and a \$47 million increase in its overall financial plan. Stony Brook is getting a \$17.8 million increase. Binghamton looks like it's getting a \$9 million increase. Stony Brook is going to go up to \$26.3 million. All those places are going up hugely because of tuition increases are also getting increases in state support. So Albany is getting almost a \$1.3 million increase in state support, Binghamton is getting \$4.7 million increase, UB is going to get a \$13 million increase, and Stony Brook is the only one that gets cut. They get cut by about \$358,000.00. And look down at the Comp sector, virtually everybody gets cut. I mean, Oswego picks up \$148,000.00 and Plattsburg gets \$585,000.00. But virtually everyone gets cut. Sector by sector, it affects us all negatively and benefit the research centers in a much more positive way. So that's what's going on with the model. Now where it finally lands and where it all comes out, my sense is that it's going to be somewhere in that range from \$600 to \$690; the ration that came out last night was \$688. But that's what's really happening here. You're tuition will go up and some of the state support is going to go away based upon the fact that it's an enrollment based model and our enrollment doesn't grow. My view, and the administration's view, regarding Rational Tuition and the promises we made regarding Rational Tuition, was that the tuition dollars were supposed to stay on the campus. It was all supposed to be reinvested to the benefit of the students. And our view is that people come to Geneseo because Geneseo offers a certain kind of education. And if you want to find excellence, you need to fund excellence. If you go to a model that uses national data in estimating the cost of educating an English major, or a Business major, or a Phys. Ed. Major, and you use that data and say that everyone in that system is getting the same amount of money to educate those people in those categories, to us it drives mediocrity. It doesn't fund excellence. And our view is that state support should have stayed the same under any model, tuition should have stayed on the campuses, and only new revenue, new state revenue, should have been used to make the adjustments for the new model so that nobody got hurt on the current model and you kept faith with the students who quite frankly supported the Rational Tuition Bill. Our view in Geneseo is that no matter what program you're in, excellence costs more than average. Excellence costs more than poor. So if you want excellent programs, excellent programs cost more. If you want a poor program or you want a mediocre program, you can run more cheaply. Our promise what that you pay tuition and it stays on campus but this model doesn't do that.

Carly: Jumping off of that, last night when I was on the phone with Brian Hutzley, I specifically asked if they were taking into consideration the quality of the programs they were funding, but they said that that wasn't their job and that's what the campuses were there for, that they were supposed to monitor the quality of their programs with whatever funding that they received, which in my opinion is unacceptable. They didn't seem to care.

Jim: One more point I guess I should make, and this is in fairness to the system. When they did this whole analysis, they looked at how much cost of instruction is being covered by tuition. And they said that 92% of the cost of instruction for the average undergraduate student is covered by tuition. So the state support is given to us to cover the additional 8% of the cost of your instruction and the administrative functions of the college – the heating bill, the electric bill, the president, the human resource people, the custodian, the groundskeeper and all that stuff. But that's what state support is being provided to cover. They did it for each level of education, so they did it for the undergraduate students, graduate students, advanced graduate students, and first time professionals. They only did it up to first time professionals, people going to medical school you know and whatever, but they found that at that level, only about 56% or 59% of the cost of instruction was being covered by tuition and they needed more state support for what that tuition should cover and what the total cost of the program was. When they looked at state support, they said state support is covering System Y, 42% of the costs of operating a system, so they said they have to weigh the average because we can't give everybody 42% because that doesn't acknowledge the fact that tuition is covering more of the costs at the undergraduate level and less of the cost at the first professional level. So they weighted the distribution of the funding now so that the Comprehensive sector gets 36% of the funding and the first professionals get 59% of the funding. It's broken down into increments but I think first time graduates get 38% and 52% for advanced graduates, and 59% for first time professionals. So that's the reason for the move away. That's why more money goes to the Centers and less money comes to the campuses. It's because they weighed those particular buckets. So that's what's happening. The model's not final but there's no sign that all of a sudden, the model is going to be turned on its head, and that we're going to get restored and they're going to say never mind. I can tell you that there's a lot of push back in the legislator. The people in the legislator that know about this, members of the higher education committees in the Senate and in the Assembly, say that this can't happen without new state money. That you can't go in under a Rational Tuition Promise and start taking away state support. That puts us in the same state as when we were crabbing at them. Who knows where this will go politically at the end of the day, but there has been some push back in that part of the legislator.

Dara: Do you have any idea as to when the Board of Trustees is planning on voting on this?

Jim: Yeah. I know that it was supposed to be done at the Board's last meeting. Now the hook seems to be, when the Finance Committee is going to act and I don't know the answer to that.

Maddie: Do you have information about what these numbers are for Research Institutions regarding TAP? How will it affect them?

Jim: The way they've done the TAP cut is they make every campus pay about 25% of the tuition increase in TAP because the system average is 25%. So 25% of students in SUNY are TAP eligible at some level. About 25% of the increase comes off and goes toward TAP and for us, only 16% of our students are fully TAP eligible. So for us to pay 25%, it means that some of our money is being distributed to some of the other campuses, which quite frankly I support because I think it's a question of equity and access. You don't want students picking colleges based upon the fact of what TAP they can get. So it's sort of making an affordable system since we're all being charged the same percentage – 25% across the system to me is an equitable distribution to fund TAP. So about 25%. At the end of the day, if you look at those University Centers, their state support has gone up and their tuition has gone up. And where is their state support coming from? It's coming from the Comps and the Techs.

Malcolm: Now the 30 community colleges in the system are not affected by this at all because their money comes from a different pot. The smart community college administrators and the smart student governments at community colleges realize they should be concerned about this because their student base is going to be going to a lot of these schools. So my question is, what if anything have you been hearing from community college sector?

Jim: Every year, there's an old formula that still kicks around in some of the heads of people, even older than me, in the legislator, that say that state support to these community colleges ought to be 40%. States are supposed to be 40%, 30% are supposed to be from the counties and 30% from tuition. That's the formula that everybody has in their head. The formula's never worked that way. State support has always been significantly less than 40% of the total cost. So what happens is that every year, SUNY asks for an increase in state support to go to community colleges. In the last couple of years, when community colleges have been looked at for development and training, the state legislator has been putting money into community colleges. So the community colleges are pretty quiet on this because their aid is sort of going to go up. So I don't know if people there care for people like me, who are going around riling up the student body, because I think what's going to happen is that the students there, those colleges are going to be happy to get an increase. What they do after community college, and where they land after, they might just use this and say, well, I'll just go to UB or I'll go to one of the Centers for undergraduate. So I don't know if they're thinking so far down the road about where they want to go. But I can tell you that their administrators, since they're not affected by this model and they are the beneficiaries of increased state support every time that argument gets put forth by SUNY, they're less likely to be out complaining about it.

Justin: Bundy Aid is not tied into the SUNY budget, correct?

Jim: Right. Bundy Aid is aid to the privates.

Justin: Have they tied enrollment to Bundy Aid entitlements?

Jim: Actually, it's almost the opposite. The conversations in the legislator, they don't focus on Bundy Aid. But the conversations in the legislator where they focus on the privates, they talk about providing some kind of matching funds for capital improvements because they look at the benefits that the privates supply to the state in terms of employment and income taxes that come from that. They also want to maintain the institutions. Higher education is a big industry in New York State. So there's been more talk, and you see this in the Regional Development Plan coming out, of making a 5% match in state support to the capital projects. Bundy Aid does get cut, just like in other years when the state has no money, but I don't think it's in any danger of going away. A lot of the big projects have political clout. Look at U of R. and RIT. The likelihood that anyone is going to change their Bundy Aid is pretty slim.

Maddy: Do we have any shot at getting any of the research money or is that all for the Research Institutions?

Jim: Do we get any research money? Yeah. Between the change between model 1 and model 2, was a change in the research model. What happened in the research model was that they only funded federally indirect research. So they took out all the service research component. And when they went back to the old model, we ended up picking up \$90,000.00 but that \$90,000.00 is not all research. Problem is they looked at three years of enrollment and not just a snapshot. But how much of the \$90,000.00 was research and how much was enrollment, we don't know yet. I can tell you that the highest number we were going to get for research is \$115,000.00 and the lowest number we could have gotten from the research bucket is \$30,000.00, so there was \$70,000.00 swing in the research budget. Not the biggest driver. If \$60,000.00 is being cut, it's being cut because of enrollment not because of research.

Justin: Have any of the others in college administration spoken out about the allocation model?

Jim: Yeah. The most vocal opponent was John F. Schwaller, who was the president of Potsdam, who recently today. He spoke out but he wasn't very well received. So if I resign next week or they drag me off in handcuffs, you'll know why.

Forrest: Could you just share about the budget advocacy trip in spring.

Jim: SUNY Day this year is sometime in February. The dates just came out. You'll be happy to know that I reserved a bunch of hotel rooms at the downtown Hampton and got some for SA. I think we got five or six rooms as soon as the dates came out. Well, basically, there is SUNY Day, where all the campuses go down to Albany and we make our pleas on the budget. What's interesting is that the Allocation Model, in the setting of the tuition is under the complete control of the Board of Trustees. So the Board of Trustees can do whatever they want in raising the tuition and how they allocate the money out to the campuses. It's all up to them. It's their authority. What's interesting though is that we can't spend one dime on the tuition increase authorized by the Board of Trustees unless it's allocated by the legislator. So if the money isn't appropriated by the legislator, we can't spend any of it. So at the end of the day, the legislator has the final say over anything the Board of Trustees wants to do. The Board of Trustees can do it, but the legislator can just not give us any authority to act on it. And that tends to get your attention if you're a Board of Trustee member. If you raise the tuition \$300.00 and the legislator says that we don't like your law, so we're not going to authorize you to spend any of that \$300.00, it doesn't do any good to have a raise when you can't spend it. So that's why we go down and encourage people to go, meet with their legislators, and advocate on behalf of Geneseo where you're spending your money. We go every year. I've been going to Albany for 25 years now in one capacity or another. And Albany is a funny place. It works kind of like this. If you show up, it doesn't necessarily mean you're going to get anything but if you don't show up, you're off the list and then you're guaranteed that you definitely won't

get anything. So they take attendance. You show up and make your plea, you might not get anything from making your plea, but if you don't show up, you certainly won't get anything.

Carly: Yeah. That's it. We're done. We're really lucky at Geneseo in that we have a really good reputation with our administration and we have a really open relationship with them in that I talk to them about three times a day back checking and everything. A lot of SUNY institutions don't have this. We're really lucky and we've started an advocacy portion of this. We sat down as an exec with Jim and talked about this for a while and we decided that we wanted him to come in and talk to you guys and answer any questions that you guys might have. But we got together and decided that in order to advocate for ourselves, and to advocate that the new allocation model is not correct and is flawed. The current one is flawed as well, but the new one that is being talked about is also flawed. So we decided we're going to be starting a letter campaign. When you guys came in, over there, there are a bunch of these letters that we put together. You can get one on your way out. Basically we came up with four specific things that we are lobbying for Albany to consider and for the Board of Trustees to consider, which are: "SUNY can maintain an affordable alternative to private liberal arts colleges through its commitment to Geneseo."; "Low faculty-to-student ratios are a defining factor in an institution's quality."; "Geneseo's programs cannot be held to the standard of the nation's average because we do not strive to be the average institution."; and "Cutting state support to institutions while increasing students' tuition is a violation of SUNY's promise of maintenance of effort. It only makes the status quo more expensive for students." There's also an entire blurb about how we're disappointed about the fact that they're not being transparent about this. You can even tell that the numbers that I got from SUNY Central yesterday are different from the ones that Jim found. They are not doing a good job in keeping students informed. If you want to sign one of these or join us in this, please sign one right now and drop them off in the SA office and we can mail them for you. Please put your name and your class year on it. We're going to be tabling in the Union and we're going to be trying to place this in as many student's radars as possible. We think that the best form of action is that if we send and inundate the SUNY Board of Trustees Chair of it with these letters, they're going to see that students are aware and that they care.

Silvia: For those of you who are seniors, it may seem like it won't affect you, but this is really important because this affects the reputation that your institution has. So when you go for a job interview or you go somewhere and say you're from SUNY Geneseo, you still want the school to have the quality of education you received where 10 years in the future, if this is something that continues to happen, and these cuts continue to happen, our institution may not have the reputation that it has now. So this is still really important for college seniors to take part in.

Carly: When I went to Student SUNY Assembly a couple of weeks ago, the chancellor actually was there and she did a whole speech about what was going on in SUNY and after she got done with her speech, she left. She didn't talk with any of the students and she didn't answer any of the questions. She didn't interact with anyone except the SUNY Student Assembly Executive Committee. I feel that this really shows how out of touch the Board of Trustees is with the student body and the student population, but we can contact them through this letter campaign.

Dara: I just want to say that I was here three years ago when all the programs got cut and the hardest thing was watching people realize that it was too late for a program they couldn't save. This is our chance to save our programs before the government takes control. Before bureaucracy happens, we can be advocates. We can fight for our school. And I just want to say that, if you were paying any attention at all, to go out and talk to your friends and tell them that there is a problem. You don't need to know it in great detail or be able to have an hour talk. But there's a letter that they can sign and really do something. I want to see our campus be truly upset and fight for something before it is too late. That's my rallying cry.

Casey: Although we are focusing on our institution quite a bit, there are other schools getting cut even more. Like Potsdam is losing almost 22% of their state funding. Just be mindful that while we're not getting hit the hardest, my beloved students are facing the same struggle. They may not know about this and don't have Jim to come in and talk to them. Nor do they have other venues for speaking out. It important to make sure that people you know, friends from other schools, people of your generation don't suffer under the rule of people who make the decisions.

Sadie: If we're getting cut \$600,000 over the next two years, meaning 12 faculty lines. These are our professors. I know that you don't love all your professors, especially during finals, but these are really important people in our lives and we need to find ways so they can continue being our professors because they teach us and for future students. Also a second point, SUNY Central doesn't really want us to be talking about this. As we can see from the President of Potsdam resigning and that happened because the President was speaking out about these problems and then had pressure placed upon him. By writing the letters, you're really sticking it to them. Like we know about this.

Malcolm: As troubling as this is, and I agree that this is deeply troubling on many levels, this becomes more disturbing if you look at it in historical context. Because over the last few years, specifically over the last three and a half academic years, since Chancellor Zimpher has taken office, this is just the latest step in a progression of actions taken by SUNY Central that is essentially amounting to declaring war on the non-university centered campuses. The community colleges that I indicated earlier are mostly indicative of this effect. All the Comprehensive, Technical, and specialty schools are at a terrible risk if this is allowed to continue. This is a dire crisis, much deeper than it appears on paper. Because if we allow this to pass without protest, it will only get worse over the next few years.. SUNY Central has been taking very small steps over the last three and a half years. Despite the fact that the Statewide Student Government has been trying an increasing amount of resistance to the steps they've been taking, and the local student governments are likewise starting to stand up and take note, but it hasn't been enough because SUNY Central has continued to take ever more egregious actions and the fact is that at this point, it's only a matter of time before they are start shutting entire campuses down. And we could be next.

Carly: So Forrest is going to pass them out. I've brought pens if anyone needs one. This is a really important issue. I can't stress this enough. Letters will be on KnightLink and available in the SA office.

Old Business

41-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$2,800.00 from Budget Increases, Account 1099 to Women's Ice Hockey, Account 1417 to provide additional practice time.

Second of Two Readings

Women's Ice Hockey: It's the same thing as two weeks ago. I do want to make an amendment to it if possible. I heard from the Athletics Department that they're going to decrease our fee by \$20.00 so it will only need to be \$2800.00 now. Basically, this money is to allow us to have more practices. The teams that we're competing against now have more practices than we do and we'd like to have a more competitive edge when we play them. No pun intended.

Malcom: Well, this is certainly an improvement from the Athletic Department, but I'm wondering if either SA or Women's Ice Hockey in particular, have heard anything more from our Athletic Department as to why our teams aren't getting free ice time.

Carly: We've been in discussions with them, but I think that that's something that's going to need discussion over time. Plus, I got sidelined by the budget thing, but I am working on that.

Women's Ice Hockey: And with their budget too, it's not something that we can quickly change.

Dara: Motion to amend the reading.

Casey seconded the motion. Passes 7-0-0.

Second of Two Readings, Passes 7-0-0.

42-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$1,500.00 from Budget Increases, Account 1099 to Crew Club, Account 1402 to cover the increase in cost for trailering boats.

Second of Two Readings

Crew Club: So ours is the same thing. We don't have anyone to transport our boats to regattas. We have to have another team take them and it is \$100.00 a boat. This would cover a couple of races each semester.

Second of Two Readings, Passes 7-0-0.

43-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$100.00 from Budget Increases Account 1099 to SA Programs, Account 1002 to create a start-up budget for Peace Action.

Second of Two Readings

Peace Action: Same as last meeting two weeks ago. We're looking for a startup budget to bring *Alternatives to Violence Project* to campus and to make sure we have bumper stickers and everything.

Dara: Do the bumper stickers just say peace action?

Peace Action: You make your own bumper stickers.

Second of Two Readings, Passes 7-0-0.

New Business

44-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$990.00 from Budget Increases, Account 1099 to Geneseo Area Gaming Group, Account 1922 to provide funding for the Magic Draft Event.

First of Two Readings

GAGG: My name is Connor McLoughlin and I am the SA Rep for Geneseo Area Gaming Group. I'm here to ask SA to allocate \$990.00 to our account to allow us to host a free Magic gathering tournament. I think that the sheet did a good job in explaining our request but I would like to go over three major points. What the Magic Draft is, what the costs are, and why this event is worth playing. Magic Gathering is a card game where players assemble cards and battle each other. It's the most popular card game in the world and one that is played the most often at our meetings. A Magic Draft is where players are given random cards from a certain set which they use to create a new deck. We really like these events for a number of reasons. First, everybody gets to take home the cards they get at the table. So for a free draft, that means they get free cards. Plus, they get any new cards they win in the subsequent tournament. Second, players who are new at the game have a better chance of winning against skilled players because the cards are more random, it is more luck based. So on to the costs. We'd be buying nine boxes of cards priced at \$110.00 apiece, each containing 36 booster packs with 5 cards each in them. Each attendee would receive four packs of cards, one of which will be thrown into a prize pool. Any extra packs we have will be thrown into this prize pool. We settled on nine boxes of cards based on previous attendance numbers in previous years. We determined this to be the most logical amount. The final point is why this event is worth funding. A Free Draft would allow people who would otherwise never play the game, or even think about playing the game, to give it a chance. In fact, if anyone in this room is interested, this Saturday there is a Paid Draft event. I haven't played Magic since I was a kid, but I went to an event before Thanksgiving, and had a really great time. I didn't know any of the rules, and I was asking questions every other round but the guys were really friendly and helpful. Anyone who attends this Free Draft will get the same amount of help, have the same amount of fun, and get free stuff, which is always great. The exposure that the club gets is huge too. A typical Late Knight event, which is what this would be, expects about 20 to 30 people in attendance. We're expecting at least 85; definitely more. That's a lot of people who are seeing the club and the people in it, who would otherwise never get the chance. We've organized Drafts before, free

and paid ones, and the one thing that we always hear after them is that they want to play again and play more. SA can help that happen. So I'll take any questions now.

Sadie: Why can't you get the Late Knight grant?

Connor: There's another event going on at that time. I think it's a massage sort of thing and Late Knight doesn't want to host two events on the same night.

Sadie: So have you guys considered moving your event to a different date?

Connor: We already rented the Union Ballroom for the event on that date.

Malcolm: Can I supplement Connor's answer? Because I know a little bit more about what's going on.

Carly: If it's short.

Malcolm: Late Knight pulled out at the last minute, literally before this reading was submitted, saying that they were going to sponsor it and then ducked out after we had already committed to the date.

Justin: First of all, you have a really good radio voice. Second of all, why weren't you able to host the Free Draft last year?

Malcolm: There was a Free Draft last year and I went to it.

Justin: It says right here "Traditionally, every year (with the exception of 2011-2012), a Magic Free Draft is organized by the Geneseo Area Gaming Group with relatively high attendance (85-100 people).

Carly: Okay, I'm going to let Jo answer.

Jo: Although the Free Draft was hosted last year using budget allocations that would normally not be spent on the Free Draft, the Free Draft could only facilitate about 55 to 60 people. It was less money that it should have been so we were able to facilitate a lot fewer people so many people were upset. It wasn't really a Free Draft the way we traditional hold it. The way we traditionally hold a free draft is that it can accommodate at least 100 people, which is the attendance that we usually receive.

Casey: This is closed to non-Geneseo students, right?

Connor: Yes. This is just for students.

Sadie: How many active members are there in GAGG?

Connor: Active members? I'm not sure of the exact numbers.

Joan: We usually have about 55 to 65 people in attendance. During the finals, it usually hits about 40 and on a good day, it usually hits closer to 80. But that's not just Magic players. It includes all the people who play games.

Forrest: At the end of the night are students walking away with free cards?

Connor: Yes.

Forrest: I don't know if students are going to keep the cards or become Magic fans or whatever, but wouldn't it be more cost effective for GAGG to keep those cards?

Connor: That's not exactly the point of the Draft. The point of the Draft is that the people who go there will get something back no matter what in return. And like I said, any extra cards will be submitted into a prize pool to be given to the winners.

Sadie: Is \$110.00 the lowest price you can find or is there a standard for these?

Connor: We can't really get a lower number for it. That's just the price range for these things.

Daniel: The lowest cost is actually \$90.00 each and that's the minimal amount while \$110.00 is the maximum amount. I still have to talk to them, to see if we can get them for less.

Sadie: Is there some kind of bulk discount?

Daniel: This is just the price. There really isn't a bulk discount.

Joan: We asked for maximum amount for security. If the vendors drop the price, we would obviously be able to come back with adjusted numbers. In that situation, the numbers would be adjusted by next week, if the reading passes this week.

Justin: Do you have a stockpile of Magic cards that haven't been used or distributed during Magic Drafts from previous years?

Connor: If you're referring to the cards mentioned in the proposal, they're just separate cards that aren't enough to assemble into packs to play. We're just giving them to players to borrow.

Justin: Let's say there are cards you don't distribute because the full expected amount of students don't come, do they go into the stockpile?

Connor: They go to prize pool.

Matt: But what if hypothetically, only 30 people show up, and you bought way more cards than you need. Would it be possible then to keep those cards and use them for later events? That is, instead of giving a ton of prizes to a very small group of people.

Connor: Yes, it would I suppose. They would be used in future Free Drafts or Paid Drafts or something.

Kate: When is the event?

Joan: It's going to be on December 7th. The Union Ballroom has already been booked as well as the upstairs conference rooms.

Kate: Where would you end up buying these from?

Joan: We traditionally got them from *Boldo's Armory*. We've worked with them before in past free drafts. We have also worked with them for our gaming convention.

Matt: When is the time of the event because Activities Commission has the Ballroom booked starting from 9:30 pm and starting the event at 10:00 pm.

Jo: We have the Ballroom booked from 6:30 to 10:00.

Justin: I would suggest saving some of the packs that don't get handed out from the Draft to build up a stockpile rather than throwing them all into the prize pile, just to keep down prices in the future.

Sadie: This is not a question, but I'm still unclear as to what exactly happened with Late Knight, so maybe before the next meeting, you can come by with some kind of statement as to why they couldn't fund this event.

Casey: GLK doesn't like funding two conflicting events at once.

Malcolm: With regards to Justin's point, building a stockpile wouldn't really work based on how the Drafts work. Draft cards need to be in sets so that they're all from the same environment and in this case a single set is intended to be drafted along. There are occasionally sets where there can be two sets drafted at once, but those we avoid because those would be much more expensive. Those tend to be in the spring anyways which is why we hold free drafts in the fall. In regards to Matt's point earlier, the odds of us having such a small turnout is slim to none. There was kind of a Stealth Draft organized at the end of the spring semester that was supposed to be a Free Draft limited to 30 people and I think we had about 60 people show up. And we didn't publicize that at all, but Free Magic Draft would be publicized. In the Free Draft, as Connor said, every participant is allocated 4 packs to use and one of those goes into the prize pool. I can speak from experience that it is possible for a novice, in my case someone with one week's worth of experience, to walk away with as many prize packs as the first place winner. So all the packs get distributed, I believe, to the top half of finishers. So if we have 80 to 90 people, 40 to 45 leave having won prizes in addition to the three packs they received initially.

First of Two Readings, Passes 7-0-0.

45-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE approve the fundraising request for People for Animal Welfare, Account 1907 to sell bracelets until May 2013 in order to raise money to support the club and meet the projected income line.

First and Only Reading

Yanish: We would like to start selling these silicon bracelets for \$1.00 each. We're going to buy 199 of them, and raise \$199.00 for our income line to use for gas reimbursements. We're making a lot of trips to shelters.

Casey: How far away are you from making it?

Yanish: I think about \$36.00.

Sadie: On the fundraiser sheet, you have taxes listed for \$19.65, but we're tax exempt.

Yanish: If SA is tax exempt then the tax won't be included.

First and Only Reading, Passes 7-0-0.

46-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE allocate up to \$539.00 from Permanent Equipment, Account 2000 to SA Tech, Account 1004 to purchase a Gx7 Power Amplifier.

First of Two Readings

George: You're probably wondering why I'm back here again after doing our speaker reading. Well, between the time that the reading passed and we were able to order the speakers, JBL decided that the MRX series speakers was not a line they wanted to continue so they discontinued it before we could order them. So what our vendor did for us is, Applied sent me an email on November 8, saying that they discontinued the line and would find suitable replacement speakers. At the time, I thought that Applied would find speakers that are roughly the same wattages and it shouldn't be a problem. Well, I received them just before Thanksgiving and put them in the Tech room. This Monday, I opened them up and looked at the specifications and the subwoofers are significantly more powerful than the current SA Tech amplifiers can allow for. The silver lining in this is that, yes, we got more powerful subwoofers, but they were also \$300.00 cheaper. In the end, we saved \$300.00 from that original permanent equipment allocation. I talked to Applied on Monday and got a quote for a new amplifier, QSC GX7. The sales manager said that they would take 10% off the price because of what happened. I'm asking the SA committee to only allocate \$250.00 on top of the original request.

Dara: So the \$300.00 that you didn't spend is going back to SA and in theory we're giving it back to you plus another \$250.00.

George: Yes.

Silvia: So the \$539.00 includes the 10% discount?

George: Yes.

First of Two Readings, Passes 7-0-0.

47-1213 BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE SA COMMITTEE approve the fundraising request for the Inter-Residence Council, Account 1201 to collect donations for the American Red Cross during the Mr. Geneseo event on Dec. 2nd.

First and Only Reading

IRC: Basically what we're looking to do with the Mr. Geneseo pageant is to make a fundraiser for Hurricane Sandy relief including collections at the door and a crowd's choice award as one of the two titles. One of the awards will be Judge's Choice and the other Crowd's Favorite. Contestants will have donation jars and whichever contestant receives the most donations will be determined as the Crowd's favorite. All the donations are to go to Hurricane Sandy relief after expenses. \$271.06 is our projected net profit.

Matt: Why did you choose to donate to Red Cross rather than Livingston CARES?

IRC: We chose based on the time we were planning the project because Hurricane Sandy had just hit and we had a lot of discussion with people from IRC and Hall Councils, so it was chosen to go to that one at the moment.

Matt: I'm in favor of this but in the future, I think it should go to Livingston CARES, because Red Cross has a 50% overhead where if you donate \$80,000.00, \$60,000.00 does not go to Hurricane relief and recovery. In the future, I think it should go to Livingston CARES because it has 0% overhead and therefore is a not-for-profit and all the money goes to the relief in question.

First and Only Reading, Passes 6-0-1, with Silvia abstaining.

Open Discussion

Forrest: If you guys have signed those letters, you can bring them up to me now.

Carly: If you've signed them please bring them up. If you want to refer other people, it's going to be on Knight Link and there will be hard copies in the SA office. You can return signed copies to the SA office as well and we will mail them for you.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anna Choo
Recording Secretary