Subject: Information and Recommendations Regarding Club Budget Appeals

Submitted by: SA Treasurer

1. **Association of Pre-Medical Students**: According to the Club Budget Policy, “If reasonably equivalent goods or services can be provided by another vendor at a lower price, funding shall not be provided for the excess amount.” CPR training and napkins/utensils may be obtained for free from SA. Therefore, funds were not allocated for the club to purchase these specific goods or services that they can already obtain at no cost from SA. **Recommendation: appeal should be denied.**

2. **Bengali SA**: According to the Club Budget Policy (General Budget Limitations #5), “Clubs can only move up one Tier at a time.” Because the club’s current tier for the 2023-2024 year was Tier #1, the club’s maximum allowable tier for the 2024-2025 year is Tier #2. Clubs in Tier #2 have a maximum allowable budget of $2,499, which is what the club received. **Recommendation: appeal should be denied.**

3. **Black Student Union**: First, the club’s requested club budget minus disallowed expenditures was $47,752.50. The maximum budget for any club is $50,000. Like all Tier 6 clubs, a 25.2% reduction was applied, to ensure that the total amount awarded to all clubs did not exceed the amount allocated. The most any club could have received in the end would have been $37,400. BSU received $35,718.87. Therefore, the maximum additional amount BSU could receive if they prevailed on the appeal would be $1,681.13, not the amount requested. Next, the club alleges that procedural error occurred because an expenditure was reduced due to historical data, which is required under the “Events” section of the Club Budget Policy, which provides, “expenses will be capped at the amount of an individual student’s semesterly activity fee multiplied by the number of undergraduate students included in a reasonable attendance estimate based upon past attendance.” The club alleges that the
attendance at last year’s event should not be considered because “attendance last year was unusually low due to the inability to receive proper funding for the event.” Even if that was true, that would most likely not constitute the basis for a club budget appeal, except maybe if that was due to procedural error by SA. But the club doesn’t allege any facts that would constitute procedural error by SA leading to that result or provide any evidence to support that allegation. The club’s budget was calculated correctly. Recommendation: appeal should be denied.

4. Haitian SA: The club was awarded the full amount that they requested. The club states that the “previous treasurer requested less funding than needed, as they were not aware that we would be classified as a tier three club.” That is not a valid basis for a club budget appeal. The SA Club Budget Policy is posted on SA’s website. Recommendation: appeal should be denied.

5. Minority Association of Pre-Medical Students (MAPS): The club did not submit a budget request by the deadline. According to the Club Budget Policy, “Any club that does not submit a budget request by the SA Treasurer’s set deadline will receive a $250.00 budget.” Also, as stated in the club’s budget determination letter, pursuant to SA Senate Resolution 2023-24-23, the amount of “active members” shall not be considered when determining club budgets for the 2024-2025 academic year only. Therefore, the club’s requirements for voting membership did not factor into their budget determination for the 2024-2025 year at all. The $250 budget was a result of the club not requesting a budget. Recommendation: appeal should be denied.

6. Muslim SA: A number of the club’s specific requested expenditures (or portions of them) were disallowed due to budget policy violations. For educational purposes, upon request, the SA Treasurer and/or a member of the SA professional staff can further discuss the basis for each such disallowance for the club’s future reference. However, as stated in the club’s budget determination letter, if a club’s maximum allowable budget is lower than the club’s requested budget minus disallowed expenditures, the disallowed expenditures do not actually affect the budget ultimately received by the club. That is the case here. This club’s maximum allowable budget for the 2024-2025 year was $26,685.47 (based on the club’s tier qualifications + Historical Data Point #1 in the Club Budget Policy). The club received their maximum allowable budget, which was then reduced by 25.2% (applicable to all clubs in that tier according to the Club Budget Policy), in order to ensure that the total amount allocated to all clubs combined did not exceed the maximum amount available.
The club also lists a number of timing-related difficulties that they claim prevented them from spending more money during the 2023-2024 year. However, the difficulties described relate to the club’s confusion related to applicable policies and timelines, not to procedural error by SA officials that would constitute a basis for allowing the club’s budget appeal. The club does not include any evidence that they were misled by anyone at SA, and all relevant SA policies may be viewed on SA's website. *Recommendation: appeal should be denied.*

7. **Pre-Law Chapter of the National Black Law Student Association**: The club did not submit a budget request by the deadline. According to the Club Budget Policy, “Any club that does not submit a budget request by the SA Treasurer’s set deadline will receive a $250.00 budget.” *Recommendation: appeal should be denied.*

8. **Pre-Meds Without Borders**: The Club seeks to retroactively alter its budget application to change the purpose of listed events. The Club Budget Policy does not allow for that. *Recommendation: appeal should be denied.*

9. **Running Club**: According to the Club Budget Policy (General Budget Limitations #5), “Clubs can only move up one Tier at a time.” Because the club’s current tier for the 2023-2024 year was Tier #2, the club’s maximum allowable tier for the 2024-2025 year is Tier #3. Clubs in Tier #3 have a maximum allowable budget of $4,999, which is what the club received. *Recommendation: appeal should be denied.*

10. **Sri Lankan Student Association**: This club should have been considered Tier 3, not Tier 1, based on the amount of events conducted. They would therefore qualify for their Requested Budget Minus Disallowed Expenditures. *Recommendation: the club’s 2024-2025 budget should be increased from $250 to $3,300.*

11. **The Women’s Network**: The club listed their appeal as being based on an alleged violation of the law, although they do not allege anything that would support that or list any specific law that is alleged to have been violated. For expenditures #1 and #2, the club requested $2,000 per bus for a local event, when equivalent bus services can be obtained for around $500. Therefore, $1500 x 2 was disallowed, but the club can still use the money provided for busses for those events. The reason that Expenditure #3 was disallowed is that the Club Budget Policy provides that the Student Association will not allocate
as part of a club’s budget request funds for tangible items to giveaway. Since $3,050 of their expenditures were disallowed, the club asks to be allowed to use that amount for something else; however, the Club Budget Policy does not provide for that option. *Recommendation: appeal should be denied.*