

LSS Budget Meeting

October 2, 2012

In attendance:

Approximately 154 students

Speaker: Andrew Dilts

Executive Director of Finance: Stuart Darrach-Cottick

Quorum of 10% of LSS members is met

Meeting called to order: 12:38pm

Introduction by the Speaker

- Circulating a quorum sheet to ensure that 10 percent of the student body is present per the LSS Constitution
- There is only one motion on the table: to approve the budget
- Executive Director of Finance will make the motion, gets first speaking turn
- Ten minutes per speaking turn
- Amendments need movers and "seconders"
- Passing motions and amendments require a simple majority
- Need for civility and use of titles of LSS officers

Motion by Executive Director of Finance: to pass the budget as the LSS Finance Committee has presented it

- Discussion of AMS policies re reimbursements
 - o Clubs and sports teams in particular cannot expense certain items like jerseys, food, alcohol or fines
 - o There have been some concerns about the use of funds and that was taken into consideration in the approval of requested items
- Budget is larger than last year, i.e. about \$23,600
 - o We are running a deficit, as many have notice, but there is a surplus from other years that will be dipped into
 - o Funding mostly comes from student fees and a few other sources
 - o Dipping into the surplus is being done as changing are underway with some of the systems currently in place
 - o It is indeed the case that historically, clubs have not always used all funds requested
 - o Executive Director of Finance looked through all funding requests and the Finance Committee put together a budget and voted on it line-by-line
 - o LSS Finance Committee is made up of the Executive Director of Finance, President, Executive Director of Clubs, Sports and Development Clubs, and two students at large
 - Students-at-large: L. Somji and T. Clarke
 - o Rugby is hosting many things this year and was originally allocated \$4800, which was taken down to \$4200 with their agreement
- Point of information on acronyms in the budget (requested by N. Stewart)
 - APLC: Asia Pacific Law Club
 - CLA: Canadian Lawyers Abroad
 - CLSA: Christian Law Students Association
 - ELG: Environmental Law Group
 - ILSA: Indigenous Law Students Association
 - IP: Intellectual Property Club
 - ILJ: International Law Journal
 - LEO: Legal Education Outreach
 - LSFC: Law Students for Choice

- SALSA: South Asian Law Students Association
- SEALS: Sports, Entertainment & Law Society

Speaker: Questions for the Executive Director of Finance

- D. Terpylo: Do clubs regularly apply for more funding than needed?
 - Finance: Few receive as much funding as requested, they consider a variety of factors and determine what the real needs of the student organizations are
- M. Zanetti: Are the projections of outside or firm sponsorship a major consideration in the allocation of funding? Is there a policy in place for this year?
 - Finance: The LSS vets and appreciates outside sponsorship initiatives as an alternative source of funding; the determination is still needs based, but sponsored clubs may not need as much direct LSS funding
- D. Wickham: Is the projected deficit expected to be eliminated by anticipated non-spending by clubs of funds allocated to them?
 - Finance: This is expected to be mitigate the expected deficit for the year, but this is still an unknown that is out of the LSS's hands for the time being; I don't consider it a concern at this time
- T. McLeod: Are any amounts of allocated funding reconsidered after the fact of allocation when actual amounts of sponsorship are determined
 - Finance: Yes, this retroactive lowering is possible; some sponsorships are secured for, say, the rugby team in respect of its tournament (Lawson Lundell), whereas others are uncertain at the time of application for funds
 - Follow-up by T. McLeod: By what amounts has this been done?
 - Finance: I don't have that information
- R. Collette: Are there any kind of ongoing reporting requirements on clubs? What is the level of disclosure?
 - Finance: There are AMS requirements on what clubs can and cannot spend their money on. They report back to me and fill out reimbursement forms. Sports teams have greater restrictions on spending. Historically, there has not been any problems with any stealing or misallocation of funds
- J. Barnum: What is the process for denying reimbursement if something should happen?
 - Finance: AMS would deny the reimbursement and the costs would simply not be covered. Repeated errors could result in deconstitutionalization of the club.
- J. Ramsay: Does the allocation of funds reflect the size?
 - Finance: Yes. Presence in the school matters, and we consider groups that are throwing events. Inclusivity matters too. For example, the Law Chaim Bagel Day is open to all students and this is an inclusive activity, which makes a difference.
 - J. Ramsay: Are the Beavers thus considered an inclusive club given their level of funding?
 - Finance: Like I said, there are a number of considerations. Presence in the school, events planning, inclusivity, and membership are all considerations.
- D. Courvant: What guidelines are there so we can judge the budget? Is there a mission statement or goals to justify student fees as a source of funding?
 - Finance: The idea is to have a source of funding for students activities to improve their experience and have some fun too. We will look up a guiding statement
 - C. Haaf: The AMS website says that the purpose is to improve the quality of the social and personal lives of students at UBC
- V. Jack: Given that clubs cannot have bank accounts and sponsorship must go through the Executive Director of Finance, what knowledge does he have about the amounts for the rugby team?
 - Finance: It is not clear yet how much funding is to be secured for rugby from sponsorship
- M. Funt: Since everyone here is obviously wondering, does anyone know the level of sponsorship for rugby from from Lawson, rugby players included?
 - Speaker: This question will be answered later
- M. Zanetti: If the Executive Director of Finance knew of the rugby funding history, is it true there were no funding projections? Why and how then did they request funds?
 - Speaker: This question will also be deferred

- D. Wickham: Will this sponsorship amount eventually go through the LSS? If it is unclear, then why are we going forward with the budget?
 - o Finance: Every amount must go through the LSS, whether revenue or sponsorship
- E. Monfared: Does the Executive Director of Finance have access to last year's rugby funding amounts?
 - o Finance: My predecessor did not include the amount. In any case, it was not substantial
 - o B. Hicks: We (rugby team) are getting \$1,000 from Lawson
 - o W. Shaw: It is the first sponsorship given to the team in two years
- T. Clarke: I was directed to have a sponsor check made out to the LSS. Is the rugby team having that done as well?
 - o Finance: Yes, all checks need to be made out to the LSS and go through me

Speaker: Debate on the Motion to pass the budget as proposed

- R. Savage:
 - o The Wine Club's budget was denied because it was alcohol-based; what is the policy in terms of reasons?
 - o There should be feedback so that they can review proposals for next year; my club just received a denial and we can't review it before the vote today
 - o I propose, in future, a review process and money set aside for new clubs so that they can get approval later for items after an ability to revise their proposal
- F. Vineberg:
 - o It seems counter-intuitive to get a budget approved without full knowledge of external sources of funding
 - o There are indeed time constraints, but we cannot vote without important relevant knowledge and where the voters are not informed
 - o Let us reconvene when there is more information
- T. Clarke:
 - o Motion for a secret ballot on the final vote *and on all amendments* (Clarified by D. Wickham)
 - o If not a secret ballot, then heads-down hands up
 - Speaker: Secret ballot is not the method under the Rules of Order
 - o Proposed amendment: to change the allocation for the Beavers from \$4,200 to \$2,422.50 (seconded by C. Israel)
 - Illegal Beavers Rugby consumes too much of the budget
 - It has essentially become their purpose to gang up and acquire undue amount of funding from the LSS
 - I have a problem with how they go about acquire funds
 - They should do more fundraising and I would fully support them in such efforts for other funding
 - o D. Terpylo: Can you extrapolate on the \$2,422.50 amount please?
 - T. Clarke: I was on the Finance Committee and I feel there is a problem with the methods used to acquire and allocate funds. They are a drain on the LSS and I think it is necessary to send a message
 - o C. Haaf: Would it be helpful to read some aims of the LSS Constitution? (Allowed by Speaker)
 - C. Haaf: The LSS recognizes and promotes dignity of members, non-discrimination on various grounds, and promotes activities for the benefit its members
 - o N. Stewart: Can we get the rugby proposal? What are the needs of their organization?
 - o B. Hicks:
 - The total cost of the program is approximately \$14,500
 - The largest item is insurance
 - They cannot play through the AMS or CoRec leagues
 - The cost of the chosen league is about \$100 per player for 33 players
 - We would not be able to play without this money
 - We have a series of games with, inter alia, the police and other law schools

- We are hosting a lot of games so the budget is higher
 - Players are paying out of pocket to cover the balance of the costs
- C. Gray: There must be ways to make things cheaper. This is a male-only activity. Is there really nothing more cost effective?
- G. Sikkes: The allocation of monies was based on membership size and they claimed to have 50 members when they actually have about 35 members
 - B. Hicks: We have had about a 20 percent attrition rate in the past; 50 people signed up
- E. Snow: Hearing about all the costs, can the treasurer speak to funds allocated to inclusive events? What amounts are assigned to events that are not exclusive to rugby players themselves?
 - A. Bjornson: We throw parties and various other events for everyone. Women are invited to play tackle rugby with the men as well.
 - E. Snow: What is the actual amount?
 - B. Hicks: You can find this out. It is public record.
 - M. Zanetti: Costs for the two parties are \$550 and \$720; revenues are \$1,800 and \$1,300
- K. McCrystal: Women have been invited to play tackle rugby. All clubs are logically limited in amount of participants, and others are religiously or culturally affiliated that are exclusive in some way.
- S. Pudar: The amount specified in the motion is arbitrary. Will all budgets be subject to this kind of scrutiny by amendments before all the students here?
- F. Vineberg: Why is the rugby team getting funding for parties and charging for them too? I don't see how this kind of double revenue stream can be fair.
- D. Wickham: The motion is not to censure the Beavers, or to determine whether is it inclusive. It is to decide whether the amount specified is appropriate. Other things about their behaviour have little to do with the motion. What alternatives are there for rugby's activities?
 - A. Bjornson: None.
 - B. Hicks: There are none. We try to ensure cost-effectiveness. Other costs are set. We try to source the cheapest stuff possible
- D. Eastveld: The point of the amount proposed in the amendment is to better reflect the membership numbers
- E. Kizell: Given the time limitations, let us move to a vote (seconded by A. Freud)

Speaker: Vote on the Motion In favour of ending debate:

- Motion passes by a large majority (A. Wilson noted in abstention)

Speaker: Vote on the proposed Amendment to change the allocation of funding for Illegal Beavers Rugby from \$4,200 to \$2,422.50

- In favour: 20
- Opposed: A clear majority
- Motion is defeated
- W. Shaw: Motion to end discussion on the budget (seconded by A. Bjornson)
 - C. Haaf: Can we get clarification on what happens if the budget does not pass?
 - Finance: If it does not pass, it goes back to committee and there will be another approval process

Speaker: Vote on the Motion to end discussion on the budget

- In favour: 82
- Opposed: 43
- Motion fails to get a two-thirds majority and discussion continues
- E. Monfared: Motion for a secret ballot
 - W. House: I want to go home
 - M. Funt: Let's spend the remaining time on further discussion

Speaker: Vote on the Motion to have a secret ballot:

- In favour: 57
- Opposed: a clear majority
- Motion fails

- C. Thomson: The dollars allocated per person among teams that require insurance is about equal
 - T. Clarke: The difference is that the rugby team is here en masse for the purpose of securing lots of funding. I would be willing to support them in other efforts to fundraise.
 - B. Ward: Do rugby players pay any money out of pocket?
 - B. Hicks: Yes. About \$400 for one year.
 - M. Zanetti: I did the math. They actually pay about \$75 per person
- R. Savage: Can you address the Wine Club's funding
 - Finance: There is concern that the Wine Club lacked structure and would devolve into a drinking club
- Finance: I have a few points to make:
 - The disconnect between the Executive Director of Finance and the clubs was undesirable; there was essentially a trickle down of information
 - New clubs did not get as much funding because many have already materialized
 - Many expenses have already been incurred and this meeting should have occurred earlier the year to avoid problems
 - Please note: no clubs are allowed to roll over money into following years and it would be unfortunate if clubs should have to put up the money when they host events
 - For rugby, the total costs for rugby are about \$14,000 and the \$3,000 covers unmet needs
 - I want to move to pass the budget
- R. Savage: I propose an amendment for funding for the Wine Club for funding and wine tasting with a sommelier and bring-your-own-wine. I want to get the \$300 we requested (seconded by J. Barnum)
 - K. McCrystal: This is unfair to other groups whose budgets were vetted by the Finance Committee
 - D. Courvant: We need more opportunities to drink wine at the law school

Speaker: Vote on the amendment to approve the Wine Club's requested funding of \$300

- In favour: 47
- Opposed: 39
- Amendment approved

Speaker: Vote to pass the budget as amended

- In favour: a large majority
- Budget approved

Meeting adjourned: 1:59pm