

LSS BUDGET PROPOSAL MEETING - 2013/2014

• LSS Executive in Attendance

Paul Kressock (President)
Andrea Fraser (Director of Communications)

Rochelle Collette (Director of Finance)
Brendan Neaf (Moderator)

• Moderator - Opening statements

- modified Roberts Rules will be used - people given 2 chances to speak at 75 seconds each
- there is only one motion on the floor - that the budget will PASS / FAIL

• Opening Statements - Paul Kressock - President

- provided background to frame the discussion -- following last year's budget, a Budget Reform Committee was formed -- efforts to improve transparency of the process
- consequently, this year a full budget is being presented -- this includes the contribution to the CSO made from our student fees, which comprises a very large portion of student fees
- student fees were allocated to the CSO by students in years past -- there was a referendum in 1998 & 2001
- the topic of the CSO will not be discussed at this meeting -- there will be a referendum and town hall held on October 31
- the meeting will be run according to the LSS Statement of Values & UBC statement on Respectful Dialogue -- execs are volunteers / spend lots of time / have feelings too
- Role of the Finance Committee -
 - goes through the budget line by line - process based on recommendations made last year during the budget reform committee
 - students will vote on the end result of that process
 - budget proposals were decided solely by the Finance Committee

• Opening Statements - Rochelle Collette - Director of Finance

- objects & aims of the LSS reviewed -- these govern everything the LSS does
- Mission Statement - developed and adopted this year by the Finance Committee
- the Budget Reform Committee reassessed the budget process from start to finish - 5 considerations:

1. inclusivity / openness
2. presence in the school
3. member ship enrollment
4. past spending
5. alternatives that were open but not selected

- the allocation process is assessed on a comprehensive basis - no one set formula
- finance orientation for all club officers was held
- expenditure restrictions were changed (teams now able to spend money on food & alcohol)
- \$50K of requests with under \$22K of funds
- CSO will not be discussed within this meeting
- SURPLUS - \$2000 surplus -- was channeled back into teams & clubs
- every year we run a surplus --
 - used to pay up-front costs for the LSS
 - provides for contingencies
 - LSS operates at a break-even
- if the budget does not pass, the budget will be reconsidered / a new budget will be formed / and re-presented following the same process
- ballots will be marked PASS or FAIL

DISCUSSION

• **Motion on the Table - PASS / FAIL**

- motioned on the floor by Rochelle, seconded by Paul

• **Jessie Ramsay - 3L**

- noted that classes start at 1:30 in the room that we're having the budget

• **Karen Seagal - 3L**

- stated goals include inclusivity & openness
- why are the majority of funds allocated to clubs that are only open to able-bodied men?

Response (Paul)

- there are certain constraints ex/ dodgeball can only have a certain number of players // some limitations may therefore be placed by sex
- club budget requests are allocated on a comprehensive

Follow up

- what considerations went into the rugby / hockey budget

Response (Paul)

- budget evaluated as a whole - operating costs + 5 considerations
- 150 / 175 per player for the expensive teams are paid out of pocket
- allocation shouldn't be a reflection of the value of a club -- many clubs can fulfill their mandate with a lesser amount of funding -- needs & other considerations are assessed

• **Allan Aldersley - 3L**

- (1) asked for an explanation of the objectives used to assess the 5 criteria -- esp the "value added"
- (2) did the finance committee recuse themselves for votes that affected clubs they were members of

Response (Paul)

- (1) yes - members were recused
- (2) objective performance measure of value-added
 - ex/ events on campus -- easier for all students to attend // open to everyone -- these factors all contribute to value-added

Follow up

- so the criteria used was subjective?

Response (Paul)

- it's not so easy to apply objective criteria -- best way to fulfill the mission statement is to evaluate each request on a comprehensive basis

• **Darcy McKitrick - President / Women's Caucus - 2L**

- rollover of funds - what happens to clubs who fundraise effectively and are left with a surplus?
- last year, WC raised \$1200 -- that surplus effectively worked to their detriment used against b/c the club ended up with less money

Response (Rochelle)

- the LSS has one big bank account -- some clubs fundraise effectively and other have less opportunity
- there is an issue with clubs accruing a surplus year after year -- this shows that the club doesn't need as much LSS money
- the decision to not allow rollovers was affirmed last year by the BRC

Followup

- last year was the 1st year that WC ran at a surplus -- firms don't always sign-up to sponsor the event, so the funding is not guaranteed

Response (Rochelle)

- each group is in the same position -- goal is to use all the funds for a given year

• **Sasa Pudar - 3L**

- can AMS de-constitute the LSS if we run a surplus year-to-year, or if we maintain separate accounts?

Response (Rochelle)

- yes, the LSS can be de-constituted if clubs have their own banks accounts, but we can run a surplus

• Robin Phillips – past Women’s Caucus exec

- affirmed that WC had a surplus last year, and the previous year they operated at a deficit
- happy to share surplus -- but feel that they’re being penalized by having a surplus

Response (Paul)

- BRC -- tried hard to deal with external sources of fundraising -- clubs shouldn’t be penalized, but we need to also address shortfalls with other clubs
- LSS helps with shortfalls initially, for clubs whose fundraising money comes later -- fundraising is expected to be addressed towards the shortfall

Followup

- fundraising at the end of the year didn’t allow for spending in a responsible manner that was beneficial to the entire law school community

• Justin Dalton – 1L

- recognizes that rollovers are a disincentive to fundraise -- this is a common principle, and therefore a common complaint, in governments -- if you don’t spend your funding, you lose it
- proposal – develop an accrual process to deal with future surpluses

• Brandon Hicks – past Rugby exec

- on NO MORE than 3 occasions tried to get access to the documents
- finally he got access yesterday, and had access for 3 hours, which he felt was insufficient – complimented Paul on his help getting the documents to him

Response (Paul)

- this year transparency was a priority -- better than any other year prior
- the budget was available for an entire week
- the budget proposals were made available
- OCI’s limited the amount of time available for the Director of Finance to answer questions
- all documents were available for the entire day, Thursday September 26, in the LSS office
- decision made not to have budget requests available for days and days
- Exec is comfortable with the amount of transparency this year

• Liz Pan – 3L

- did not agree that the process was transparent
- people should know why decisions are made -- the process is patronizing
 - subjective & vaguely-defined criteria
 - minutes from the Finance Committee meetings should be made publicly available
 - wants to see a mix of subjective & objective criteria
- wants to defeat the budget

Response (Paul)

- Liz’s concerns mirror those of others
- transparency has been improved -- and we can continue to improve
- it’s the job of the Finance Committee to go through budget requests line by line -- not this forum
- allocations should not assess in comparison to other clubs
- totally objective criteria is inappropriate -- principled approach is optimal given each clubs’ unique history / mandate / goals
- feels process is fundamentally fair

Response (Rochelle)

- can make minutes available going forward
- re: reasons // the Director of Finance is not required to provide individual reasons for each club
- to do so would be unrealistic given the limited

• Wes Berger – quasi-Social Council – 2L

- general question -- liked that he didn’t have to pay any money to play on clubs and thought it was LSS policy to provide “no cost” athletic opportunities -- has there ever been a promise from the LSS not to have to pay?

Response (Rochelle)

- there has never been a policy (so far as she knows) that teams will be 100% funded
- the BRC policy is new this year -- no guarantee that teams will get all the money they need

Response (Paul)

- No - requests are far greater than money available - LSS doesn't tell clubs what to do -- some are more high-cost than others -- for example, the LSS couldn't fund a heli-skiing club
- LSS endeavors to enable activities -- but we can't make the wide diversity of clubs and teams cost-free

Followup comment

- Wes no longer feels like paying to play is a betrayal

• David Kemp - VP Social

- in advocating for reasons to be given, please remember the LSS is composed of volunteers and that LSS execs already devote a great deal of time to the process -- the process is imperfect
- not fair to lump even more work on LSS Execs

• Natasha Rana - Grad - 3L

- president of 3 clubs -- understands time
- feels that there should be reasons given for budget allocations

• Motion to call for the end of the meeting

- Gord Lamb - motioned
- Everyone - seconded
- motion passed by show of hands

ELECTION RESULTS - secret ballot - budget PASSED

Pass: 86

Fail: 46