# Imperial College Union Budgeting – Faculty Union Funding A paper by the President

#### Background

At the start of this week, C&S online budgeting opened. As usual, clubs will submit their budgets to their CSCs/FUs, who will bid for money from CSB. Included in the Faculty Union bids are items for representation and executive activities, including the operation of their offices.

The FUs are in a strange position at CSB, as they must bid against clubs, in a room full of clubs-focussed people, for money towards representation. The opposite problems has also occurred, where Faculty Unions fend off cuts to their clubs budgets by warning of cuts to representation. I do not consider this to be good practice.

Since the Collins review we have had two bodies – CSB, for clubs and societies, and RWB, for representation and welfare. When it comes to allocation of money, we do not treat them in this way. RWB has continued to be the "poor relation", with a negligible budget and very few responsibilities. The funding conundrum provides us with an opportunity to move towards the equality that was always intended.

#### Discussion

There are three options for funding of Faculty Unions presented below, although variations could also be considered.

Regardless of the option selected, budgets will continue to be submitted as usual this year.

Note: In the next couple of meetings we will have to decide how big the pots for CSB and RWB will be. We still do not know how much money we will get from the College.

## Option 1

Continue budgeting as last year. CSB holds all money for student activities, except the amount awarded directly to RWB. Faculty Unions seek money for both representation and clubs from CSB.

*Pros:* CSB is a one-stop shop for all FU funding needs.

*Cons:* Representation can be used as a defence against cuts to club budgets. Money for representation can be raided to prop up club spending.

### Option 2

Faculty Unions approach two areas for funding – CSB for their clubs and RWB for their representative and executive functions. Relative to last year, money is transferred from CSB to RWB to cover this.

*Pros:* Money for representation is not used to prop up club spending. Conversely, "we'll have to cut representation" is not used as a defence against FU club cuts.

*Cons:* Faculty Unions have to go to two budgeting meetings. Someone has to decide how to split CSB vs RWB funding.



Executive Committee 14<sup>th</sup> January 2009

# Option 3

As Option 2, but budgets for purely executive functions (stationery, office equipment and supplies) are assigned by the ICU executive separately.

*Pros:* As Option 2, but with the aim of reducing duplication (e.g. why do we have several different printer contracts, paper suppliers?)

*Cons:* Faculty Unions face three different bodies to get funding. The budgeting meeting for ICU Exec would get longer.

**Decision Required:** To determine a method for Faculty Union funding during this budgeting round.

