

Clubs and Societies Board  
6<sup>th</sup> December 2011

Imperial College Union  
**Annual Budgeting – Minimum Funding Levels**  
*A paper by the Deputy President (Finance & Services)*

## **Background**

In the past there has been a funding model for MGs which guaranteed 80% of the previous year's funding, less their underspend, from that year. In 06/07 this changed to 75% and then in 07/08 it was changed back to 80%. In 08/09 and 09/10 CSB voted to keep the minimum funding levels at 80% despite each DPFS advising CSB to lower the level to 60%. In 10/11, CSB passed the decision onto the Executive Committee, who voted to maintain it at 80%, again despite the DPFS's recommendation to lower it to 60%.

I am proposing three models for discussion: Model A guarantees 60%, Model B 70% and Model C 80%, all less their underspends.

## **Issues**

The higher the minimum allocation percentage, the more difficult it is to adjust for any change. This is a problem if a particular MG is overfunded. A MG could be overfunded for many reasons, e.g. it has closed a number of clubs; similarly, a MG can be underfunded through the addition of many new clubs. I therefore suggest lowering the minimum funding level to 60% (less underspend) and have the remaining 40% allocated in the CSB budgeting round, so that there can be flexibility in the allocations and to encourage robust budget applications.

## **Matters for Decision**

- To accept one of the three proposed funding models: Model A (60%), Model B (70%) or Model C (80%)

Michael Foster  
5 December 2011