

**Tours Policy – A paper for discussion**

It is suggested that many of the problems we have with the process of tour funding are to do with:

- The difficulties of ensuring equal funding during the different periods
- Lack of clarity of what the tours funding should actually be used for
- The ethos behind how we should be dividing it.

A proposal suggested at the Working Group to counteract this is as follows:

- Tours to all be proposed at the beginning of the year with their feasibility to be decided on at this point
- Some money should be ring fenced to go to ADB as a specific 'tours development' for proposals that only become apparent during the year
- To discuss further at CSPB preferences on the divide of tour funding – see attached suggestions from RSM

### Changes to Tour Funding

1. Rename "Tour Funding" to "Tour Transport Funding" to make explicit what the funding is used for to students applying.
2. Remove ambiguity of "trip" and "tour" by replacing it with a list of criteria "You can apply for tour transport funding IF... [list of criteria generally included in the current Tour subheading]"
3. Cheaper tours should receive the highest % of tour funding
  - a. a club that wants a tour to be open to as many members as possible will go to a place nearby to reduce costs for the members
  - b. a club that wants a tour to an exotic place should not receive a higher % of money than those clubs who are actively seeking to reduce the cost by going somewhere less exotic
4. The policy needs to be more explicit about whether to apply for tour funding or whether the tour should be budgeted for
  - a. A club should not be able to receive more money through tour funding than through budgeting, this will encourage clubs to plan ahead and reduce the number of tour funding applications.
5. A tour cannot be budgeted for if the location is not known, even if the period in which the tour will take place is known in advance
  - a. Students only have a specific amount of time in which to go on a tour, this might even be key dates in the academic year which are specifically known. If a new committee is deciding on the location of the tour after budgeting, it should be a classic example of a tour funding application rather than budgeting for an unknown tour.
6. A club should not be discouraged from returning to the same geographic location
  - a. A club that is not constrained to a specific location by safety (i.e. Ice Climbing) or a specific sporting competition will not want to return to the same place every year, so there is no need to encourage them to go to new places for new opportunities
    - i. Clubs going to the same sporting competition each year will likely be doing so because it is at a time (i.e. away from exams) and place (i.e. within the UK) which is selected because they will make the tour accessible to the maximum number of people
7. If a tour funding application is to be queried, a representative MUST be invited, else it should not be rejected
  - a. There needs to be no ambiguity about an application that "might" be queried. If a representative is needed it should be explicitly said with a good amount of time before the CSPB meeting.
8. Point 18 should not be ambiguous, it needs to be stated if other sources of funding are purely external or internal, or if internal funding is included, the specific sources should be quoted to make the policy more explicit for students applying to tour funding (who will not have experience of the policy, they might be new to the role)
9. A club can apply for up to 3 tours in one year (rather than one per session)
  - a. This is a solution to the problem faced by societies such as Acappella, who have sub-societies within a larger umbrella who want to go on separate tours.
  - b. This might cause some other problems which would need to be discussed.