

Clubs, Societies, and Projects (CSP) Budgeting Paper

Proposed by Richard Cameron

Seconded by Benjamin Howitt

Background

Historically, the clubs and societies budgeting process – and the resultant distribution of funds between different clubs – has been highly inconsistent between different clubs and management groups.

This was addressed last year with the introduction of a new budgeting process, which removed the discretionary powers held by management groups and centralised the process to the Clubs, Societies, and Projects Board (CSPB). As a result, funds are now allocated in a more consistent and fairer manner than previously.

However, the policy failed to address the lack of consistency in budgeting between years. Currently, CSPB is able to make changes to the budgeting process at its own discretion, and at any time – including during the process itself.

This effect can cause clubs to have funding allocated according to a different set of rules to those under which the budget was submitted – and has been shown on several occasions to have a significant impact on clubs and societies.

In addition, these altered rules are often not successfully carried through to subsequent years and therefore may yield no long term benefits to CSPs.

The Union notes:

1. For the last few years, there have been significant annual shifts in the way CSP budgeting is carried out.
2. These changes are currently at the discretion of CSPB.
3. Changes can currently be made during the budgeting process itself, and after clubs have submitted their budgets. This can affect clubs significantly and can leave them with little or no opportunity to change their budget submissions accordingly.

The Union believes:

1. Funding levels which fluctuate significantly from year to year depending on the membership of CSPB are not fair on clubs and societies, and hinder responsible financial planning on the part of the clubs.
2. Consistency in policy (and funding levels) between years should be an aim of the CSP budgeting process.
3. Budgeting should be carried out under a well-defined set of rules and funding aims/priorities.
4. The relevant rules, priorities, and important dates for the budgeting process should be decided (and made public) in advance of the process.

The Union resolves:

1. To mandate the Deputy President Clubs & Societies (DPCS) and Deputy President Finance & Services (DPFS) to produce a list of budgeting aims and priorities in consultation with the incumbent and incoming CSPB, by the 1st Council meeting of 2015-2016.
2. To mandate CSPB to produce a formal budgeting policy by the 2nd Council meeting of 2015-2016, in which shall be described the rules under which the budgeting process will be carried

out.

This policy shall then become binding on CSPB, and govern the budgeting process.

3. In future years, CSPB may make alterations to the budgeting policy until the 2nd Council meeting of the academic year by simple majority vote.
4. All proposals for alterations to the policy must explain their benefit to the process, within the context of the Budgeting Mission Statement as approved by the Trustee Board.
5. CSPB may, after the 2nd Council meeting of each year, further alter the budgeting policy with a two-thirds majority vote. Such alterations shall be made only where deemed absolutely necessary, and with direct reference to the Budgeting Mission Statement.