

CSP Annual Budgeting Mission Statement

Proposer:

Alex Savell Deputy President (Finance & Services)

Contributors:

Abigail de Bruin (Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)),
Joe Cooper (Managing Director),
Anthony Crowther (Student Activities Manager)

Policies affected/related: CSP Budgeting, CSP Policy

Policies superseded: None

1. Background:

- 1.1. After the significant change to the CSP Budgeting Process in 2013-14 we are undertaking a review of the process and assessing where to change or build on this moving forwards
- 1.2. One thing that has come to light from this is that we don't have a clear 'Mission Statement' when it comes to funding student activities.
- 1.3. It is my feeling that all decisions on the process and further rules and regulations pertaining to club and society funding should have moving towards this goal at their heart

2. Objectives:

- 2.1. The Board of Trustees should be the ones to set the direction of the Union
- 2.2. The formation of such a mission statement should:
 - 2.2.1. Give clear guidance on why we fund activities
 - 2.2.2. Define our stance on accessibility, participation, the promotion of excellent and any other factors such as healthy lifestyle that we may agree are pertinent
 - 2.2.2.a. Particularly how these priorities interact with one another
 - 2.2.3. Be in keeping with our Charitable Objects and our Strategic Objectives

3. Possible Resolve:

- 3.1. Based on the talking points in Appendix A are we able to define a short mission statement defining what we as an organisation believe is objective behind funding club, society and project activities?

Appendices

A. Talking Points

- A.1. Below are some possible talking points on this issue to attempt to address the various factors. They by no means need to be adhered to or considered as a limitation and we may well not wish to cover all of them.
- A.1.1. Anything in *italics* is flagged as potentially wording that could be used in a final statement
- A.1.2. The talking points don't follow any particular format or order – they're quite informal to encourage debate and engagement with the issues
- A.2. *Enhancing the Student Experience*
- A.3. Below is a problem regarding how we treat the difference between access and participation:
- A.3.1. George, Kate, Will and Harry are all coming to Imperial this year. George and Kate both like board games & athletics, Will likes athletics, knitting and tea but Harry really only likes Flying Aeroplanes.
- A.3.2. We have £200 to assign among the board games, athletics, tea, knitting and piloting societies
- A.3.2.a. Board games appeal to about half of students, are reasonably cheap and are an asset but most students like other things too
- A.3.2.b. Athletics appeals to about three quarters of students and has very low costs
- A.3.2.c. Tea and knitting are cheap but few students benefit from them and the students interested all have other hobbies
- A.3.2.d. Piloting is very expensive. Without a lot of funding the few students that like it would not be able to do it and don't really have any other hobbies
- A.3.3. How should we divide our funding?
- A.4. How important are the following things and how do they relate? Are any not relevant to us at all?
- A.4.1. *Participation – Ensuring as many students as possible can take part in activities*
- A.4.2. *Access – Ensuring all students are able to participate in an activity regardless of financial situation*
- A.4.3. *Excellence – Helping students perform at the peak of their chosen activity*
- A.4.4. *Enhancing the Health/Wellbeing of Students*
- A.4.5. *Encouraging New Activities*
- A.4.6. *Liberation and Equality group access – groups that may need special arrangements to have access to activities*
- A.4.7. *Variety – of activities and compared to what else is around our campuses and community*
- A.4.8. *Appeal – activities with wide or narrow appeal*
- A.4.9. *Community*
- A.4.10. *Outreach*
- A.4.11. Any others

- A.5. The Goldilocks Approach - Funding cheap activities provides no further access to activities, though might encourage participation. Funding expensive activities costs a lot to significantly increase access. Funding medium expense activities can make a genuine difference to access and increase participation. Are medium expense activities just right?
- A.6. Some potential statements:
- A.6.1. *“As part of our goal to Enhance the Student Experience we fund student activities”*
- A.6.2. *“We aim to both increase access and participation equally; allowing the largest number of students to engage in activities by providing a large variety of options that are accessible regardless of financial background”*
- A.6.3. *“We have secondary objectives of promoting excellence, health and wellbeing, variety of experiences and a better integrated Student Community”*

B. Current Funding Criteria – For Reference

- B.1. The current CSP Budgeting Policy states a number of things that should be considered when awarding funding (See B.2.)
- B.1.1. Most of these are of a more practical or pragmatic nature. However, some may have a bearing on our mission. For instance it is established that some activities may be too expensive to fund
- B.1.2. I have tried to address most of these points in the Appendix A talking points
- B.2. Current Funding Criteria (Paper to Board of Trustees - January 16 2014):
- B.2.1. SGI: How much SGI a CSP has will be considered, and whether this SGI has been allocated for investment in club activities. Where a club has a large amount of SGI and no plan for how they will spend it, they may be ineligible to receive grant or receive a reduced amount. Turnover of the CSP will be taken into account here. Efforts to raise their own source of funding will be looked on favorably.
- B.2.2. Amount of money to distribute: There is a limited amount of funding that can be distributed. Funding requests may be deemed to be too large to fund given other competing requests and to ensure funding is distributed fairly.
- B.2.3. Improvement in activities: Whether a CSP has increased its levels of activity and this has had an impact on costs due to a greater level of participation.
- B.2.4. Economies of scale and efficiency: Whether these can be achieved will be assessed, and the sharing of resources between CSP's will be encouraged where possible. It is also recognised that lower membership may result in higher costs on a per member basis.
- B.2.5. Sporting leagues: The accompanying increases in costs for promotions and demotions in leagues and competitions will be taken into account, looking at facility usage and location of matches, however funding will not be awarded as a reward for promotion.
- B.2.6. Aims & Objectives: how far does the activity meet the aims and objectives of the CSP?
- B.2.7. Justification of the expenditure: Poor quality applications and requests may be rejected due to a lack of substantiation or lack of transparency in figures.
- B.2.8. Number of students benefitting: The students who benefit do not all have to be members of the CSP, but only Imperial students should be taken into account. Direct and indirect benefits will both be considered.

- B.2.9. Level of subsidy and remaining cost of participation: How much impact the funding will have on subsidising the activity and whether this will have a positive effect on access to the activity.
- B.2.10. New activities: It is recognised that CSPs will innovate and we should encourage innovation. Funding decisions with new activities will usually have less information to base the decision upon but as far as possible a lack of previous budgets to base decisions upon should not be a major factor in the awarding of funding.
- B.2.11. Loss of external income streams: Income such as sponsorship or ticket sales can be variable on an annual basis and sometimes out of the control of the CSP. As a result funding should be awarded in exceptional cases where externally generated income has failed to be generated. This should not be awarded where income has failed to be secured due to negligence or circumstances under the control of the CSP Committee.