# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT TO COUNCIL

**MEETING DATE:** December 4, 2013

**MEETING DATE:** January 15, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time and location:</th>
<th>7:00pm, USC Board Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Jack Litchfield LTPB Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2013-12-04

**Attendance:**
- Chan, Adrienne
- Chan, Caleb
- Cote, Dalai
- Hamel-Carassi, Isabelle
- Sobel, Jacob
- He, Jenny
- Li, Kelsey
- Zawalsky, Michael
- Li, Qingning
- Kremic, Stefan
- Obradovic, Vladmir
- Litchfield, Jack

**Regrets:**
- Cote, Dalai (late)
- Schnurr, Cooper
- Hamel-Carassi, Isabelle (late)

**Absent no regrets:**
- Fong, Eric

**Observers:**
- Brown, Spencer – Vice President Finance, USC
- Khan, Fahad – Assistant VP Finance, USC
- Hayward, Kojo – Governance Officer, USC
- Singh, Arjun – Assistant Speaker
- Soti, Emil – Kings USC Councillor
- Pearson, Jordan – FIMSSC President

### 2014-01-15

**Attendance:**
- Chan, Caleb
- Schnurr, Cooper
- Hamel-Carassi, Isabelle
- Sobel, Jacob
- He, Jenny
- Li, Kelsey
- Zawalsky, Michael
- Kremic, Stefan
- Obradovic, Vladmir
- Litchfield, Jack

**Regrets:**
- Chan, Adrienne
- Li, Qingning

**Absent no regrets:**
- Cote, Dalai
- Fong, Eric
Observers:

Brown, Spencer – Vice President Finance, USC
Khan, Fahad – Assistant VP Finance, USC
Hayward, Kojo – Governance Officer, USC
Singh, Arjun – Assistant Speaker
Helfand, Matt
Carter, Jen – KUCUSC President
Addison, Emily – HUCUSC President
Zhu, Maggie – Social Science Councillor
Boekhoff, Ian – Western Gazette
Wellington, Mark – Senior Manager USC Student Life

Item #0 – Corporatism Presentation
Recommendation: that council receive the following as information:

At the invitation of the chair, FIMSSC President Jordan Pearson gave a presentation on “corporatization” on campus and the concerns it raises among elements of the student body. This was done to give the committee a contextual understanding of the “corporatization” issue as it is pertinent to the long-term fiscal planning of the USC as well as the day-to-day duties of this committee.

Item #1 – Q2 Budget Update (Sept - Nov)
Recommendation:
The vice-president finance presented the LTPB with the following information regarding the Second Fiscal Quarter:

More revenues collected from student fees this year. Due to Western improving at allocating the fees resulting in more interest on them. Transfer payments are on schedule (Bus, Health, Dental etc.) $404 000 entry relating to audit purposes, not normal operations. Better insurance projections, despite previously projected 10% increase, we are now paying less on insurance. This is due to the introduction of a new insurance company.

Due to the new true costing initiative only half of the occupancy costs of the Spoke and Mustang Lounge are charged to the budget lines. This marks a $4000/month decrease in costs on these lines. There is $75 000 in reserve for salary contingencies. This will hit the bottom line and mitigate accrued debts if not expended.

Purple Bikes – noted as $17K gains, this is based on 20K grant, has never charged occupancy for last 4 years. True costing results in need of 20K for occupancy --> capital fund.

PVPs are tracking below projections, but numbers haven't transferred from Purple Fest, Arkells, OneLove, Kardinal Official etc. These transfers should balance the portfolios.

One love was taken out of vp internal lines. Wanted 1000 ticket sales, got 200. Difference taken from existing innovative lines for VPI

Elections – no costs yet

Media doing well in sales
Rentals (building space) – noted previously as behind due to error made in rentals based on cost of goods. Behind budget based on erroneous numbers. However actually full capacity – mistake to be corrected for next budget.

Western Connections – ahead of budget due to space rentals via increased commercialization.

Productions – more bookings resulting in more costs. Mitigated by $2 fee increase for service levels maintenance.

Western Film – break even for last 10 years, now behind schedule. Budget 101 presentation for this service to address this issue. – follow up promised. Suggestions for more residence programming and more advertising.

Wave rough Nov. but back in line. Spoke way ahead of schedule, but exec innovation fund projections may not be met.

Creative Services – lag due to new service – loss of entrenchment
  • people looking for old service
  • not looking great now
  • optimistic for next year
  • break even vs subsidized students?
  • Break even in 3yrs?
  • Discussion for 2015-2016 budget

Purple Store – doing well. Being open during SAO helps with this.

Stabilization fund approval - stabilize budget for break even bottom line.

**Summary:**
The Long Term Planning and Budget committee was presented with the second fiscal quarter budget update from the vice-president finance for informational purposes at previous meetings. This marks the second instalment in budgetary updates. All-in-all we are still in good shape.

**Legislative History:**
N/A

**Discussion:**
Concerns about poor turnout at social events such as OneLove and Kardinal Offical. What implications does this entail for the budget. The USC is a non-profit organization and thus does not require profitable events to maintain its legitimacy. However this trend is disconcerting for the future of USC events and the use of student funds.

**Financial Implications:**
N/A

**Attachments:**
Item #2: Grants Report
Recommendation:
That council receive the following information:

Summary:
VP Finance reported on the YTD sums allocated and available from the USC grants fund. There are class on $50-60K of the fund out of $100K available.

Legislative History:
The LTPB Standing Committee's mandate includes receiving status updates on the usage of grants funds.

Discussion:
There are some concerns about whether or not the grants will be fully allocated this year. These issues are being addressed in the Grants Policy debate.

Financial Implications:
Potential for left over funds from the Grants Fund.

Attachments:
N/A
Consultation:
Discussions with VP Finance

Item #3: Grants Policy
Recommendation:
That council receive the following information:

Summary:
The LTPB examined and debated a draft of the new USC Grants Policy. This policy was not available to the committee in advance. The policy requires further debate and consultation before it will be sent to council. We expect to present the policy at the February meeting of council.

Additionally it has come to the attention of the finance portfolio that changes to the extant grants policy may mitigate the number of successfully awarded grants this year. This is because the USC resolved to no longer directly fund charities, certain high-risk actuary risk events/groups.

Discussion:
As the committee is still actively debating the policy the pith and substance of the debates shall not be reported on in detail at this time. However concerns arose pertaining to the clauses limiting travel funding to domestic locales, the iteration of the policy vis-a-vis the grants committee guidelines, the nomination process of the grants committee and the
classification of acceptable initiatives eligible for funding.

**Legislative History:**
Concerns about the integrity and outdated nature of the grants policy were raised to the LTPB in November. These concerns resulted in an inquiry and policy overhaul.

**Consultation:**
USC VP Finance, USC Senior Student Life Manager, USC Grants Committee.

**Financial Implications:**
The new policy will provide contingencies for un-used grants funds, as well as provide more policy about acceptable grant areas.

**Attachments:**
N/A – draft under review

**Item #4: Bus and Health-plan Opt-in for Part-Time Students**
**Recommendation:** That council receive the following as information:

**Summary:**
The LTPB received a report from the VP Finance about the feasibility of bus and health-plan opt-ins for part-time students. This was not feasible. However the USC could provide such services as opt-outs. The LTC and USC are comfortable with providing these services to this demographic if it is blanketed with the option to opt-out instead of opting in. Additionally the LTC is comfortable with providing passes to any unique demographic in its entirety, e.g. the nursing students who spend part of their undergrad at Fanshawe.

**Legislative History:**
The LTPB was given this issue from the WSS. The VP Finance was tasked with (in November) investigating the feasibility of these services in light of interest from the Student Senators.

**Discussion:**
The LTPB resolved that while this can be recognized as an issue, we require more metrics on the matter before implementing a referendum. As such we are conveying to the WSS our recognition of the issue and willingness to conduct surveys in conjunction with the WSS.

**Financial Implications:**
Council would collect health, bus and possibly dental fees from all part time students. This would play havoc with short-term budgetary projections until we can establish a trend in opt-out rates.

**Attachments:**
N/A

**Item #5: Budget Review Subcommittee**
**Recommendation:** that council receive the following as information:

**Summary:**
Tabled pending internal decision with conflicting terms of reference vis-a-vis LTPB.
Regardless there will be a committee composed of at least some members of the LTPB which will meet on February 10th and 13th to review and discuss the 2014-2015 budget.

**Legislative History:**
The Council of 2012-2013 passed legislation disbanding the Finance Standing Committee and creating the new LTPB. The LTPB’s terms of reference include reviewing the board of directors recommended budget. This is also the job of the budget-review subcommittee. There is not enough time for the two committees to review the budget. Furthermore the subcommittee is largely composed of LTPB members.

**Discussion:**

N/A

**Attachments:**

N/A

**Item #6: 2014-2015 Budget Update [In Camera]**

**Recommendation:** that council receive the following as information:

The LTPB received in camera the first sweeping points of the next USC operating budget. More debate to follow. Contingent somewhat on the decision of LTPB vs. Budget-review subcommittee.
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