



**FINANCE
COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, March 20, 2018
4:00 PM
SUB 0-48**

We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students' Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory.

We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the

University of Alberta Students' Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

ATTENDANCE

NAME	PROXY	PRESENT	SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK (IF ABSENT)
Robyn Paches (Chair)		Y	
Connor Palindat		Y	
James Thibaudeau		Y	
Darren Choi		N	Sent thoughts in for the attendance
Abigail Bridarolli		N	N
Delane Howie	NAME?	N	
Habba Mahal		Y	
Monica Lillo		N	N
Ilya Ushakov		Y	VIA PHONE CALL
Lane Anderson	NAME?	Y	
Robert Bilak		Y	
Jonathan Barraclough		Y	
Emma Ripka sp? GUEST		Y	
Nicholas Sorensen	PROXY	Y	

MINUTES (FC 2017-13)

2017-13/1 **INTRODUCTION**

2017-13/1a **Call to Order**

Meeting called to order at 4:12 PM.

2017-13/1b **Approval of Agenda**

THIBAUDEAU/BARRACLOUGH MOVE to approve the agenda
7/0/2

PROXY FOR HOWIE/PROXY FOR ANDERSON abstains

2017-13/1c **Approval of Minutes**

PACHES MOVES to approve the minutes.
5/0/4

THIBAUDEAU, PROXY FOR HOWIE, PROXY FOR ANDERSON, USHAKOV

2017-13/1d **Chair's Business**

2017-13/2 **QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD**

2017-13/3a Budget Principles

FC-2017-13.02

PACHES: NONE, AXED

2017-13/3 **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

2017-13/3a **PACHES/MAHAL MOVES** to recommend the approval of the 2018/19 Budget Principles to the Executive Committee & Students' Council.
9/0/0 CARRIED

See FC-2017-13.02

PACHES: Introduces 3a. The motion reads as a recommendation to Exec Committee because they haven't seen in it due to timelines. Finance will recommend it to exec and exec will recommend to Council and when it comes to Council, it will be recommended by Finance & Exec if we choose to recommend it. Please see attached. I went through the format of principles with the committee beforehand. Budget Principles are similar to the first reading of a Bylaw then we go into various guiding tenants that form the SU financial

management policy and how we form the budget. We'll get this approved and review each itemized budget line-by-line. Very similar to the first and second reading of the bylaw. The question you'll ask yourselves - Does this reflect the approved principles? Does it make sense and is it acceptable. I'm going to go through the document and point out things edited, added, or removed. I trust that everyone will read through it on the own time. I did provide the year before. Businesses is edited to remove a couple of them which I will go through in more detail. One thing that will be changed is under services involvement - Orientatino is now referred to as New Student Orientation. Fiscal consideration shows various considerations eg. CPI, changes to post-secondary learning act. The first couple changes are in 2 and 4 - they used to say the SU cannot budget for a deficit and cannot exceed total operation fees/revenues. I amended number because the first sentence was like number 2 so the first sentence in no. 4 is deleted. No. 2 used to be more binding, loosed this principle. It used to say under no circumstance SU will not budget for deficit, but we will have to budget for a deficit this year because: we're building up conferencing/events unit, make a strategic move into building up our catering which we project ot have bountiful returns only due to a significant investement which brings us into a deficit and also the SEI. The only way a deficit can occur if council is provided with a multi-year projection. How does everyone feel?

?: I think it's responsible.

PACHES: I would also argue that organizations have deficits and surpluses and sometimes you have to make a significant investment for a long-term surplus.

?: Is there a limit to the deficit we can rack up?

PACHES: Not in principles but there is incentive for the organization financially through maintaining its own business practices that it wouldn't be a large deficit. An organization wouldn't want to get rid of its reserves.

?: How many years ahead to we plan on projecting?

PACHES: 3 to 5. Once you get to 5, hard to predict.

?: In that projection, how long do we predict we're in deficit?

PACHES: 3. After that, back to increase. I did not introduce our guest. Emma Ripka is elected VP Ops Fi, my successor.

RIPKA: I think it's rude he's leaving me with a deficit. But, strategically speaking, it's good news.

PALINDAT: For the bylaws in french, is it removed?

PACHES TO PALINDAT: I'd like to highlight 2 was amended to budget for a

deficit. We are projecting a deficit this year. A lot of first 10-15 are necessary for budgeting.

PACHES: No 10. I edited the CPI. 19 was edited in response to 2nd principle. 19 was about businesses and deficits > "shall strive". Just a loosening of language. 26 is NEW. This year we're creating a conferencing and events dept. In the long-run, we're making a big push into conferencing and catering business on campus. Not many ppl like Aramark and we want to push into this. We're hiring staff to be client facing, reaching out to university depts and creating business there, making sure every client and a client-specific manager for each individual. If there are any problems, you call them so our customer service is top notch. 27 - I will change this to meeting rooms in the lower level SU building. Even though SEI failed, we will still move forward to lower level meeting rooms because a lot of that can be financed, it's a capital investment so we'll move forward with that. It's the last plan with the commercial kitchen - L'Express full catering and make it a new lower level space because the bookstore is moving out. It will be divisible for tradeshows. We are ready for tender, we got pricing from contractors, soon as budget is approved, construction will begin. Next, "Resources should be made for the sponsorship for execs" The SU gets a ton of requests to support their initiatives but we don't have any money for university departments eg. Augustana Round Dance so Marina ended up charging that out of her personal line out of project allocation so flagged an issue because we don't have something for this. We don't want to create a sponsorship line for SGs because we already invest heavily in SG granting and that's already \$100,000 of student dollars going back to student groups. The attention is that we'll make a \$10,000 fund for sponsorship of events. Students groups may not apply to this but if they do something that doesn't apply to the categories then they could be eligible but this is for the things that falls through the cracks.

?: How is that going to be allocated?

PACHES: This one will likely be Executive Committee for the time being. I believe the attention is to create an internal staff sponsorship committee to handle it so Council wouldn't want to worry about it unless they want. We could get a Councillor on that committee. Next, SU shall include multi-year projection with budget proposal - Ice machine in RATT and that's about it. This year we are going to provide a multi-year projection which is something we've never done before. We usually provide just one year and this year, we'll be doing 3 year but we're talking about doing a couple of more years. Keeping in mind, that once you start projecting revenues and costs into 4-5 years in the future then reliability decreases but 2-3 years can be relatively reliable. 32. The SU shall cease operations of L'Express and Underground, the spaces will be made available for lease.

?: So I thought L'Express was moving downstairs. Are we not doing that anymore?

PACHES: Money. L'Express has been going down a decline of revenue the past 5 years, about \$100,000. However, catering has been on a steady increase so it's a consolidation to its competitive advantage - catering. Underground was created as a space-holder because when we first built the atrium, we wanted to stimulate the area so we built a coffee shop to get people to hang out. We also didn't know the viability of having a leasehold there, now we know.

?: So will this leasehold cease to exist?

PACHES: The business of L'Express & Undergrind will cease to exist and the space they hold are now available, are now part of the food court RFP and will be filled by other tenants. We're expecting a pulling of \$300,000 in gifts from respondents for the food court which will offset some costs for lower level construction and some of the costs from the SEI (loss). There's an interesting clause in the RFP - we also make it that all tenants have to agree to this, it says if the SU ever cease to be able to have automatic enrolment as a membership, these tenants are required to provide preferential pricing to those that become SU members or more expensive if you're not.

?: It'll probably be more expensive if you're not.

PACHES: There's a difference in pricing if that ever happens and all leaseholds agreed to it. There's going to be some changes in the food court. By the end of this week, everyone should be notified. Next principle, resources will be made available... to be honest, this has been a principle for 2 years and it hasn't been done. I think we take it out of budget because no one has it done and if it someone wants to take it on in the future, please do. I've talked to ppl from CSJ, the idea of translating policies to french is very political and no one is going to read them once they're translated. It's a symbolic translation into bylaws and policies. As far as getting it done, they were half completed last year by volunteers so we don't need to pay for this. That's my own opinion. It's a hard budget year, we're budgeting a deficit, something's got to give.

?: I disagree with this principle, just getting rid of it just because we've seen 3 candidates coming from CSJ. All very focused on CSJ doesn't feel like they're getting hurt and I think it shows that this is an important issue to take forward. I know it hasn't done yet but it's something the SU committed itself to. Eliminating it from the budget principle makes it easier to forget what it's for. Having it in the principles and part of the budget makes it a conscious issue until it's completed.

?: I kind of agree but mostly disagree. I think removing the principle just strategically pivoting how we're approaching the translation. I agree that we don't need to pay for it. There's lots of free student volunteer resources like CSL especially when we're budgeting for a deficit.

?: It says "funds no longer needed" not like we're not going to do it. Just by

taking it out doesn't mean we're not going to do it ever.

PACHES: I hear your comments and agree it shouldn't be lost. We shouldn't lose track on this and should be a priority on CAC next year and we're in a tough year and need to make cuts where we can. This makes sense because we can find labor elsewhere.

?: If it's already half completed, how much will it cost to get the other half done?

PACHES: A few thousand. Translation is a lot of work, it adds up really quick.

?: Maybe de-allocate the resources instead of funding if someone wants to request funds from a certain pool?

PACHES: There's a council budget principle. It could be argued that the translation of bylaws and policies into french is encompassed by 16 - The SU shall allocate resources to provide sufficient staffing and support student governance objectives.

?: Can we add ***"included but not limited to translation of bylaws into French"*** You're getting it but then you lose the drama of removing it.

PACHES: I'm in favor of putting it on 16 and putting "as such..." so it's not lost. I agree we shouldn't lose it. Number 2 - DONE. I removed it, finished last year. Number 3 - resources will be made available... it's incorporated into the larger budget and doesn't need to be there because we're carrying it over from last year. Expenses to repair pianos will be added into the budget every year.

?: The number one complaint I heard from students during elections was "when are you going to fix the microwaves?"

PACHES: When did it become our problem?

?: There's new microwaves in HUB by OASIS.

PACHES: We put one down by undergrind.

?: There's a few in rutherford.

?: I think we should include in budget principle that we allocated some money for microwaves.

PACHES: Amendments:

Point 10 - ACPI 17/18 should be 18/19

16 shall be amended to read - The Students' Union shall allocated resources to

provide sufficient staffing to support student governance objectives, such as but not limited to the translation of bylaws and policies in French.

27 will be amended to read “meeting rooms” instead of “meeting room”

32 - “2018 Students’ Union food court request for proposals and not just request proposals” typo??

2017-13/3b

PACHES/PALINDAT MOVES to approve the 2018 disbursement of the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund as per the attached documents.

9/0/0 CARRIED

See FC-2017-13.03

PACHES: This is a DFU that was recently renewed at elections. It’s a fund that everybody pays into that helps pay for sports on campus that are non-varsity. There’s various competitive clubs, fitness facilities EG HUB community receives, CSJ gets some funding to help with their fitness equipment.

?: Who changed Wednesday, March 14?

PACHES: I changed it, that’s my signature. I will note that this year for the allocation process, this was the best year I’ve seen for CREF. Each club does a presentation and they do 12 hour interviews and it’s impossible for an exec to get there. Thankfully, I was able to make it to one of them and Nathan made it to one of them as well. The committee was very knowledgeable that this was unreasonable. It ranges from a taekwondo request from \$750 and got \$600. That’s where all intramurals get their money. The most ridiculous one was Cheer team for \$22,000 for 20 people and they gave them \$7,000.

?: What is Orchasis? They asked for \$10,000 and got \$0.

PACHES: I have no idea what that it.

?: Dance program.

PACHES: I would ask Nathan that at Council.

?: It’s another dance program outside of mod?

PACHES: Nathan is aware that his signature isn’t on this.

?: In the application it says, 2 were denied but there were 3 that got 0.

PACHES: Michener park residence is ineligible automatically because they’re grad students. I would encourage you to ask Nathan if you’re curious.

2017-13/4 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

2017-13/4a FC-2017-12, Meeting Minutes

See FC-2017-13.01

2017-13/4b Budget Principles

See FC-2017-13.02

2017-13/4c CREF Documentation

See FC-2017-13.03

2017-13/5 **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

2017-13/5a **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, April 3, 2018 @ 4:00PM in SUB 6-06.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

MOTION	VOTES
THIBAUDEAU/BARRACLOUGH MOVE to approve the agenda	7/0/2 PROXY FOR HOWIE/PROXY FOR ANDERSON abstains CARRIED
PACHES MOVES to approve the minutes.	5/0/4 THIBAUDEAU, PROXY FOR HOWIE, PROXY FOR ANDERSON, USHAKOV CARRIED
PACHES/MAHAL MOVES to recommend the approval of the 2018/19 Budget Principles to the Executive Committee & Students' Council.	9/0/0 CARRIED.
PACHES/PALINDAT MOVES to approve the 2018 disbursement of the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund as per the attached documents.	9/0/0 CARRIED.