



GRANT ALLOCATION COMMITTEE MINUTES

2013 – 2014 #18

Date: February 06th 2014

Time: 5.01 pm

In Attendance:

JESSICA NGUYEN (Chair)

JOSH LE

WILLIAM LAU

SAMANTHA LAM

MAXWELL DOUGLAS (Proxy for ABDULLAH HAMID)

CORY HODGSON (Proxy for TAIMUR MALIK)

Excused Absence:

Others in Attendance:

IAN and VANG (Department of Athletics)

SACHITHA KUSALADHARMA

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by NGUYEN at 5.01 pm.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

NGUYEN amended the agenda to remove the first 2 items.

DOUGLAS moved to approve the agenda for February 06, 2014 as amended.

The motion was seconded by LAM.

Vote 4/0/0

CARRIED

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

HODGSON moved to approve the minutes for January 30, 2014 as tabled.

The motion was seconded by DOUGLAS.

Vote 4/0/0

CARRIED

4.

None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

5. OLD BUSINESS

Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund Reserve

NGUYEN: In the last few meetings, we discussed about the interpretation of the original referendum question regarding this, and about how to move forward. We agreed that Ian and Vang coming to the meeting would be good. We are allowed to change the referendum question.

HODGSON: It's in bylaw 3000. However, it has to be done with the agreement of the Department of Athletics.

NGUYEN: So, the 2 options we had were: 1) move it with the rest of the granting money, and 2) keep it as a reserve fund. Keeping it there isn't healthy. If teams were to apply after a cut, would it be sustainable to keep funding every year? We want the feedback from the Department of Athletics on how to proceed.

IAN: A reserve was a good idea in principle, but didn't make a lot of sense. It provided contingency in the event of a catastrophic cut. Usually, a catastrophic cut means that we are going to eliminate a team forever. There's more to it than just the budget. There's not enough money there to fund a team forever, and it's not the role of the fund to do that. We would have approximately \$50,000 there in the fund. There are no teams that you can fund with that amount of money. So, I never thought it was a viable thing. It's good to set money aside, but we need to think about what we are going to do with that money. The reserve is not doing the intended job. If you are rolling it in, would you roll it in all the time?

VANG: In the past few years, the reserve was only utilized for special projects. Those focused on the entire group rather than individual teams. So, if you are keeping a reserve, it's better to ensure that everyone is benefitting from it. It's up to interpretation what the 50-30-20 split means anyway.

NGUYEN: So, how is the 50-30 done right now?

VANG: Each of the teams essentially utilizes projects which allows for an interpretation on whether it fits with the 50% or the 30%. We never said that this project is exclusively in the 50% or vice versa.

VANG: If we are defining the 20%, it will be good to define everything at once.

LE: How much money was taken for the high performance training center?

VANG: We asked for \$50,000. Realistically, only \$5000 was taken from the reserve because we didn't utilize the entire fund.

LE: What happened was, the whole amount was given without 20% being allocated to the reserve.

VANG: Initially, my interpretation was that the \$50,000 should come from the reserve.

LE: What happened 3 years ago depleted the reserve.

VANG: In the document that has all the allocations, you will see that there are negatives for some years. That would mean that money was taken out from

the reserve. In other years, there was \$20,000 added to the reserve. Again, I can't say that we followed the 50-30-20 rule.

LE: Do you see any teams being potentially cut in the next few years?

IAN: That would depend on the fee increase. There are some teams at risk right now. We are looking at a \$400,000-500,000 problem. \$50,000 is not going to help much. However, I anticipate that the fee increase will be approved. Therefore, I don't foresee cutting any teams for a long time.

The things we had problems in the past few years were the casinos. It's around \$80,000 every 2 years. For a team to lose a casino is a huge hit. We lost casinos for several teams. We didn't lose them forever; only for 1 rotation. So, that's an example of an emergency we may encounter.

HODGSON: Instead of cutting a whole team, what about a small cut to a team?

IAN: Actually, we are passing a \$15000 cut to every team. We are in a deficit situation, and don't know when the fee increase would occur. This will be a 1 year cut for 2014-2015. We won't pass that cut along if we get the fee increase in March.

HODGSON: What if a single team gets cut by 5%? Can the reserve help that?

IAN: I would advice having the reserve giving money in such a situation because the easiest thing for us would be to make a cut in order to get money from the reserve. It's a lame way to do business.

The Legacy Fund has been there to fund travel which is extra to the league. The Legacy Fund gives out money across the board. In the 90s, we had already cut funding to teams across the board before the Legacy Fund was established.

NGUYEN: So, we wanted to decide whether to keep the reserve or not. You gave us the points for both sides. Is there any option that you prefer?

IAN: I think it should be rolled into the fund. The 50-30 can be adjusted. It was only a guideline anyway.

I want to find ways that the fund benefits the larger student population. One option is to have a campus promotion co-coordinator with a budget. This would benefit student life on campus and more people would come to watch games. This would be a good form of promotion. So, the 20% could be set aside for promotional activities.

NGUYEN: So would we have to redefine it?

IAN: It's really up to you guys to decide on what you are comfortable with. I don't think having a reserve set aside is necessarily important. 20% would be around \$40,000.

NGUYEN: Is that a good amount to work with for promotion?

IAN: It would be great. We would be able to hire a person for promotional activities. The only difficulty is that you can't make decisions panning multiple years. So, you can't really hire someone for a permanent position. What do you guys think?

LE: I'm in between. I feel that we should still have a reserve in case there is some sort of an emergency.

VANG: As Ian said, there are some teams right now which are enduring cuts

due to not receiving money from the casinos. The cut is up to \$40,000 per year for 2 years.

LE: In the spirit of things, I wouldn't assume that you would cut a team for the sake of getting money from the reserve. We should wait and see what happens with the fee increase.

IAN: In the years where there is no affect from a reduction in casino money, it could be used for something else.

LE: We can have a clause saying that cuts would be prioritized. We should still keep an amount in the reserve just in case.

IAN: The casino is a perfect example of a temporary situation.

HODGSON Do you think it's useful to hold money for such situations?

IAN: Yes, it makes some sense. That situation should never have happened. But it did. Anyway, the amount shouldn't be too high. Maybe we can place a cap on the reserve at around \$100,000.

LE: For not for profit organizations, the reserve should be able to cover 1 year. So, that would amount to around \$200,000. We are currently around the \$110,000. So, for 2 more years, money would go to the reserve. After that, if there's a cut, money would go out, and the reserve would be replenished back to the \$200,000 mark.

VANG: I agree with capping it.

LE: So, we'll cap it at around \$200,000 and keep the rest flexible.

I guess you guys would keep us in the loop about future cuts.

LAU: Ian was talking about how to get other students involved. There are 2 things that popped up. The first one is how we can get more students to wear golden bears and pandas gear. The next one is funding student ideas. We can set aside a small portion to fund student ideas promoting athletics.

VANG: The University Athletics Board would love your idea.

IAN: That provision is there now.

VANG: We are interested in all those ideas.

LE: For the time being, we'll leave the reserve till it gets to the \$200,000 mark unless it is called upon.

LAU: Should we change Standing Orders?

HODGSON: Technically, we should go to council.

NGUYEN: Yes.

Feedback for future Golden Bears an Pandas Legacy Fund application forms

NGUYEN: We had some ideas about this. Councilor HODGSON had an idea about an online application form. Basically, the checklist says what the Standing Orders say. We thought that it was a little bit confusing. We should make it simpler in the future.

HODGSON: Right now it's mostly coaches who are applying. They understand most of the criteria. However, there's the possibility that other groups could apply for money. We wanted to make the access easier. What

we thought was having simple questions with yes or no answers for the checklist. The Standing Orders are not as clear as they should be.

NGUYEN: Yes. Having a linear form where you would go through the questions would be good. The applicant would know whether they are eligible or not by going through the questions.

A big use of the Golden Bears and Pandas Legacy Fund (GBPLF) Committee is to work on making an application.

LE: Vang, are you the one sending out the applications?

VANG: Yes. We send it to the coaches, the University Athletics Board and the Events Manager.

LE: Do the applications close on Monday?

Vang: Yes.

LE: Would the student digest newsletter help with the promotion?

VANG: Definitely. There might be other student groups interested in promoting Golden Bears and Pandas athletics.

LE: This can be used as a trial year.

VANG: The February 10 internal deadline is to make coaches send us their stuff.

IAN: When is the GBPLF committee going to meet?

VANG: I'll have to set it up.

LE: Who is the councilor from the Grant Allocation Committee (GAC)

NGUYEN: It's Taimur Malik.

LE: It's exciting to see the Legacy Fund back on track.

6. CLOSED SESSION *NIL*

7. NEXT MEETING *February 13, 2014 at 5 pm.*

8. ADJOURNMENT *The meeting was adjourned by NGUYEN at 5.47 pm.*