AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: May 17th, 2014  Time: 14:00 - 18:00  Venue: SUB 266J

Present:
Members: Nilourfar Keshmiri, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Stephanie Goh, Marjan Hatai, Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Kurtis Harms, Thea Simpson

Guests: Cole Leonoff

Regrets: Serena Ng, Jeffery Li

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 14:07 pm.

2. High-level Overview of the Budget

- The Vice-President Finance (VPF) started by saying that the AMS is projected to eliminate the deficit in the 2014-2015 year. Based on Business Administration Governance Board (BAGB)’s forecasting, business revenues are projected to be ~$485,000 adjusted for New Sub and other considerations.
- The VPF stated that AMS Administration overhead was projected to be $809,828 and is split 50:50 between Student Administration and AMS Businesses.
- The VPF stated that the Ombuds fee brings in ~$50,000 and that the committee needs to discuss whether this should be included in the budget.
- The VPF stated that the Student Services Reserve which is currently at ~$400,000 (~$467,000 when including the SAC fee).
- The VPF finished this section by stating the current planned surplus for the 2014-2015 year should be over $300,000. He further stated that in his opinion, Council should put the majority of the surplus into the endowment fund.
- A member of the committee asked if the current budget includes the AMS App and if we have considered hiring UBC students to make the app for us in order to be more cost effective? The VPF replied that the current plan is to go outside of campus and the Executive is cautious about not using a professional for this. He further suggested this might be a discussion to have at Council.

3. Student Government Budget

- A member of the committee asked what the plan for the AGM was. The VPF replied that the current proposal is to continue holding the “UBC’s Got Talent” competition, integrate it to the AGM, and that it should cost approximately $15,000. A member of the committee stated that this might be overly optimistic number. The chair stated that this budget item should not be included in the “AGM” budget line as we do not charge for anybody to attend out AGM and that should be made clear. The VPF replied that is it not clear which department is running this event at the moment. The committee continued to discuss the proposed event and raised numerous concerns.
The VPF stated that he will bring it up with the department in charge once it is determined and the Executive Committee.
- The chair asked why there is $30,000 budgeted for “Legal”. The VPF replied that this was just a precaution in case legal expenses did come up.
- Members of the committee raised concerns about “Staff Appreciation” budget lines as last year money was spent despite nothing being budgeted. The VPF reported that there are some discrepancies in the accounting system that might have caused this but it is something that falls to Council to consider.
- A member of the committee asked why the Oversight Committee wasn’t listed in those with budgets. The VPF replied that they currently do not have an account but one is being created for them.
- The VPF asked for the committee’s opinion on the $43,000 in the fund used to support the UBC Ombudsperson as the AMS has never actually given them this money. He stated that UBC collects the fee for us and gives us the exact number in the fund. The fee specifies that it has to be used to support an Ombudsperson but doesn’t specify between the AMS or UBC Ombudsperson. The chair stated that she thinks the current practice is appropriate going forward. The VPF replied that the issue is that we pay the amount before the AMS gets the actual amount from UBC. It was raised because this payment in (the past) makes the AMS Ombudsperson budget look very high, would it be possible to put it somewhere else? The VPF replied it would be a non-discretionary transfer and that he would look into it.
- The chair questioned why the “Elections and Referenda” budget has been budgeted at such a substantially reduced amount compared to last year’s actuals. The VPF stated that last year’s actuals were due to the large amount of staff hired. Members of the committee who were involved in elections and the Yes/No campaign stated that they were concerned about the actuals as they were pretty sure they should be higher. The VPF stated he would look into this and report back.
- The VPF reported that in the “University and Government Relations” budget there is an increase in contracts/wages as determined through union negotiation and that this position is also planning to hire a Research Assistant for $4,000.
- The chair questioned the proposed budget of $2,500 under “Special and Professional” and if we needed this. The committee agreed that a further discussion on staff development and volunteer appreciation was warranted.
- The chair questioned is the budget for the “Whistler Orientation Weekend” should be renamed as it was not being held there anymore. The committee agreed.

4. **Executive Budget**
- During this portion of the meeting the VPF explained and answered questions on the Executive Committee’s proposed budget.
  - The committee raised concerns about the unbudgeted revenue of $6,390 listed as “Special Projects”. The VPF stated he would look into this and that it was likely an accounting error.
  - A committee member asked what “Community Involvement” was. The VPF explained that it was for things such as Exec Storm-the-Wall. The reason why it is budgeted separately from Executive Team Building is that the Community Involvement directly interacts with other students/community.
- It was asked why the All President’s Dinner budget was increased? A committee member replied that last year no funding received from the UBC Vice-President Student’s office and thus more needs be budgeted.

- During this portion of the meeting the committee generally discussed the Executives’ budgets.
  - A member of the committee asked if the current salaries should be budgeted with the bonus. The VPF replied that they currently were and should be in case each Executive receives the full bonus.
  - The VPF noted that phone reimbursements have gone up to $75 from $65.
  - The VPF noted that as per code, each Executive is entitled to a certain amount of Conference & Official Business.

- The committee discussed the “Partnership Building” budget line. It was noted that only the External portfolio has requested money for Partnership Building. It was agreed that there is value and necessity for money to be spent on things such as coffee with other groups. Furthermore, it was suggested that all portfolios should have a budget for this but not at the same amount. The chair proposed an allocation of $150 for President’s department, for $150 for Academic and University Affairs department, $50 for Administration and Finance departments, and for the External department to be discussed later on – this was agreed upon by the committee.

- President
  - During this portion of the meeting the VPF explained and answered questions on the President department’s budget.
  - The VPF noted that the reason the salary budget line has increased is because of the two new positions: Special Projects Coordinator and Secretariat of Council. Members of the committee expressed concerns that these positions have not been created through proper procedures yet.

- Vice-President Academic & University Affairs (VPA&UA)
  - During this portion of the meeting the VPF explained and answered questions on the Academic and University Affairs department’s budget.
  - The committee discussed the increased number of staff in this department and the merits of each position.
  - The committee discussed the “Special Projects” budget line. The chair noted that since the proposed budget is less than last years and that the actuals were very small if we need to spend this much. The VPF replied that the VPA&UA was not aware of her full budget when she came into the position last year, and hence did not spend the amount budgeted. The VPF further stated that he would send out a more detailed breakdown of this budget line in a separate document.

- Vice-President Administration (VPA)
  - During this portion of the meeting the VPF explained and answered questions on the Administration department’s budget.
  - A member of the committee asked for clarification on what was included in the “Furniture and Equipment” budget. The VPF stated he would follow-up on this.
  - A member of the committee asked for clarification on what was included in the “Hardware/Software” budget. The VPF stated this was for a new computer screen.
  - The chair asked why the New SUB staff budget does not have any allocations. The VPF stated this is because the money is coming out of the New SUB budget. A member of the committee
raised the concern that there should then be a transfer from the New SUB project to the Administration department to ensure proper tracking of expenditures. The chair raised the point that we should do that then there are numerous other lines we need to do that for. The committee agreed that we would keep the line as is for now.

- The committee requested to see a breakdown of the different SAC salaries. The chair raised concerns that she doesn’t feel it is appropriate to have Food and Refreshments in SAC when other committees do not have similar budgets. The committee agreed that this budget line should be reduced to $0.

- The VPF explained what the SAC Wine and Cheese event is. A member of the committee raised the concern that the current budget is too high considering how much was budgeted last year. The committee agreed that $1000 would be appropriate.

- The chair questioned what the budget line “Executive Orientations” was for. The VPF replied that it was for training for AMS Club Executives

- The chair asked why we budget Shinerama’s revenue. The VPF replied that that was a mistake and would be changed.

- The VPF presented on the Artist In Residency program. A member of the committee stated that they do not feel this is an appropriate expenditure as there are already many grants available for artist through government and outside organizations. The chair questioned how this would be different than if that AMS, for example, gave out research grants to science students. Other members of the committee voiced their opinions that this was a unique situation in that they are representing the art gallery. Due to lack of information available during the meeting, the committee requested more information on this budget line.

- Vice-President External (VPE)
  - During this portion of the meeting the VPF explained and answered questions on the External Department’s budget.
  - The VPF stated that he has been involved in discussions with the department about providing more detailed breakdowns/justifications for their budget as there are a lot of increases compared to last year.
  - The VPF stated that the Federal, Provincial, and Municipal Election Funds have some weird wording in code that we will need to look at. Currently the AMS puts $5,000/year into the funds if they are below $30,000. The committee agreed that LPC should be consulted on this.
  - A member of the committee raised concerns that the “Campaigns and Public Outreach” budget was very large and that a more detailed breakdown was in order.
  - The committee questioned the “GetOnBoard” campaign budget and how it is different from the “Municipal Lobbying” budget. The committee agreed to request a further discussion from the VPE on this.

- Vice-President Finance
  - During this portion of the meeting the VPF explained and answered questions on the Finance Department’s budget.
  - The chair asked the VPF if the video on what the AMS is doing with student’s money should come out of this budget or the Communications department. The VPF replied the in-house communications doesn’t have the video capabilities and thus they would likely be doing out of house.
5. **Services Budget**

- The committee asked if the part-time staff position for the U-Pass office should be included in this budget as it was voted down at Council. It was agreed that for the moment this item should be eliminated from the budget until Council approves it.
- It was asked and answered by the VPF stated that “Conference and Official Business” within the Executive Director’s budget was for a course of business negotiation. The committee stated that this item should be moved to the “Professional Development” line.
- The VPF presented the Student Services Managers proposed budget stating that there were a few more items in this budget he needed to further investigate and would get back to the committee on them.
- The committee asked why the AMS Connect Office spent so little money on special projects last year. The VPF replied that he was unsure and would look into it and report back to the committee.
- The committee raised concerns about the amount the AMS Foodbank spent on volunteer appreciation last year but that they would discuss it at a subsequent meeting as previously agreed upon.
- The VPF stated that the Speakeasy budget had increased due to the need to hire another assistant coordinator in order to prevent overworking staff as happened last year. It was asked why the proposed “Volunteer Training” budget was so high. The VPF replied this because of a plan to increase the number of and to provide better training. The committee then asked what was involved in the “Special Projects” budget line. The VPF replied that this was for outreach. The committee requested that it might be more appropriate for this item to be under a different budget line.
- The VPF stated that there is an ongoing discussion/negotiation about the status of the grants for AMS Tutoring but that the level of funding the AMS will receive will be decreasing.
- There were numerous concerns raised around SASC’s actuals from last year: staffing, advertising and promotions, volunteer appreciation, etc... The VPF responded that the SASC fund collects ~$150,000 per year and that code states that they have to spend at least 75% each year. The VPF stated he would talk to SASC about their actuals and spending practices.
- A member of the committee raised concerns that there are many line items within the Communications budget that are being charged to other departments despite the significant resources given to them last year. The committee raised concerns with various aspects of the department’s budget and requested the VPF obtain more justification for the proposal.

The meeting adjourns at 18:08 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: June 4th, 2014       Time: 17:00 - 19:00       Venue: SUB 224

Present:
Members: Kurtis Harms, Thea Simpson, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Marjan Hatai, Tanner Bokor, Christopher Roach, Serena Ng

Guests: Cole Leonoff

Regrets: Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Stephanie Goh

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 17:03.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.
Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Thea
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes

Due to administrative problems arising from chair transition, minutes from previous meeting will be presented at the next budget committee meeting.

4. Overview of Preliminary Budget Process – Discussion
   - During this portion of the meeting the chair went over the process for the preliminary budget as agreed upon by committee members from conversations since the previous meeting. The committee agreed that due to time constraints, it would be looking at the budget from a macroscopic point of view and leave the microscopic investigation to the final budgeting process.
   - At the request for the chair, before the meetings all members of the committee looked over the current version of the budget and flagged department/budget lines that were of major concern. The chair informed the committee which lines/departments these were (see following sections) and that the heads of the departments were invited to attend the meeting to discuss the issues raised by the committee.
   - The chair asked if there were any concerns or thoughts about the proposed process for the preliminary budget. A member of the committee asked if the committee should be assessing if they think a proposed project is appropriate for the department or only looking at the proposed budget and assessing if that is appropriate. The committee discussed this point and came to the conclusion
that the committee’s role was to thoroughly assess the proposed budget and ensure it was produced responsibly.

- The chair asked again if there were any additional concerns or thoughts about the proposed process for the preliminary budget – no more were raised.

5. **Academic and University Affairs Department Budget** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went through the Academic and University Affairs department’s budget and identified the areas of concern. This included Research and Community Projects.
- The committee went through the detailed proposal prepared by the Vice-President Academic and University Affairs (VPA&UA) for this budget line and asked a series of questions about the budgets for 2014 academic survey, the Acadia Park campaign, and the Aboriginal Student Engagement Campaign.
- After discussion with the VPA&UA, the committee agreed upon decreasing the proposed budgets to the Student Senate Caucus, the Academic Experience Survey analysis, and the amount allocated for the Longhouse Lunch.

6. **External Department Budget** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went through the External department’s budget and identified the areas of concern. These included Conference and Official Business, Special Projects, ABCS membership dues, the GetonBoard Campaign, and Election Lobbying.
- The committee asked the Vice-President External (VPE) to explain in detail what was included in the Special Projects and the GetonBoard Campaign budget lines. After presenting the projects included within these lines, the committee asked a series of questions to gain a better understanding of the projects the department was planning and which budget line they were contained under. The committee voiced a strong agreement that the proposed projects in these budget lines were important, however without more detailed proposals it did not feel comfortable approving the budgets in full. As such, the committee decided it would be the most fiscally responsible to decrease these budget lines and let the department know they would have the opportunity to increase it back to the proposed levels during the final budgeting process.
- The committee discussed the proposed budget for the ABCS membership dues and decided that instead of putting it in during the preliminary budget, the committee would wait to see if Council approved joining the organization as a dues paying member and then take the appropriate action in the final budgeting process.
- Because of the policies around the three election funds (Federal Election Fund, Provincial Election Fund, and Municipal Election Fund), it was voiced that only the proposed budgets of more than $5000.00, the amount put into each fund annually, should be included in the budget. The President raised the point that there will likely be a motion at the next Council meeting to suspend code to allow no money be put into these funds as there is discussion on removing them. As such, the committee felt it would be most appropriate to leave the budgets for these areas as presented.

7. **Events Department Budget** – Discussion
During this portion of the meeting, the committee went through the Events department’s budget and identified all of the areas of concern. These included department staff, Welcome Back BBQ, Block Party, Conferences and Official Business, Advertising and Promotion, Non-flagship events, and Farmade.

The chair of the committee noted that the head of the events department is unfortunately away on Society business and was unable to attend the meeting.

Because of the absence of the department head and the large amounts of concerns raised, the committee discussed two potential options for this department: 1) setting the budget at the 2013-2014 amounts or 2) cutting the budget lines of concern by 50%.

Agreeing that neither was an ideal option and that the department would have the opportunity to increase their 2014-2015 budget back to the proposed levels, the committee decided it would be the most fiscally responsible to set the preliminary budget levels to that of 2013-2014 budget.

8. Additional Preliminary Budget Considerations – Discussion
- The chair asked if there were any additional items committee members wanted to raise around the preliminary budget – none were raised. Thus the following motion was made.

BIRT Budget Committee approves the preliminary budget as finalized in the June 4th Budget Committee meeting and recommends it to Council for approval.

Moved: Chris; Seconded: Curtis
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

9. Final Budget Process and Timeline – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the chair explained the proposed process for preparing the final budget – before the next meeting the committee would go through the current budget with a microscope lens and flag all lines into one of 5 categories: 1) no issues, 2) concerns about under-budgeting or loss of revenue, 3) concerns about over-budgeting which requires the committee to receive a verbal explanation from the department head, 4) concerns about over-budgeting which requires the committee to receive a verbal and written explanation from the department head, and 5) areas of interest to have a general discussion about. Once finished, the chair would contact the appropriate department heads to obtain the requested information.
- The chair further stated that he and the Vice-President Finance would design a standard template form for department heads to use to produce the written justification for the committee.
- The chair asked if there were any concerns about this process – none were raised.

BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Kurtis
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 7:33 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: June 4th, 2014  Time: 17:00 - 19:00  Venue: SUB 224

Present:
Members: Kurtis Harms, Thea Simpson, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Marjan Hatai, Tanner Bokor, Christopher Roach, Serena Ng

Guests: Cole Leonoff

Regrets: Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Stephanie Goh

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 17:03.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.
Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Thea
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes

Due to administrative problems arising from chair transition, minutes from previous meeting will be presented at the next budget committee meeting.

4. Overview of Preliminary Budget Process – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the chair went over the process for the preliminary budget as agreed upon by committee members from conversations since the previous meeting. The committee agreed that due to time constraints, it would be looking at the budget from a macroscopic point of view and leave the microscopic investigation to the final budgeting process.
- At the request for the chair, before the meetings all members of the committee looked over the current version of the budget and flagged department/budget lines that were of major concern. The chair informed the committee which lines/departments these were (see following sections) and that the heads of the departments were invited to attend the meeting to discuss the issues raised by the committee.
- The chair asked if there were any concerns or thoughts about the proposed process for the preliminary budget. A member of the committee asked if the committee should be assessing if they think a proposed project is appropriate for the department or only looking at the proposed budget and assessing if that is appropriate. The committee discussed this point and came to the conclusion
that the committee’s role was to thoroughly assess the proposed budget and ensure it was produced responsibly.
- The chair asked again if there were any additional concerns or thoughts about the proposed process for the preliminary budget – no more were raised.

5. **Academic and University Affairs Department Budget** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went through the Academic and University Affairs department’s budget and identified the areas of concern. This included Research and Community Projects.
- The committee went through the detailed proposal prepared by the Vice-President Academic and University Affairs (VPA&UA) for this budget line and asked a series of questions about the budgets for 2014 academic survey, the Acadia Park campaign, and the Aboriginal Student Engagement Campaign.
- After discussion with the VPA&UA, the committee agreed upon decreasing the proposed budgets to the Student Senate Caucus, the Academic Experience Survey analysis, and the amount allocated for the Longhouse Lunch.

6. **External Department Budget** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went through the External department’s budget and identified the areas of concern. These included Conference and Official Business, Special Projects, ABCS membership dues, the GetonBoard Campaign, and Election Lobbying.
- The committee asked the Vice-President External (VPE) to explain in detail what was included in the Special Projects and the GetonBoard Campaign budget lines. After presenting the projects included within these lines, the committee asked a series of questions to gain a better understanding of the projects the department was planning and which budget line they were contained under. The committee voiced a strong agreement that the proposed projects in these budget lines were important, however without more detailed proposals it did not feel comfortable approving the budgets in full. As such, the committee decided it would be the most fiscally responsible to decrease these budget lines and let the department know they would have the opportunity to increase it back to the proposed levels during the final budgeting process.
- The committee discussed the proposed budget for the ABCS membership dues and decided that instead of putting it in during the preliminary budget, the committee would wait to see if Council approved joining the organization as a dues paying member and then take the appropriate action in the final budgeting process.
- Because of the policies around the three election funds (Federal Election Fund, Provincial Election Fund, and Municipal Election Fund), it was voiced that only the proposed budgets of more than $5000.00, the amount put into each fund annually, should be included in the budget. The President raised the point that there will likely be a motion at the next Council meeting to suspend code to allow no money be put into these funds as there is discussion on removing them. As such, the committee felt it would be most appropriate to leave the budgets for these areas as presented.

7. **Events Department Budget** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting, the committee went through the Events department’s budget and identified all of the areas of concern. These included department staff, Welcome Back BBQ, Block Party, Conferences and Official Business, Advertising and Promotion, Non-flagship events, and Farmade.
- The chair of the committee noted that the head of the events department is unfortunately away on Society business and was unable to attend the meeting.
- Because of the absence of the department head and the large amounts of concerns raised, the committee discussed two potential options for this department: 1) setting the budget at the 2013-2014 amounts or 2) cutting the budget lines of concern by 50%.
- Agreeing that neither was an ideal option and that the department would have the opportunity to increase their 2014-2015 budget back to the proposed levels, the committee decided it would be the most fiscally responsible to set the preliminary budget levels to that of 2013-2014 budget.

8. **Additional Preliminary Budget Considerations** – Discussion
- The chair asked if there were any additional items committee members wanted to raise around the preliminary budget – none were raised. Thus the following motion was made.

BIRT Budget Committee approves the preliminary budget as finalized in the June 4th Budget Committee meeting and recommends it to Council for approval.

Moved: Chris; Seconded: Curtis
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

9. **Final Budget Process and Timeline** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the chair explained the proposed process for preparing the final budget – before the next meeting the committee would go through the current budget with a microscope lens and flag all lines into one of 5 categories: 1) no issues, 2) concerns about under-budgeting or loss of revenue, 3) concerns about over-budgeting which requires the committee to receive a verbal explanation from the department head, 4) concerns about over-budgeting which requires the committee to receive a verbal and written explanation from the department head, and 5) areas of interest to have a general discussion about. Once finished, the chair would contact the appropriate department heads to obtain the requested information.
- The chair further stated that he and the Vice-President Finance would design a standard template form for department heads to use to produce the written justification for the committee.
- The chair asked if there were any concerns about this process – none were raised.

BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Kurtis
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 7:33 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: June 24th, 2014  Time: 18:00 - 20:30  Venue: SUB 266J

Present:
Voting Members: Serena Ng, Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Kurtis Harms, Thea Simpson, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Marjan Hatai, Tanner Bokor, Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach

Guests: Bahareh Jokar, Ava Nasiri

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 pm.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.

Moved: Kurtis; Seconded: Marjan
PASSED (7 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes

BIRT the minutes entitled “Budget Committee_Minutes_20140517” and “Budget Committee_Minutes_20140604” are approved as presented.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Stephanie
PASSED (7 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

4. Overview of Final Budgeting Process – Discussion 18:05 – 18:10

- During this portion of the meeting the chair explained the proposed process for preparing the final budget – after the last meeting the committee went through the current draft budget with a microscopic lens and grouped all lines into one of five categories: 1) no issues, 2) concerns about under-budgeting or loss of revenue, 3) concerns about over-budgeting which requires the committee to receive a verbal explanation from the department head, 4) concerns about over-budgeting which requires the committee to receive a verbal and written explanation from the department head, and 5) areas of interest to have a general discussion about. Once finished, the chair contacted the appropriate department heads to obtain the requested information using a standard template form designed by the committee and ensure the department head would be present at the meeting if needed based on the budget line assignment.
- The chair stated that this meeting would primarily focus on general items for discussion and the Executive budgets.
- The chair asked if there were any concerns with this process – none were raised.

5. **Items for General Discussion (Highlighted Orange) – Discussion**
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over three general discussion areas: 1) Volunteer/Staff Appreciation, 2) Phone/Fax, and 3) Miscellaneous.
- 1) The chair explained that upon inspection of the budget, there wasn’t an underlying formula to determine how much each department should be allocating for staff appreciation and volunteer appreciation. The chair noted that numerous departments seemed to have a different amount per individuals and it might be beneficial for the committee to establish a formula for this. The chair asked if there should be a different amount allocated for staff then volunteers – the committee agreed that some money should be allocated for staff appreciation but it should be less then volunteers as they are already receiving compensation. The chair then asked if the amount should be per individual or based on each department’s size – the committee agreed that in order to standardize this it would be best to allocate money per person but allow departments to propose increasing these budgets should the standard amount prove insufficient. The committee then discuss how much should be allocated per person. During the discussion, numerous examples from various Constituency Societies were shared and the committee eventually agreed that $15 per staff member and $25 per volunteer was an appropriate amount with a departmental maximum of $800 before a proposal needs to be sent to committee. A member of the committee asked if we should also allocate budgets for the general members of AMS committees as they also volunteer a large portion of their time to the Society – the committee agreed on the condition it not be used on councillors/Executives. A member the committee commented that it will be important for the committee to verify the number of staff and volunteers so departments can’t artificially inflate this budget line – the VPF and chair offered to do so.
- 2) The chair raised the concern that it appeared most departments seemed to have a different amount allocated to their phone/fax budget lines. The Vice-President Finance (VPF) explained that this is due to two reasons – 1) each office has a different number of phone and/or fax lines and 2) a lot of the departments have money allocated for monthly cell phone reimbursement but the entire amounts are not always distributed. The chair then asked if there were any concerns on this topic – none were raised.
- 3) The chair raised the concern that most departments seemed to have a non-standardized amount allocated to their miscellaneous budget lines and it might be best to standardize this across all budgets. The chair asked the committee if a specific amount or a specific percentage would be most appropriate for standardizing this – the committee agreed a percentage would be most appropriate. The committee then discussed what percentage should be allocated to each budget line. During the discussion numerous examples from various Constituency Societies were shared and the committee eventually agreed that miscellaneous budgets for each department should be 3% of the total budget, less fixed costs, up to a maximum of $750. A member of the committee asked if the committee thought a minimum amount should be allocated – the committee agreed and decided on a minimum of $250.

6. **Executive Committee Budget Review – Discussion**
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Executive Committee budget focusing on three budget lines: 1) Community Involvement, 2) Annual Softball Game, and 3) Teleconferencing Equipment.

- 1) Community Involvement – the President explained that this budget line was to support a lunch for the UBC Orientations leaders in exchange for the ability to hold a workshop with them. A member of the committee asked if $500 would be enough to cover everything – the President said they were quoted just under $500 but would happily budget more. It was proposed this line be increased to $750 – the committee agreed to the change. The chair asked if there were any more concerns – none were raised.

- 2) Annual Softball Game – the President explained that this budget line was to support a large scale All-Staff meeting and staff appreciation event the AMS usual held during the summer and gave justification for the importance of this event. A member of the committee asked how many staff members usually attended the event – the President responded that it was usually 80. A member of the committee stated that the name of the budget line was a little misleading and that it should be named Staff Appreciation – the committee agreed with the change. The chair asked if there were any more concerns – none were raised.

- 3) Teleconferencing Equipment – the President explained that the Executive offices have a conference phone that is used for large meetings and the Society has to pay an annual costs for the service of teleconferencing. It was explained that this cost isn’t new and has historically been a part of a different AMS budget but as it is primarily used by the Executive it seemed more appropriate to move it into this department’s budget. A member of the committee suggested that the name of the budget line was misleading and that it should be named Teleconference Services – the committee agreed with the change. The chair asked if there were any more concerns – none were raised.

7. **President’s Office Budget Review** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the President’s Office budget focusing on one budget line: 1) Staff Salaries.
- The President explained the reason for the increase in this budget line is two-fold – the previous President held off on hiring an assistant for the majority of their term due to the large budget deficit. Because there was a large projected surplus, the President stated they were comfortable keeping this position. Additionally, the President stated they were looking to hire an “Executive Project Assistant” which will be involved in a variety of projects (Access AMS, Engage AMS, Governance Framework Review, AGM, etc…). The chair asked if there were any concerns – none were raised.

8. **Academic and University Affairs Department Budget Review** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Academic and University Affairs (A&UA) department budget, focusing on one budget line: 1) Research and Community Projects.
- The chair stated that the VP A&UA was away on vacation and was unable to attend this meeting however they had prepared a very detailed budget for this line and that the committee had already initially reviewed it at the last meeting. A member of the committee raised a concern about how much was being allocated to the “Mental Health Network” and proposed the amount be raised. The committee discussed this proposal and agree that it should be increased from $750 to $1000. A
member of the committee raised the concern that in this budget line there was $1000 budgeted for “Contingency” and that this would be more appropriate to have moved over to the Miscellaneous budget line and follow the agreed formula – the committee agreed. The chair asked if there were any additional concerns – none were raised.

9. Administration Department Budget Review – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Administration department budget focusing on seven budget lines: 1) Furniture and Equipment, 2) SAC Fee Wave, 3) Intercultural Fair, 4) SAC Wine and Cheese, 5) Deans Debate, 6) Club Exec Awards Night, and 7) Executive Orientations.
- 1) The Vice-President Administration (VPA) stated that their office is in desperate need for a new computer monitor. The chair asked if there were any concerns about this proposal – none were raised.
- 2) The VPA explained that this budget line was going to be used to cover the cost of booking a room in the SUB for non-profit groups as the Bookings department was unwilling to give free bookings for these types of organizations. A member of the committee asked why it was budgeted for $504 and not rounded to $500 – the VPA replied this was because it covered an exact number of bookings. The chair asked who would be adjudicating this budget – the VPA replied it would be done by SAC. The chair further asked if there were any more concerns – none were raised.
- 3) The VPA explained what the Intercultural Fair was and how it will bring together a variety of cultures (both ethnic and lifestyle cultures) at UBC in collaborating on shared projects in early 2015. After a long discussion on the proposal, the VPA stated that this project was still a work in progress and would be happy to remove it and come back to the committee with a more complete proposal – the committee agreed.
- 4) The VPA explained what the SAC Wine and Cheese event and that it was to bring clubs together and allow for networking between Executives. The committee asked a series of questions about timing of the event in relation to the Executive Orientations and if both events were needed. The VPA stated that while these events are close, one is about training while the other about networking. A member of the committee raised the concern that just providing food and a venue is not the best way to facilitate networking and perhaps the proposal should be modified. After additional discussion, the chair summarized the total discussion stating that overall the committee is supportive of the proposal as is however it would happily entertain a new proposal for additional funds in this area as it believes it is a very important. The chair asked if this was an accurate summary – the committee agreed. The chair asked if there were any additional concerns – none were raised.
- 5) The VPA explained what the Deans Debate was and that it was to improve interactions between Deans and first-year students. After a short discussion the chair asked if there were any concerns with the proposal – none were raised.
- 6) The VPA stated due to other Club-based events and the All-Presidents Dinner, the department was no longer planning on holding this event that is requesting the budget put at $0.
- 7) The VPA explained the Executive Orientations event and how it would be to give club Executives and overview of the AMS procedures and protocols. A member of the committee asked if this event was mandatory for all club Execs – the VPA replied it was. The member further asked if we need to spend money on the event if it is mandatory – the VPA replied that it wasn’t absolutely required
However they felt it would be good for the AMS to do so as it would promote a better relationship with the clubs. After additional discussion the chair asked if there were any more concerns about the proposal – none were raised.

10. External Department Budget Review – Discussion
   - During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the External department budget focusing on four budget lines: 1) Conferences and Official Business, 2) Special Projects, 3) (GetonBoard) Participation Costs, and 4) Campaigns and Public Outreach.
   - 1) The Vice-President External (VPE) presented the conferences the department planned on attending and the reasons for why they will advance their goals. The President commented the Union of BC Municipalities conference is usually more expensive than predicted and suggested increasing the budget from $1000 to $1500 – the committee agreed. The chair then asked if there were any additional concerns – none were raised.
   - 2) The VPE explained the Special Projects proposal stating that it focused primarily on two items – the Outreach AMS website and Awareness Street Teams. The committee and the VPE discussed the use of the Outreach AMS website and what the External department’s plan for it would be in the upcoming year. A member of the committee raised the point that if we were planning on investing in the website each year and had to pay annual upkeep costs then a separate budget line should be produced – the VPF stated he would look into this. There was general agreement on the budget for Outreach AMS budget and $5000 was allocated. The committee and the VPE has a discussion about the use of street teams and whether each department should have their own team or whether there should be a large AMS-wide team that works for all departments. A member of the committee asked if the VPE could see using as many street team hours as they were proposing – the VPE replied this would be an easy as the department planned on a lot of outreach this year. The VPE noted that the Events department is also proposing a budget for a large street team and were not concerned where the money for this item is listed so long as this resource will be available. The chair suggested the committee temporarily approving half of the proposed budget for street teams and revisit increasing or decreasing this area after discussion with the Events department. A member of the committee asked the VPE if they would be ok with temporarily reducing the budget to $0 until the committee had chatted with the Events department and then revisit this point if the VPE was not satisfied with their department’s ability to access this resource – the VPE stated they were ok with this.
   - 3) The VPE explained the GetonBoard participation costs proposal and its importance to the AMS over the next year. After a short discussion, the chair asked if there were any concerns about the proposed budget – none were raised.
   - 4) The VPE presented a new proposal for a Campaigns and Public Outreach budget for a Commuter Fair and explained its purpose. Due to the committee only seeing this proposal for the first time now and the large budget associated with it, the committee asked the VPE if they would be ok with delaying this discussion so the committee could review the proposal – the VPE agreed.

11. Finance Department Budget Review – Discussion
   - During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Finance department budget focusing on one budget lines: 1) Executive Orientations
- The VPF explained this proposal to the committee and its purpose. A member of the committee asked if this was still needed as Executive Orientation were already budgeted in the Administration department – the VPF replied yes as this was for a separate session all the finance officers of AMS clubs needed to attend. The chair asked if there were any more concerns – no were raised.

- The President commented that as the final budget was not yet finished, the committee would need to request an extension from Council. The chair stated they would move that motion and provide the rational on behalf of the committee. Thus the following motion was made:

  **BIRT the chair submits a motion to Council on behalf of the Committee requesting an extension of one Council meeting to present the Final Budget.**

  Moved: Chris; Seconded: Serena
  **PASSED** (8 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Kurtis; Seconded: Marjan
**PASSED** (8 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 8:36 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: July 4\textsuperscript{th}, 2014  Time: 15:30 - 18:00  Venue: SUB 266J

Present:
Voting Members: Serena Ng, Kurtis Harms, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Tanner Bokor, Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach

Guests: Anna Hilliar (via Skype), Daniel Levangie, Nilofur Keshmiri

Regrets: Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Thea Simpson, Marjan Hatai

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:44.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.

Moved: Kurtis; Seconded: Serena
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes

BIRT the minutes entitled “Budget Committee Minutes 20140624” is approved as presented.

Moved: Stephanie; Seconded: Mateusz
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

4. Staff Professional Development – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the Executive Director shared their philosophical views on part-time and full-time staff development and appreciation as well as the importance it plays within the Society to keep individuals motivated and wanting to work at the AMS. They further went on to propose that the committee, after the final budget is approved, should think about starting discussions with LPC on establishing code that specifies a specific amount which can be spend in this area for each department.

5. Executive Director Department Budget Review – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Executive Director’s budget focusing on one area: 1) Conferences and Official Business
- Conferences and Official Business – the Executive Director presented the proposal for this budget line and explained its importance to the AMS. A member of the committee commented on the specific amounts allocated to each aspect of the budget line proposal – the Executive Director replied that they had priced things based on the research done in preparation for submitting the proposal. A member of the committee replied that it might be good to increase the requested amount from $1868 to $2000 to account for price inconsistencies between now and when the purchases are made – the committee agreed. The chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

6. **University and Government Relations Department Budget Review – Discussion**
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the University and Government Relations department budget focusing on one area: 1) Special and Professional Development.
- Special and Professional Development – the chair presented the proposal for this budget line explaining how this management class will benefit the department and allow it to better serve the AMS. The Executive Director further commented that this type of course is perfect for this department due to the large number of projects going on in it. The chair asked if there were any questions or concerns about this proposal – none were raised.

7. **Archives Department Budget Review – Discussion**
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Archives department’s budget focusing on three areas: 1) Professional Development, 2) Professional Services, and 3) Part-time Salaries.
- Professional Development – the chair presented the proposal from the Archives department for Professional Development and explained how it would help increase the AMS’ knowledge and capabilities in archiving. The chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.
- Professional Services – the chair presented the proposal for increasing this budget line to the committee and noted that due to the financial constraints of the Society last year, the Archives department held off on shredding a lot of documents; this increase reflects the fact there is a lot of catch-up to do in this area and that it needs to be done before the end of the year and the move into the new SUB. The President further stated that there are approximately twenty boxes of archives that need to be disposed of. A member of the committee asked why shredding costs so much – the President replied that this was because it can’t just be done with a normal paper shredder. The service professionally removes the documentation, shreds it, and burns it to ensure it is properly disposed of as is required of the organization. The chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.
- Part-time Salaries – the chair presented the proposal to increase this budget line to reflect the need for an additional assistant to assist with the various projects the department has around the AMS’s Centennial celebration. The President further remarked that this department previously underestimated the amount of time this major initiative required and without additional staff there is no
way the project will be completed unless normal duties of the department are neglected. The chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.

8. **Events Department Budget Review** – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Events department budget focusing on four areas: 1) Conferences & Official Business, 2) Advertising and Promotions, 3) Part-time Salaries, 4) Concern, Speaker, Laff@Lunch, Live@Lunch, and Special Events

- Conferences & Official Business – the Events Manager presented the proposal for this budget line and explained the importance of attending these conferences for being able to recruit talent for AMS major events, for networking with the management side talent, for negotiating deals, and for getting new ideas of events to incorporate into student life at UBC. A member of the committee asked how many conferences this budget included – the Events Manager replied there was money in this proposal for the Events Manager to attend two conferences, their assistant to attend one, and the First Week Coordinator to attend one. A member of the committee asked for the specific costs of each of these conferences – the Events Manager replied that they did not have the specifics but would be willing to get them for the committee. The chair of the committee asked if the Events Manager would be ok with the budget for the First Week coordinator being moved out of this budget line and into the Frist Week budget – the Events Manager replied this would be ok. The chair asked if there were any questions or concerns about this proposal – none were raised.

- Advertising and Promotions – the Events Manager presented the proposal for this budget line and explained it would be used for production of website material, and ad for the AMS insider, event print material, design costs for approximately twenty events, social media ads, and design of a sponsorship package. A member of the committee asked if the design for the events could be done by the Design Services department – the Events Manager replied that there is an understanding between the two departments that Events will go outside the AMS to do this. The chair further commented that a common theme seems to be that the Communication/Design Service department are at capacity in terms of work and that a lot of departments need to go outside the Society to have things done on time. A member of the committee commented that with all the money the Society is spending on outside design services, could the AMS hire additional staff to do the work – the chair responded that this is a good question and perhaps a discussion the committee should have during the next meeting when the Communications Manager is present. A member of the committee raised the point that if we are not having the AMS Insider, we can probably delete that expense from the proposal – the committee agreed. The chair asked if there were any questions or concerns about this proposal – none were raised.

- Part-time Salaries – the Events Manager presented the proposal for this budget line and explained that it will cover the sound tech costs for approximately forty shows. The chair of the committee asked if there were any concerns with this proposal – a member of the committee asked the Events Manager if the AMS was actually planning on holding 40 different shows in addition to everything else planned. The Events Manager replied that at the moment the department didn't have 40 planned however it is possible the department will hold this many. The chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns about this proposal – none were raised.

- Concern, Speaker, Laff@Lunch, Live@Lunch, and Special Events – the Events Manager presented the proposals for these budget lines (one proposal). The committee discussed each expense with the Events Manager to gain a better understanding of what was involved and more specifics on
where the money was being spent. After a long discussion, the committee concluded that a more detailed breakdown was needed for each of these before it could approve the expenditure and asked the Events Manager to come back at a later meeting with them. The committee asked the Events Manager what the “Joint Projects” within this proposal was – the Events Manager replied that this is a historic budget line that has been used for AUS- and SUS-based events but the AMS usually breaks even on them. Members of the committees from these two organizations stated that they knew the AUS and SUS were not planning on holding joint events with the AMS this year and thus the budget line should be reduced to $0 – the committee agreed. It was raised that over this meeting we have seen proposals for a large number of events this year coming from this department. Based on this, the department would need to hold more than one event per week, including in the summer semester. The individual asked if this is something the committee should be worried about. The chair agreed with the individual and replied that if the committee thought it was a concern they would bring it to the attention of the Executive committee. The committee decided in the best interest of time they should move on to the next topic.

9. First Week Budget Review – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the First Week budget focusing on five areas: 1) Kit Sales, 2) Security, 3) Credit/Debit Card Costs, 4) Sponsorship, and 5) Lecture and Variety.
  - Kit Sales – the Events Manager explained that the decrease in revenue from this line is reflective of the fact that First Week has decreased the amount of items that are offered in the kit this year which is reducing their price. The Events Manager further explained that this change is a reflection of First Week focusing less on selling kits and more on events tickets. The chair asked the committee if they had any questions or concerns – none were raised.
  - Security – the Events Manager explained the proposal for this budget line and that because First Week is holding more events this year, there will be an increase in the number of security guard hours needed and thus an increase in cost. The chair asked the committee if they had any questions or concerns – none were raised.
  - Credit/Debit Card Cost – the Events Manager explained that this cost is associated with the transactions costs involved in people, mostly parents on move-in day, purchasing frosh kits with their credit/debit cards. While this cost hasn’t disappeared, it is now included in the Kit Sales budget. The chair asked the committee if they had any questions or concerns – none were raised.
  - Sponsorship – the Events Manager presented the proposal for First Week Sponsorship and explained that the reason why this line was decreased compared to last year’s actuals is two-fold: 1) last year was a record breaking year for sponsorship and the department is unsure if they can do that again and 2) some of the major sponsors are unable to provide the same level of funding this year. The Events Manager further stated that the department currently has around $10,000 in committed funding and is continuing to try to get more. The committee discussed this budget line and decided that under $20,000 was not an ambitious enough goal and that it should be raised. The chair asked the committee what they felt an appropriate amount way – the committee replied between $25,000 and $27,000. The chair stated that they would talk to the Events Manager about this and see if they are ok with changing the budget line to reflect this. The chair asked the committee if they had any questions or concerns – none were raised.
- Lecture and Variety – the Events Manager presented the proposal for the Lecture and Variety explaining the different events that would be held during the week. The chair of the committee asked the Events Manager if they felt it would be more appropriate to change the name of this budget line to “Events” as opposed to “Lecture and Variety” – the Events Manager agreed. After a long discussion on the various events being held, the committee approved of the proposed budget.

10. AMS Insider Budget Review – Discussion
- The chair reported that the reason the budget for the AMS Insider was set at $0 was because there was a strong feeling that with the development of the AMS app, there was no longer the need for the Insider. The chair asked the committee if they had any concerns with this – none were raised.

11. Finance Department Budget Review – Discussion
- The Vice-President Finance (VPF) reported that the plans for “special projects” under the finance commission have currently been put on hold and thus the budget can be reduced to $0.
- The VPF reported that the department needs to have an increase in the “Computer Software/Hardware” budget line to $1440 as the program they use for survey taking have increased their price. A member of the committee asked if the purpose of OrgSync would result in the AMS no longer needing this program – the VPF replied that they were correct however they felt more comfortable changing the budget to reflect this price until Council approved the expenditure of OrgSync. A member of the committee asked the VPF if they had looked into other options to the current program used which would be cheaper – the VPF replied that they hadn’t, however they expressed reluctance about changing programs due to the fact it is integrated into a lot of the AMS’ systems. After discussion, the committee requested that the VPF look into additional options which would be cheaper and report back to the committee at the next meeting.

12. External Department Campaigns and Outreach Budget – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the commits discussed the External Departments proposal for their Campaigns and Public Outreach budget as presented by the Chair. The committee was informed that the VP External (VPE) had help from the Events Department in crafting the proposals and the various expense/revenue projections. After a long discussion on these projections, the committee came of the conclusion that because of the large cost associated with this proposal and the fact that this event appears to be on a similar scale to Block Party and Welcome Back BBQ, the committee would be more comfortable with Council approving this project. The chair stated that as it is not the committee’s role to decide if a project is valid or not, there appeared to be two ways to go forward with the proposal – 1) to let the VPE present the intent of the project to Council and upon approval, work on the budget or 2) finalize the budget and then the project proposal in its entirety to Council for their approval. A member of the committee voiced that option 1 was not ideal as the purpose to bring such a proposal to Council was to present the pros/cons of having the event as well as the costs of having the event and letting Council decide if it was worth the expenditure. As such, the committee’s role should be to help the VPE produce the budget in preparation for the presentation to Council. The committee agreed and tasked the chair with
contacting the VPE to continue the discussions. The chair asked the committee if they would be ok with working on this proposal after the final budget is approved – the committee agreed.

BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned. 
**PASSES** (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

Moved: Mateusz; Seconded: Serena

The meeting adjourns at 5:38 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: July 9th, 2014  Time: 15:00 - 17:30  Venue: SUB 266J

Present:
Voting Members: Serena Ng, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Marjan Hatai, Tanner Bokor, Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach

Guests: Daniel,

Regrets: Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Thea Simpson, Kurtis Harms

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 15:11.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Serena
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes

BIRT the minutes entitled “Budget Committee_Minutes_20140704” is approved as presented.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Serena
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

4. Communications Department Budget Review – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Communication departments’ budget focusing on four areas: 1) Printing Costs, 2) Professional Development, 3) Website, and 4) Part-Time Staff.
- Printing – the Communications Manager presented the proposal for this budget line and explained that previously it was used to pay for all Society printing but this has been changed this year to reflect how much each department actually uses. The current costs will be used to cover Council Annual Report, official Society documents, brand guides, and various posters and banners. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.
- Professional Development – the Communications Manager presented the proposal explaining it was to take a course on mentoring and team management. Since the preliminary budget the
The request has decreased to $1412.50 to reflect the exact costs of the course. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

- **Website** – the Communications Manager explained that this is a new budget line for the Communications department and is a reflection of the fact the Communications department is now managing the website instead of the Design Services department. In addition the website now requires an additional $500/year for maintenance. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

- **Part-time Staff** – the Communications Manager explained that the increase in this budget line was due to the Junior Website Developer position being transferred from the Design Services department to the Communications department and the production of a new position, the Web Editor. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

5. **Design Services Department Budget Review** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Design Services department’s budget focusing on three areas: 1) Photographer, 2) Design Services Expenses, and 3) Professional Development.
- **Photographer** – the Communications Manager explained the department was looking to hire a photographer and videographer for the AMS to produce two videos and one photo shoot for promotional material. The plan is to use students for these so costs stay low. The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.
- **Design Services Expenses** – Historically this line was not been used before, however in an effort to increase transparency the department has moved the money usually spent on these services out of the “Promotions” budget line and into this. The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.
- **Professional Development** – The Communications Manager explained that in the last the Design Manager has not been given a budget for professional development and they would like this to change. The proposal will allow for $500 for professional classes and $250 for a membership to linda.com – all of this will be to support them being able to better perform for the AMS. The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.

6. **Block Party Budget Review** – Discussion
- The Chair reported that because a proposal for Block Party options had not been presented to Council they were not comfortable with putting down any budget for this event in the current Final Budget, however wanted the committee to emphasis to Council that it should leave at least $40,000 available for the event. The Chair asked if there were any concerns with this sentiment being presented – none were raised.

7. **Elections and Referenda Budget Review** – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Elections and Referenda budget focusing on two areas: 1) Salaries and Wages and 2) Advertising and Promotions.
- **Salaries and Wages** – the President reported that the decrease in this budget line compared to last year was due to the hiring of the Elections Administrator being held off until September as opposed to having them being a full year position. A member of the committee asked if this will affect the
operations of any of the constituency elections that happen early in term 1 – the President replied this shouldn’t as they will be trained well before those elections start. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

- Advertising and Promotions – The President reported that the increase in this budget line was a reflection of wanting to have a larger promotions budget in case it is needed. They stated that while the last year’s Election Coordinator only used a third of it, because of the importance of Elections and the desire to do more promotions this year they thought it most appropriate that the line be increased. The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.

8. **Events Department Budget Review Pt. 2 – Discussion**

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Events department budget focusing on three areas: 1) First Week, 2) Farmade, and 3) the Welcome Back BBQ.

- First Week – the Chair presented the detailed breakdown for the First Week budget as a continuation of the conversation from the previous committee meeting. The Chair reported that the Events Manager was not comfortable increasing the estimated sponsorship revenue to $25,000 as they felt it was a number they would not be able to obtain. After discussion the committee decided it was comfortable with keeping the budget at the proposed amount acknowledging First Week will try to raise as much sponsorship as possible. After a lengthy discussion the committee agreed to approve the budget.

- Farmade – the Chair presented the detailed breakdown for the Farmade budget. They further stated that while the proposed budget currently shows a profit from the event, the event should be reported as net neutral as all profits will be donated to the Farm. After a lengthy discussion the committee approved the budget.

- Welcome Back BBQ – the Chair presented the detailed breakdown for the Welcome Back BBQ budget as a continuation of the conversation from the previous committee meeting. The committee expressed concerns with allocating $75,000 for talent but acknowledged that we needed to trust the Events Manager with the amount needed as none of the members of the committee have any expertise here. Overall the committee was ok with the level of budgeting detail presented in the proposal however it expressed concern about approving a budget which projected a $65,000 loss. After a lengthy discussion the committee decided to approve the budget but expressed the desire to pass it to Council as a second motion after the approval of the Final Budget as an amendment to the budget, thus letting Council make the assessment of if the event would be worth the cost.

9. **Student Services Manager Budget Review – Discussion**

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Student Services Manager’s (SSM) budget focusing on four areas: 1) Assistant Student Services Manager (ASSM), 2) Conferences and Official Business, 3) Advertising and Promotion and 4) Staff Appreciation.

- Assistant Student Services Manager – the SSM presented the proposal to the committee for the production of the ASSM position. Due to the high work load of the SSM and that they are working 10-20 hours a week more than they are supposed to, the ASSM position is designed to provide additional managerial support to the Services department. The SSM explained that long term the SSM and ASSM positions are designed to be equal positions in which each over sees the Services
and report to the Executive Director. However this year they are looking to have ASSM act as a transition and as test to see if the model will work. After a large amount of discussion the committee agreed to the proposal.

- **Conferences and Official Business** – the SSM explained that historically the Services department has only been given enough money to allow half the Service directors to attend conferences and they were given out at the decision of the SSM. This year they would like to increase this budget line to allow enough money for each director to attend one conference. After some discussion the committee agreed with the proposal.

- **Advertising and Promotion** – the SSM presented the proposal for increasing this budget line between the SSM budget and the ASSM budget to a collective total of $15,000. They further stated this proposed increase was due to wanting to increase the promotions of the Services; however they weren’t any solid plans of exactly how the money would be spent. The committee discussed the proposal and numerous members expressed that even though they believe this area was very important, they had concerns about doubling this budget line based on last year’s actuals without a solid plan. A member of the committee proposed decreasing the requested amount to $12,000 and for it all to be held in the SSM’s budget – there was consensus among the committee for this.

- **Staff Appreciation** – the SSM stated that in the past few years the moral in the Services department has been very low. One of the way they are trying to correct this is by holding more team binding events for the department to promote a more healthy atmosphere. The SSM would like to take all the service coordinators out on a team building activity once a month (ex. Hiking) to help fix this. As they are planning on doing this 10 times at a cost of $150, they are requesting a budget of $1500. The Chair raised the point that the amount requested would be more than the standard amount for staff appreciation based on the formula the committee previously made. After a discussion the committee agreed this was ok due to the nature of the request.

10. **Services Budget Review** – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over various Service department’s budget focusing on four areas: 1) Furniture and Equipment, 2) Speakeasy Volunteer Training, 3) AMS Connect Opportunities Fair, and 4) Tutoring Salaries and Staff.

- **Furniture and Equipment** – the SSM requested the Advocacy, Volunteer Connect, Foodbank, and Tutoring budgets be allocated $250 for this area each due to them not having been budgeted money in these areas the past few years and that they are in desperate need for new furniture. A member of the committee asked if they would be able to fund this through the new SUB – the SSM replied that the items they need could not be covered this year or that they would needed them sooner than when they would move into the new SUB. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

- **Speakeasy Volunteer Training** – the SSM presented the detailed budget breakdown for the three training sessions in August, September, and January and each’s purpose. After a discussion the committee approved the proposal.

- **Tutoring Salaries and Staff** – the SSM explained the reason there is a large difference in Tutoring’s budget compared to the 2013-2014 year is because the model has changed. They are focusing on more one-on-one tutoring and less on group tutoring which will help make the department more revenue neutral. The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.
BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Serena; Seconded: Mateusz
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 17:43 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: July 14th, 2014  Time: 18:00 - 20:00  Venue: SUB 266J

Present:
Voting Members: Kurtis Harms, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Tanner Bokor, Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach, Marjan Hatai

Regrets: Thea Simpson, Serena Ng, Armin Rezaiean-Asel

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 18:05.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Kurtis
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Council Budget Review – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Council budget focusing on two areas: 1) Team Building and Development and 2) Special Projects.
- Team Building and Development – the President explained the proposed budget was for to pay for professional Board training for Council. The President stated that the company they have contacted specializes in providing training for non-profits. They further stated that the quote for training is ~$2200 and the additional budget will be used for food/drinks for the event. A member of the committee asked what the difference between this training and the Council retreat was – the President replied that this event was more focused towards councillor training while the Council retreat was more focused on team bonding. A member of the committee asked if there was a concern about getting people out to attend the training – the President replied there was and that if there was not enough interest from councillors or if not enough people could attend they would not hold the event. The Chair asked if there were any more questions – none were raised.
- Special Project – the President replied that this budget will be used to support a fund will be open to any student, student group, or AMS committee run a special project which will help forward the purpose of the Society. A member of the committee asked how the amount of $2500 was reached – the President stated that this amount was arbitrary and that they were only looking for this year to be a trial run which will be re-evaluated next year to see if this is something that AMS wants to continue. The chair asked what body would do the adjudication – the President responded that this
was not yet determined but would most likely be the Agenda Committee. The Chair asked if there were any more question or thoughts – none were raised.

4. **University and Government Relations Budget Review Part 2 – Discussion**
   - During this portion of the meeting the Chair presented a request from the University and Government Relations department to update their budget. The Chair stated that the sole increase to the department is in the “Conference and Official Business” budget line to reflect the increased costs associated with registration to the UBCM conference the department head will be attending. The Chair further stated that the department has decreased the amounts budgeted to the “Telephone/Fax”, “Office Supplies”, “postage/Courier”, and “Photocopying and Administrative” budget lines in order to keep the overall budget for the department the same. The Chair asked if there were any questions or concerns – none were raised.

5. **Events Budget Review Part 3 – Discussion**
   - During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Events department’s budget focusing on six areas: 1) Computer Hardware and Software, 2) Concert Expenses, 3) Speaker Expenses, 4) Laffs@Lunch, 5) Live@Lunch, and 6) Pub Programing and Special Events.
   - Computer Hardware and Software – the Chair presented the departments proposal for this budget line explaining that it was divided as $1000 for a laptop, $1000 for software and protective hardware, and $1000 for a iPad or two iPad minis. A member of the committee asked why the department needed an iPad or two minis as this request didn’t make sense – the Chair replied that they were unable to answer this question. The Vice-President Finance (VPF) stated that they thought their new computer was covered through the new computer fund and did not understand why they needed more money budgeted. A member of the committee expressed concern about needing $1000 for software and protective equipment. The Chair summarized the committee’s concerns with the rationales provided for this request and suggested the committee find out more information from the department – the committee agreed.
   - Concert Expenses – the Chair presented the department’s proposal for this budget line and provided an example budget for a show. After a long discussion on the proposal, the committee raised numerous concerns around the example budget provided. The committee thought it would be best to hold off on approving the proposed budget and work with the Events department in producing a better one before approving it and submitting a motion to amend the final budget at a later Council meeting. The Chair proposed that the committee allocated enough funding to support one show at the PIT to allow the department enough flexibility to start booking talent now and not run into the problems currently being seen with First Week and the Welcome Back BBQ – the committee agreed.
   - Speaker Expenses – the Chair explained that this budget line was for a Speaker series. A member of the committee asked for a more detailed budget breakdown – the Chair replied that one had not been provided. The committee expressed concern about approve the budget request without any information on what exactly this money would go towards.
   - Laffs@Lunch – the Chair explained this budget was for ten comedy shows which would cost $200 each. A member of the committee asked what exactly this money would go towards – the Chair replied they thought it would go towards sound/equipment set-up and hospitality for the
performers. A member of the committee questioned if this proposal should be a standalone budget or if it should be incorporated into the “Pub Programming/Special Events” budget line – after a discussion on this the committee agreed. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

- Live@Lunch – the Chair explained that this budget request was to support a series of free live band performances for students during the lunch hour. The committee expressed concern that a detailed budget breakdown had not been provided and would like the hold off on approving this budget until the next meeting.

- Pub Programming and Special Events – the Chair presented the budget breakdown for this budget line and that it would support a 25 small weekly band shows, 30 trivia nights, a weekly Karaoke night, a weekly open mic night, seven Bar Talks, a beer garden once a semester, and an all-ages show. The committee again expressed concerns about the number of events the department is planning on holding throughout the year and if it is too high. A member of the committee asked if it would be more appropriate to have the All-Ages show be moved into the “Concert Expenses” budget line as it is a concert – the committee agreed. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns – none were raised.

6. Ombudsperson Budget Review – Discussion
- During this portion of the meeting the committee went over the Ombudsperson department’s budget focusing on one area: 1) Conference and Official Business.
- Conference and Official Business – the Chair presented the proposal from the department for attending the Annual US Ombudsperson Conference. A member of the committee asked if there were any similar conferences in Canada – the Chair replied they did not know. The committee spent a few moments googling for any such conferences and were not able to find any. The Chair asked if there were any more questions or concerns around the proposal – none were raised.

7. Final Budget Approval – Discussion
- The Chair asked the committee to review the current version of the budget and ask any last minute questions in preparation of a motion to approve the budget as the final budget. The VPF reported that there were two additional changes that needed to be made to the budget. First was that the “Computer Software/Hardware” budget line in the Finance department could be dropped to $500 as they had managed to negotiate a lower price with the service provider. Second was that the “Accommodations” budget line in the Student Union Development Summit needed to be increased to $16,500 to reflect more accurate costs being quoted to the External Department. The Chair asked the committee if there were any concerns with making the requested changes – none were raised.

BIRT the Budget Committee approved the Final Budget as presented.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Kurtis
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)
BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Stephanie; Seconded: Mateusz

PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 19:41.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: July 25th, 2014          Time: 17:00 - 17:30          Venue: VP Finance’s Office

Present:
Voting Members: Serena Ng, Kurtis Harms, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Marjan Hatai (on phone), Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach

Regrets: Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Thea Simpson, Tanner Bokor

1. Call to Order

   The meeting was called to order at 5:16.
   - The Chair asked the member of the committee calling into the meeting if they could hear all the individuals in attendance – the member replied they could.

2. Approval of the Agenda

   BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.
   
   Moved: Chris; Seconded: Serena
   PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Backyard BBQ Budget Review – Discussion
   - During this portion of the meeting the Chair presented the budget for the Backyard BBQ. The chair asked if there were any questions. A member of the committee asked what the “wristbands” line under revenue was – the Chair replied that $7 from all First Week wristbands would go to the event. A member of the committee asked why we were only paying $100 for a DJ – the chair replied that this amount was only for an individual who would be playing before the show started/in-between performers and were not part of the talent. A member of the committee asked what the SOCAN fee was – the Chair replied that this was the cost associated with acquiring the rights to play other peoples music during the event and that it was a fixed cost. A member of the committee asked why the overall costs for the event were higher per head than the proposed budget for the Welcome Back BBQ – the Chair replied that a major reason for this is there are a lot of fixed costs (e.g. stage set-up, sound equipment, medical, fire, etc...) that cost the same regardless of if the event is tailored for 5000 people or 2800 people. A member of the committee asked how much this event would cost in relations to Block Party last year – the Vice-President Finance replied this event would still cost more than Block Party and the Welcome Back BBQ together.
   - The committee expressed concerns around the amount that was being spent on talent as the planned attendance would probably be achieve through the event’s name alone. After a long
discussion the committee agreed to the total amount being proposed highlighting the unfortunate time crunch.

BIRT the Backyard BBQ Budget is approved as presented.

Moved: Chris; Seconded: Marjan
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

BIRT the meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Mateusz; Seconded: Serena
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 17:28.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: August 7th, 2014
Time: 14:00 - 15:30
Venue: SUB266J

Present:
Voting Members: Thea Simpson, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach

Visitors: Abby Blinch, Sheldon Goldfarb

Regrets: Serena Ng, Kurtis Harms, Armin Rezaiean-Asel, Marjan Hatai, Tanner Bokor

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 14:17.

2. Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order without quorum.

3. Centennial Project Budget – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the committee discussed the proposal for the 100th Anniversary Book staff increase. The Vice-President Finance (VPF) and Clerk of Council explained the purpose of the project and that currently it is behind schedule and more staff hours to ensure it gets done on time.

- A member of the committee asked if all the staff hours in the proposal was for the 100th Anniversary Book or if some of it was for the Archives department – the Clerk of Council replied that the majority of it (all but 25% of one position) was for the project.

- A member of the committee asked why the staff extensions proposed for the work/learn assistants was for $17.07/hour – the Clerk of Council reported that while this is their current pay, UBC contributes ~$9/hour through the work/learn program. Because the AMS has used all of the funding from UBC, the AMS must pay for their entire pay. A member of the committee raised the concern that this was an excessively large amount to be paying to a student employee and that there are currently no students in the Society who makes this much. After discussion, the committee agreed that these employees should be paid at the level of a “tier 2” student staff - $11.50/hour.

- The VPF noted that the benefits allocated are off and should be readjusted to 6% of pay.

- The Chair asked the committee if they thought the budget for this project should be under Council or the Archives department. After discussion the committee agreed upon Council.
4. **AMS NEST Promotions Campaign – Discussion**

- During this portion of the meeting the committee discussed the proposal for the AMS NEST Advertising and Promotions campaign. The Chair explained that this was originally proposed to be covered by the Capital Projects Fund at the last Council meeting, however Council did not feel comfortable with the proposal based on the interpretation of the fund’s code.

- A member of the committee asked what the purpose of the Radio Ads were – the Communications Manager answered that they were for advertisement on The Peak radio station to increase awareness in the Vancouver community and hopefully attract people out to the events. The chair asked if there were any targeted outreach to the University Neighbourhood Association (UNA) and if this money might be better suited towards that – the Communications Manager replied that there wasn’t a specific outreach strategy for the UNA but they were already in conversation with them about co-hosting an event for the Opening Week.

- A member of the committee asked how the transit ads worked and if we get to choose which busses – the Communications Manager replied that there is a “Student” package which allows for the majority of the ads to be on the busses most commonly used by students.

- A member of the committee asked the Communications Manager what the purpose of the advertisement in the Trek Magazine was – it was answered that this was to increase awareness in the alumni population and hopefully draw them out to the events. The Chair asked if Alumni UBC has been consulted about ways to engage Alumni – the Communications Manager said they had yet to do this.

- After a long discussion, the committee decided to approve all funding except $4550 ($1550 from radio and $3000 from the Trek Ad) of the funding requested. Members of the committee further stated that they would be open to the Communications Manager coming back to the committee with an additional proposal for a joint event with the UNA.

- The VPF pointed out that the “Miscellaneous” part of the budget should be changed to reflect the committee’s 3% rule.

The meeting was adjourned at 15:06.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: October 28th, 2014  Time: 1:00 - 2:30  Venue: SUB 266J

Present:
Voting Members: Thea Simpson, Mateusz Miadlikowski, Stephanie Goh, Christopher Roach, Niloufar Keshmiri

Guests:

Regrets: Kurtis Harms, Marjan Hatai, Tanner Bokor,

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:58 pm.

2. Approval of the Agenda

BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.

Moved: Niloufar; Seconded: Mateusz
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes

BIRT the minutes entitled “Budget Committee_Minutes_20140709”, “Budget Committee_Minutes_20140813” are approved as presented.

Moved: Thea; Seconded: Stephanie
PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

4. Academic and University Affairs Department Budget Adjustment – Discussion
   - The Chair presented the request from the Academic and University Affairs (A&UA) department to add $10,000 to their budget for the Exam Database. It was stated that the need for this additional allocation was due to an accounting error in that money given to the AMS for the project from the UBC Vice-President Students’ Office was accidently counted as revenue last year and never given to the Centre for Teaching, Learning, and Technology.
   - A member of the Committee asked the Vice-President Finance (VPF) why the AMS could not do a carryover account charge in this situation and we had to make a budget change – it was replied that because of the nature of the budget this was difficult to do and would be overly burdensome compared to changing the budget.
The Chair asked if there were any more concerns with this proposed change – none were raised.

5. **Student Life and Communications Committee Budget Adjustment** – Discussion
- The Chair presented the request from the Student Life and Communication Committee (SLCC) for 1) the Faculty Cup, 2) UBC Storms Thunderbirds Games event(s), and 3) various Small “Viral Ideas” Projects and explained SLCC’s rationale for wanting the adjustment to their budget.
- The Chair noted that the committee was waiting to hear back from the “UTown@UBC Community Grant” and the “Walter H. Gage Memorial Fund” to see if they would be awarded the collective $3,000 to support the Faculty Cup.
- A member of the Committee suggested that it might be wise to hold off on voting on approving this budget increase so that should SLCC not receive the full $3,000 from the funds, they could request additional money from the Committee – the Committee agreed.
- The Chair asked the Committee if there were any concerns with the proposed budget adjustments as presented – none were raised.

6. **Budget Amendment Approval** – Approval
- Because the SLCC did not know the exact amount needed and the A&UA department budget adjustment was not time sensitive the Committee opted to hold off on approving a new budget until the next Committee meeting.

7. **Business and Governance Board Appointment Process** – Discussion
- The Chair presented to the Committee their proposed process for hiring new members to the Business and Governance Board (BAGB) and asked if the Committee had any suggestions.
- A member of the Committee pointed out that last year during the hiring process the most challenging aspect was scheduling interview times with students so it would be ideal to do this as soon as possible to avoid delays in giving the nominations to Council.

BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Chris; Seconded: Niloufar
**PASSES** (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 2:22 pm.
AMS Budget Committee Meeting

Date: November 21st, 2014
Time: 2:00 - 3:30
Venue: MSL 303

Present:
Voting Members: Kurtis Harms, Thea Simpson, Marjan Hatai, Christopher Roach, Niloufar Keshmiri, Riley Fisher

Guests: Ross Horton, Keith Hester

Regrets: Mateusz Miadlikowski, Tanner Bokor, Stephanie Goh

1. Call to Order
   The meeting was called to order at 2:08 pm.

2. Approval of the Agenda
   BIRT the agenda is adopted as presented.
   Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Thea
   PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

3. Approval of Minutes
   BIRT the minutes entitled “Budget Committee_Minutes_20141028”.
   Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Thea
   PASSES (5 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

4. Business and Governance Board Appointment Process – Discussion
   - During this portion of the meeting the Chair informed the Committee that 12 students had applied for the two student spots on the BAGB.
   - The Chair further commented on the selection process stating that they were going to send out the candidate’s resumes to the Committee after the meeting in order for the Committee to rank them so to determine which will continue on to the interview process.
   - A member of the Committee asked who would be doing the interviewing – the Chair replied that as was previously discussed it would be them, the AMS VP Finance (VPF), and the AMS Executive Director. The Chair then asked if there were any concerns with this – none were raised.
   - The Chair thanked Thea for helping to craft the questions and the case study which would be used during the interview process.
5. Business and Administration Governance Board (BAGB) Business Projections and Ramifications – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the General Manager (GM) and the Director of Finance and Administration (DF&A) presented to the Committee BAGB’s updated business contributions in order to discuss how they would affect the AMS budget.
- The GM and DF&A stated that due to The Nest not being open yet, to low traffic in the SUB, and to new staff already being hired for new programming in The Nest (in anticipation of a September 2014 opening date), BAGB has made the recommendation that the business contributions to the AMS needs to be changed from +485,000 to -$320,000.
- The Chair stated that with this new level of contribution the AMS budget will go from having a ~$400,000 surplus to a ~$300,000 deficit. They further commented that while this doesn’t look good, it is important to remember that this deficit is different from the ones of the previous two years as it isn’t a systemic problem with how the AMS fees are organized but is a by-product of delays to The Nest.
- The GM stated that in addition, it is important for the committee to remember that the business projections are mainly a “snapshot in time” of how the businesses are performing and that they were not concerned about being net positive with a few months after The Nest opens. In addition when the Whistler Lodge is sold, from an accounting point of view they will still be net-positive.
- A member of the Committee asked if we should be looking into making a series of budget cuts in order to try to get the deficit as low as possible or if should leave it?
- A member of the Committee asked the Chair if there were any major budget items that were not yet budgeted – the Chair replied there were and these items were things like Block Party, numerous social programming budgets, the Transit Fair, as well as numerous other small budget lines.
- The Chair asked the Committee what they thought the best path forward would be – the general consensus was that the Committee should take a straw poll of Council to see if they would like the Committee to cut as much as possible or if Council is comfortable with having a large deficit so long as there is plan to recoup these costs with future business revenues. The Chair informed the Committee they would work with the VPF to draft these questions and send them out to Council.
- A member of the Committee requested BAGB provide the Committee with 1) a more detailed breakdown of the business contributions and 2) a detailed breakdown of the new projections – the GM agreed to get these to the Committee.

6. Services Budget Adjustments – Discussion

- During this portion of the meeting the Committee reviewed three proposals from the Student Services Manager (SSM): 1) changing of names of select budget line, 2) increasing three Services “Advertising & Promotions” budget line, and 3) SafeWalk vehicles.
- 1) The SSM presented that there were three budget lines the Services Department was hoping to have the names changed: “Conferences & Official Business” to “Coordinator Professional Development”, “Special & Professional” to “Conferences & Official Business”, and “Furniture & Equipment” to “Furniture, Equipment, and Vehicle”. The SSM went on to explain that the request for these changes was to better reflect their true purpose as was previously presented to the Committee. The Chair asked if there were any concerns or questions – none were raised.
2) The SSM resented that there were three budget lines the Services department was looking to increase. These were the “Advertising & Promotions” in the Tutoring, Foodbank, and Volunteer Avenue budgets. The SSM explained that the purpose of these increases would be to allow each Service to increase its promotions through an additional advertising campaign(s). The Chair asked the Committee if there were any concerns – a member of the Committee raised that they didn’t think it was appropriate for the Committee to increase these budgets without direction from Council unless each individual service was able to keep their overall costs increases net-zero. The Committee was in general agreement.

3) The SSM reported to the Committee that currently SafeWalk is spending more per month on the Modo Car membership than it would cost per month to purchase a car. As such, they have been investigating numerous options for the AMS to purchase a car such as a lease-to-buy or a straight purchase. After the business proposal was presented, the Committee approved the purchase of a vehicle in principle however they raised numerous concerns and questions it wanted to be addressed before they would recommend to Council the allocation of the money. These included a breakdown of insurance costs per annum and documentation on this, investigation into the establishment of a fund to replace the vehicle, and documentation from UBC (in writing) promising SafeWalk’s ability to drive this vehicle anywhere on campus for SafeWalk (or where ever it normally goes).

7. Student Life and Communications Committee Budget Adjustment – Discussion

- The Chair presented the updated Student Life and Communications Committee (SLCC) Special Projects budget. The SLCC was only able to receive $450 out of their needed $3000 from the external funding sources and were requesting their budget be increased to reflect this.
- After revisiting and discussing the proposal as was previously presented, the Committee came to the conclusion that due to the new business projections from BAGB it was not comfortable with covering these increased costs unless it received direction form Council.

8. Budget Amendment Approval – Approval

BIRT the Budget Committee approves the amendments to the Budget as presented and recommends them to Council.

Moved: Chris; Seconded: Riley
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

BIRT the committee meeting be adjourned.

Moved: Marjan; Seconded: Kurtis
PASSES (6 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

The meeting adjourns at 3:54 pm.