

For information, whilst considering each application please try to have in mind the overall situation of all applications for the total funding pot of £5849

All applications received are as follows, you can find all applications tabbed under bookmarks for ease of access:

ACC American Football	Anything up to £1038
ACC Badminton	£465.65
ACC Boxing	£400
ACC Cricket	£820.67
ACC Fencing	£263.87
ACC Lawn Tennis	£200
ACC Ultimate Frisbee	£420-840
Belly Dancing	£1000
Bridge	£170
Canoe	£440
Caving	£1577.12
Debating	£500
Felix	£150
Funkology	£180
Gliding	£1049
GSU Exec	£1304
ICSM Basketball	£500
ICSM Mountaineering	£250
LegoSoc	£350
Leonardo Fine Arts	£900
Management	£610
Outdoor	£580.30
Palestinian	£926
RAG Exec	£60
RCC Ice Hockey	£637.15
RSM Exec	£147.09
SCC Budgeting Appeal	£1580
Singapore	£700
Starcraft	£40
Surf	£600
Synchronised Swimming	£400
Underwater	£903.54
Wushu	£418.50
Total	£20,000.89

Budget appeal

We have been denied subsidy for kit purchase. This is not something that will cause the club to collapse in 2015-16, but it seriously compromises the safety of our members.

Our kit has a safety guarantee for 6 years, (10 with a 5-year check & repair). The club has now been in existence for 8 and the kit has not been replaced since the club was founded. It is unreasonable to purchase kit for a prospective membership of 55 players at 270 pounds per person, (14850 total) in one single year so we are spreading the cost over the next three years to ensure all of our kit is replaced before it becomes unsafe for use.

If we cannot replace the kit before it passes its safe lifespan we are putting our members at unreasonable risk of injury. Helmets are the most important concern in this request. Of course, other padding also prevents serious injuries but injuries without major lifelong implications. Old helmets have been shown to have almost no protection against concussion and other serious head injury, (see Virginia Tech helmet ratings). Repeated or severe concussions can have major lifelong effects to a person's motor skills, cognitive function and memory. They are a significant risk if we cannot replace kit in a timely fashion.

As such, any amount of funding towards the 1038 pounds we initially asked for would be helpful in ensuring the future safety of our players. Otherwise we anticipate replacement of all kit to take 4 or 5 years, leading to a limited gameday squad size, (due to lack of safe kit) which will severely impair our ability to compete at the top level of British American Football.

Thank you for your consideration,

Alex Brockhurst

Treasurer, ACC American Football

ACC Badminton (003) Appeal for CSPB Funding

President: Pok Yin Hui, Treasurer: Sanjana George

March 2nd, 2015

(a) Appeal Amount

We would like to appeal on the budget allocation for Identifier number "A-3-640-1", which estimates our expenditure for shuttlecocks. We would like to ask for increase in funding from £0 to £465.65.

(b) Initial Request for Funding

Our estimated cost for feather shuttles through the year were as follows:

This year the club used high quality RSL NO.6 (£6.08/tube), Li-ning A60 (£13/tube) and VICTOR NO. 2 (£8.75/tube) feather shuttlecocks for club members and team members respectively.

Each day of club session uses 3 tubes of RSL. Each day of team training uses 5 tubes of Li-nings. Each home team match uses 4 tubes of victor.

Club: $£6.08 \times 3\text{tubes} \times 2\text{days} \times 11\text{weeks} \times 3\text{terms} = £1203.84$

Team training: $£13 \times 5\text{tubes} \times 11\text{weeks} \times 2\text{terms} = £1430$

BUCS: $£8.75 \times 4\text{tubes} \times 5\text{away matches} \times 3\text{teams} = £525$

Total cost = £3158.84

Of this total cost we requested 25% subsidy, giving a total sum request of £789.71.

(c) Comments from CSPB

Shuttles are an absolutely integral part of the running of ACC Badminton, without which the club would be unable to fulfil its purpose. As such they make up one of our core costs. Following an initial CSPB meeting, the cost of shuttles was moved to

CSPB-B, rather than CSPB-A.

These comments were given to us:

Shuttlecocks can be reused between practices - using 5 tubes a week of high quality shuttles is not necessary. For Team training, much much lower quality /cheaper shuttles can be used. Doesn't make any sense that BUCS shuttles are significantly cheaper than those used for Team training.

(d) Cost Adjustments to Budget

On an initial note, once feather shuttles are broken they cannot be reused and old shuttles are already used for warm ups until they are no longer functional. It is also impossible to compromise on the quality of shuttles used in the BUCS league and so this cost remains constant.

Nevertheless, we acknowledge the validity of the statements in section (c) and have therefore adjusted our cost estimation.

- Old shuttles will in future be used for drill practises during training as well as the warm up.
- We will use the RSL shuttles, which are the lowest cost, for both club and team training sessions.
- 4 tubes of shuttles will be used in Team trainings, rather than 5. 2 tubes of shuttles will be used during Club sessions, rather than 3. This results in a total reduction of 88 tubes of shuttles over the year.

The calculations are thus altered.

Club: $\pounds 6.08 \times 2\text{tubes} \times 2\text{days} \times 11\text{weeks} \times 3\text{terms} = \pounds 802.56$

Team: $\pounds 6.08 \times 4\text{tubes} \times 11\text{weeks} \times 2\text{terms} = \pounds 535.04$

BUCS: $\pounds 8.75 \times 4\text{tubes} \times 5\text{away matches} \times 3\text{teams} = \pounds 525$

Total cost = $\pounds 1862.60$

Total Subsidy Requested = $0.25 \times \pounds 1862.60 = \pounds 465.65$

Appeal for Budget Allocation ACC Boxing (066)

We would like to appeal against our budget allocation 2015. Specifically we appeal against our grant allocation towards our expenses for All Stars Boxing Gym ground hire (line A-66-735-1):

- We asked for a subsidy of £1200 towards All Stars Boxing Gym Ground Hire and received £600.
- Compared to last year, subsidy for All Stars Boxing Gym Ground Hire has decreased by £200, while costs have increased by £975.
- Overall total grant has been reduced by £405.50, while expenditure increased by £840.
- Thus we are requesting at least a subsidy of £776 towards ground hire.

All Stars Boxing Gym Ground Hire represents the main expenditure of the Boxing Club and thus an adequate subsidy towards this expense is vital. The All Stars sessions are essential for the boxing club, as these are the only sessions where our members have access to professional boxing equipment such as heavy bag, speed bags and a boxing ring. Training with this equipment is necessary to prepare for fights and thus the ability to enter BUCS competitions. We have explored other options but none appear feasible, i.e. putting up punch bags with stands in Union Gym.

Our expenditure increased due to increased training prices at All Stars Boxing Gym. Additionally, we have carded more boxers than any previous year. Seven boxers have been carded already this year, compared to just two last year, this was a record for the club last year. These boxers will compete next year, resulting in increased expenditure for competitions. We have not applied for a grant towards these expenses, as we expected to pay towards these expenses from our SGI. However, with the decreased funding for our main expenditure, we will have to utilize a bigger part of our SGI to pay for training session. As a consequence, the Boxing Club will not be able to finance entering competitions, which are essential for a competitive sport such as boxing

In conclusion, we believe that a subsidy of £600 for All-Stars Boxing Gym Ground Hire is too low to maintain an adequate training standard for one of Imperial's biggest sport clubs and will put us at risk of running a deficit next year.

Thus we ask for:

- An increase of current subsidy towards All Stars Boxing Gym Ground Hire from £600 to £1000.

Imperial College Union Cricket Club Budget Appeal

A-7-710-1: Ground Hire

The current allocated subsidy is 21% (dropped from 35% last year). However, we have only been subsidised 21% of the total cost of 100 net hours of ETHOS (£2550x21% = £535.50). This amount is simply not sufficient for us to support our training needs.

Lords vs ETHOS

1. Cost

The costs of Lords nets are £53/hour/net peak (up from £49) and £48/hour/net off-peak (up from £45). Originally we intended to use 3 nets every Tuesday during peak hours and 3 nets every Wednesday during off peak hours. However, owing to the difficulty in securing funding and the increase in net prices at Lords, **we are willing to reduce our Wednesday net usage to 2 nets**. Therefore, our total cost per week = (£53x3 + £48x2) = £255. We receive (£3x6x0.8) = £86 in net fees every week. Therefore, our total projected cost per week = £255-£86 = £169. Over two terms, this would make the total cost = 20 x £169 = £3,380

Since ETHOS nets are booked two nets at a time, on Tuesdays we would require a 2 hour session (4 net hours in total) so as to allow an equivalent number of people to train as we would in Lords. Therefore the total cost of ETHOS per week = £51x3 = £153. Owing to the much lower quality of nets in ETHOS compared to Lords, it would not be fair of us to charge our members net fees. Therefore the total cost of ETHOS would be 20 x £153 = £3060 (instead of the £2550 calculated by the CSPB).

The actual difference in cost per week between Lords and ETHOS would be = £169-£153 = £16. We feel that this extra cost is more than made up for by the added quality and safety offered by Lords.

The information in this section has been tabulated for your benefit:

Per week	Lords	Ethos
Peak hour cost/net/hour(pounds)	£53	Nil
Peak hour usage(hours)	1	Nil
Peak hour lanes	3	Nil
Off-peak hour cost/net/hour(pounds)	£49	£25.5
Off-peak hour usage(hours)	1	3
Off-peak hour lanes	2	2
Total cost	£255	£153
Income from Net fees	£86	Nil
Total Expenditure	£169	£153

As can be seen from the table, the cost of training at Lords is not much greater than training at ETHOS, but the former offers far greater safety and quality of training.

2. Safety and Quality

We feel that we are being shoehorned into training at ETHOS because of Lords' name, and the implication that we are deliberately searching for the most expensive option to remain active over the winter months. This could not be further from the truth. We choose to net at Lords because it is simply the best available facility, considering a multitude of factors. As a club, we already have strict budgeting constraints; finding a balance between the additional cost of training at Lords and understanding that we simply cannot train anywhere else has not been easy.

The reason we choose to train there is not because of the name or prestige of the venue. The Lords indoor training centre is open to the public. Young children (under 9 years old) train there because Lords is the only accessible indoor net facility in London which offers a **SAFE, accessible and quality environment** that is unmatched by ETHOS.

The indoor nets at ETHOS are not a suitable training facility for us because the sports hall has not been built with cricket training in mind. The extent of the flooring is a slippery turf mat placed onto a wooden surface. Fast bowlers put a lot of strain into their run-up and action and this slippery floor, coupled with the fact that the run-up area is far too short, combine to create an environment that is extremely prone to sliding/jarring injuries, particularly at the ankle. We would be required to ask our players not to train properly in order to mitigate this, which makes training itself counter-productive. Furthermore bounce is very uneven on a wooden floor which will cause misjudgement on part of the batsmen, resulting in them getting hit by a very hard ball. Therefore, we feel that ETHOS is simply unsuitable for cricket training and we cannot afford to risk injury to our players.

At the same point last year, we were told that Sport Imperial were going to take a good look into the safety of the training facilities at Ethos, with a view of compromise and allowing us to make the informed decision to train there in the future. Yet, we have received absolutely no communication as to whether this has occurred and are now being asked to train there when the same issues prevail.

3. Medics Cricket Training

One reason given to us to use ETHOS to train is because the Medics cricket team does so. Based on information from our members who train with both teams, we have come to understand that the Medics do not, in fact, train at ETHOS and have not done so for the past three years. Regardless, even if they were to train at ETHOS, the medics train about 1 or 2 times each term, so their threat of suffering injury is obviously much lower than ours.

We also have many members who are Medics, and the reason they train with us is because they feel that we offer a higher standard and quality of training. If we are unable to offer them Lords as an option, there is no reason for them to train with and play for us, and this would prevent us from reaching our membership target.

4. Membership

Training at Lords is also the primary USP for our club, it is our main selling point at Freshers' fair and it is how we attract Freshers and new members to the club. Our membership target was calculated based on the premise that we would have training at Lords, but if we are no longer able to offer Lords as a training option, we are very unlikely to achieve our membership target, which would

mean even less of the already limited grant we have been allocated will actually be given to us. We would also receive less in membership fees.

As a club, we decided to poll our members to see if they would prefer to train at Lords or at ETHOS. Despite us making clear the benefits of ETHOS (Cheaper, no travel necessary, no white necessary), the overwhelming majority of our members voted in favour of training at Lords. This once again reinforces our belief that achieving our membership target next year is heavily contingent on us having Lords as a training venue.

Over the last two years our club has lost a large number of committed senior members, but we have done well this year to attract a new crop of members to take us into the future, and this has not been easy. Losing Lords as a training venue would significantly reduce interest in our club going into the future.

5. Competitors

We are a highly competitive team playing in BUCS DIV 2A, and therefore it is crucial that we are given the opportunity to train in safe and quality conditions, in order to remain competitive. Our primary competing teams (LSE, UCL, RUMS) train at Lords, and it would be to our detriment if our training is of poorer quality compared to theirs.

6. Other sports clubs

Other sports seem to have facilities specific to their sports to train in/on. Football and Rugby train on football and rugby pitches. Basketball trains in the ETHOS basketball court. Tennis trains on tennis courts. Squash trains in squash courts. Cricket is a summer sport and therefore it is not possible for us to train on cricket pitches and outdoor facilities during the winter. The only facilities that are built specifically for cricket training are indoor nets, and Lords is the venue which provides the highest quality and safest indoor nets for us to train in.

7. Publicity and Sponsorship

The fact that we train at Lords is one of our major selling points to potential sponsors, because we are able to improve their visibility with new members as well as others training at Lords. Without this selling point, it is likely to be even more difficult than it already is to obtain sponsorship for next season. Furthermore, training at Lords significantly boosts the publicity for our club. For example, this year we were featured in a segment on Channel 4 News regarding cricket gear and safety. This also enables us to improve the public image of Imperial College and College sports teams. Such opportunities are presented to us only because we train at Lords and we would lose them by training at ETHOS.

Percentage Expenditure

Ground Hire is our single greatest expenditure for each year, which is why we had asked for the greatest subsidy in this area (60%). In the budgeting meeting with the Deputy President of Finances (DPFS), **we were given guarantees that we would get a higher subsidy for categories that were more important for us, if we showed that we were actively funding ourselves and reducing what we asked for in other categories.** We have done just this, and have asked for no subsidy in a few

categories such as Referees (for LUSL games) and Equipment (Balls for home games). We have budgeted to use our SGI in these cases, and therefore we have received no subsidies in these categories, despite the fact that other clubs have (23% for Equipment and 27.5% for Referees).

The reason we budgeted to use SGI to self-fund these categories was **based on the assumption that we would receive a higher subsidy for our area of greatest need**, Ground Hire. Simply allocating the same percentage subsidy in each category to all clubs, while not giving any subsidy in categories for which no money has been requested, is highly **unfair to clubs like ours which have a single great expenditure every year** as opposed to lower expenditure across multiple categories.

Below is a table of expenditures for which we have not requested any subsidies, along with the amount we would have received had we asked for subsidies:

Expenditure	Category	Cost (£)	% Subsidy	Subsidy amount (£)
LUSL Umpires	Referees	480	27.5	132
Match Balls	Equipment	384	23	88.32
Friendlies	Ground Hire	240	21	50.40
Teas	Consumables	576	23	132.48
Total	-	1680	-	403.2

As is clear from above, because we budgeted assuming we would get a greater subsidy for ground hire, we are **losing out on £403 of potential subsidies**. It is unfair to deny us these subsidies simply because we budgeted for them based on the above-mentioned assumption.

A-7-680-1: Entrance Fee for BUCS outdoor tournament

A-7-680-2: Entrance Fee for BUCS indoor tournament

A-7-680-3: Entrance Fees for LUSL outdoor tournament

We have not been given subsidies for any of these costs for 2 reasons:

- 1) CSPB believes our SGI is high enough to cover all these costs
- 2) The allocated funds for the LUSL entrance fees for this year have not been used

1. High SGI

There are multiple reasons for our higher SGI at this point this year compared to last year.

Firstly, owing to unforeseen lack of attendance and the unavailability of Lords on Wednesdays, in the second term we booked only 1 net for an hour every week at the Oval for 6 out of 9 weeks (We attribute this to the high number of new members who are also involved in other clubs. We expect them to be more committed to cricket net attendance in future years, and therefore do not foresee this problem reoccurring). The oval nets cost £35/net/hour but offer far less quality in comparison to Lords because the play surface is hard ground and not turf. Therefore the total cost of Wednesday nets in second term was = £70x3 + £35x6 = £420. Due to the lack of attendance, we received only £18 pounds of net fees every Wednesday, therefore making the total income from Wednesdays = 9x£18 = £162. Therefore, the total expenditure on Wednesday nets in second term was £420-£162 =

£258. If we had made our original booking of 2 nets every Wednesday at Lords for 10 weeks, our total cost would have been = $10 \times £49 \times 2 = £980$. The total net fees would have been $10 \times £3 \times 12 = £360$. Therefore our total expenditure on Wednesday nets would have been $£980 - £360 = \underline{£620}$. Thus, the actual net saving we have made in second term is = $£620 - £258 = \underline{£362}$.

The total cost of our entrance fees is = $£126 + £270 + £168 = £564$. As is clear from these calculations, the actual savings we have made this year do not compensate for the cost of our numerous entrance fees. **Therefore, at the very least we should be allocated the shortfall = $£564 - £362 = \underline{£202}$.**

Secondly, we have numerous costs that have yet to be deducted from our SGI at this stage. **We are a summer sport, and thus the bulk of our expenditure occurs in the summer.** As a result, at the time of budgeting our SGI doesn't reflect the true financial position of the club, as it does with other clubs. For example, the aforementioned Referees and Equipment expenditure will only be incurred by the club in the summer term. Furthermore, there are still outstanding claims to be made from SGI from our socials, and we need to replace much of our equipment that has been damaged (currently, we have no cricket bats to provide our members and are reliant upon members sharing their own equipment). As a result, our SGI will be significantly depleted by the end of the current academic year.

2. LUSL funding

The reason the funding for LUSL entrance fees was not used up at the point of budgeting was owing to a mistake by Ms. Tegan Pickles, wherein she forgot to enter our teams into the tournament. Therefore, we feel it is unfair that we are denied funding on these grounds as it is the result of a genuine mistake, and not our own at that.

Conclusion

By our estimations, based on the current grant we have been allocated, and without any sponsorship having been secured this far, we would be in debt as a club by the end of our season in 2016 if we wish to continue training at Lords:

Balance as of 24/02/15	2725.99
Kit Shipping Cost	35
BUCS Umpires 2015 Season	640
LUSL Umpires 2015 Season	480
BUCS Umpires 2016 Season	640
LUSL Umpires 2016 Season	480
Balls for 2015 Season	384
Balls for 2016 Season	384
BUCS Affiliation 2016	525
BUCS Outdoor Fees 2016	126
BUCS Indoor Fees 2016	270

LUSL Outdoor Fees 2016	168
Lords Training 2016	5100
Equipment (2 Bats, Helmets)	300
Total Cash Outflow	8892
Membership Income 2015/2016 (3 Left from 2015 season, and 65 from 2016 Season)	2380
Subsidy Received	783.25
Net Fees Income	1440
Match Fees Income (LUSL and BUCS)	880
Total Cash Inflow	5483.25
Net Cash Flow	-3408.75
Closing Balance (End of 2016 season)	-682.76

As a club, we would be portraying a poor image to our members if we cannot provide them with good training facilities. We are already finding it difficult to replace broken equipment due to budgeting constraints (as mentioned above), and again this reflects poorly on our image. While we understand that the Union has an obligation to ensure that all activities are being run in a cost-effective manner, it also has an obligation to ensure that Imperial students get the safest and best experience training, because we are representing the college.

Therefore, if we do not receive a higher percentage subsidy for our main cost of Ground Hire, or at the very least receive the same percentage subsidy offered to other clubs in our other categories, we will no longer be able to run the Cricket Club.

Below is a table with our proposed subsidies:

Expenditure	Category	Cost (£)	% Subsidy	Subsidy amount (£)
Lords Indoor Nets	Ground Hire	5100	21	1071
LUSL Umpires	Referees	480	27.5	132
Match Balls	Equipment	384	23	88.32
Friendlies	Ground Hire	240	21	50.40
Teas	Consumables	576	23	132.48
Entrance Fees	Competitions	564	23	129.72
Total	-	7344	-	1603.92

We are simply asking that we receive the same percentage subsidy in each category as every other club. We appreciate you taking the time to read this, and trust that you will give our appeal fair consideration. Thank you and we look forward to hearing from you.

ACC Fencing Budget Appeal

B-10-685-1 (Equipment and Repairs)

This year we have applied for subsidy of £354.27 for Equipment and Repairs, from a total predicted cost of £1147.27. Although we applied to CSPB-B for this, it is still a key expense for the club. Fencing is an expensive sport in terms of equipment, and as such a large proportion of our members rely on the club's kit in order to take part in team matches for BUCS, BUCS individuals, or just regular training sessions. This is particularly true for our beginners, who take up the sport while here at Imperial. As such, it is important that we maintain our equipment so that it is available for members to use and meets the appropriate regulations in terms of safety. Further, our Ground Hire costs for next year have increased by 62% compared to previous years, as we must now pay ground hire for home matches. This has severely constrained our SGI, and in particular the amount we can put towards maintaining our equipment.

We currently have not been allocated any subsidy for this. We request that this is increased to the standard subsidy level for Equipment and Repairs of 23% of our predicted cost, i.e. **£263.87**.

ACC Law Tennis Budget Appeal

The Lawn Tennis Club is appealing due to the fact that no money has been allocated for Travel Costs for the second year in a row. Due to the Men's first team entering into the Premier League and our teams going up in ranking, the travel expenditure is a significant portion of the club's total spending. The Travel Expenditure was placed under CSPB-B as Ground hire is more important to the club, in order for team and social members to be able to train. Nevertheless Travel Costs are higher than social tennis ground hire and keep increasing as teams go up in the league. When first submitting the budget, as a draft, we were told to increase what we were requesting for travel costs since it was clear that a large portion of our income was going into this.

Allocation Number: B-17-895-1- **Travel expenditures**

Details:

Travel to and from matches:

It is important to note that travel expenditures have increased due to the Men's first entering the Premier league. Some of the away matches include Bath and Exeter and their high costs are specified below.

Predictive amount based on Term 1 of 2014/2015: travel is subsidized exclusively to and from matches and only including train tickets up to a maximum of £50 per team per away match. Each team member can only claim £12.50 for travel, and each away match consists of 4 players. The team members in the Premier League are required to pay £15 each, for each journey, therefore a reduction of £15 X 4 players = £60 reduction from the total cost of the journey for all 4 players. ---

TERM 1: 2 trips for Men's team:

$279.40 + 191 + 257.75 = 728.15$ (trips to Exeter and Bath and Loughborough)-

2 Trips for Women's teams:

$50+50=100$

TERM 2: we predict travel for 4 players to 3 matches at around £12.50 each: $12.50 \times 4 \times 3 = £150$

--- TOTAL: $728.15 + 150 + 100 = £978.15$

Income from club membership + grants = $4\% \times £10,986.67 = £439.50$

Subsidy = $£978.15 - £439.50 = £538.65$

N.B: The predicted travel expenditures have increased since the previous budget submission as the Men's first team had an additional away match to Loughborough. Therefore the costs for travel have now reached almost £1000. The Team travel expenditures for next year are also subject to change as different University teams enter each league.

Predicted Cost	Subsidy Requested	Initial Management Group Allocation
£720.4	£280.90	£280.90

Initially the full amount requested was subsidized, but the final CSPB Allocation was £0.00

If we do not receive subsidy for travel expenditures, we will have to take money from hiring courts and purchasing equipment in order to cover the extra costs. In addition, team members pay in full for travel for home matches and are required to contribute £12.50 per journey for travel outside London.

Current Subsidy	Proposed Subsidy
£0.00	£200

Budgeting Appeal for Ultimate Frisbee (035)

When submitting the budget one of our key lines was accidentally entered as CSPB-B instead of CSPB-A. This mistake was spotted and the ACC chair was emailed about the problem before the second budgeting meeting, unfortunately it seems that among all the other concerns this one was overlooked. Ultimate Frisbee would therefore like to request that the line in our budget for funding the Competition Fees for Regional Tournaments be reconsidered as though it had been part of the original submission.

The budgeting line

Description –

Entry to Regional Competitions - These are vital tournaments as can be attended by every player who wants to go, as they are open to all skill levels. They also help us to qualify for Nationals, which help to build Imperial's reputation as a club as well as giving us a chance to earn BUCS points. COST BREAKDOWN: Men's Indoor Regionals x 3 teams, Mixed Indoor Regionals x 3 teams, Women's Indoor Regionals x 2 teams, Men's Outdoor Regionals x 2 teams, Women's regionals x 2 teams Regionals cost about the same as nationals, tourneys are priced at cost Total £140 x 12 = £1680, subsidy at 50%=£840. Subsidy of 50% similar as given in 2012-2013 budget.

Category – Competition fees

Predicted cost - £1680, Predicted Income - £0

Subsidy Requested - £840

Why the money is required.

Members pay a significant amount to travel to tournaments and we feel that requiring them to pay at this level for tournament fees is and would deter many of our members who are relatively new to the sport from attending tournaments. Tournaments are absolutely essential in ultimate as they are our only opportunity for high level matches as we do not have regular fixtures like other sports. Additionally if we do not receive sufficient funding we may have to take fewer teams to these tournaments and turn away keen new players of the sport from playing in these tournaments. The cost of the tournaments grows faster than the income we receive from membership because a few more members means we can send another team to a tournament and each team costs £150 per tournament. If we are sending an additional team to multiple tournaments this cost adds up quickly, 3 tournaments is £450 but the membership income for a team of 10 is £320. We subsidise our tournaments as we never turn away someone who wants to play and they are our key funded activity, however some people can't make it and their membership is what has previously allowed us to run our finances like this. Additional teams are all additional expense though.

Comments on the limited pot of money

We understand that there is a very limited pot of money in the appeals process but the money requested is essential to the operation of the club. In previous years the club has used its membership fees to subsidise tournaments and keep the cost to members down however with the growth in the size of the club it does not seem possible to continue with that trend, especially with the reduction in money received from the union since the budgeting process has changed. Therefore we accept that costs will have to increase for our members (unfortunately) but we hope that this request is at least funded to the percentages set in the CSPB-A round and the club does not suffer greatly for this small oversight. If the full amount cannot be funded then we request 25% of our costs which is £420.

From: [Iyer, Rishi](#)
To: [Abigail de Bruin - ICU Deputy President \(Clubs & Societies\)](#)
Subject: Appeal by ICSM basketball
Date: 10 March 2015 14:43:31

Dear Abigail,

I am writing to you on behalf of ICSMSU Basketball Society. We have been allocated a grant of £1226.65. We do not feel that this sum is sufficient enough even to maintain running of the club.

- Last year, we received a sum of £1918.15; this amount was not enough for us go through with any plans of club expansion; it is just enough to meet the needs of the club in terms of court hire, referees and other expenses.
 - We are usually billed for our court expenses at the end of the year, and so the amount of money currently in our account will markedly reduce before the start of next year.
 - Even though we will choose to continue to train at City of Westminster college (rather than Ethos) because of the cheaper courts, £1226.65 + SGI from membership is not enough money to meet the basic needs of the club, and I fear we will enter a deficit at the end of next year.
 - In addition to this, I have been informed that we must now pay for our court hire at BUCS matches, which means we require at least £250 more money than last year to break even. That means, that we would really hope for a budget of £2168.65 at least
-
- We feel that we have not been granted enough for our referee and court hire costs and request more money in those lines.
 - **£500** will increase our budget to £1726.65; that is still £192.25 less than what we received last year, plus, it doesn't even take into account the extra £250 we will need for home BUCS matches

Thank you for considering our appeal, I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest.

Kind regards

Rishi Iyer

ICSM Basketball President 2014-15
ICSM Neuroscience Society Ambassador 2014-15
Third Year Medical Student, Imperial College London

From: [Naing Win, Maung T](#)
To: [Abigail de Bruin - ICU Deputy President \(Clubs & Societies\)](#); [Alex Savell - ICU Deputy President \(Finance & Services\)](#)
Subject: Appeal for Union Funding (Imperial College Singapore Society OSC319)
Date: 10 March 2015 12:47:38

Dear DPCS,

I am Maung Thet, Treasurer of Imperial College Singapore Society (ICSS). At ICSS, we provide Singaporeans at Imperial College a support avenue as well as organise and represent Imperial in UK-wide events involving Singapore societies in major UK universities. Unfortunately, we have been allocated no grant from the Union for the 2nd year running. As a Treasurer who had to work with no union grant, I understand the constraints of having less financial abilities to maximise our members' benefits, and I would not like the next committee to face the same issue. Normally we apply for sponsorship from overseas government-linked Singapore organisations, however, as this year Singapore is celebrating her 50th year of independence, we hear that funds will mostly be directed towards events to celebrate the nation's Jubilee and less towards overseas student societies, making Union funding all the more crucial for the running of our society this year.

We are making this appeal because we had applied to CSPB-B and not CSPB-A for our core expenditure and received no grant allocation. This was done on the advice of the previous Treasurer(2013-2014). This is because he had applied to CSPB-A for the most important expenditures in his year and did not receive any funding, while in the previous years, the society applied to CSPB-B and received a grant consistent around £500 each year.

I am writing to you in appeal of union support on behalf of my society in terms of financial grant for the following activities:

1. Nottingham Winter Games

All major UK universities with a sizable number of Singaporean students take part in this Winter games, involving up to 11 Sports and Mindsports (Badminton, Floorball, Netball, Football, Captain's Ball, Table Tennis, Ultimate Frisbee, Tennis, Touch Rugby, Mahjong and Contract Bridge). This is an annual event held at University of Nottingham and ICSS participates in large numbers each year, up to 50 members in various sports. This event is something our members look forward to each year and it is very much one of the core events in our term every year. This is primarily because it is the only chance for our members to represent Imperial College in a major sporting competition, especially for the majority of our members who are not at advanced stage to represent Imperial's sports clubs at a National level. Secondly, because this event being the sole unifying event that bonds Singaporeans from all over UK.

Because of the venue hires, sports equipment and the sheer geographical distance we

have to cover to get to Nottingham, the committee spends a sum of money for the registration fees of our teams. We normally subsidise these registration fees (£257) fully as we feel that no member should be hindered by this fee to compete. Together with return transport fees (£700), this was a **sum of £957** in 2014. As the primary and sole competition for our society, we appeal for a grant of **£300** as a support of the Union for sports teams representing Imperial. The rest of the sum will be drawn from membership fees collected and sponsorship (if any).

2. Sports Subsidies

Only in the period (6 Oct - 31 Oct 2014 for last year) leading up to the aforementioned sporting event, our society traditionally subsidises in full training sessions for the sports teams which would be representing Imperial College in the competition. We see this as a way to encourage our members to train harder and show that the society is supporting them in the lead up to the competition. Mainly utilising Ethos for our venue hires, we spend around **£800** in the month of October for hires and equipment purchase like shuttle cocks, before the Nottingham games in the first week of November. This forms a bulk of our society's expenditure each year and we hope to continue subsidising our members before the competition. The members turn up in force for these sessions as these are the only sessions that are available for training before the actual competition.

Therefore, I know I say this on behalf of the society when I say that the society really requires and appreciates funding for this aspect. Thus we appeal for some Union funding to alleviate this expenditure, because I am certain that the price of booking courts in Ethos will never decrease, but might only increase in price each year. As a society, we do not wish for our members to represent ICSS and Imperial College, being less prepared than they could potentially have been, all because of the costs of the training sessions. Therefore, we appeal for **£400** of Union funding for sports subsidies leading up to the competition only. The rest of the sum will be drawn from membership fees collected and sponsorship (if any).

The society supports the Union in all the ways we can, for example, making many changes to our election to join the union's Big Elections this year. Also, we form one of the largest OSC societies and we maintain a healthy balance of payments each year. In fact, the slight surplus each year is to save enough money for our once-in-three-year societal publication that details all our activities and events. The previous publication was done in 2012, hence the next publication is due for printing this year in 2015 by the next committee.

In all, we are appealing for **£300 + £400 = £700** from the appeal funds of £6000. Hope to hear a reply from you and we will be there at the meeting on the 17th.

Best Regards,
Maung Thet
Treasurer
Imperial College Singapore Society
OSC 319

To whom this may concern,

On behalf of the current committee of the Belly Dancing society, I would like to appeal the decision not to provision RCC belly dancing (149) with any funding next year.

Removing all funding from the society is a drastic measure that could totally undermine its existence. We also feel that is unjustified, as it was mostly due to an administrative delay.

Since its creation in 2007, the Belly Dancing society has greatly contributed to the dancing scene of Imperial College. In spite of the challenges it faces, the society has been very successful in running high quality activities for all of its members, while keeping a high level of engagement for various members old and new. The level of excellence it strives for and the status it's gained amongst other dancing clubs and professional Belly dancers is unparalleled in London, if not the UK. This success was due to the commitment of the society as a whole to only hire instructors of high standing. Doing this while maintaining classes affordable for all members is only possible through the funding grant we've been receiving from the Union year on year.

The aspect of our funding that covers this, and hence the most important part of our annual budget, is detailed under "Instructors" below (funding line # A-149-735-1)

Category	Rank within Category	Predicted Cost (£)	Predicted Income (£)	Subsidy (£)
----------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-------------

Initially Requested:

Instructors	1 - Most Important	£4,200.00	£1,250.00	£1,500.00
Workshops	2- Important	£270	£192	£78
Costumes	1 – Most Important	£300	£0	£100
Cultural activities	2- Important	£147	£147	£30
Showcase	1 – Most Important	£100	£40	£30
Christmas dinner	1 – Most Important	£300	£180	£0
Fresher's social	2 - Important	£50	£0	£0
Goods for resale	3 – Average Importance	£50	£50	£0

New Request:

Instructors	1 - Most Important	£3,500.00	£2,500.00	£1,000.00
Workshops	2- Important	£200	£200	£0
Costumes	1 – Most Important	£200	£0	£0
Cultural activities	2- Important	£147	£147	£0
Showcase	1 – Most Important	£100	£40	£0
Christmas dinner	1 – Most Important	£300	£180	£0
Fresher's social	2 - Important	£50	£0	£0
Goods for resale	3 – Average Importance	£50	£50	£0

Membership Target (Full)	50	Funding Balances	
Membership Target (Associate)	5	Grant	438.56
Membership Cost	£6	SGI	1867.56
Current Members	41	Harlington, IC Trust,	
Life/associate Members	6	College	0
		Liabilities	-1080
		Grand Total	1226.12

The revised figures are based on a diminished offering to members, as well as a higher cost to members. The details regarding the weekly classes with professional instructors are displayed below:

Cost per hour: £50

Classes per year (all levels): 70

Total cost: £3,500

Subsidy: £1,000

Remaining Cost with subsidy: (total) £2,500, (per class) £35.7

Remaining Cost without subsidy: (total) £3,500, (per class) £50

Average number of attendees per class: 7

Price charged per attendee: (subsidised) £5, (unsubsidised) £8

This effectively cuts our subsidy by 33% compared to the amount we were allocated last year. Without any grant from the union, we would need to raise our fares by 60% or more, which would not only lose our current loyal member but also further discourage new potential members from joining.

While our membership target for next year is larger than what we've gained so far, we believe it is manageable. The society has experienced a lot of changes in its dynamics since last year, as it used to rely heavily on longstanding members who have now left Imperial College. The focus of the current committee is thus to re-orientate the society towards more general and accessible activities, in an effort to recruit new members who will then stay in the society for the next coming years. Some of these new measures include student-run classes, as well as the introduction of Tribal classes, a modern form of Belly Dancing. These have proved to be very popular with our current members, and have greatly helped in attracting new people. However these changes need to be run for a longer period of time to really have the desired impact.

Deborah Schneider – Luftman (President 2014/15)

Budgetting Appeal – Bridge Club 2014/2015

Bridge club would like to appeal for a grant allocation this year. At the moment we have not been awarded any funding, due to our lack of a membership target submitted with our application (which we apologise for). Our committee is new this year and we have not been through the budgeting process before which is why we neglected this, but we do not feel that the club should suffer because of this and would therefore like to appeal for subsidy towards our core expenses as a club which is predominantly:

- Entering bridge competitions around the UK
- Subsidising the travel costs of our members
- Replacements for our damaged equipment.

Since the bridge club was re-founded 7 years ago we have been a great asset to the university, most notably for our performance at the 'Portland Bowl', the UK's largest inter-university competition, where we have either won or come second in three of our seven years as a club. Unfortunately in recent years our most experienced players have graduated and left the club, and so the onus is on the committee to attract and train a new generation of bridge players so that our club can continue to prosper. Many new players feel put off entering competitions due to the fees associated (with e.g. travelling to Warwick for a tournament), but this is one of the most important activities we can encourage them to do and therefore it is vital that we are able to subsidise this as much as possible. We would therefore ask the board to consider granting us the following:

Description	Breakdown of costs	Predicted Cost	Original Subsidy Submission	Appealing For
Entry Fees for Competitions	Three main tournaments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - London Cup: On average 4 teams of 4, £10 per team to enter; usually ask £1 contribution per player leaving £24 to be paid by club - Portland Bowl: 2 teams of 4 at £44 per team. Will ask £5 per player leaving £48 to be paid by club - Warwick Festival: On average 5 pairs, £5 per pair. Usually fully subsidised by club due to increased travel expenses 	£168 of which £97 to be paid by club	£80 (47% of total cost)	£50 (30% of total cost)
Travel Expenditure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Warwick bridge festival, 10 people at ~£20 per ticket - Portland bowl, dependent on number of rounds entered but totalling ~£20 people with 8 people 	£360	£120 (33% of total cost)	£100 (28% of total cost)
New Equipment	Bidding boxes have become damaged, with sheets missing and one set is missing a box; these need to be replaced over the years. 2 sets to be purchased at £24 a set.	£48	£36 (75% of total cost)	£20 (42% of total cost)
TOTAL	---	£516	£236 (46%)	£170 (33%)

Our membership target for next year is, as in previous years, 20 members and the membership cost will be £5.

From: [Schlemper, Jo](#)
To: [Abigail de Bruin - ICU Deputy President \(Clubs & Societies\)](#)
Cc: rcc.chair@imperial.ac.uk
Subject: Budgeting Appeal
Date: 10 March 2015 16:36:38

Dear DPCS,

Funkology has only been allocated £161 for competition (A-680-680-1) and £53.06 for travelling (A-680-895-1) which is less than the half amount of last year (£258 and £131.25). We believe this amount is insufficient to cover these costs and will put a lot of pressure on dance crew members and the society as a whole.

We have historically participated in at least two competitions each year: Loughborough Dance Competition and RHUL Dance Competition. These are the major dance competitions among the universities in the UK and we believe it is important for Funkology to compete and represent Imperial College at these events as there are no other dance teams from Imperial that do so.

The entry fee for Loughborough is £27 per performer and for RHUL is £8. Normally we have about 20 people in the performing crew working out a total around $(£27+£8)*20=£700$.

The cost of hiring an Imperial mini van for travelling is around £200. If the number of people is greater than 15 (incl. driver) then it is not possible to hire a single mini-van (which was the case this year) and performers will have to travel there by train or use public coach service. This year, the travelling cost was £290 for Loughborough (coach) and $£20*20$ (train) for RHUL which adds up to £690 in total.

Last year, with the allocated grant of £389 (for competition and transport) this allowed a saving of around £22 per performing member ($£389/17 = £22.88$). Each performing member paid £35 (entry) + £18 (transport Loughborough) + £20 (transport RHUL) of £73. This meant that members paid £50 out of their pockets overall.

With the allocated amount of £214.06 (£161 entry + £53.06 transport) and going off the amount of performing members this year (16, which is traditionally less than usual) as estimates, the total saving per performing member is only £13 ($£214/16$). As a result, performing members have to pay at least £60 if we keep on the tradition of representing Imperial College at these high profile dance competitions.

Even with these estimates, this year was quite fortunate, we only had 16 members so we could perfectly fit into a private minivan (external company). If it is anything like the previous years, next year, we'll have to get the next van size up for which the typical hire fee is £600 for 16+ ppl (£37pp). Considering other means of transport is obsolete as the

return journey via train from just the Loughborough competition costs £66.50 per person.

In this case, even after taking into account the currently allocated grant, the total per person would amount to £80 to £108. As you can see, this is already a doubling of the amount it cost for performing members to represent Imperial last year. We would greatly love to continue competing at these competitions, it promotes growth amongst the performing members gives new society members something to aspire to do and also places our name firmly on the map for university dance teams in the UK as can be seen from our performance records!

These competitions do very much contribute to this part of student life from Imperial and so we ask for another £100 to subsidise competition entry and £80 for travel expenses as we do not want representing Imperial College to be a taxing effort on our members who are, after all, students!

We really hope that you could reconsider our situation by taking into account all the factors that have been discussed and allocate us the further amount required.

Thank you very much.

Jo, Terence and Toni (Chair, Vice and Treasurer)
Funkology

Canoe Club appeal

We were unable to find the Budget Description lines requested, apologies.

Line Descriptions:

Ethos	Ground Hire	1, Most Imp.	CPSB-A
Misc Accessories	Consumables	1, Most Imp.	CPSB-B
Petrol	Travel Expenditure	2, Imp.	CPSB-A

As a club we feel that we have may have been under allocated in parts of our budget for next year, which will cause a severe strain on our club. This may well mean our aims and objectives for next year will be compromised.

Specifically, we feel we have been underfunded for the hire of Ethos swimming pool, repair of boats, and fuel for weekend trips.

The hire of Ethos swimming pool is an essential part of our core activities, as it allows us to develop skills and for new members to complete safety drills before they come on a trip. It is also very costly to the club, £1269 per year. We feel the allocation of £266.49 is too low, compared to last year which was £444.15, and £360 the year before that, putting the club under much financial strain. This is the primary usage of membership fees, and with less subsidy membership costs may rise in the future. We are asking for £100 extra, so that next year's allocation is more in line with previous years.

We also feel that we should be allocated some money for spare parts to repair boats. This has not been in the budget for previous years, which we believe a major omission. Many of our boats are missing small parts such as screws and outfitting, and need repairing to ensure they are functional and don't leak. This will cost the club £117 and we asked for a £40 subsidy, but no allocation was given. We are asking for £40 to enable us to maintain our fleet of boats; often otherwise serviceable boats are not used due to small, cheap parts missing which cause boats to leak. We have never allocated money before for this is the budget, so some funding would definitely enable us to start including this in the club's finances.

Thirdly, we feel that we have not been allocated enough money for petrol to ensure our weekend trips remain affordable for students. This year we have had to increase the cost of our trips from £35 to £40, some as high as £50. This was when we were allocated £791 for petrol over the year. Next year, with an allocation of only £464.06, the trip cost will have to be increased, and may be no longer affordable for many students. This will mean, once again, Canoe Club will struggle to get enough new members, and may compromise the future of the club. We are asking for £300 extra allocation, so that this year's allocation is more on a par to that of last year.

The caving club aims to provide students with the opportunity to tread where no man has been before, at a discount price.

The total allocation this year suffered two major setbacks in the transport subsidy, and accommodation support which together account for a decrease of almost 25% compared with last year's total allocation. However, because we have had to budget for trips previously considered 'tours' in the grant we asked, £670 of our transport funding have been awarded at the expense of other vital purchases we make annually. The real setback for the club is approaching **35%** of what money we were awarded and spent during the course of this year.

Transport

Firstly, **Line A-106-895-1** has been awarded £1109.88 which represents 20% of our estimate for transport costs this year is £5478. With the regular increase in the Union minibuses' hire costs, our estimates for transport can only grow annually.

Caving is not an activity which can be brought to London to reduce those costs. Our caving locations remain unchanged: Wales and Mendips for fresher weekends, Yorkshire for varied and technical caves.

We use the buses sparingly, but have to hire them over the weekends to reach our destinations in time, but most important of all, have the flexibility to reach cave entrances rapidly to drop off and pick up cavers.

Sensible driving can reduce the fuel consumption, but the club has no power over the minibus fees.

We ask that the board review the allocation of this line and top it up to a level of £2191 (40% of our estimate of £5478).

This will be used to hire minibuses on weekend trips.

Accommodation

Secondly, **Line A-106-710-1** was not awarded any funding. Last year's allocation was critical in maintaining low weekend costs.

At £35 per person for the whole weekend, all included, the standard caving trip is among the cheapest, and best value for money on offer across the whole panel of outdoors club. This was sanctioned by freshers this year who experienced different clubs and decided to stay with us.

The accommodation expenses are an integral part of our trip budgets, but we are limited to cottages with the adequate facilities (stores, drying rooms).

This year again we aim to keep our product at as low a price as possible. We ask for that line to be awarded £496, or 20% of our estimate of £2480.

This will be used to pay accommodation fees for our stay in the cottages.

This help will help maintain low costs for students and give next year's committee financial manoeuvrability concerning the other vital expenses to which the club inevitably has to make.

Tanguy Racine and Oliver Myerscough
Imperial College Caving Club

Dear Abi,

On behalf of the Debating Society, I would like to appeal the decision of the CSPB not to allocate any budget subsidy for the society in 2015/2016. Debating is a big society with about 40 active members and we are an integral part of the UK and international debating community. We regularly take part in tournaments in the UK and abroad where, as well as providing our members with a chance to develop valuable skills, we represent Imperial College and Imperial College Union on the global stage and build up our reputation. We also organise several tournaments of our own throughout the year.

The primary aim of the society is to improve reasoning, speaking and debating skills of our members. This is done through weekly sessions, where experienced coaches hold training workshops and judge practice debates. More importantly, we send our members to competitions on nearly weekly basis. There they have chance to test their skills in real tournament atmosphere, get feedback from some of the best judges in the debating community and socialise with other debaters. Apart from that, taking part in these competitions improves the reputation of the society as well as of College and Union. Therefore sending teams to competitions is our core activity, which we always aim to support. Since the entrance fees and travel expenses can be discouraging factor for many debaters, the society (along with most of the other debating societies in the UK) subsidises these costs of its members. With the average cost of £30 per team per tournament, and the target number of members set at 50 for the following academic year, we will spend about £300 each term just on UK tournaments. The travel costs amount to about £200 a term.

On top of that, we also send teams to European and World Championship. Next year we want to build on the success we have had in these competitions in the previous years. These are the most prestigious tournaments and taking part in them is very important to Imperial debating reputation. Should we not be able to take part, our abilities and competency as a society would be questioned by the whole UK debating community. The entrance fees and travel expenses, however, usually add up to several hundreds of pounds per each debater. It is therefore not possible to ask participants to pay all the associated costs by themselves, and the society stands firm in subsidising its teams as much as it is possible. These tournaments are therefore a substantial item in our expenses.

Second core area is organisation of our own tournaments. These are among the established competitions in the UK and are recognised for their high level of organisation and quality of the debates. Holding several schools competitions, we also aim to reach out to secondary school students, foster their interest in academic debate and raise their aspirations. As a part of our commitment to social mobility, we grant free entry to these competitions for participants from state schools. We see this as outreach for the College and the Union, and argue that it considerably benefits IC and ICU's public image. All the tournaments are a source of income to the society, generating about £1,000-2,000 annually, and can cover large part of our expenses. Our members see the value of this and donate large amounts of their time to make them possible. However, we need to make an initial investment (in the form of hospitality, external judges, prizes and other material) to make them possible. To organise one tournament costs the society about £300-400, and we usually hold 3-4 tournaments in a year.

Thirdly, we organise public debates open to all students of Imperial College. These tackle current issues in an intelligent and engaging way and are a contribution to the academic life on campus. The debates are free for everyone; however, the society bears the cost of securing speakers (travel costs and hospitality), venue and refreshments for the audience. Further to the positive contribution to the student community at Imperial College, members of the society volunteer to teach non-members debating skills on several occasions. Most recently we gave a lecture on debating to a class of Civil Engineering MSc students.

Considering the situation at hand and the amount of money available for appeals, we understand that it is not realistic that our initial request for £1,100 will be satisfied. However, to carry on with our activities, we require a subsidy of at least £500. This would enable us to send teams to competitions and organise a tournament to bring some more funding to the society. If we carefully reconsider the tournament subsidy policy, we will be able to manage our funds so that we can continue being an active member of the debating community, provide our debaters with opportunities to improve their skills and make positive impact through our public events and tournaments.

We believe that the Debating society helps building public image of Imperial College and Imperial College Union and makes positive impact on their behalf. We proudly represent both institutions on national and international scene and build and uphold their reputation as excellent academic and student bodies. Through our work with members and non-members, we offer an irreplaceable service of improving public speaking and reasoning skills, something that no other society covers to such extent as the Debating society. And by organising tournaments and events, we reach out beyond university debating community and make positive impact on secondary school students as well as student community of Imperial College. For these reasons we urge you to reconsider your initial decision and allocate a budget subsidy to Debating society.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Martin Opatovsky

Treasurer, Imperial College Debating Society

Felix Grant Appeal

We would like to appeal the Budget line 'A-381-650-1' which was grant to print *Phoenix*, the Arts supplement produced and printed by *Felix*.

For us to print one edition of *Phoenix* will cost approximately £550 for a 16 page edition (pages are run in multiples of 8, with higher costs for pagination which is not a multiple of 8). The amount of grant we have been provided makes it impossible to print *Phoenix* as advertising income from the main paper does not go to the club account, instead it's held centrally by ICU. Therefore it would not be possible to do the most basic print run of *Phoenix*.

Phoenix differs from the weekly arts section in *Felix* as it is produced by a wide range of contributors, and predominantly offers a showcase of student art, unlike the weekly section in *Felix* which focuses on art around London. It is an effective way to make the work produced by Arts societies and students to be seen by the wider Imperial community.

We have been allocated £400, therefore we request this is topped up by £150 to £550 as requested before. This money will exclusively be used to cover printing costs of *Phoenix*.

From: RAG Treasurer - Shaneil Patel
Sent: 09 March 2015 12:22
To: RAG Chair - Benjamin Fernando
Cc: Fernando, Benjamin
Subject: RAG Appeal for Travel Funding

Dear Alex,

On behalf of RAG, we would like to appeal the decision made at the Annual Budgeting Meeting to withhold any funding for travel to the RAG Conference. As members already contribute significantly to RAG, both financially and in terms of time, it will be difficult to attend this crucial event without a subsidy as we are unable to fund travel through our SGI - to take donations away from charity to pay for this would be highly unethical given the conditions under which it was donated.

Therefore, we would like to kindly ask for a 50% subsidy for train tickets to the event. This subsidy will amount to £60. This will be vital to ensuring that we as the fundraising arm of the union can continue to function effectively through taking advantage of this networking opportunity at the conference.

Kind Regards,

Shaneil Patel & Sina Lari,

RAG Treasury Team



RCC Gliding (112) – Budget Appeal

10th March 2015

The club is submitting this appeal as we strongly feel that the current level of funding that we have received will result in the inability of the club to operate and specifically to insure, store and maintain the £130,000 worth of union assets entrusted to it.

Background

We currently have 180% student membership (105 total), a 20% increase on last year and a record in the club's 85 year history. We have had to limit further expansion due to a lack of funding and resources. The majority of our costs relate to essential costs. You cannot partly maintain, insure or store an aircraft. The club owns three gliders which have to be inspected annually and maintained to airworthy standards. Any further drop in funding will result in the club being non-viable.

Historical Significance

Formed in 1930, ICGC is the oldest and largest university gliding club in the country, and the second oldest continually-operating gliding club of any sort in the UK. Over 85 years, the club has trained thousands of students to fly and has produced several world champions. Indeed, one of our current students has been selected to represent Great Britain in the next Junior World Championships. His selection is a direct result of being able to fly the university's gliders and compete in modern, competitive machinery against the best pilots in the country. A full history of the club's activity and fleet can be found on the ICGC Archive website: <http://www.icgcarchive.co.uk/>

Appeal

The £100/target member cap has resulted in extremely low subsidy levels in many areas of our budget, mostly due to a rather conservative membership target that was based on entirely different criteria. Table 1 highlights the extremely low subsidy rates we have been awarded for some categories.

Table 1: Member activity subsidies

Category	Subsidy
Instructors	11%
Competition Entry Fee	13%
Travel Expenditure	16%
Affiliation Fees	17%

Because these are directly related to our member's core activity, rather than fixed overhead costs, we recognise that these can at least be mitigated by further increasing the amount our members pay for each of the above.

However, this is not the case with the fixed overhead costs of insuring, storing and maintaining a fleet of three gliders. During the second CSPB meeting we received lower levels of core safety related ground hire and equipment subsidy than other 'top ups', simply because we were arbitrarily targeted as being the most expensive club. We are therefore appealing to increase the subsidy level of these categories closer to those of other clubs. For example, ACC Swim/Water Polo received 52% Ground Hire and both RCC Mountaineering and Caving received 55% Equipment subsidy.

A-112-710-1 Ground Hire**Request: Increase subsidy from 23% to 50% (£804 increase)**

Gliders must be stored in a sheltered, dry environment and out of direct sunlight in order to protect the structure and surface finish. Our gliders are kept at Lasham airfield, Hampshire. This is where our core activity takes place and it would be highly impractical to store them elsewhere due to difficulty in transporting and storing them, not to mention the detrimental effect that storing gliders off site would have on our activities. To keep costs down we currently elect to keep our 2 single seat gliders in their enclosed trailers rather than in a hangar. The cost of this is £487 per trailer, a saving of £1622 over keeping them in the hangar. It is however necessary to keep our two-seater in the main hangar for a number of reasons. Firstly the glider is much larger, heavier and more awkward to assemble on a daily basis and this can only be carried out by a small number of qualified individuals. This glider is also used extensively during the winter training months where rigging and de-rigging would use up a large proportion of daylight hours that could otherwise be used for flying. Although members contribute a significant percentage towards these storage costs by paying the club for every minute flown in our gliders, the current subsidy awarded of £686 is insufficient. Should we be unable to continue to store our gliders in this way, the consequences would be:

- Decreased usage of the gliders, resulting in reduced income for the Club from flying fees.
- Inability of members to readily access the gliders, resulting in slower pilot development and training.
- Increased risk of damage to the two-seat glider in potential assembly accidents. This is both a health and safety issue and could result in very costly repair bills.

Overall, this would result in the club being unable to function coherently, reducing our main source of income due to reduced flying activity and ultimately threaten the existence of the club.

We therefore request an increase for this core, safety related ground hire subsidy from 23% to 50%. (This increases this funding from £686 to £1491.)

A-112-685-1 Equipment & Repair**Request: Increase subsidy from 44% to 50% (£245 increase)**

In order to operate our three gliders, by law they must be inspected annually by a registered aircraft inspector and any defects rectified by qualified engineers. The majority of our equipment costs relate to compulsory inspection and maintenance required to keep these assets in airworthy condition. For both single seat gliders, this represents an annual cost of approximately £2000. Due to its size and complexity, the two-seat glider costs approximately £1600 per year. Additionally the essential ancillary equipment such as parachutes must also be legally maintained. These 4 parachutes must be repacked every 6 months costing £200 annually. Our members fund a considerable proportion of these costs through the fees they pay us each time they fly our gliders.

The present subsidy levels would create an unmanageable strain on either the members' contributions or the dwindling Club SGI balance. Should the club be unable to adequately maintain our gliders, this would result in:

- Gliders that cannot be maintained to legal airworthiness requirements and are subsequently de-registered, resulting in a significant reduction in value of these assets (currently apx. £130,000).
- If the club is no longer able to operate its own fleet of gliders then members would have to try and hire gliders from Lasham Gliding Society. However, without our own two seater there would not be enough gliders available for us to train our members. Few students would also be able to afford to rent these gliders, whether training in two seaters or flying solo in single seaters.

As with ground hire, insufficient funds for equipment maintenance would result in the club's inability to operate sustainably and ensure that the club does not reach its 90th anniversary.

Consequently, we request that subsidy be returned to 50% from the current level arbitrarily imposed at the end of the last CSPB meeting. This is still below the 55% subsidy rate that several other clubs are receiving for safety related equipment costs. (This would increase funding in this category by £245.)

Description	Category	Rank within Category	Predicted Cost (£)	Predicted Income (£)	Subsidy (£)	Budgeting Board Applying To	Initial Management Group Predicted Cost (£)	Initial Management Group Allocation (£)	CSPB Predicted Cost (£)	CSPB Allocation (£)
Freebies for raising the profile of GSA to the postgraduates in various events. This includes t-shirts (to be reused throughout the year at various events, as well as other branded goodies to give away (t-shirts: 200£, mugs, etc.:300£)	Publicity	3 - Average	500	0	200	CSPB - A	500	200	500	0
General stationary (i.e. markers, cellotape, quality paper, cardboxes, box files) to be used in GSA Exec meetings, AWOs meetings, the various events that get organised and the new GSU office.	Consumabl	3 - Average	100	0	50	Exec	100	50	100	50
Exclusive postgraduate cinema screenings have been quite successful this year with large turnouts to several movie screenings. We intend to run around 8 screenings per year. Per showing, Royalties: £90, Hospitality £160. Total £250 per screening. Total £2000.	Hospitality	2 - Importa	2,000.00	0	1,000.00	CSPB - B	2,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	0
AWOs meetings with department reps offering a coffee or tea and biscuits to encourage attendance (5 AWOs x 4 meetings per year x £10 per meeting = £200).	Hospitality	1 - Most Irr	200	0	50	CWB	200	50	200	50

GSU organises sports events where it needs to hire ground from Ethos and equipment from other societies for an average attendance of 30 people. In past years we have run badminton sessions and the equipment hired from Badminton society costs around £50 per session (Total 5 sessions x £50 = £250). The ticket price will be used to pay the ground hire costs. The GSA will also organise a five-a-side football tournament that we expect to attract at least 80 PGs (16 teams). It will be organised in summer and the football pitch of Ethos will be booked for a full day (Total 8 hour slots x £40/slot = £320). The tickets need to be subsidised in order to encourage participation.

Ground Hir 3 - Average	570	0	300 CSPB - B	570	300	570	0
------------------------	-----	---	--------------	-----	-----	-----	---

GSU now sponsors the GSU football team. In order to join a league an annual payment of £260 is required. Payment to FA £60 per year. £24 for player registration. £18 for insurance. Total: £362.

Competitio 2 - Importa	362	0	200 CSPB - B	362	200	362	0
------------------------	-----	---	--------------	-----	-----	-----	---

GSU Christmas Party. Due to the success of this year's Christmas Party, we would like to organise it again next year. The cost of the venue is £1035 for hiring Metric. Mulled Wine £75. Total: £1110.

Ground Hir 2 - Importa	1,110.00	0	400 CSPB - B	1,110.00	400	1,110.00	0
------------------------	----------	---	--------------	----------	-----	----------	---

GSU Christmas Party Decorations £200.

Equipment 3 - Average	200	0	100 CSPB - B	200	100	200	0
-----------------------	-----	---	--------------	-----	-----	-----	---

Joint event with Kings College Union and LSE. This is a networking event organised at Metric. Imperial's share of the minimum spend and drink tokens come up to £350.

Conference 1 - Most Irr	350	0	170	CSPB - A	350	170	350	0
-------------------------	-----	---	-----	----------	-----	-----	-----	---

GSU/HSC Boat Party organised in conjunction with the HSC. Welcome party for new students at the beginning of October exclusively for PG students in a great location. Venue Hire: £1700.

Ground Hir 1 - Most Irr	1,700.00	0	600	CSPB - A	1,700.00	600	1,700.00	0
-------------------------	----------	---	-----	----------	----------	-----	----------	---

GSU/HSC Boat Party organised in conjunction with the HSC. Welcome party for new students at the beginning of October exclusively for PG students in a great location. Food for 200 guests: £1000.

Freshers 1 - Most Irr	1,000.00	0	500	CSPB - B	1,000.00	500	1,000.00	0
-----------------------	----------	---	-----	----------	----------	-----	----------	---

Trips to Oxford and Bath organised during the summer term. Surveys suggest that day trips out of London would be very popular. At a coach hire cost of £490 per trip this would amount to £980.

Cultural Ac 2 - Importa	980	0	490	CSPB - B	980	490	980	0
-------------------------	-----	---	-----	----------	-----	-----	-----	---

Theatre evening have proven to be very successful as long as the ticket prices are competitive. In order to access some of the more popular venues maintaining competitive ticket prices, partial funding would be necessary from the GSU. For 100 tickets, at the retail price of £70, a subsidy of £20 per ticket would be necessary.

Cultural Ac 3 - Average	7,000.00	0	2,000.00	CSPB - B	7,000.00	2,000.00	7,000.00	0
-------------------------	----------	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	---

Musical tickets for students. Current sales this year are at 500 and expected to rise to about 900 by the end of the year. In order to maintain an average price of £40 per ticket GSU would have to cover some of the costs. Covering £10 for 200 tickets: £2000. Total: (900 * £40 = £36000 + subsidy for more expensive tickets: £38000).

Cultural Ac 1 - Most Im	38,000.00	0	2,000.00	CSPB - B	38,000.00	2,000.00	38,000.00	0
-------------------------	-----------	---	----------	----------	-----------	----------	-----------	---

Summer Term BBQ. GSU would like to organise such an event this year and include it in the list of subsidised events in the future. We are looking to hire a company (Scotts) that will cover all the incidentals including food, grills and staff. Their suggested priced for a package suitable to 120 people would be £1299. 120 x £11 = £1320. £500 for drinks. To be in line with the current on campus meal prices (excluding drinks £4; Tuesday Farmers Market (£5 per burger)) we would sell tickets at around £9 each so the rest of £6 would have to be covered by the GSU. £6 x 120 = £720. £500 for drinks.

Hospitality 3 - Average	1,800.00	0	720	CSPB - B	1,800.00	720	1,800.00	0
-------------------------	----------	---	-----	----------	----------	-----	----------	---

Executive Meeting refreshments. Biscuits and soft drinks for the meetings of the Executive Committee to encourage attendance and make the event more enjoyable overall (15 meetings x 15£ = 225£)

Consumabl 1 - Most Im	225	0	150	CSPB - A	225	150	225	0
-----------------------	-----	---	-----	----------	-----	-----	-----	---

Contingency fund at 10% of the budget. A large number of the events we run are based on the concept of pre-booking tickets and selling them on to students. This is prone to something going wrong due to unforeseen circumstances. A contingency fund would be required to cover losses in such an event.

Insurance	2 - Importa	5,700.00	0	1,000.00	CSPB - B	5,700.00	1,000.00	5,700.00	1,204.00
-----------	-------------	----------	---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

GSU Pub Quiz occurring monthly in h-bar. Prizes will be distributed as vouchers for food or drinks at h-bar (£30). Total cost: £30 x 12 months = £360)

Competitio	1 - Most Irr	360	0	200	CSPB - A	360	200	360	0
------------	--------------	-----	---	-----	----------	-----	-----	-----	---

Workshops have proven popular we intend to run several workshops with speciality speakers such a lectures on website development and software usage (LaTeX, Excel, Python...). We expect that the cost for speakers will be approximatly £500 in total.

Speakers	1 - Most Irr	500	0	250	CSPB - A	500	250	500	0
		62,657.00	0	10,380.00		62,657.00	10,380.00	62,657.00	1,304.00

ICSMSU Mountaineering

Appeal Request Amount: £250

In previous years we have received significantly more subsidy than we have received this year. This is despite the fact that we have increased our membership and have managed to successfully improve our equipment stocks and increase the general activity of the club. In the 2013/2014 budget we received **£704.73** and in the 2012/2013 budget we received **£950.00**, compared **with £475.94** this year (2015/2016) – despite increased membership and increased club activity. We recognise that funding from the Union is limited but we feel this severe restriction will seriously damage the future potential of this historic club.

By far our greatest cost is transport – as all our trips involve travelling to (relatively distant) locations that require the hiring of a minibus from the union for the weekend which is a significant expense (£235) as well as the fuel costs incurred. This is why we asked for such a significant subsidy in this area. We are grateful that the committee recognised this need and did award us a significant subsidy – however we believe additional funding is required to ensure the ability of the society to run these trips.

Additionally we received no subsidy for accommodation/camping costs or for food/toiletries etc which are our second greatest expenditures. Taking another look at our budget we have reluctantly made changes to increase the planned ticket price of our trips and hope to be able to reduce our dependence on subsidy in this area – however we still believe we need additional funding from the Union. Currently our trips range in cost from £20-30. We recognise that this is a low cost for a weekend trip however we believe this is in line with the core ethos of our club - to promote Mountaineering among students who would not be able to afford to experience this exciting and dynamic hobby without help and support from ICSMSU Mountaineering and the Union. Previously we have managed this low cost by running a limited number of subsidised trips (typically 3-4 throughout the year) thereby maximising the amount we can subsidise each trip within our budget. We have agreed to raise the price of future trips (in the region of £30-40) in order to deal with reductions in the budget and increases in trip expenditure however we believe additional funding is required to prevent raising the ticket price prohibitively high (above £40).

While we do have some 'rainy day' money set aside in our SGI, having a relatively significant contingency fund in the SGI is important to our club because of the potential and significant one-off expenses incurred in replacing important safety equipment should it become damaged while in use on trips or during wall climbing. The club is also vulnerable to changes in fuel costs - given the distance we travel on trips.

Currently the subsidy that we have received will greatly restrict our potential to run climbing trips – which is at the core of our activity as a club. We recognise that funds are tight this year (and particularly in the appeals process) and as such we have already planned to cancel one of our trips for next year and will be increasing the ticket price for the remaining trips to run next year – in order to give greater value for money to the Union for the subsidy they invest with us. However without the additional funds we have requested in this appeals process we would need to cancel another trip – which would seriously curtail the activity of our club and the enjoyment of our members and threaten our ability to involve new members. We currently run 4 main climbing trips a year (we also have other non-subsidised activities on a more ad hoc basis) – therefore cancelling two of these trips would be very detrimental to our society. We believe we need an additional £250 funding in order to maintain the proper functioning of the club. These funds will allow us to run one of our 4 trips which will otherwise have to be cancelled, subsidise another in order to make it more affordable to members and will also allow us to pay for the remainder of our British Mountaineering Council Membership (which is our insurance policy).

We are asking for **£250** additional funding. We realise that this is a significant amount of money but we believe it is essential to maintaining the smooth running of one of Imperial's oldest societies. This money will be used to subsidise the involvement of students in what can be a prohibitively expensive activity without help from the club and of course the Union. Given our historically much higher subsidy

and our increase in membership this year, we believe that it would be damaging to drastically cut the budget this year and hope the committee will agree.

Leonardo Fine Arts Society Budget Appeal

Summary

Leonardo Fine Arts Society has an initial allocation subsidy of £0, which is a large reduction compared with the history of running the society. We are aware that this would be due our inability to fill in certain administrative fields (Membership Target, Aims and Objectives) by the stated deadline for budgeting. We accept full responsibility on our part for this failing and would like to take this opportunity to appeal for our usual subsidy of around £800. Based on our submitted budget, which will be quoted in more detail later on, Management Group gave us a suggested allocation of £1,137 for our core activities. The last three years of budgeting has awarded us £756.03, £870.49, £861.87 respectively and as we always spend this full grant amount, we feel it is fair of us to request at least £800 in total subsidy. Whilst this is an increase on last year's allocation, it is a small reduction on the average allocation we have been awarded in recent years.

Initial Proposed Allocation

This table shows the amounts of subsidy we are requesting in our core CSPB-A categories:

Brief Description	Original Predicted Costs (£)	Updated Predicted Costs (£)	Initial Management Group Allocation (£)
Standard Session Instructors	760.00	760.00	460.00
Standard Session Consumables	579.60	809.60	400.00
Course Instructors	4460.00	4460.00	200.00
Course Consumables	152.94	182.14	77.00

Predicted costs have been updated compared to this year's original budget based on the actual spend so far this year (as found in eActivities transaction lines).

Leonardo fine arts has a membership target of 100 (membership cost: £8), and often we cater to more people than this in terms of resources used.

Our Aims and Objectives

As a society we will strive to hold to these main points:

- We aim to provide weekly art sessions for all levels with professional tutoring, providing the materials, equipment and venue for these sessions. In addition to these provide several art courses focused on a particular topic on a weekly basis. These will be acrylic, life drawing and digital.
- Maintain and improve the studio for members to use outside the weekly sessions, also allowing members to use the materials available.
- Hold two annual exhibitions:
 - Leonardo Society exhibition, where our members can submit their artwork and exhibit in Imperial's Blyth Gallery
 - Leonardo Society and PhotoSoc collaboration (Artsfest), members of both societies can produce collaborative pieces and exhibit in Imperial's Blyth Gallery
- Provide members with the opportunity to visit art galleries and artistic events in London.
- Organize annual LeoSoc tour to an artistic/cultural centre outside the UK.
- Play a supporting role in the organisation of a collaborative competition with the RCA (Royal College of Arts), resulting in an exhibition in the Blyth Gallery during the summer
- Provide club merchandising in the form of Hoodies/T-Shirts
- Provide an increased awareness of the visual arts in and around Imperial College

Current SGI

Leonardo Fine Arts often comes into question over the amount of SGI it has in pocket around the time of budget allocation. This year in particular has been a difficult year as whilst the SGI total shows a value of £1694.71 this is not accurate. Some of the funds for last year's easter trip have not been refunded to the correct committee member due to many unfortunate technical issues arising at the same time, meaning the receipts needed to do this still haven't been procured. The total amount still to pay out is in the region of £1568.43 (for flights and accommodation) and so we have been taking the decision to remove this from our calculations as this should be resolved by the end of the year. With other expenditure in mind we are looking to end the year with an SGI amount of only a couple hundred, which is much less than in previous years, making this year's allocation absolutely crucial for us to continue running at our current level.

Consumables

Last year's allocation for consumables was £176.03 and this has proven to be a difficult amount to work with. We are coming towards the end of our second term of spending and have spent (with rounding) roughly £1,000 on consumable items for the club (on both regular and course sessions). Our membership income has been roughly £680 and we have made in

the region of £400 from our session income. On paper, this seems like we have covered our consumable costs well, but this has left us no money to replace multiple items that have broken this year and they are proving difficult to work around (these items being artistic equipment and the tea kettle that tend to have a three year lifespan - or less if they are popular items). With all these things in mind we feel that a £400 subsidy in this area is crucial to us continuing to operate. This is more than a 100% increase on last year's allocation but brings us back into the range of allocation from the two years previous to that, and these were remarkably more successful years.

Instructors

One of the most positive aspects of Leonardo Society is that not only are people able to engage in their creative sides, they are able to actively expand it through the knowledge of the professional external artist's we have been bringing in throughout the weeks. These people are warmly welcomed and are the other crucial aspect of the society. Our sessions pay them along the same lines as the RCA pays artists and these prices have gone up in recent years. For example, whilst we previously paid tutors £640 for the evening courses we now pay them £800; we could not avoid this increase and so we require our usual subsidy amounts to be able to soak up this extra expenditure whilst not increasing the price of events so much that it becomes undesirable. Historically we have always been awarded £500 - £600 for Instructors in total; we feel this is a reasonable sum to ask for, though we could afford for this to drop to the range of £400 - £500 as we understand there is only so much money in the general pot.

Budgeting Appeal – SCC Management (467) Society 2015-2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

It is to our great dismay that we, as an active departmental society hosting several tutorials and events throughout the academic year for a large membership (122 members in the 2014-2015 academic year), have been informed that we will not be allocated any grant for the 2015-2016 period because we “did not submit details of [our] target membership and/or membership cost”. We believe that these details have been submitted, and as such we are making an appeal, so that we may at the least receive the Initial Management Group Allocation in order to grow and improve as an academic departmental society working for the greater benefit of the student community, providing welfare and supporting students undertaking the Management BSc, as well as those with a general interest in Management.

Details regarding our target membership and membership cost are as follows:

Target Membership: 100 – This was based on our current membership of 122 students for the 2014-2015 academic period. As we are an academic society who runs tutorials and organises events for students undertaking the Management BSc, we expect the vast majority of these students to become members of our society given that we will not be charging for membership.

Membership Cost: £0.00 – As a departmental society, we believe that we should not have to charge for our membership as we provide vital academic support and welfare for students undertaking the Management BSc. We believe that this should be available for free, in order to maximise attendance at our tutorials, to maximise educational benefit, and to foster a culture of altruism when it comes to the provision of academic resources and support. Our aims and objectives are intrinsically intertwined with those of the business school as we provide welfare and educational support for students undertaking the Management BSc. For instance, the series of tutorials we run are completely free and aim to reinforce material delivered on the Management BSc in order to maximise student's potential for success when it comes to exams, coursework and other summative assessments.

We sincerely hope that you will reconsider and realise that the Initial Management Group Allocation of £610.00 is important for our operation, given that we are a highly active departmental society with a large membership, who would like to progress further over the coming academic year, with the intention of organising larger, better events and talks. Though we do not charge for membership we hope that you will be able to make a grant allocation for our society, given that we are a departmental society operating in the name of student welfare and support, and in this respect we hope you can see that our cause is for the greater benefit of the student community. Full details of our budget can be found in the appendix below. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Prem Chouhan
Management Society Treasurer (2014-15)

Imperial College Union
Beit Quadrangle
Prince Consort Road
London
SW7 2BB

M: 075 0863 3069

E: prem.chouhan11@imperial.ac.uk

Appendix – Budget Submission 2015-2016:

Aims/Objectives: To provide a platform and to create the opportunity to increase the exposure to management and leadership within industry, targeting particularly the healthcare industry and the NHS.

Planned Activities: Speeches and lectures by keynote speakers. Possible educational opportunities to develop personal leadership and management skills. To work alongside the business school to provide support for students in education.


Student Members Target: 100

Non-Student Members Target: 0

Membership Cost (£): 0.00

Sponsorship Details: N/A

Budget Submission & Allocation:

Description 	Category	Rank within Category	Predicted Cost (£)	Predicted Income (£)	Subsidy (£)	Budgeting Board Applying To	Initial Management Group Predicted Cost (£)	Initial Management Group Allocation (£)	CSPB Predicted Cost (£)	CSPB Allocation (£)	Management Group Comments
Speakers - To cover the cost of sourcing professional speakers for our events and tutorials. 4 events at £100 per speaker: 4 x 100 = £400	Speakers	1 - Most Important	400.00	0.00	400.00	CSPB - A	400.00	400.00	0.00	0.00	
Refreshments - To provide snacks for attendees at our events and tutorials. 4 events with a £30 worth of refreshments for each event: 4 x 30 = £120	Cultural Activities	3 - Average Importance	120.00	0.00	120.00	CSPB - C	120.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Conferences - Cost of attending FMLM 2016 conference for 7 committee members: 7 x 30 = £210	Conferences	3 - Average Importance	210.00	0.00	210.00	CSPB - A	210.00	210.00	0.00	0.00	
Tutorial Handouts - Cost of producing handouts for tutorial attendees of 5 tutorials held throughout the year: 5 x 15 = £75	Consumables	2 - Important	75.00	0.00	75.00	CSPB - C	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Free printing at SAC
			805.00	0.00	805.00		805.00	610.00	0.00	0.00	

Outdoor Club Appeal

Despite the Outdoor Club applying for more funding than we have in any of the previous 5 years, we have received less funding than in any of the previous 5 years. Our budget has been cut from £4,800 last year to £3,300 this year. Even if we receive all the appeal money we are asking for, this will still be a cut of almost 20% on last year's allocation.

While most of the cuts we have received will be difficult, Outdoor Club has been cut particularly harshly on travel this year. The core aim of the club is to provide its members with opportunities to learn or refine outdoor skills such as climbing, mountaineering, mountain biking and fell running. In order to do this we have to be able to run weekend trips to mountainous regions around the UK which means a large proportion of the club's funds go on travel expenditure. Unfortunately, we have had to cancel a couple of trips this year meaning that we have only run 7 so far and have 4 more planned which was less than originally intended. We are planning to run 13 trips next year and from the calculations it seems we have been budgeted for only 11 trips, and so we would like funding for 2 more for travel at a cost of £208 for minibuses and £121.50 for fuel. Giving a total increase in subsidy of £329.50.

The other budget line we are asking to be increased is the hire of Ethos. We are the only society that runs climbing sessions on campus. We therefore feel that without this session, we would see a significant drop in members especially as many of our members join the society just to climb weekly at Ethos. We would thus like our funding to be increased from 21% to 40% (£277.20 to £528) otherwise we will struggle to run this session.

These increases in subsidy are fair and will allow us to continue running the club to the same level as it has been run in recent years. We are also nowhere near the £100 cap per member so we think the amount we are asking for is very reasonable.

TOTAL SUBSIDY INCREASE: £250.80 + £121.50 + £208 = £580.30.

Total grant afterwards: £3940.51

Imperial College Palestinian Society – Budgeting Appeal

Target: 40 members
Cost: £2/membership

Our society has grown by 4 times since 2012 (from 10 to 40 members). We have formed a fully structured committee with annual events throughout the academic year.

Aims/Objectives: We aim to educate our members about the culture, traditions, history and the ever-changing political situation of Palestine through interactive events. As well as create a social platform for Palestinians and those interested in Palestine to interact and socialise.

Planned Activities: Our planned activities will be talks from external academics and notable figures from the Palestinian community as well as international academics and active figures. Dabke lessons, our annual 'Christmas in Bethlehem' event, film screenings, tours to Palestine, exhibitions on and off campus, charity fundraising, joint events with other university Palestinian societies and outreach to other overseas societies through OSC events or joint events.

Extra notes: Palestinian Society has had an increasingly successful 4 years, turnout to events varied between 30 and 50 for talks and More than 300 people attended Prof. Noam Chomsky's talk in March, 2012. Our 2 year old annual 'Christmas in Bethlehem' event has had the number of attendees increase from 60 (2013) to 70 (2014) and expected to attract more people next year and is to be held in a larger venue. As an overseas society, food plays a major role in attracting students and Palestinian food is expensive in London, so please bear in mind that the subsidy requested does not include a major factor of our expenses.

We are also in the process of organising a tour to Palestine, similar to the one held in Summer 2010 (if the political situation permits).

Identifier	Budgeting Board Applying	Description	Category	Rank within Category	Predicted Cost (£)	Predicted Income (£)	Subsidy (£)
C-261-842-1	CSPB - C	External Speakers (Speaker charges and travel costs, as well as clip microphone hire, hand-held microphone hire, each cost £25, not both would be required for every talk)	Speakers	1 - Most Important	150	0	150
C-261-650-2	CSPB - C	Freshers' Fair (Flags £5, Badges 50p each, printing leaflets - Imperial charges 12p, standing noticeboard hire - £30 each), Meet & Greet (Palestine Posters & Scarves), Photo Exhibition (Printing materials and standing noticeboard hire - £30 x 3)	Cultural Activities	2 - Important	130	0	50
C-261-825-2	CSPB - C	Colour printing of posters for events, blutack and selotape (these will be used for all other events as well, but most times for publicity)	Publicity	2 - Important	20	0	10
C-261-640-1	CSPB - C	Food (Freshers Fair - Baklawa & Maamoul, Meet & Greet - Falafel Sandwiches + Drinks), Freshers' Dinner and end of year dinner. Cost for dinners would be collected from members, subsidised with membership and bargaining! Food for Melting Pot	Consumables	1 - Most Important	450	0	450
C-261-650-1	CSPB - C	Christmas in Bethlehem: This is a new event which we tried this year and was very successful, with 65 attendees. The aim is to celebrate Palestinian culture with Dabke (Palestinian traditional dance) and Palestinian food, and also highlight the current situation in Bethlehem. The costs include cost of speaker fees, Dance group fees, Cutlery and tableware hire (forks, knives, spoons and glasses for everyone ~65), food and drinks. Next year we plan to make Christmas in Bethlehem even bigger with even more variety of events and a larger number of attendees (judging by the interest shown this year but which we were unable to accommodate due to lack of space thus we will be going for a bigger location next year). Subsidy is only requested for tableware hire and fees.	Cultural Activities	1 - Most Important	750	0	200
C-261-650-3	CSPB - C	Dabke lessons (Palestinian traditional dance)	Cultural Activities	3 - Average Importance	50	0	25
C-261-725-2	CSPB - C	Films (we would like to introduce film screenings and carry out hopefully 2 next year). Here we would like subsidy to film rights	Copyright Materials	2 - Important	83	0	41

Annual Budgeting - RCC Ice Hockey Initial Allocation Appeal

In the initial annual budgeting allocations decided on by CSPB, RCC Ice Hockey will see a 24% reduction in overall subsidy relative to the 2014/15 academic year. This will raise the average contribution per member from £337.27 to £391.28 in an academic year. It is our fear that this will directly lower participation rates in the sport. Due to the fixed nature of our primary cost (ground hire), we will be forced to raise member costs even further and drive away more participants.

The aims and objectives of RCC Ice Hockey include the provision of opportunities to participate in the sport, without introducing prejudice regarding financial background. It is an unavoidable fact, however, that fundamentally Ice Hockey is an expensive activity to pursue in London. This is due to the presence of 2 appropriate ice rinks (only 1 of which is in close proximity to Imperial's South Kensington campus, where our equipment is stored), that cater to over 30 teams comprising professional, recreational and university teams as well as public skating sessions.

The high costs are largely borne by our members. In the 2014/15 academic year, the average member will spend £337.27 across two categories: essential (and therefore subsidised) activities such as training, match participation and insurance; and non-essential (unsubsidised) expenditure such as team jerseys and socials. This does not take into account the typical £100 expenditure on ice skates that first-year members will also be faced with. Our retention rates from our "Give It A Go: Learn To Play" sessions are typically low, reflecting the deterring nature of these costs.

For the 2015/16 academic year (with current allocations), the average member will spend £391.28 - a 16% increase. The extra deterrent that this represents will likely reduce the number of members we can achieve. Our primary source of expenditure, ice rink hire, is not scaleable. It is not possible for us to hire less than 1 ice rink for a training session, therefore our expenditure will not decrease with falling membership. As such, we will need to raise the cost per member for these sessions even further. This will have another knock-on effect on our membership, forming a cycle which could irreversibly cripple our club.

Whilst I recognise CSPB's stance on ground hire subsidy rates, the current level of 21% is well below the 35% applied in the 2014/15 academic year. Implementing such drastic changes to a club's finances this quickly is very difficult to plan around, especially given the high cost and essential nature of the activity in our club's case.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that any such future decisions should be made with a view to implementation 1 or 2 years down the line. This would allow affected clubs and societies time in which to research and experiment with appropriate strategies that would allow them to adapt to the new budgetary constraints.

Proposal: To award RCC Ice Hockey £637.15 from CSPB funds held for appeals, in order to raise allocations for budget lines A-134-710-1 and A-134-710-2 to the 35% subsidy rate given for ground hire in the 2014/15 academic year.

From: [Lamzed-Short, Andrew](#)
To: [Abigail de Bruin - ICU Deputy President \(Clubs & Societies\)](#)
Subject: Re: Budgeting Appeals - Final Reminder
Date: 10 March 2015 16:52:39

Hello Abi,

I'm the President of LegoSoc and I believe that we should receive an appeal for the following reasons:

- All the current committee members are brand new to the job and have never tried to organise the running of a society before, and the previous committee all left Imperial and thus we didn't have sufficient knowledge to start out with - we weren't able to fill in the membership targets as we just weren't aware of where it was or that we had to do it
- Lego bricks are fairly expensive, and being a fairly new society we don't have many bricks of our own at the moment, and being able to appeal the money would enable us to finally buy more and have a sensible amount per person in the club.
- We have great plans to do big things. With the money in our account at the start of the year we were able to fund a trip to a Lego Art exhibition, as well as the dome of our scale Queen's Tower build that we are hoping to get going as our first project as a society so we can gain popularity and notice as a society, as not many people know about us.

We have estimated that we need around £350, possibly more as we've not finalised next year's plans or finalised the design of the Queen's Tower yet, and it will go almost exclusively towards funding general use and Queen's Tower bricks, as well as subsidising ticket costs for a trip to LegoLand Windsor and other costs that come with that (minibus etc).

Many thanks,
Andrew Lamzed-Short

From: icu-allclubofficers-bounces@imperial.ac.uk <icu-allclubofficers-bounces@imperial.ac.uk> on behalf of Abigail de Bruin - ICU Deputy President (Clubs & Societies) <dpcs@imperial.ac.uk>
Sent: 10 March 2015 14:37
To: icu-allclubofficers
Subject: [ICU-AllClubOfficers] Budgeting Appeals - Final Reminder

Hi all,

Just a final reminder that any budget appeals are due by **5pm today**. If your club really can't operate on what has been allocated for 2015/16 this is your only chance to appeal the decision – the appeals pot is not big and has to cover all appeals for all 350 societies so please do only apply if you genuinely think you could not survive as a society without further funding. To apply, please submit a written application stating exactly why you should receive an appeal, how much and what it will be used for **to me** before 5pm.

If you have submitted an appeal, please make sure that you or a member of your club committee will be able to attend the meeting of CSPB (Clubs, Societies & Projects Board) on March 17 at 6pm.

Also a reminder to [vote](#) in the big elections! This is your chance to decide who gets to annoy you with these emails and make some of the biggest decisions affecting you guys – make sure your voice is heard! Some of the societies are roaring ahead compared to the rest of the student population in voter turnout and I'm really impressed, keep voting guys!

Best wishes,

Abi de Bruin

Deputy President (Clubs & Societies)

Imperial College Union
Beit Quadrangle
Prince Consort Road
South Kensington
London SW7 2BB

tel: +44 (0)20 75948060

email: dpcs@imperial.ac.uk

web: www.imperialcollegeunion.org



From: [RSM Treasurer - Matthew Pike](#)
To: [Alex Savell - ICU Deputy President \(Finance & Services\)](#); [Abigail de Bruin - ICU Deputy President \(Clubs & Societies\)](#)
Subject: RSM Exec appeal
Date: 10 March 2015 16:58:02

Hi Alex & Abi,

Cutting it fine to 5pm I know, time just flew by...

We'd like to make an appeal for our Bottle Match allocation for next year (£1172.41 travel + £680.50 accommodation = £1852.91). Appeal to £2000 total (slightly under our cap).

In 2013/14, the year we last had an 'away' Bottle Match, RSM Exec received a total Union grant of £2060 for all activities. At this time the mining and oil and gas industries was doing well, and we got £2000 in sponsorship, yet RSM still made a loss of £2000 for Bottle Match that year.

Sponsorship as of late has been very bleak - BP gave us £650 after we asked for £3000 - so we are more reliant on funds from our departments, and alumni.

Away Bottle Match typically costs at least £13,000. Say we increase ticket prices to £55 for players (low to gain incentive to make it to the team) and £65 for supporters. We'll ignore the uproar this will cause and pretend everyone will be happy to pay such a price - although in reality people will not be happy to pay this for a weekend. 85 players + 65 supporters (which is VERY ambitious) totals £7416.60 after VAT. Thus we are left with a shortfall of around £5500.

Donations from departments and alumni would total around £2000, but I would feel very pessimistic about more than £1000 sponsorship, if any. No more are the days when Rio Tinto would throw money at us.

Camborne School of Mines are reliant on us to attract enough members to bring down to Cornwall - they go through the effort of booking out their Union and the Falmouth rugby club stadium. Realistically, we need supporters there just as much as players. Could you imagine Imperial Varsity without the supporters or provisions for them? It's unwritten, but the aims of the RSM sports teams are to beat the CSM and we want to make this event as accessible to many people as we can! It's the second oldest varsity event in the world, (only The Boat Race is older) so I think it deserves some form of discretion and protection with support from ICU.

Hope this can suffice.

Regards,

Matt Pike

Treasurer | Royal School of Mines Union

Room 2.27A, RSM Building
Prince Consort Road
SW7 2BP

SCC Budgeting Appeal

The SCC Treasurer (Lauren Anders) and SCC Chair (Tom Rivlin) would like to appeal against the decision to not award clubs that did not submit a membership target any funding for 2015/16. We have spoken to the clubs in question since the budget submission deadline and we can assure CSPB that the clubs do intend to charge for membership in 2015/16 – the lack of membership target was in error.

The following table shows the SCC clubs that did not submit a membership target, including the intended membership target/cost as far as we are aware. Some clubs have yet to submit a membership target to us, but we are confident that these clubs are not requesting a grant anywhere close to the £100/member limit imposed during the CSPB meeting on 17th February. This table also shows the final Management Group (MG) allocation prior to the CSPB budgeting meetings for each club, as well as the final 23% MG allocation and the proposed amount to be appealed for.

Club	Members hip target	Membership cost (£)	Final MG allocation (£)	23% of MG allocation (£)	Appealed amount (£)
ABACUS	100	3	526	120.98	120
Ahmadiyya	25	2	30	6.90	30
Anime	70	4	150	34.50	50
Christian Union	50	7	1630	374.90	400
Debating	50	8	1100	253	600
Feminist	25	3	140	32.20	50
Krishna			130	29.90	50
Labour	25	2	200	46	50
Lego			70	16.10	50
Quiz	20	2	615	141.45	150
Rock & Metal			30	6.90	30
Total			4621	1062.83	1580

Most of the amounts requested in this appeals paper are small. The largest appealed amount is for the Debating society of £600; we have been assured that this £600 is absolutely essential to their survival as a club, due to the cost of traveling to various debating events.

We are confident that awarding each of the clubs outlined above £0 will have serious consequences on the club's ability to run successfully during 2015/16. As a zero membership target was submitted in error, we believe that these clubs should be considered at the CSPB budgeting appeals meeting on 17th March and awarded some grant for 2015/16.

Starcraft Society Budget Appeal

To date we have received no grant of any kind. We would like to appeal our line 'Guest Starcraft 2 account for members who want to try the game before buying it.' We have a strong core of members, but after we get a wave of freshers at the beginning of the academic year, it is very difficult to get new members. This is in part due to the monetary barrier to the game. We believe buying an account that members who don't have their own account can use will allow us to attract more members and get more people interested in the game; this will help our society a lot in both short-term and long-term. We require £40 which is the price of an account.

RCC Surf Budget Appeal

David Leonard, RCC Surf President

10 March 2015

This year's subsidy

RCC Surf's budget for next year (£2,374) has been cut by £687. This represents a cut of 22% from the total received by surf society last year (£3,058).

Club activity

RCC surf club has shown consistent growth over the last few years. We expect to see this trend continue this year with over 60 members (currently 47) by the summer tour - our most popular annual trip. We understand that there is competition for budget for a number of other well run and valuable clubs. For us to be able to provide well run events for an increasing number of students we need greater financial support than has currently been allocated to us.

Comment [E1]: I don't understand why you expect 13 new members in the last term? Is this realistic? Did this happen last year?

The reason for the growth of the club is due to the annual calendar of club events becoming more established. The first summer tour was added to the calendar in 2013? Followed by the first winter tour in 2014? The trips abroad provide a fantastic opportunity for students to surf in new locations, and have significantly improved the surf club in terms of ability and as a community.

The surf society currently has the following 3 primary areas which are subsidised:

- 4x Weekend trip to Cornwall/Devon/Wales - costs include minibus + fuel, accommodation and surf hire. The trip numbers vary from a full minibus (16?) up to 45 surfers on the fresher's trip.
- Summer and winter tours - costs include flights + airport transfers and a 1 week surf/accommodation/food package. Winter tour consists of approximately 20 surfers, summer tour approx. 30 surfers.
- BUCS surf competition - costs include minibus + fuel, accommodation, surf hire and competition entries. Approximately 15 surfers.

Comment [E2]: Richard's comment on how you deduce your budget.

Comment [E3]: Make it clear you are talking about the surf comp.

Impact on the club

With a reduced budget next year, the RCC Surf club will either have to increase the price of trips or reduce the number of surf trips available to members in order to maintain affordable prices. Our likely action would be to increase the price of trips, as opposed to reducing their number. With only 4 weekend trips (2x Autumn term, 2x Spring term) available to members it has been found long periods between trips really impacted the club as a social community. We are understandably concerned about putting the trips outside of the reasonable price range for some students.

Due to the large amount of travel associated with being a London surf club, the increase in price of trips has a compounded effect. Increasing trip prices it will not always be possible to fill minibuses and accommodation, increasing the cost per person further since the club will effectively be paying for empty beds and empty seats to Cornwall and back.

The reduced budget allocation will result in a reduction in the hire subsidy provided by the club. The surf club does have a tendency to struggle with beginner members - the travelling combined with 8 degree water in winter is a noticeable barrier already. The committee and more experienced members gladly help new members to learn, but cannot help when it comes to financial hurdles

One of the key aims of the club is to continue to provide affordable opportunities for students to learn to surf.

CSPB Allocation

With a predicted expenditure of £29,116 for 2015/16, the allocated budget will subsidise club expenses by only 8.1%. According to the "CSPB Budget Allocations for 2015-16", the average subsidy for RCC clubs receiving funding is 18.3%.

Some clubs do not require much money to run and so I understand these figures are not necessarily representative of clubs such as the Surf Society with a predicted expenditure of £29,000. I have provided the budget allocation of RCC clubs with similar predicted expenditure for comparison.

Club	Members (02/03/15)	Predicted cost	Requested subsidy	Final CSPB Allocation	Percentage subsidy
RCC Canoe (105)	52	£15,594.50	£6,615.00	£3,373.73	21.63
RCC Caving (106)	38	£28,905.89	£7,917.49	£3,911.55	13.53
RCC Gliding (112)	105	£49,861.00	£20,957.85	£12,593.60	25.26
RCC Ice Hockey (134)	41	£20,288.42	£6,866.39	£4,637.15	22.86
RCC Mountaineering (116)	109	£39,377.50	£4,733.63	£3,322.93	8.44
RCC Outdoor Club (120)	75	£16,685.00	£5,507.20	£3,360.21	20.14
RCC Surf (685)	46	£29,116.00	£5,400.00	£2,374.06	8.15
RCC Underwater (126)	46	£52,946.18	£16,935.00	£8,706.34	16.44
				average	18.33

Looking at the table above, it appears RCC Surf is receiving noticeably less than the other despite being in a similar position to other clubs in terms of predicted cost and relative number of members.

It would be great to know why this appears to be the case and how next year's committee can help surf society towards the position of other clubs with a higher level of subsidy.

Our appeal

I am requesting that RCC Surf is considered for £600 of the £6,000 pot, enabling the club to function successfully. The money would be spent subsidising weekend trips (mostly minibus fees, fuel to Cornwall and back, weekend hostel accommodation and hire). This will enable the club to fill minibuses for more efficient spending and provide affordable hire to beginners needing to rent equipment. This would result in affordable trips to the coast and an affordable experience for beginner surfers who will ultimately carry on the legacy of the club.

Regarding particular lines that need topping up, we are unable to give details as the 2015-16 surf budget information is not complete on eactivities. A screenshot of the surf society budget submission page taken at 16:35, 10/03/15 has been added to the back of the document.

Summary

- RCC surf club has shown consistent growth over the last few years and requires the grant to sustain our community and accessibility.
- The planned reduction to RCC Surf's budget will force next year's committee to either increase the price of weekend trips or reduce the number of trips (from only 4 per year).
- A reduced budget would result in less efficient spending due to difficulty filling minibuses/accommodation, having a compounded impact.
- We are very reluctant to decrease the level of subsidy for beginners, as it reduces the accessibility of our sport.
- We are appealing for £600 to match last year's budget, allowing the club to operate effectively.

Comment [E4]: Stating the obvious?

Thank you for taking the time to consider our appeal and we look forward to hearing from you.

Download Budgeting Lines:



Description	Category	Rank within Category	Predicted Cost (£)	Predicted Income (£)	Subsidy (£)	Budgeting Board Applying To	Initial Management Group Predicted Cost (£)	Initial Management Group Allocation (£)	CSPB Predicted Cost (£)	CSPB Allocation (£)	Management Group Comments
Coach Hire for Freshers surf trip	Travel Expenditure	2 - Important	1,600.00	0.00	400.00	CSPB - A	1,600.00	400.00	0.00	0.00	
BUCS Minibus Hire. 1 minibus for 4 ...	Travel Expenditure	3 - Average Importance	500.00	0.00	150.00	CSPB - B	500.00	150.00	0.00	0.00	
Minibus Hire for 4 weeks We aim ...	Travel Expenditure	1 - Most Important	3,000.00	0.00	1,800.00	CSPB - A	3,000.00	1,200.00	0.00	0.00	
BUCS Accommodation 15 people. 3 nig..	Ground Hire	3 - Average Importance	675.00	0.00	200.00	CSPB - A	675.00	200.00	0.00	0.00	
Freshers trip Accommodation 45 peop..	Ground Hire	2 - Important	1,350.00	0.00	500.00	CSPB - A	1,350.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	
Hostel accommodation for 4 weekend L..	Ground Hire	1 - Most Important	3,000.00	0.00	1,200.00	CSPB - A	3,000.00	1,200.00	0.00	0.00	
Winter tour Likely to be morocco ag..	Ground Hire	5 - Least Important	7,500.00	0.00	0.00	CSPB - C	7,500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Summer tour Likely to be France/Port...	Ground Hire	4 - Minimal Importance	9,000.00	0.00	0.00	CSPB - C	9,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Hire. The club policy is to charge ...	Equipment & Repair	1 - Most Important	2,660.00	0.00	800.00	CSPB - A	1,330.00	380.00	0.00	0.00	Math error, cost is £1,330 rather t...
Surf Lessons. Just for freshers tri...	Instructors	1 - Most Important	500.00	0.00	200.00	CSPB - A	500.00	170.00	0.00	0.00	
Socials Depending on the event. (Bc...	Consumables	1 - Most Important	400.00	0.00	0.00	CSPB - C	400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
BUCS competition entries. £29 per p...	Competitions	1 - Most Important	261.00	0.00	150.00	CSPB - A	261.00	99.18	0.00	0.00	
			30,446.00	0.00	5,400.00		29,116.00	4,299.18	0.00	0.00	

Imperial College Synchronised Swimming Budgetting Appeal

Purpose of the appeal:

Following the annual budgeting allocation we would like to appeal regarding the subsidy received for our weekly pool rentals. The lines this appeal refers to are partly copied below (ID: A-150-710-1 and A-150-710-2).

We realise that the budgeting process is a arduous one, and we would not appeal if we did not believe that the current allocation will substantially damage the activities of our club.

Reasons for the appeal (*more details are given at the end of this paper*):

1. Weekly pool rental is our main expense and relates to our main activity and its subsidy was reduced by 59% - this will force us to reduce our activities significantly throughout the year, and cancel our summer term activities.
2. While our overall budget hasn't decreased much, this is because we are expending our activities (taking part in another competition) and we cannot simply redirect the money allocated for this new purpose to ground hire.
3. Our fees for regular training have been increasing regularly every year and are currently 60% more than 4 years ago. We feel that increasing our fee for this activity any more will only be detrimental to the club and lead to a decrease in the number of members.

Overall we feel that such a small subsidy for our ground hire will not be viable for the club.

Proposal:

Allocating an additional £400 towards weekly ground hire for IC Synchronised Swimming, splitting it as follows:

- **£300 for line A-150-710-1**
- **£100 for line A-150-710-2**

Corresponding to a reduction of a little more than 20% compared to the allocation from 2014-2015 for these same expenses, a reduction in budget that matches the overall decrease in budget allocation for RCC clubs this year.

Details of the reasons for the appeal:

Weekly pool rental is our main expense and relates to our main activity and its subsidy was reduced by more than 50% - this will force us to reduce our activities significantly throughout the year, and cancel our summer term activities.

Our 2014-2015 subsidies towards weekly ground hire is £1026. As things stand, the allocation for 2015-2016 will only be £422.73 for the same amount of training. This is *a decrease of 58.8%*.

This year (as usual) we will use all of our grant allocation and a big part of our SGI (all of the membership fees and term fees and some of the money we had on the side from previous years) towards our weekly training pool rental cost. We will also use more of our SGI for some additional training sessions in ethos that we found necessary to be ready for the competitions we are taking part in.

A typical student synchronised swimming team (such as those we compete against) trains three times a week for 2h. This is the amount of training ideally required for swimmers to retain the level of fitness and technical ability that they gain during each training session. We only train for 1h30 once a week most of the year and increase the training to twice a week for a few months prior to competitions.

Reducing the amount of training to any less than what we currently do would go against our aims and objectives as our swimmers would not be able to progress in their practice of the sport, they would only stagnate at a level slightly above beginner.

The current allocation would force us to cancel our second training per week during the months leading to the competitions and to cancel our summer term training. Students who join us in the summer term only will not be able to participate anymore, therefore reducing the impact of the club on student life significantly.

The lack of additional training prior to competitions will make it more difficult for a team to be ready on time and especially for new members to progress enough to take part in the competition. This would probably mean that only a few of our members would be able to compete, most probably only more advanced members, and they would take part in the solo or duet sections only.

While our overall budget hasn't decreased much, this is because we are expending our activities (taking part in another competition) and we cannot simply redirect the money allocated for this new purpose to ground hire.

In previous years we started to take part in a competition in France, the French University Championship. In order to prepare for that, we increased our trainings to twice a week.

This year, because a lot of new members wanted to compete we also registered for an international master competition in Paris, where our team is accepted despite not being affiliated to the ASA and despite including a male swimmer. As the club is becoming

more active we are planning to go to this competition every year in the future. We therefore apply for funding for this activity.

As funding for the competition has been granted our overall budget does not seem to be decreased too much, however, redirecting the money we usually spend in round hire to travel expenses is not a solution as this will lead to less time to prepare for such a competition and probably keep us from participating as a team.

Our fees for regular training have been increasing regularly every year and are currently 60% more than 4 years ago. We feel that increasing our fee for this activity any more will only be detrimental to the club and lead to a decrease in the number of members.

Synchronised swimming is not a very common sport in the UK, and although people who try it get hooked fairly quickly, it is more difficult to get people to commit to pay a fairly high fee for a sport they do not really know. Therefore, increasing our fee even more would lead to more difficulties to find enough new student members.

We think that the beauty of imperial college union is the diversity in the activities it proposes to its members, and feel that supporting slightly less commonplace clubs would help it keep this characteristic. This can be done by allocating enough money to these clubs to keep their fees attractive to people wanting to discover something completely new and slightly unusual.

Lines the appeal refers to:

ID	Description	Cost	Income	Subsidy	MG alloc.	CSPB alloc.
A-150-710-1	<p>WEEKLY POOL RENTALS</p> <p>1h30 pool rental in ethos once per week for three terms. This is our main training, all our members come. This year we train at St Mary's because ethos was not available, but ethos would greatly benefit our club as freshers would be more likely to join, and our members themselves would benefit from training in a full size pool, allowing them to fully experience synchronised swimming.</p> <p>Cost: $\text{£}31.5 \times 1.5 \times 33 = \text{£}1559.25$.</p> <p>Income: Term fee: $\text{£}15$ per term per member, assuming 26 members join for one term and 8 of them train all year (numbers based on years 2011/12 and 2012/13; 2013/14 is assumed to be an anomaly and not representative) = $15 \times 26 + 15 \times 8 \times 2 = \text{£}630$.</p> <p>SGI, from membership: $\text{£}9$ for 25 members minus 20% VAT = $\text{£}180$.</p> <p>Subsidy required: $1559.25 - 630 - 180 = \text{£}749.25$</p>	1559.25	810	749.25	623.7	327.4425
A-150-710-2	<p>WEEKLY POOL RENTALS</p> <p>1h30 pool rental in St. Mary's once per week during the second term only to allow for more preparation towards the competition. (Competitions are essential to allow our members to really enjoy their sport but also to ensure we keep the support we currently have from sport imperial) Cost: $\text{£}27.5 \times 1.5 \times 11 = \text{£}453.75$</p> <p>Income: $\text{£}8$ additional per member deciding to take part in those trainings (increase of $\text{£}3$ compared to this year). Based on 10 members choosing that: $\text{£}8 \times 10 = \text{£}80$. SGI, from</p>	453.75	217	236.75	181.5	95.2875

	end of year show tickets: 50 tickets, £5 each, minus VAT and minus cost of renting pool: $50 \times 5 \times 0.8 - 63 = \text{£}137$. Subsidy required: $453.75 - 80 -$ $137 = \text{£}236.75$					
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

The budget for ICUC got cut down significantly from £12.5K last to £8.7K this year, and this could significantly affect the club next year with this limited funding.

Equipment servicing **(A126-685-1)** is vital to diving safety, as equipment failure underwater could lead to fatal accidents. All regulators and breathing apparatus must be serviced annually in order to ensure that they are safe to use, and to prevent any malfunctions underwater. By law, cylinders must also be serviced every 30 months, whereas Nitrox EANx cylinders must be serviced every 15 months, to make sure the cylinders are safe to use. The subsidy level is currently at 40%, and we would like it increase this to **50%**, and for this particular activity the amount we are appealing for is **£351.50**.

The club air compressor **(A126-685-2)** must be inspected and serviced annually to comply with legislation, and to ensure that the air fills are safe to breathe.

The club owns three boats: one RIB and two inflatable boats, which are regularly used for club trips and training trips. Boat servicing **(A126-685-3)** is vital to ensure that the boats are safe to use in water, and maintenance is carried out by external professional companies. Failure to do so would cause breakdowns in unhelpful situations, eg at sea, which could incur an even higher maintenance cost in the future. The subsidy level is currently at 43%, and we would like it to increase this to **50%**, and for this particular activity the amount we are appealing for is **£82.21**.

The club run weekly training sessions and regularly trips to seas and various inland sites, which causes the equipment to be exposed in harsh conditions frequently. This would result in deterioration of diving equipment, and we would need to replace a few piece of equipment every year. **(A126-685-4)** The subsidy level is currently at 35%, and we would like to increase this to **50%**, and for this particular activity we are appealing for **£330**.

We also require some spare components **(B126-640-3)**, in order to undergo minor maintenance of the club equipments. Without these it would result in equipments which are malfunctioning but are easy to be repaired by club members. This would also reduce the need for equipment to be sent out to repaired for minor malfunctions. We have asked for a 30% subsidy initially for this activity, but did not receive any subsidy for this, therefore we would like to appeal for our initial amount of **£129.60**.

In total, we would like to appeal for **£903.54**.

Activity	Predicted cost	Allocated	Subsidy for 2015-16 %	Proposed subsidy %	New allocated	Amount appealed for
Equipment servicing	£3,515.00	£1,406.00	40.00%	50.00%	£1,757.50	£351.50
Compressor service	£1,060.00	£519.77	49.03%	50.00%	£530.00	£10.23
Boat servicing	£1,200.00	£517.79	43.15%	50.00%	£600.00	£82.21
Equipment	£2,200.00	£770.00	35.00%	50.00%	£1,100.00	£330.00

rolling replacement						
Spare components	£432.00	£0.00	0.00%	30.00%	£129.60	£129.60
					Total	£903.54

Budget appeal - ACC Wushu Society

Written by Amanda You (Wushu Treasurer), Henrik Hagemann (Wushu Chair) and Oliver Benton (ACC Chair)

CSPB Notes:

- Due to a mis-entered membership cost for ACC Wushu, £0 grant was automatically assigned for 2015-16.
- £10 membership cost was charged 2014-15 and will be charged in 2015-16
- A membership target of 20 is appropriate considering the amount of finalists. This is bolstered by a high associate membership count.
- Students and young instructors are hired to keep costs as low as possible.
- ACC Wushu was allocated £665 last year.
- The amount of money in the appeals pot is limited to ~£6000.

CSPB believes:

- ACC Wushu should not be unfairly penalised for a small, almost typographical mistake, that was overlooked at club level and was not queried at either MG and DP level.
- It is unfair to push more of the cost of the core activity, Wushu Instruction, onto the members of ACC Wushu

CSPB resolves:

- To fund A-45-735-1, at slightly lower than the initial budgeting allocation for instructors, $15\% \text{ } \pounds 2790 \times 0.207 = \pounds 418.5$