



OCTOBER 13TH REPORT OF THE FUNDING COMMITTEE TO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

CURRENT STATE: Evaluation of previous funding protocols has revealed that the current process utilizing Wufoo is fragmented, overly complex, and requires a great deal of staff time.

WE ARE AMELIORATING THE FUNDING PROCESS TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE:

- using our staff time wisely;
- making sure that funds are dispersed in a timely fashion; and,
- making the funding application process as accessible and simple as possible.

THE MAJOR CHANGES INCLUDE:

- **Eliminating second instalments.**
 - o Upon evaluation we noted that the majority of applicants provided an accurate estimation of fund use in their application submissions, as such second instalment reports create an unnecessary burden on the resources of our funding staff and accounting departments.
 - o We are doing away with second instalments for applications under \$2000. This means that we will provide the full amount (100%) of funding upon approving the initial submission. We are capping at \$2000 to safeguard large disbursements. Around 20% of our applicants submit for amounts over \$2000.
 - o Accountability measures will be put in place through a final report submission (similar to the second instalment report).



- **Eliminating the “One Event, One Fund” rule**
 - o We found that the funding committee generally granted applicants funds from those that differed from what they applied to based on suitability and alignment with each of the 8 funds. As such the Funding Committee will now be making those decisions, allowing for less applications.
- **Deadlines will be rolling**
 - o We are committing to providing funding on a basis that better supports our clubs and services. Rather than having staggered deadlines for the various funds, we are committing to processing applications on a first come first serve basis and urgency (i.e. earlier event dates will be prioritized)

New Software!

In order to better serve our clubs and services, we have decided to move to a dedicated grant management platform. This is a standard method used across many institutions, and would align SSMU with our fellow universities across the country (e.g. U of T uses FluidReview, UOttawa and York use CommunityForce). This will allow us to:

- track applications;
- streamline and integrate processes between the funding and accounting staff;
- provide a comprehensive overview of club fund use to aid in our auditing process;
- allow us to process applications and disperse funds at a much faster rate; and,
- provide us with valuable data to inform the funding allocation process for years to come.



We have conducted demos and obtained trial software from 4 companies, those being:

- CommunityForce
- WhizHive
- FluidReview
- Fluxx

Based on price points (current budget being \$3000), we have narrowed our choices down to CommunityForce and WizeHive. There will be a final evaluation session next week and we hope to have a contract secured for rollout by November.

Current applications are being submitted through Wufoo and utilizing the prior funding process. We have received 15 applications thus far which will be ready for Funding Committee review next Thursday.

Respectfully Submitted,

Arisha Kahn

SSMU Funding Commissioner