Aurora Center for Advocacy and Education

Off-Year Update

Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $278,000
Recommended Allocation: $278,000

Comments: The Committee appreciates the call center’s expansion into texting based services. We believe that this will allow students more access to Aurora’s services. This is particularly appreciated in light of the recent uptick in crime.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) The Aurora Center provides an essential service to students in times of need. GDM: 1

2) The Aurora Center has been reached out to greater numbers of students across the University and expanded knowledge of its services. GDM: 4, 5

Directives: First, the Committee would like the Aurora Center to look into grant funding to alleviate the stress on student fees. Not too long ago the Aurora Center was fully funded by grants, but has since become mainly fee funded. We do not want the Aurora Center to give up looking for grant funding.

Another concern is the allocation of reserves and whether the money was going to a one-time cost or continual programing. The Committee wants to make sure that these do not become assumed costs that will be covered year to year.

The last concern is the programing at the Aurora Center. We want to see more programing targeted toward men as they are almost half of the student body. A few suggestions of programing toward men included men groups or speakers. Also we want future Committees to look at the effectiveness of the Step-Up programing.
Boynton Health Service

Off-Year Update
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $8,696,333  Recommended Allocation: $8,596,333

Comments: The Committee commends Boynton Health Service for its continued service to University students. Boynton’s response to the rising need for mental health specialists on campus has been quick, and the student fees-funded infrastructure implemented and operated by Boynton continues to offer invaluable support to students. We are impressed by Boynton’s ability to deal with increased demand in their clinics and their utilization of technology to provide their services more efficiently. The Committee also commends Boynton for its efforts to secure external funding, recognizing that grant-funded initiatives will benefit students.

In the future, the Committee would like to know how initiatives resulting from the ACA will affect Boynton. More specifically, how the laws will affect Boynton’s reliance on student fees.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Boynton provides invaluable services to all students as a campus health center. GDM: 1, 4, 5

2) Boynton has worked to secure funding outside of Student Services Fees.  GDM: 7

3) Boynton has fully justified its fees request.  GDM: 9
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Initial Recommendation

Committee Votes: 4-3-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568  Recommended Allocation: $118,068

Comments: The Committee recognizes the service that the Learning Abroad Center (LAC) provides for the University. We recognize the success of the LAC in obtaining external funding from their programming and grants. The Majority has approved the request of the LAC, with the exception of a $1,500 programming request entitled ‘Student Aid’, under the premise that this program serves only 3-5 students.

The recommended allocation is solely the initial recommendation of this process and may be increased or decreased at the discretion of the Committee through further deliberation.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) ‘Student Aid’ does not reach out to and/or serve a wide audience.  GDM: 4, 5

2) LAC serves the academic curriculum of the University and aids in fostering a sense of community among student participants. It does so by developing many quality programs that serve many students.  GDM: 1, 2, 3

3) The LAC’s general programming reaches out to a diverse range of students  GDM: 4

4) The Committee questions whether or not the LAC targets its programs and services to all who have a need for them, specifically graduate students.  GDM: 5

5) The LAC secures funding outside of the Student Service Fee through various fees for its programming charged to and paid for by the program users.  GDM: 7

5) The essential nature of the advising staff, as well as the value of the peer advising position has been demonstrated.  GDM: 10

Directives: The Committee showed concern for the lack of commitment of the LAC toward serving graduate-level students, who are included amongst fee paying students. Thus, the Committee would like more information about the services available to graduate-level students, and whether or not it is practical for the LAC to include this group in their services, and furthermore, in their advertising efforts.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Initial Recommendation

Committee Votes: 4-3-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568
Recommended Allocation: $118,068

Comments: The Committee recognizes the service that the Learning Abroad Center (LAC) provides for the University. We recognize the success of the LAC in obtaining external funding from their programming and grants. The Majority has approved the request of the LAC, with the exception of a $1,500 programming request entitled ‘Student Aid’, under the premise that this program serves only 3-5 students.

The recommended allocation is solely the initial recommendation of this process and may be increased or decreased at the discretion of the Committee through further deliberation.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) ‘Student Aid’ does not reach out to and/or serve a wide audience. GDM: 4, 5

2) LAC serves the academic curriculum of the University and aids in fostering a sense of community among student participants. It does so by developing many quality programs that serve many students. GDM: 1, 2, 3

3) The LAC’s general programming reaches out to a diverse range of students GDM: 4

4) The Committee questions whether or not the LAC targets its programs and services to all who have a need for them, specifically graduate students. GDM: 5

5) The LAC secures funding outside of the Student Service Fee through various fees for its programming charged to and paid for by the program users. GDM: 7

5) The essential nature of the advising staff, as well as the value of the peer advising position has been demonstrated. GDM: 10

Directives: The Committee showed concern for the lack of commitment of the LAC toward serving graduate-level students, who are included amongst fee paying students. Thus, the Committee would like more information about the services available to graduate-level students, and whether or not it is practical for the LAC to include this group in their services, and furthermore, in their advertising efforts.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Minority Opinion

Committee Vote: 4-3-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568  Recommended Allocation: $118,068

Comments: While the Minority agrees with the elimination of the $1,500 ‘Student Aid’ expenditure. We maintain three main concerns.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) There does not seem to be a commitment to graduate and professional student programing. While graduate and professional students may not have the same study abroad, internship, and volunteer needs as undergraduate students, they pay the same amount in the Student Service Fee (SFF) and should be offered programs and services similar to opportunities afforded to undergraduate students. GDM 2, 4, 6

2) The Minority contends that programs and services currently funded by the SSF could be funded in alternative manners without affecting quality. See “Directives”. GDM 7, 8

3) The Minority is concerned that the SSF is used to subsidize or offset normal administrative costs for the LAC. Specifically, fees are currently funding $18,166.56 in undergraduate peer advisors. Likewise, the Minority was not provided data that demonstrated that the partial funding for 7 full-time staff members was providing benefits consistent with the amount of funding provided. GDM 3, 8

Directives:
The Minority would like more information as to the impact and effectiveness of programs and services. The majority of the LAC presentation focused on study abroad programming, when in reality, the Student Service Fee is only providing funding for non-credit based opportunities.

The Minority would like the LAC to explore alternative models for funding these programs. Using reliable online providers instead of vetting the programs individually could reduce programming labor costs. Alternatively, charging volunteer/internship program users a nominal fee to use these services through the University could reduce general student fee dependence.

The Minority would also like the LAC to make a substantial commitment to engaging graduate and professional students. If it is determined that the LAC is not able to provide opportunities for these students based on their unique needs and/or the capacity of the LAC, then the minority would encourage the elimination of graduate and professional students from this particular fee requirement.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Years 2015-2016
Minority Opinion

Committee Vote: 4-3-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568
Recommended Allocation: $118,068

Comments: While the minority agrees with the elimination of the $1,500 ‘Student Aid’ expenditure. We maintain three main concerns.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) There does not seem to be a commitment to graduate and professional student programming. While graduate and professional students may not have the same study abroad, internship, and volunteer needs as undergraduate students, they pay the same amount in the Student Service Fee (SFF) and should be offered programs and services similar to opportunities afforded to undergraduate students. GDM 2, 4, 6

2) The Minority contends that programs and services currently funded by the SSF could be funded in alternative manners without affecting quality. See “Directives”. GDM 7, 8

3) The Minority is concerned that the SSF is used to subsidize or offset normal administrative costs for the LAC. Specifically, fees are currently funding $18,166.56 in undergraduate peer advisors. Likewise, the Minority was not provided data that demonstrated that the partial funding for 7 full-time staff members was providing benefits consistent with the amount of funding provided. GDM 3, 8

Directives:
The Minority would like more information as to the impact and effectiveness of programs and services. The majority of the LAC presentation focused on study abroad programming, when in reality, the Student Service Fee is only providing funding for non-credit based opportunities.

The Minority would like the LAC to explore alternative models for funding these programs. Using reliable online providers instead of vetting the programs individually could reduce programming labor costs. Alternatively, charging volunteer/internship program users a nominal fee to use these services through the University could reduce general student fee dependence.

The Minority would also like the LAC to make a substantial commitment to engaging graduate and professional students. If it is determined that the LAC is not able to provide opportunities for these students based on their unique needs and/or the capacity of the LAC, then the minority would encourage the elimination of graduate and professional students from this particular fee requirement.
The Minnesota Daily

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 5-3-0
Requested Allocation: $505,000  
Recommended Allocation: $383,529

Comments: The Committee commends the Daily for continued service to the University and recognizes the breadth of the Daily’s impact. The unit aids the fostering of a sense of community among students. Moving forward, we are in favor of the Daily developing their proposed mobile app and believe the unit’s excess of reserves should be put toward that task. There is concern that budgeted travel does not directly impact a broad enough range of students. Moreover, while we recognize the Daily is proposing a decrease in papers printed, the current 43% rate of paper returns is too large considering the costs in print and distribution. Lastly, we recognize the goal to maintain 6 months of reserves. However, the Daily is currently beyond this reserve goal.

The recommended allocation is solely the initial recommendation of this process and it may be increased or decreased at the discretion of the Committee through further deliberation.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) The Daily provides quality service to students and fosters community.  GDM: 1, 2

2) The Daily provides a service that is in demand by many at the University and serves a broad variety of students.  GDM: 3, 4,

3) The Daily works to secure funding outside of the Student Service Fee.  GDM: 7

4) The extent of printing and distribution does not appear to be consistent with the demand of University students.  GDM: 6

5) There is no demonstration that travel costs for a small group of students has benefits for the broader student body. GDM: 4, 5

6) The Daily has an excess of reserves. GDM: 9

Directives: The Committee hopes to see the Minnesota Daily move forward with the development of its mobile app. The Committee wishes to understand the scope of the travel budget request and its benefit to fee paying students. The Committee would like to see a printing and distribution budget that targets a decreased rate of returns. Finally, the Committee would like to see the Daily commit to a 6-month reserves budget as discussed.
Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Minority Opinion

Committee Vote: 5-3-0
Requested Allocation: $505,000
Recommended Allocation: $505,000

Comments: The Minority differs in opinion on the matter of how much money should be left in the Daily’s reserve account. We believe that reserve cuts should be lower than that proposed by the Majority. We believe that initially recommended cuts could put the Daily in financial trouble.

For example, one of the reasons cited by the Majority for reducing reserves was because the large number of unread newspapers and subsequently high return rates. We learned that in the newspaper business there needs to be a certain number of newspapers on the rack to encourage readership pick up. While we do not like to see waste, we realize that this is part of the newspaper business.

The Minority would like to see the Daily use the reserves to establish an iPhone application estimated to cost around $100,000, but then refrain from building reserves back up to current levels. We believe that future Committees should reexamine the Daily’s reserves on an annual basis.
Northrop Concerts & Lectures

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $480,629.78  
Recommended Allocation: $150,600

Comments: The Committee was pleased to see and hear about Northrop’s newly renovated space and the opportunities it will offer for students. We commend Northrop for its year-round programming, specifically its pop-up events and “Push for Art” program.

The Committee decided to keep Northrop at its base level of funding for a number of reasons. Given that Northrop’s space has not been open for use, we could not justify funding new programs and initiatives without a demonstrated history. Additionally, the Committee determined that some of the new programs could be funded by diverting funds from events with relatively small student impact, such as the summer concerts. The Committee will leave fund reallocation to Northrop’s discretion and we encourage the unit to discuss the demonstrated success or popularity of any new initiative with future Committees.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Northrop provides a service to students by offering easy and affordable access to cultural and artistic events.  
GDM: 1

2) In addition to planning and executing events, Northrop offers a variety of internships open to students across all academic departments and units. 
GDM: 4

3) Northrop invests heavily in student engagement by utilizing the unit’s student group and student engagement coordinator. 
GDM: 1, 5

4) Many of the programs and initiatives proposed by Northrop for FY 15 and FY 16 have not yet been implemented. As such, the extent of the programs as well as their demand cannot be reliably determined. 
GDM: 3
Northrop Concerts & Lectures

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 5-2-0
Requested Allocation: $483,061.19  Recommended Allocation: $150,600

Comments: The Committee was pleased to see and hear about Northrop’s newly renovated space and the opportunities it will offer for students. We commend Northrop for its year-round programming, specifically its pop-up events and “Push for Art” program.

The Committee decided to keep Northrop at its base level of funding for a number of reasons. Given that Northrop’s space has not been open for use, we could not justify funding new programs and initiatives without a demonstrated history. Additionally, the Committee determined that some of the new programs could be funded by diverting funds from events with relatively small student impact, such as the summer concerts. The Committee will leave fund reallocation to Northrop’s discretion and we encourage the unit to discuss the demonstrated success or popularity of any new initiative with future Committees.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Northrop provides a service to students by offering easy and affordable access to cultural and artistic events.  
   GDM: 1

2) In addition to planning and executing events, Northrop offers a variety of internships open to students across all academic departments and units.  
   GDM: 4

3) Northrop invests heavily in student engagement by utilizing the unit’s student group and student engagement coordinator.  
   GDM: 1, 5

4) Many of the programs and initiatives proposed by Northrop for FY 15 and FY 16 have not yet been implemented. As such, the extent of the programs as well as their demand cannot be reliably determined.  
   GDM: 3
Northrop Concerts & Lectures

Fiscal Year 2014–2015
Minority Opinion

Committee Vote: 6-1-0

Requested Allocation: $480,629.76  Recommended Allocation: $170,000.00

Comments: While the Minority agreed with the majority that the request of $480,629.76 was too high, we believe that a marginal increase is justified. The opening of the $88 million renovation will allow Northrop to provide its services with a higher marginal value to a greater number of students. Additionally, we consider some initial funding for new projects to be important in adequately analyzing their success and considering long-term implementation.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Northrop has demonstrated constant monitoring of performance attendance and metrics of their success.  GDM: 2,3

2) Northrop functions with a large student involvement and non-student staff continues to be funded by other means than the Student Service Fee.  GDM: 9

3) The programs provided by Northrop could not be provided without fee allocation.  GDM: 7,8

Directives: The Minority urges Northrop to consider increments in request in a more conservative fashion with the aim or creating historical information that support adequate use of financial resources.
Northrop Concerts and Lectures

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Minority Opinion

Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $480,629.76
Recommended Allocation: $170,000.00

*Comments:* While the Minority agreed with the majority that the request of $480,629.76 was too high, we believe that a marginal increase is justified. The opening of the $88 million renovation will allow Northrop to provide its services with a higher marginal value to a greater number of students. Additionally, we consider some initial funding for new projects to be important in adequately analyzing their success and considering long-term implementation.

*The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:*

1) Northrop has demonstrated constant monitoring of performance attendance and metrics of their success. GDM: 2,3

2) Northrop functions with a large student involvement and non-student staff continues to be funded by other means than the Student Service Fee. GDM: 9

3) The programs provided by Northrop could not be provided without fee allocation. GDM: 7,8

*Directives:* The Minority urges Northrop to consider increments in request in a more conservative fashion with the aim or creating historical information that support adequate use of financial resources.
Radio K

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $246,644  Recommended Allocation: $232,999

Comments: The Committee is pleased with Radio K’s engagement of student volunteers. The Committee believes this is both fiscally responsible and provides a valuable learning and community-building opportunity for students.

The Committee appreciates the commitment from Radio K to secure $10,000 in funding through an alternative source for the radio tower inspection. However, the Committee remains concerned about the potential future implications a tower replacement would have on student fee requests.

The Committee is concerned about survey results that demonstrate low student listenership. The Nielsen ratings don’t differentiate between students and non-students, and no data was provided as to how many students are benefitting from on-campus programming or events.

The Committee would like more information regarding the $10,000 in the requested training budget. Specifically, we are concerned that the costs associated with sending 10 students to these 4 conferences and festivals seem high. We would like to understand how this expense provides an important benefit to the student body.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Radio K fosters community on the Twin Cities campus as a source of information and a guide to activities and events on campus and in the greater community. GDM: 1

2) The programming is of high quality and professionalism. GDM: 2

3) Radio K offers a wide programming mix catering to a diverse student body. GDM: 4, 5

4) Radio K’s pledge drive and efforts to fund their radio tower inspection show dedication to securing funding outside of student fees. GDM: 7

Directives: If the radio tower inspection demonstrates that replacement is needed, then the Committee would like a detailed report outlining the costs and benefits of doing so. If terrestrial radio is indeed a dying technology, then future Committees will need to understand how the benefits of investing in a replacement tower outweigh the cost of doing so.

For future presentations, more focus should be on how programming benefits the student body focus less on national awards and accolades. While these awards might demonstrate national recognition, they don’t necessarily translate into meaningful and substantial benefits for the student body as a whole.
Radio K
Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $250,344  Recommended Allocation: $232,999

Comments: The Committee is pleased with Radio K’s engagement of student volunteers. The Committee believes this is both fiscally responsible and provides a valuable learning and community-building opportunity for students.

The Committee appreciates the commitment from Radio K to secure $10,000 in funding through an alternative source for the radio tower inspection. However, the Committee remains concerned about the potential future implications a tower replacement would have on student fee requests.

The Committee is concerned about survey results that demonstrate low student listenership. The Nielsen ratings don’t differentiate between students and non-students, and no data was provided as to how many students are benefitting from on-campus programming or events.

The Committee would like more information regarding the $10,000 in the requested training budget. Specifically, we are concerned that the costs associated with sending 10 students to these 4 conferences and festivals seem high. We would like to understand how this expense provides an important benefit to the student body.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Radio K fosters community on the Twin Cities Campus as a source of information and a guide to activities and events on campus and in the greater community. GDM: 1

2) The programming is of high quality and professionalism. GDM: 2

3) Radio K offers a wide programming mix catering to a diverse student body. GDM: 4, 5

4) Radio K’s pledge drive and efforts to fund their radio tower inspection show dedication to securing funding outside of student fees. GDM: 7

Directives: If the radio tower inspection demonstrates that replacement is needed, then the Committee would like a detailed report outlining the costs and benefits of doing so. If terrestrial radio is indeed a dying technology, then future Committees will need to understand how the benefits of investing in a replacement tower outweigh the cost of doing so.

For future presentations, more focus should be on how programming is benefitting the student body focus less on national awards and accolades. While these awards might demonstrate national recognition, they don’t necessarily translate into meaningful and substantial benefits for the student body as a whole.


**Student Conflict Resolution Center**

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Initial Recommendation

*Committee Vote:* 7-0-0  
*Requested Allocation:* $315,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $315,000

*Comments:* The Committee finds that the Student Conflict Resolution Center (SCRC) provides a good value to students and provides excellent services. In doing this, SCRC uses their budget effectively and efficiently.

*The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:*

1) The Committee agrees that SCRC has continued to provide services of high quality and importance to students.  
   *GDM:* 2

2) SCRC has continued to reach a broad and growing array of students at all levels of their education.  
   *GDM:* 4

3) SCRC has provided data portraying their success in serving students.  
   *GDM:* 3

*Directives:* While we like the way the SCRC has reduced their reserves, we acknowledge that they need more funding. We would like them to continue to keep adequate reserves, but to keep them around current levels. Moreover, SCRC should try to promote their services more on campus. That said, we acknowledge that SCRC is at capacity.
**Student Conflict Resolution Center**

Fiscal Year 2015-2016  
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 7-0-0  
**Requested Allocation:** $322,000  
**Recommended Allocation:** $322,000

*Comments:* The Committee finds that the Student Conflict Resolution Center (SCRC) provides a good value to students and provides excellent services. In doing this, SCRC uses their budget effectively and efficiently.

*The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:*

1) The Committee agrees that SCRC has continued to provide services of high quality and importance to students.  
   GDM: 2

2) SCRC has continued to reach a broad and growing array of students at all levels of their education.  
   GDM: 4

3) SCRC has provided data portraying their success in serving students.  
   GDM: 3

*Directives:* While we like the way the SCRC has reduced their reserves, we acknowledge that they need more funding. We would like them to continue to keep adequate reserves, but to keep them around current levels. Moreover, SCRC should try to promote their services more on campus. That said, we acknowledge that SCRC is at capacity.
Student Union and Activities - Operating

Off Year Update
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $5,553,710
Recommended Allocation: $5,553,710

Comments: The Committee appreciates and congratulates the management of Student Union and Activities (SUA). We feel that SUA is critical to providing a sense of community on campus.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) SUA provides quality and widely known services to students. GDM: 2,4

2) SUA does an admirable job of seeking additional funding outside of student fees, while demonstrating the need for the Student Services Fee as well. GDM: 7,8

Directives: The Committee recommends that SUA seek to increase the ratio of 4 student employees to 1 full time employee; this directive is with the aim of improving cost efficiency and providing more student employment opportunities on campus. We also recommend that SUA find ways to target graduate/professional students and to create more mature programing.
**Student Union and Activities – Facility Support**

Off Year Update  
*Committee Vote:* 7-0-0  
*Requested Allocation:* $875,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $875,000

*Comments:* The Committee appreciates and congratulates the management of Student Union and Activities (SUA). We feel that SUA is critical to providing a sense of community on campus.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) SUA provides quality and widely known services to students.  
   - GDM: 2,4

2) SUA does an admirable job of seeking additional funding outside of student fees, while demonstrating the need for the Student Services Fee as well.  
   - GDM: 7,8
Student Union and Activities – Capital Planning & Enhancement

Off Year Update
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $3,716,516          Recommended Allocation: $3,716,516

Comments: The Committee appreciates and congratulates the management of Student Union and Activities (SUA). We feel that SUA is critical to providing a sense of community on campus.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) SUA provides quality and widely known services to students. GDM: 2, 4

2) SUA does an admirable job of seeking additional funding outside of student fees, while demonstrating the need for the Student Services Fees as well. GDM: 7, 8
University Recreation & Wellness – Operational & Facilities Fee

Off-Year Update
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $9,186,157  Recommended Allocation: $8,976,157

Comments: The Committee commends University Recreation and Wellness (URW) for completing their building expansion. The new facilities and services have been well received by students and provide a welcoming and inclusive space. Moreover, we appreciate the commitment to securing alternative forms of revenue, including internal sales and user fees for specific programs and services.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) The Committee recognizes that the various facilities managed by Recreational Sports require staff and other resources to operate and provide the programming they offer to the student body. These resources are used to maintain the quality of the programs and foster the student experience with Recreational Sports.  
   GDM: 1, 2, 3

2) The new expansion requires more staff to operate the facilities and programs. Recreational Sports is the largest employer of students on campus and the growing number of students and professionals employed by the program justifies the increase in operational fees that was approved the previous year.  
   GDM: 3

Directives: The Committee wants to encourage URW to continue to focus on user fees as alternative revenue, as focusing on people specifically using the facility has the potential to reduce the burden on the general Student Services Fee.
University Recreation & Wellness - Advancement Program

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Initial Recommendation

Committee Vote: 7-0-0  
Requested Allocation: $109,400  
Recommended Allocation: $0

Comments: The Committee commends University Recreation & Wellness (URW) for its efforts to acquire external funding through alumni donations. Although the fundamental goal of the Advancement Program is supported by the Committee, its current implementation is not.

After 3 years of receiving student fees, the program had not yielded enough of a return to justify continued funding. A key point of concern was the lack of a clear time-frame within which the Advancement Program would become self-sufficient. Another concern was that alumni typically donate to their respective colleges and it was therefore possible that the Advancement Program would continue to be funded through student fees for far longer than the given estimates.

The Committee encourages URW to build on the infrastructure put in place over the last 3 years and use its non-fees-funded alumni relations staff to continue building on the Advancement Program’s progress.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) The Committee felt that the advancement program had not demonstrated a benefit to students.  
   GDM: 4, 5, 6
University Student Legal Services

Off Year Update

Committee Vote: 7-0-0  
Requested Allocation: $1,076,000  
Recommended Allocation: $1,076,000

Comments: The Committee was impressed with the management of University Student Legal Services (USLS). We acknowledge their commitment to the legal health of students.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) The benefits to students outweigh the fees students’ pay.  
   GDM: 1

2) USLS effectively serves a large number of students annually.  
   GDM: 5

3) Most students might not be able to access professional legal advice without USLS.  
   GDM: 3

4) USLS provides services to students that are high quality.  
   GDM: 2, 4

Directives: The Committee recommends USLS consider increasing the percentage of paralegals within the unit with the aim of reducing labor costs and improving cost efficiency. Additionally, we reiterate the directive of 2012 and 2013 in recommending USLS to continue to expand their efforts of making their services better known to the student body.