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Chair’s Preface

To all involved parties and students,

This year, the committee reviewed the funding requests for over seventy student groups and organizations. The groups requesting student service fee funding represented the diverse community that the University of Minnesota seeks to foster. In order to approach each of the various student groups from the same viewpoint neutral perspective, the committee considered each funding request by applying pre-determined viewpoint neutral criteria to each group’s funding request. These criteria, called the Guidelines for Decision Making, can be found on the page immediately following the chair’s preface, as well as in the SSF handbook.

Though the committee applied each of the criteria to each group, the committee maintains the authority to weight the criteria. This year, the committee gave great consideration to guideline 6: “Demonstration of benefits of programs and services to students who pay the student services fees but do not participate in the programs and services,” and guideline 9: “All organizations ... must fully justify their fees request, including any financial reserves.” These guidelines were weighted most heavily because the committee is mindful that the purpose of the Student Service Fee is to use student money to provide services for students. If such a benefit cannot be demonstrated, funding should be obtained by other sources.

The committee has worked for many hours to produce these funding recommendations. Ample time was provided for each group and no one group received special treatment. For the sake of transparency, funding rationales include detailed explanations for the recommended dollar amount, and minority opinions are presented alongside those of the majority.

Student Service Fee funding is a public process. As such, the committee welcomes questions, comments, and concerns, which can be presented to us at the upcoming public hearings, submitted on the SSF website, or sent via email to either myself or the SSF advisor, Megan Sweet.

Sincerely,
Katharine Saphner
**Guidelines for Decision-Making**

**Fulfillment of the following does not guarantee approval for funding:**

1. Extent of contribution to one or more of the following:
   a. Providing a service to the student body.
   b. Supplementing the academic curriculum.
   c. Helping to foster a sense of community on the Twin Cities campus.

2. Quality and quantity of programs and services provided to the student body, consistent with the mission of the organization.

3. Extent of and demand for the programs and services provided. Groups must quantify their answer by such things as attendance numbers at events, number of phone calls / office visits, inquiries, etc. Groups must specify the method of tabulation and provide specific documentation upon request.

4. Breadth of service to students across academic departments or academic units.

5. Targeting of programs and services to the largest number of students consistent with the need.

6. Demonstration of benefits of programs and services to students who pay the student services fees but do not participate in the programs and services.

7. Efforts to secure funding in addition to the student services fees.

8. Demonstration of financial need that cannot be fulfilled with alternative sources of income.

9. All organizations (student groups and administrative units) must fully justify their fees request, including any financial reserves.

10. Student groups must fully justify their use of staff to the SSFC, but a maximum percentage of fees income to fund staff is not imposed.

   a. What is provided to students who pay the Student Services Fee from administrative units versus student groups is generally quite different. Since administrative units are primarily dedicated to providing services to students, the SSFC will impose no restriction on staff compensation for administrative unit employees.

   b. The Fees system would be severely constrained if student groups become reliant on paid staff. Fees money to pay staff should only be used if they are a necessary component of a group’s ability to provide high-quality, relevant services to students.

11. Demonstration of compliance with the audit/agreed-upon procedures performed by audit firm designated by the Student Fees Committee.

12. Written justification of significant deviation from the proposed budget outlined in the prior year’s student services fees request.

13. Previous access to funding from student services fees shall not be considered when evaluating requests.
African Student Association (#399)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $18,760  
Recommended Allocation: $18,760

Majority Opinion:

Comments: After hearing the African Student Association’s presentation and reviewing the submitted materials, the committee recommends fully funding the requested allocation of $18,760. The committee appreciated the Association’s commitment to steady and responsible growth and budgeting as an organization. The committee was also particularly impressed with the group’s efforts to partner with other organizations and make their program relevant and accessible to a wide audience. Despite the potential for a narrow focus, the group has used connections to others and variety in activities to appeal to the broader student body. And while the group had some purchases that the Committee found to be an unnecessary use of fees (board apparel and gifts for example), the group was conscientious in funding those purchases using other resources.

The only inconsistency is the professed fees request of $18,760 on the fees application and the total of $19,230 represented on the estimated budget for 2013-2014. Given this uncertainty, the committee recommends an allocation of $18,760.

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

1) Budget request is fully justified.  
GDM: 1, 2, 5, 7

Directives: Continue to partner with other groups and balance fees request with other funding sources. Consider cost per student at some meals and explore alternative or cheaper rooms when the event allows.
All-Campus Elections Commission (#369)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $9,427

Recommended Allocation: $9,427

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee has approved the amount requested by All-Campus Elections Commission. The Committee found that many of the events that the group was planning aimed at engaging a larger number of students in the election process. The committee looked favorably on the advertising budget and the plans that were associated with that budget.

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 Budget requested was justified. The group presented strong arguments that were in lines with the guidelines for decision making.
   GDM: 1a, 1c, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9a, 9b, 9c, 9d, 10a, 10b, 11, 12, 13.

Directives: Build a stronger sense of student community by encouraging the student engage with the elections process. Reach out to students in the key areas of and around campus.
Al-Madinah Cultural Center (#612)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $ 66,550  Recommended Allocation: $ 64,500

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that Al-Madinah receives $64,500 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends Al-Madinah for the quality of its programming, and for its policy on stipends and leadership. The Majority also appreciates the educational programming Al-Madinah provides to students. However, certain events and expenses were not found to provide a service to the greater student body, as detailed in the deductions below.

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

1) Deduction of $300 for operational food at meetings. This food expense does not draw in students, and is not integral to the organization in any way. GDM: 1, 2, 6

2) Deduction of $1200 for operational food at board/community discussion meetings. Again, these food expenses clearly fall outside funding guidelines. GDM: 1, 2, 6

3) Deduction of $450 for various gifts and prizes at programming events. These gifts/prizes benefit only a small number of students. GDM: 5

4) Deduction of $100 for retreat travel. This event does not provide a service to the greater student body. GDM: 1, 5

Directives: The Majority recommends that Al-Madinah looks into outside sources of funding, as SSF currently funds nearly all of Al-Madinah’s budget.
Alpine Ski Team (#939)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $22,172  Recommended Allocation: $10,320

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee deeply appreciates the Alpine Ski Team’s dedication and commitment to the sport. Therefore, The committee has decided to fund the Alpine Ski Team $10,320 for 2013-2014. On that note, however, this will only be temporary funding until recreational sports opens up their funding application. Student Services Fees do not usually fund such sports teams. The committee hopes that this will lessen students’ burdens in participating in the sport.

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

1) For the Alpine Ski Team, the majority has decided to take the approach of funding what seems essential to the team as the programs of the Alpine Ski Team mostly only benefit the particular individuals who participate in the events. Hence, the committee is recommending providing $2500 for a coach, $6440 in timing and supplies, and $1380 in MCSA fees to enter the competitions. GDM: 4, 5, 6

Directives: The committee highly encourages Alpine Ski Team to seek recreational sports’ funding as well as other outside resources. In addition, the committee would like to see more advertising for this team.
American Indian Student Cultural Center (#274)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $33,727     Recommended Allocation: $21,100

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the American Indian Student Cultural Center requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. In particular, the group’s breadth and depth of programming and efforts to bring together all American Indian students on campus. The SSFC wants to commend the American Indian Student Cultural Center for doing a good job taking responsibility for missing money in last year’s budget. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with several line items within the American Indian Student Cultural Center’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $3250 for student worker, $250 for parking validation, $400 board meetings, $25 SUA registration fee, $1000 Printing, $5,302 overall food, $2000 contest prizes fall round dance, $300 other t-shirts spring powwow, $50 other t-shirts fall powwow, and $50 prize talent show.

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

1) A $3,250 deduction for a student work from Salaries, Wages, and Stipends. AISCC did not demonstrate that the financial need for student workers cannot be fulfilled elsewhere. The majority believes that the salaries for student workers can be filled by student volunteers.
   GDM: 8

2) A $250 deduction for parking validation. The majority does not feel that parking should be funded through SSFC funds, as it does not benefit the campus or students.
   GDM: 1, 6

3) A $400 deduction to board meetings from Operational Food. The majority does not feel that the board meetings need food to be successful.
   GDM: 1, 6

4) A $25 deduction for SUA registration fee. All organizations have to pay this fee, even ones who do not have large enough budgets to qualify for Student Services Fees. Therefore, the majority believes it is not within the responsibility for SSFC to pay these fees.
   GDM: 6, 8

5) A $1,000 deduction to printing under Operational Supplies. The majority does not feel that the AISCC needs to offer free printing.
   GDM: 1, 4.
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6) A $5302 deduction in overall food budget. The majority does not feel like the U of M student participation overall in AISCC programs warrants such a large food budget. GDM: 6

7) A $2,000 deduction in contest prizes fall round dance and a $500 deduction in prizes for the talent show. The majority does not feel that prizes are necessary at events. GDM: 6

8) A $300 deduction in t-shirts. The majority feels that if t-shirts are for sale, the SSFC should not need to pay for this item. GDM: 6, 7, 8

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (#139)

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $5,200  Recommended Allocation: $0

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* The majority did not approve allocation of funds for AIAA because the committee found the application to be incorrect. The funds requested on the budget cover sheet under the programming expenses for “travel” did not match the program breakdown section “travel.” The budget cover sheet indicates that the travel for programming expenses is $1,000 but the programming breakdown travel indicates that there is $1,900 requested. This implies that the budget document itself is inaccurate. The inaccuracies of the submitted budget resulted in the committee having the inability to determine AIAA’s funding needs.

*Directives:* Please revise the budget sheet. The totals of all expenditures listed in the program breakdown should equal the amounts listed on the cover sheet. Please correct and resubmit the budget sheets to the committee for reconsideration. If this description is not clear, please contact the committee for further explanation.

**Minority Opinion:**

*Requested Allocation:* $ 5,200  *Recommended Allocation:* $3,835

*Comments:* The minority feels that AIAA provided adequate information for the committee to determine a funding level for the needs of the organization. Although it is difficult to discern the needs of AIAA, no funding at all is a leap to one end of a decision process.

*Directives:* Go to the public forums and justify any concerns the majority may have and provide support through the use of guidelines for decision making.
American Medical Student Association-Pre Med (#54)

Committee Vote: 9-0-1

Requested Allocation: $58,545       Recommended Allocation: $25,036

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Pre-Med AMSA requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. The SSFC did take issue with a few line items within the Pre-Med AMSA’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $500 for board meeting food, $15 registration fee, $800 kids against hunger mobile pack, $75 local travel for Pre-med Week, $5,344 Chicago Conference, $5,250 San Antonio Conference, $4,000 DC Convention, $15,000 International Volunteer Program, and $2,525 Leadership Forum.

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

1) A $500 deduction to food for board members. The majority does not feel that the board meetings need food to be successful.               GDM: 1, 6

2) A $15 deduction for SUA registration fee. All organizations have to pay this fee, even ones who do not have large enough budgets to qualify for Student Services Fees. Therefore, the majority believes it is not within the responsibility for SSFC to pay these fees.       GDM: 6, 8

3) A $800 deduction for kids against hunger mobile pack. The SSFC will fund food for participants and room rental, however, does not think it is appropriate to fund meal donations.                  GDM: 1

4) A $75 deduction in local travel for Pre-med Week. The Committee does not find it necessary to fund local travel expenses.                  GDM: 6, 8

5) A $5,344 deduction for the Chicago Conference, $5,250 deduction for the San Antonio Conference, $4,000 deduction for the DC Convention, $15,000 deduction for the International Volunteer Program, and $2,525 deduction for the Leadership Forum. The committee is helping fund 2 students at 50% of costs, expecting that the two students can help copay for their travel.  GDM: 6, 7, 8

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.
American Society of Civil Engineers (#676)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $6,325  
Recommended Allocation: $0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The American Society of Civil Engineers provide a fair amount of programming for their small request in student service fees. The committee believes that ASCE has good budget sense and is fairly frugal when it comes to spending. However, the projected carryover of $17,960.98 for 2013-2014 is far too high for a budget this small. In fact, even with no funding from the student service fee, ASCE will still have a carryover of over $12,000.

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

1) Carryover funds are very high and have not been justified to the committee. Carryover funds from 2012-2013 can and should be used to cover expenses in the upcoming academic year.  
   GDM: 8, 9

Directives: Continue to provide this service to the students at the same low cost while spending down your carryover next year.
Amnesty International (#174)

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $3,565  
Recommended Allocation: $0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee was unable to justify allocating funds to Amnesty International at this time with the information provided to the committee.

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

1) A carryover of $2535.48 was identified in the budget for the requesting year, and a current carryover of $2580.48 is projected out of the current year. With no operating expenses given, an operational reserve/excess carryover could not be justified.  

GDM: 9

Directives: The Majority of the committee would like to see any additional information the committee has regarding operating expenses or holding an operational reserve in order to justify receiving fees money.

Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $3,565  
Recommended Allocation: $2,432

Comments: The minority feels that Amnesty International provided adequate information for the committee to determine a funding level for the needs of the organization. Although it is difficult to discern the needs of Amnesty International, no funding at all is a leap to one end of a decision process. The minority feels that Amnesty International is given less patience due to missing mandatory steps even though the organization has gone through the appeals process and actions have already been taken to correct that misstep.

Directives: Go to the public forums and justify any concerns the majority may have and provide support through the use of guidelines for decision making. Consider updating the budget sheet to reflect better financial need so the committee can utilize it in the decision making process.
Asian-American Student Union (#157)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $85,700  
Recommended Allocation: $65,250

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Asian-American Student Union requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. In particular, the group’s breadth and depth of programming, efforts to bring together all Asian students on campus and a willingness to engage with other student organizations. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with several line items within the Asian-American Student Union’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were; $300 for operational travel; $300 for operational food; $300 for operational equipment; $450 for operational supplies; $8,000 for a surplus or carry over; $4,600 in unspecified programing other, $500 kick off month, $800 light up the night, $2,000 ASU winter gala, $1,000 ASU spring conference, $300 ASU rice bowl; $5,000 for ASU spring conference, $2,000 travel, $3,000 entertainment.

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

1) No information was provided to justify the need of founds for operational travel. GDM: 9
2) No information was provided to justify the need of founds for operational food. GDM: 9
3) No information was provided to justify the need of founds for operational equipment. GDM: 9
4) No information was provided to justify the need of founds for operational supplies. GDM: 9
5) A carryover of $8,000 was subtracted from the request. GDM: 9
6) Unspecified “other” expenses in several programs lacked explanation in kick off month, light up the night, winter gala, spring conference, and rice bowl. GDM: 9
7) Travel for ASU spring conference was not justified to the committee. GDM: 1, 9
8) $3,000 was deducted from the $10,000 of entertainment from the spring conference because the committee felt that an effort should be made to find other funding sources such as fundraising. GDM: 7, 8
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*Directives*: The committee feels that ASU should work to increase accountability for expenditures. ASU should also seek additional revenue sources like grants and fundraising and try to include more educational programing in each of their events.
Ayn Rand Study Group at the University of Minnesota (#2373)

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $32,700

Recommended Allocation: $0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: Though the Ayn Rand Study Group to some extent provides a service to students by contributing to a diverse community of ideas, the committee was concerned with many aspects of this group’s request. The first concern dealt with the required audit. There were several payment support issues that were not addressed by the group in their presentation. Specifically, there were some payroll transactions that were not backed up by payment support. There were also some issues with reimbursements. Due to numerous issues with the audit report, the committee initially saw fit to impose a penalty of 25% of the eventual allocation to the Ayn Rand Study Group.

However, after analyzing the full budget request, the amount of Ayn Rand Study Group’s budget that the committee felt had been justified was smaller than their carryover funds. Due to the fact that these carryover funds come nearly entirely from student services fees of the past, the committee feels responsible for ensuring that these funds are spent in ways that are beneficial to fees-paying students. With the amount of money projected in carryover from 2012-2013, the committee is confident that the Ayn Rand Study Group can continue to provide all planned programming, and thus continue to provide a service to students.

Were the Ayn Rand Study Group to further justify some of the expenses listed below, it is likely that the committee would still consider imposing a 25% penalty for the audit issues, unless those were satisfactorily explained as well.

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 were several aspects of Ayn Rand Study Group’s overall budget that the committee felt did not help to benefit students who do not participate in the group, but still pay the student services fee. The committee saw fit to make deductions from the budget for the following amounts: $1300 from stipends, $250 from operational food, and $50 in “umn expenses.”

GDM: 3, 6
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2) There were also several items in the budget that the committee felt were not fully justified. The deductions the committee made in this category were as follows: $1500 in consultant fees, $18,000 in office space, and $150 dollars for a desk. The committee was also of the opinion that as planned, the advertising budget of Ayn Rand Study Group is far too high, and the ratio of advertising to attendees seems to be an indication of ineffective use of student money, so the committee had planned to reduce the request by $9,000. In addition, the food budget for some programs is far too expensive, and the committee recommended a $2,000 decrease. GDM: 9

3) The committee was also concerned with the lack of fundraising attempts by the Ayn Rand Study Group, as shown in the audit report and next year’s projected budget. The committee believes that the need shown by this group could be met either fully or partially through outside funding. GDM: 7, 8

Directives: The committee urges Ayn Rand Study Group to pursue other types of funding and more efficient advertising. If the group has further justification for the items addressed above, the committee recommends that this information be brought to light through further written communication with the committee and/or participation at the public hearings.

Minority Opinion:

Comments:  The minority does not agree with the recommendation to defund the Ayn Rand Study Group.  A 25% penalty was assessed for poor record keeping found in the audit.  This penalty brought the requested budget for the Ayn Rand Study Group below its operational reserves and caused the recommendation that the Ayn Rand Study Group be defunded.  The minority feels that the 25% penalty was excessive when compared to other groups whose audits also showed poor record keeping but were not penalized.
Black Graduate and Professional Students Association (#956)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $13,503  
Recommended Allocation: $11,865

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee found BGAPSA behaved responsibly with the use of student service fees. The committee appreciates the decision to decline fees for this year due to the large carry-forward. The recommended allocation has increased by 31% from the last year that BGAPSA received student services fees funding. The committee enjoyed the presentation and understands the difficulty of organizing a dispersed group of individuals.

While it was thought that following costs should not be funded by student fees, it does not mean that external funding shouldn’t be sought as the majority supports the continuation of this organization and encourages growth where possible.

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

1) $900 cut from monthly executive board meetings. The majority feels that student fees should not fund individuals or events that don’t include the option of participation from the entire student body.  
GDM: 1a, 6, 9

2) $525 cut from plane travel (plane tickets, hotel room, per diem). The majority feels that this service does not benefit students who do not participate.  
GDM: 1a, 6, 9

3) $213 cut from the Kick-off mixer for the other expenses. The majority feels that the fees request for this portion of the event was not fully justified because there was not specification of what the other was.  
GDM: 1a, 9

Directives: The committee would like more information on the other expenses for the Kick-off mixer.
Black Motivated Women

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $13,020  Recommended Allocation: $8,004

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee enjoyed BMW’s presentation. It was engaging and showed the organization’s enthusiasm and commitment to the community. Funding for the upcoming year has decreased from this year due to the large carry-forward of the organization.

The committee did feel that some expenses were not fully explained and would like those to be elaborated. Also, gift items and give aways are considered not beneficial to the entire community but the committee encourages BMW to find external funds if this is a large incentive for attendees.

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

1) $1596 cut to reduce the carry-forward. This should be 0-10% of operational expenses.  
   GDM: 1a, 9

2) $1850 cuts: $500 misc. equipment, $700 misc. supplies and $650 for collaborations. The committee felt these expenses were not justified fully due to the vagueness of the title.  
   GDM: 1a, 9

3) $1020 cuts: $150 Men’s Appreciation give aways, $300 Gala gifts, $570 Fashion Show gift cards, give aways, and good bags. The committee felt these expenses were not justifiable usage of student fees and do not benefit the University community as a whole.  
   GDM: 1a, 6, 9

4) $550 cut for the Board Retreat. The committee feels use of student fees for a retreat does not benefit students who pay the fees but do not participate in the services  
   GDM: 6

Directives: The committee would like more information on the miscellaneous expenses.

Note: Following deliberations, it has come to the attention of the committee that several of the events that had funding allocations for gifts included outside funding that could be used to purchase these gifts. The committee finds this to be acceptable, and will be taking this into account during final deliberations.
Black Student Union (#243)

Committee Vote: 8-2-0

Requested Allocation: $64,309.80  
Recommended Allocation: $48,281

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee was impressed with BSU’s ability to obtain funding in addition to Student Services 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) There were several aspects of BSU’s overall budget that the committee felt did not help to benefit students who do not participate in the group, but still pay the student services fee. The committee welcomes a demonstration of financial need for these costs, but has in the mean time recommended a deduction of $3,815 for rent and utilities (“network telecom service”), $1,019 for cable costs, $320 for board shirts, $5,600 stipends, $100 gas, $50 parking, $200 food for board assessment meeting, $2,750 from the leadership conference and $300 for food for the leadership conference.  
GDM: 3, 6

2) A deduction of $1,874 has been made for having an excessive operational reserve with no justification as to why the reserve is over the recommended 0-10%.  
GDM: 9b

Directives: Please continue to provide excellent programming while spending down carryover funds.

Minority Opinion 1:

Requested Allocation: $64,310  
Recommended allocation: $48,382

Comments: The minority felt that the stipends requested by BSU was fully justified. The minority felt that the groups size and the quantity of work the group put into the student body justified the stipends request for the officers.

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

1) The minority felt that following guidelines were met.  
GDM: 10a, 10b
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Directives: In the future to show a detailed work/job description for stipend positions to provide further clarity to the committee.

Minority Opinion 2:

Requested Allocation: $64,309.80

Recommended Allocation: $42,681

Comments: The minority is opposed to student stipends for student leadership positions that provide valuable student leadership development opportunities as well as benefit students’ resumes.
Campus Atheists, Skeptics and Humanists (#63)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $11,000  Recommended Allocation: $11,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee has approved the amount requested by the Campus Atheists, Skeptics and Humanists. The committee found that Campus Atheists, Skeptics and Humanists continue to provide an intellectual dialogue for students with a different perspective within the U’s 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) The Budget request was justified with the groups goals for the upcoming year. The following guidelines were met. GDM: 1a, 1c, 2,3,4,5,6,7,8, 9a, 9b, 9c, 9d, 10a, 10b, 11, 12, 13.

Directives: Continue to bring interesting speakers with a new perspective for the student body. This committee found that this element engaged a very interesting sector of the student body.
Campus Outreach (#1279)

Committee Vote: 8-1-1

Requested Allocation: $11,638  Recommended Allocation: $0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee appreciated Campus Outreach’s application and presentation, and the clear passion of the students to the organization. The committee was pleased with the students’ stated goal of gaining funding to take more ownership of the organization’s activities. However, based on this year’s application, the committee is not convinced that the organization meets the necessary requirements to receive Student Services Fees. In particular, the majority was concerned with the amount of the group’s programming that seems to take place off-campus and for limited numbers of students. A very large number of anticipated programs involved taking students to off-campus venues for food and/or recreational activities. It is unclear how these events would benefit the greater campus community. Additionally, the majority of the Fees Committee noted that the organization’s professed aversion to traditional means of advertising (flyers, posters, chalking, social media) restricts the number of students who are aware of the group and how they can take advantage of events that they are funding indirectly through their Student Services Fees. It is critical that Fees-funded events be open and communicated to all students, and the language surrounding many of the events refers to “friends” or “students we invite.”

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 majority does not see clear benefits to the group’s programming for students who pay fees but do not participate in the group’s events, and the committee is also concerned that not enough has been done to make all students aware of the opportunities provided by the group.

   GDM: 4, 5, 6, 8

Directives: If Campus Outreach would like to be considered for fees funding in the future, the Committee encourages you to plan a larger proportion of your programs on-campus where they are more accessible and beneficial to the University community. Also, the committee would like to see increased efforts to advertise events as open to all and to spread awareness of the organization. Additionally, the role that student leaders play in the driving the organization vs. the church “staff” referenced in the presentation was unclear. The Committee does want to see this organization operate primarily under student leadership and guidance, and wants the primary benefit of any future fees funding to be to students on the campus.
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Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $11,638

Recommended allocation: $7,418

Comments: The minority felt that the group deserved some sort of funding and did not agree with the committee’s decision to not fund the group at all. The minority felt the group’s mission and values justified the way they were approaching the student body. However, the Minority felt that fees requested for certain programs was extensive and felt it appropriate to reduce the request for most events with food and travel by half.

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

1) Looking at the budget request the minority felt the following guidelines were not fulfilled.

   GDM: 4, 7, 8.

Directives: Seek outside funding for programs and request members and students who are attending the programs to pay a subsidized amount for food.
Catholic College Student Group (#518)

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $11,145  Recommended Allocation: $2,980

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Catholic College Student Group requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. The SSFC did take issue with a few line items within the Catholic College Student Group’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $4,200 for bus rental and $5,065 for spring break mission trip.

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

1) A $4,200 deduction for bus rental. The committee thinks there are many other forms of transportation that are more cost effective.          GDM: 6, 8

2) A $5,065 deduction for spring break mission trip. The committee recommends the Catholic College Student Group seek volunteer experiences here in Minnesota where they can give back to the community in which they live.          GDM: 6, 8

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: The minority does believe that some funding should be allocated to CCSG for its Spring Break Trip. Traveling to a different part of the country can provide a unique change in perspective when serving others, and this opportunity would not only impact the students traveling directly with their work over the trip, it would empower them to be more effective in serving our community at home in the twin cities.
Chabad at the UofM (#2,555)

Committee Vote: 7-3-0

Requested Allocation: $54,178       Recommended Allocation: $31,748

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Chabad at the UofM requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. In particular, the group’s breadth and depth of programming. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with several line items within the Chabad at the UofM’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were; $10,000 for salaries to advisors; $250 for operational travel to advisors conference; $7,000 in food for Shabbat dinners, $1,000 kick for cholent club food; $3,300 in food and travel for the New York City leadership conference.

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 did not feel that adequate justification was given for the need for SSF money to be used to pay Chabad advisors. GDM: 10

2) No information was provided to justify the need of funds for operational travel. GDM: 1, 6, 9

3) The committee had concerns about Shabbat dinners bringing in students new to Chabad instead of giving the same students consistent meals. GDM: 5, 6

4) The committee had concerns about Shabbat dinners bringing in students new to Chabad instead of giving the same students consistent meals. GDM: 5, 6

5) The committee had concerns about Cholent club food bringing in students new to Chabad instead of giving the same students consistent meals. GDM: 5, 6

6) The committee did not feel that Chabad adequately justified the utility of 15 students attending the NYC leadership conference. GDM: 5, 6

Directives: The committee would like to see Chabad at the UofM increase their advertising efforts in order to reach a broader group of university students and show more effort to collaborate with other student organizations.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: No minority opinion was submitted.
Colleges Against Cancer (#1450)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $14,916  Recommended Allocation: $14,091

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee felt the $825 reduction was justified. A $525 reduction in the operational expenses was due to the fact that the committee did not feel that using fees money to fund operational travel and food was appropriate. Furthermore felt that students should pay for the registration fees as it is a requirement for all student groups. The request for $50 for activities fair seemed to lack solid backing. Finally a $300 reduction in the program ‘Kicking Ash’ was recommended. The committee felt buying prizes for the event with fee’s money was not an appropriate use of money.

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 a $120 reduction in Operational travel for parking fees, a $250 reduction for Operational food for the final committee meeting and a $75 reduction for Operational food for the holiday party was appropriate.  GDM: 6, 8

2) Also the $300 reduction in the prizes for Kicking Ash was appropriate.  GDM: 6

Directives: Seek outside funding for prizes for the program Kicking Ash. Request for members to pay for their own parking money involved in Operational Travel. The committee requests the group to pay for registration through the members.
Collegians for a Constructive Tomorrow (#789)

Committee Vote: 8-1-1

Requested Allocation: $157,598  Recommended Allocation: $117,722

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee was impressed with the breadth and variety of programs and services CFACT provides to the student population. The Committee appreciates the number of events intending to create discussion in the student body through forums, debates, and workshops. However, the majority was not convinced that the nature and volume of the group’s work justified the fees money granted to officers as stipends, and the committee was generally concerned with the number of expenses that did not benefit students not directly involved in the group. For example, a couple of the group’s projected events like the gun range trip and park trip had relatively high costs per student and also did not demonstrate any clear benefits to students outside the organization or those who are unable to participate. Ultimately, CFACT demonstrated clear value to the campus, but the majority believes it could spend fees money more cautiously and efficiently, thus the reduction in the recommended allocation.

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 majority’s most significant recommended reduction to the CFACT request was the elimination of all student officer stipends totaling $26,000. The majority did not believe the payment granted to student officers was fully justified, especially given the presence of a paid full-time staff member that supports the group. The majority believed the experience and opportunities afforded to the student leadership is sufficient incentive for the time they commit to the organization, the number of members involved, and the level of impact the organization has on the rest of campus. GDM: 9, 10, & 13

2) Deductions were made of $700 from the Gun Range event, $2700 from the Park Trip, and $575 for the poker tournament. These trips were heavily funded by fees, had few projected attendees, and demonstrated little benefit to students not participating in the trips. GDM: 5, 6, 7

3) In operational expenses, a total of $1100 was removed from the local travel expenses, lounge provisions, and registration fees. These items were vague in description and the majority believes they were unlikely to provide a service or benefit to the student body. They would be more appropriately funded through other means. GDM: 1, 6, & 7
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4) The majority is recommending deductions of $1850 of fees funding for the Eco-Summit. In the group’s request, the Committee believes the amount of fees being used to support nearby travel and the number of students subsidized was excessive for the relatively small benefit to students not participating in the trip. The Committee recommends cutting any food funding and significantly reducing the number of attendees funded by fees money. The majority believes that there are diminishing returns to the student population as the number of attendees at off-campus events increase, and either fewer attendees should be covered by fees money or should be supported through other forms of income.  

5) Similarly, the majority is recommending eliminating all fees food costs for the CPAC trip, as this is food only for the individual members participating and gives no benefit to the rest of campus. Additionally, the committee proposes reducing the number of fees-subsidized attendees to 6 and funding only half of the cost for those students. This would reduce the fees funding required by $3,900. The committee does see value in students attending the conference and sharing their experiences on campus, but believe that those students derive the most value and so should be responsible for a significant portion of the costs for the experience. The current fees request and attendance numbers would mean the fees were paying nearly $300 per student who participates in the trip, and the committee believes the benefit does not justify that expense.  

6) The majority is also reducing the fees money for the State of Climate Change event by $1500. Currently, fees represents 100% of the funding for this event, and at the estimated attendance numbers, the event would cost nearly $40 per student in attendance. The majority believes that number is excessive, and wishes to reduce the fees money provided to encourage the group to either find a cheaper alternative or seek additional supplementary funding from other sources.  

7) The Committee noticed several events in which fees money was used to provide food to small and/or restricted numbers of participants and not as a means to draw others to the event. The majority believes these are private benefits to those students and should not be funded by fees. Thus the majority recommended a reduction of $1000 in fees money spent for events with limited participation.  

Directives:  
The Fees Committee appreciates the diversity of events planned by CFACT this year and hopes they will continue to provide venues for campus discussion. The Committee believes you can continue your current levels of programs and participation without providing additional fees funding to student officers. While the committee did not recommend a deduction in funding for office space this year, the Committee is not thoroughly convinced of the need for this space, which is a significant financial commitment. In future requests, either consider operating without  
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this space, or provide more thorough evidence that it is a necessary aspect of your group’s work (GDM 3). The Committee also asks that you use most of your Student Services Fees for on-campus events open to all students, and using other funds for off-campus recreation with limited access to the wider student body.

**Minority Opinion:**

*Comments:* The Minority did not feel that CFACT fully justified its large entertainment and stipend budget, especially given the limited number of members.

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

1) CFACT’s large entertainment budget does not accurately reflect the number of students served by the group.  
   GDM: 2, 3

2) CFACT’s stipends and salaries are too high, given that full justification was not provided for their existence. Having multiple staff members was not justified.  
   GDM: 10

*Directives:* In order to justify a higher entertainment and salary budget, attempt to build member population and demonstrate need for staff.
Community Child Care Center (#765)

Committee Vote: 6-5-0

*Requested Allocation:* $85,000
*Recommended Allocation:* $83,602

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* The majority respects the service Community Child Care Center provides to the university. Their service is an essential component to many students with children. As SSF should benefit the university students, the committee values that the top priority is given strictly to 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) From other operational expenses, the committee has taken out $313 for staff and parent gifts, and $1010 for field trips and events. Gifts and field trips only benefit those who are directly receiving the items/services and do not provide a greater benefit to the student body.

   GDM: 5,6

2) It is at the discretion of CCC to decide what it becomes a member of, and if the benefit of a membership entices CCC to join, the membership dues should not have to be subsidized but self-sustained.

   GDM: 1a, 8

*Directives:* The majority recommends continuing to put our university students at its highest priority when accepting children.

**Minority Opinion:**

*Requested Allocation:* $85,000
*Recommended Allocation:* $84,612

*Comments:* The Committee Minority believes that spending of $1,010 of Field Trips and Events is a justified expense and provides a benefit to those who utilize CCC’s services.
Como Early-Learning Center

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $80,000  Recommended Allocation: $79,849

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee felt the service provided by the Como-Early Learning Center was vital to many students on campus. However it felt that a reduction of $151 was appropriate. The committee did not see enough justification for it to fund student fees for Operational Travel of $53 and Field trips of $98.

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 Budget met most of the guidelines in the handbook. However the committee felt enough justification was not provided for guideline 8

Directives: Tell members to pay for Operational Travel and request parents to pay for field trips.

Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $80,000  Recommended Allocation: $79,947

Comments: The Committee Minority believes that the $98 for Field Trips is a justified expense and provides a benefit to those utilizing the services of Como Early Learning Center.
Compassionate Action for Animals (#954)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $20,000  
Recommended Allocation: $20,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee agreed that Compassionate Action for Animals should be funded in full by Student Services Fees. The student group not only has great programming, but also took the Student Service Fees process very seriously.

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

1) Budget request is fully justified.  
   GDM: 9

Directives: Keep up the good work!
CRU (#1035)

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

*Requested Allocation: $23,934  Recommended Allocation: $0*

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* The committee feels that CRU has not been responsible with its financial obligation in record keeping. The audit identified an ending ledger balance of $8,832, which could not be explained in the budget sheet. There were multiple transactions that state that payment support was not received. The committee decided a penalty of a 25% overall cut of what was recommended would suffice; however, upon looking at the budget, there were several errors that have not been resolved.

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

1) Organizations must fully justify their fees request, including any financial reserves. CRU has a projected reserve of half their operational costs, which is far too high. In addition, the projected reserve expenditure for 2012-2013 does not match the projected reserve income for 2013-2014. This indicates a problem with the budget.

*GDM: 1a, 9*

*Directives:* The committee strongly urges CRU to submit a written explanation for the audit issues, as well as a new, fully accurate budget for reconsideration.
Dance Marathon (#2486)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

*Requested Allocation:* $6,150  
*Recommended Allocation:* $3,000

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by Dance Marathon requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with areas of Dance Marathons request. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were; $300 for operational travel; $300 for operational food; $250 for operational food; $2,900 for an overall cut to programing.

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

1) No information was provided to justify the need of founds for operational food. GDM: 5, 6, 9

2) The committee feels that other sources of revenue would be more appropriate for this event as the entirety of the programing is in one event. GDM: 7

**Directives:** The committee feels that Dance Marathon is an admirable cause but that due to its nature of being a single event it would be more appropriate for the organization to seek grants from other sources that focus more on granting money for single events. The committee would like to see the addition of additional programing so that the group goes beyond a single program if they wish to apply for SSF funding in future years.
Disabled Student Cultural Center (#230)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $28,779.31  Recommended Allocation: $28,754

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee was impressed with the amount of support and awareness that the DSCC group offers to the students at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities.

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 found that using student services fees to pay for student group registration does not justify students who do not participate in the DSCC programs or services, thus, $25 was deducted for student group registration. GDM: 6

Directives: For the Silver Linings Playbook, please look into partnering with student union and activities. Keep up the good work!
Economics Student Organization (#55)

Committee Vote: 5-0-3

Requested Allocation: $ 6,000  
Recommended Allocation: $ 6,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that Economics Student Organization receives $6,000 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends the ESO for providing educational programming and for finding additional sources of income to supplement SSF. Including programming for graduate students and offering a free tutoring program clearly provides benefit to the entire university. However, the Majority would like to stress that the corporate presentation series should not primarily act as a recruiting tool.

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

1) ESO provides a valuable service to the student body while targeting multiple groups and keeping costs low.  
   GDM: 1a, 1b, 2, 4, 5

Directives: Have each corporate presentation focus on a relevant topic, rather than act as a recruiting tool. Continue to provide strong programming.
**Engineers Without Borders (#1469)**

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

*Requested Allocation:* $6,930  
*Recommended Allocation:* $6,705

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Engineers Without Borders requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. The SSFC did take issue with a few line items within the Engineers Without Borders’ request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $25 for registration fee and $200 for travel gas.

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

1) A $25 deduction for SUA registration fee. All organizations have to pay this fee, even ones who do not have large enough budgets to qualify for Student Services Fees. Therefore, the majority believes it is not within the responsibility for SSFC to pay these fees.  
   GDM: 6, 8

2) A $200 deduction in travel gas. The Committee does not find it necessary to fund local travel expenses.  
   GDM: 6, 8

*Directives:* Please consider individual contributions to cover these small operational costs, and keep up the good work!
Ethiopian Student Association (#159)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $8,620  
Recommended Allocation: $4,330

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Ethiopian Student Association requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. The SSFC did take issue with a few line items within the Ethiopian Student Association’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $400 for general meetings food, $50 for board meetings food, $180 for local travel for Feed by Starving Children program, $3,000 for ESAI conference travel, and $600 for Freshman camping experience.

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

1) A $400 deduction to general meetings food and $50 for board meetings food from Operational Food. The majority does not feel that the board meetings need food to be successful. GDM: 1, 6

2) A $180 deduction in local travel. The Committee does not find it necessary to fund local travel expenses. GDM: 6, 8

3) A $3,000 deduction for ESAI conference travel. The committee is helping fund 2 students at 50% of costs, expecting that the two students can help copay for their travel. GDM: 6, 7, 8

4) A $600 deduction for Freshman camping experience. The committee does not think there is a demonstrated need for this activity. GDM: 6, 8

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.
Forensic Science Club (#900)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $3,500  
Recommended Allocation: $2,615

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee enjoyed the Forensic Science Club’s presentation and is excited about the opportunities the organization provides within the university. As first time fee receivers, be responsible with expenditures and keep record/receipts. Fee receiving groups are audited every 3 years. Continue to look for external funding beyond student fees as well. The committee recognized that the Forensic Science Club had difficulty creating the budget sheet and the update was not any clearer. However, the subcommittee that saw the Forensic Science Club’s presentation felt they understood the funding needs of the organization enough in order to determine an amount. Understand that future committees may not feel the same and it is essential to provide information the committee can utilize.

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

1) $50 cut for MDIAI conference. The committee feels funding local travel is not a justifiable use of student service fees.  
   GDM: 1a, 9

2) $735 cut from AAFS conference. The committee feels there should be some effort to find external funding and is willing to fund half the costs.  
   GDM: 7

3) $100 cut from Lab Tours. The committee feels funding food that does not contribute to the university, as a whole is not justifiable. Look towards external funding for these events  
   GDM: 1a, 7, 9

Directives: Continue looking for other sources of funding. Increase advertising and outreach to promote growth and success within the organization and its events. Make an effort to ensure that the budgets submitted in the future are fully accurate when submitted.
Fraternity Purchasing Association (#1215)

Committee Vote: 5-1-2

Requested Allocation: $10,000  Recommended Allocation: $0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that the Fraternity Purchasing Association receives $0 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority feels that the Fraternity Purchasing Association provides a valuable service to its member organizations. However, because member organizations (who receive the vast majority of services from FPA) can be directly charged for any costs, it would be inappropriate to assess the general student body any fees associated with FPA.

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

1) Deduction of $10,000 for rent. Fraternity Purchasing Association does not provide enough of a service to the student body, and could directly bill its member organizations.
   GDM: 1a, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8

Directives: To receive SSF fees in the future, offer more extensive services to non-members.

Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $10,000  Recommended Allocation: $10,000

Comments: The minority understands that Fraternity Purchasing Association already charges their members fees and could obtain the rental funds needed through those means. However, the minority also feels that students that participate and use the Fraternity Purchasing Association as a resource are also student service fees paying students. The Fraternity Purchasing Association provides a service to the U community and is only requesting a small portion of their expenditures to be funded through fees, which would keep membership costs down.

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

Directives: Provide rationale for how the organization aligns with the guidelines for decision making.
Go First (#2467)

Committee Vote: 6-2-0

Requested Allocation: $52,375  Recommended Allocation: $34,350

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the GoFirst requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. The SSFC did take issue with a few line items within the GoFirst’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $12,500 in salaries and wages, $1,000 parking at shop, $1,000 general meeting food, $25 SUA registration, $700 for volunteering at IRI, and $2,800 volunteering at regionals.

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

1) A $12,500 deduction for a student work from Salaries, Wages, and Stipends. The committee does not think the student stipends are justified.  GDM: 8

2) A $1,000 deduction for parking at shop. The majority does not feel that parking should be funded through SSFC funds, as it does not benefit the campus or students.  GDM: 1, 6

3) A $1,000 deduction to food for general meetings. The majority does not feel that the board meetings need food to be successful.  GDM: 1, 6

4) A $25 deduction for SUA registration fee. All organizations have to pay this fee, even ones who do not have large enough budgets to qualify for Student Services Fees. Therefore, the majority believes it is not within the responsibility for SSFC to pay these fees.  GDM: 6, 8

5) A $700 deduction for volunteering at IRI and $2,800 deduction for volunteering at regionals. The committee does not see volunteering for events as an appropriate use of student services fees.  GDM: 6, 8

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.
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Minority Opinion:

Comments: The Minority of the committee does believe that more funding should be recommended for the Salaries, Wages, and Stipends on the basis that the officers of the group should be compensated more for the significant amount of work that they put in, relative to the benefits and opportunities all students receive from this group.
Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (#155)

Committee: 7-3-0

Requested Allocation: $463,105  Recommended Allocation: $434,465

Majority Opinion:

Comments: GAPSA provides many councils with funding, as well as funding a hefty grants program for graduate and professional students. They provide the necessary service of bringing graduate and professional students together and advocating on their behalf.

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 were a couple of operational expenses that were not fully justified. The committee is of the opinion that providing food for the executive board does not provide a service to students who pay the fee but are not members of the group, so $1,000 was deducted from the request for operational food. Along the same lines, $1,500 was cut from the request for parking reimbursement.

2) The committee feels that it does not currently have enough information on the Leadership Development Workshops to fund them at the level of the request. With the attendance figure cited, the food budget is extremely excessive, so $11,000 was deducted from the request. In addition, the travel for this event was not explained, so $10,000 was deducted from the request.

3) The committee found that the budget for food for GAPSA forum was too high, and therefore $3,500 was deducted from the request.

Directives: If GAPSA would like the committee to reconsider any of the above deductions, the committee welcomes follow-up information. The committee is especially interested in additional information (especially attendance figures) about the Leadership Development Workshops.

Minority Opinion 1:

Comments: The Minority did not feel that GAPSA justified its large budget increase from the 2012-2013 fiscal year, and also failed to show a large enough benefit of its leadership conference.
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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 GAPSA budget rose dramatically from the current fiscal year, and the additional programming did not justify such a large increase. GDM: 2, 9

1) The Leadership Conference was not a justifiable expense, especially given the small amount of students impacted. GDM: 2, 4, 5, 6

Directives: Direct SSF funds towards events that have an impact on a larger number of students.

Minority Opinion 2:

Comments: The minority felt that the GAPSA leadership development workshops should be funded at least $6,000 in food. GAPSA does provide a service to the student body and does help foster a sense of community on the Twin Cities campus. Through the leadership development workshops, GAPSA is providing students to learn the necessary skills that being a leader possesses. Also, the leadership development workshops are on the University of Minnesota campus and benefits not only students but the university as a whole.

Directives: In future’s fees requests, please indicate where the food is being provided from and how necessary it is to provide funding for food at events like the leadership development workshops.
Habitat For Humanity at the University of Minnesota (#335)

Committee Vote: 6-2-0

Requested Allocation: $19,773  
Recommended Allocation: $12,583

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that Habitat for Humanity at the University of Minnesota receives $12,583 in funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends Habitat for Humanity at UMN for providing wide-reaching benefit to the community, and engaging students through events such as Shantytown. However, the Majority finds that Habitat for Humanity at UMN incurs some costs that do not provide a service to the greater student body, defined in the deductions below.

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

1) Deduction of $2000 for operating food at general meetings. Food at general meetings is not integral to the group and does not attract students. GDM: 1b, 2, 4, 5

2) Deduction of $300 for volunteer events travel. Although the Majority approves of the volunteer events, local travel does not fall under SSF guidelines. GDM: 3, 4, 5, 6

3) Deduction of $4490 for Habitat Youth Leadership Conference. Sending 16 members does not provide any benefit to the student body. The committee has reduced funding to cover half the cost of sending 2 members to the conference. GDM: 4, 5, 6, 8

4) Deduction of $400 for Habitat on the Hill. The committee has reduced funding to a level that would cover half the cost of 2 members attending the conference. GDM: 4, 5, 6, 8

Directives: The Majority recommends that Habitat for Humanity focuses on reducing conference expenditures and providing more programming on campus. In addition, greater attention needs to be placed on monitoring financial statements. The audit found an unexplained variance in the ending bank statement for this group.
Hillel: Jewish Student Union (#175)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $37,950  Recommended Allocation: $30,592

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Services Fees Committee recognizes the service that Hillel provides to the university community. Unfortunately, the committee found many issues with Hillel’s proposed budget. All of the concerns addressed by the committee are listed below.

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

1) Travel in the FYSH program appears to be local travel, which the committee does not believe provides a benefit to all students. GDM: 6

2) The food expenses for programming have doubled since last year, and the committee does not believe that this increase has been justified. GDM: 9

3) According to the budget documents provided, Hillel has no operational expenses whatsoever, yet they still hold several thousand dollars in operational reserves. This has not been justified to the committee. GDM: 9

4) The committee does not feel that it is the role of Student Services Fees to pay the $25 SUA Registration fee. GDM: 1

5) It appears that in 2012-2013, Hillel was funded with $41,000 of Student Service Fees, but only $36,000 in SSF funding appears in the projected 2012-2013 income section. This implies an inaccurate budget, as it would produce a carry-forward of $5,000 for this year. This level of carry-forward is unjustified. GDM: 9

Directives: The committee strongly urges Hillel to follow up with the committee to justify and explain the above issues.

Note: Not all of the issues discussed below resulted in a funding cut in the initial recommendation, but it is extremely likely that if these points go unaddressed, they will be revisited in final deliberations.
Hmong Minnesota Student Association (#291)

Committee Vote: 7-0-1

Requested Allocation: $27,315  Recommended Allocation: $24,465

Comments: The committee was impressed with HMSA’s effort in seeking outside funding in addition to student services fees.

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

1) There were several aspects of HMSA’s overall budget that the committee felt did not help to benefit students who do not participate in the group, but still pay the student services fee. The committee welcomes a demonstration of financial need for these costs, but has in the mean time recommended a deduction from the operational food breakdown: $100 from “Board Meetings”, $200 from “HMSA Office,” $100 from “Events,” $200 from “HMSA Office” under equipment breakdown, and under other operational expenses breakdown: $50 from “registration fees,” $200 from “gift cards,” $100 from “Park fees/Vouchers,” $400 from “Honorarium,” and $1,500 from “Donations to others.”

Directives: Keep up the good work!
Horticulture Club (#483)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $12,373.5  Recommended Allocation: $7,239

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Services Fees Committee believes that the Horticulture Club fills a unique need on this campus and provides a valuable service to students. It does not believe that student money should be used in the production of alcoholic beverages or attainment of equipment to do so. It also does not feel that using student fees money to pay for the travel expenses to conferences where the ability to widely impact students back on campus is not apparent, or for the purchase of food items explicitly for operational purposes.

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

1) $120 was deducted in regards to food for officer meetings because the committee believes that it is an inappropriate use of student services fees.          GDM: 1, 6

2) $399 was deducted in regards to brewing equipment because the committee believes it is an inappropriate use of student service fees and inconsistent with other University Policies. There is not a specific guideline for this, but it is stated within the SSF handbook that Student Services Fee money must not be, directly or indirectly, used to purchase alcohol.

3) $900 was deducted for travel to research conferences.              GDM: 6

4) $3716 was deducted for a large carryover in addition to operational reserves and a foundation.  GDM: 1, 9

Directives: Continue to seek funding for travel expenses for events off campus.
Indian Student Association (#10)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $7,278  
Recommended Allocation: $6,628

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee appreciated the preparedness of the Indian Student Association and the amount of collaboration the organization is planning on. The committee feels that the cost and time of becoming a non-profit organization is more costly than the benefits that could result.

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

1) $25 non profit annual filing, $20 US bank overdraft protection, $200 food for the ISA board meetings, $80 food for the ISA board turnover meetings, $25 SUA registration fee, and $300 board member T-shirts are cut because they don’t provide a service to the student body or demonstrate a benefit to students who are not participating.  

GDM: 1a, 6, 9

Directives: Follow through with the plans to collaborate with multiple student organizations. Research the benefits of becoming a non-profit closely.
Innovative Engineers (#2454)

Committee Vote: 7-0-1

Requested Allocation: $5,000  Recommended Allocation: $1,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The majority believes that Innovative Engineers have greatly displayed the name of our university, and is glad to see such an exponential growth of this organization. However, there is much concern regarding the benefits it provides to the students who are not directly participating in the events and the breadth of its programs. Therefore, it has decided to fund Innovative Engineers $1,000 for 2013-2014.

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 has cut $4000 from its Outreach program as its benefits go directly and mostly to the high school students and the residents of Nicaragua. Furthermore, such outreach event is a personal development opportunity for the individuals who participate in the program, not the general student body.  
   GDM: #4,5,6

Directives: The majority recommends requesting co-pay to the individuals who go on the outreach trips as the student body cannot and should not pay for all individuals’ travel expenses.
Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $8,500
Recommended Allocation: $5,375

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation IPID requesting financial support for 2013-14 and found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with the extent of founding for IPID. The committee had questions about the appropriateness of IPID’s grant program and chose to only partially fund the program.

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 was concerned about the ability of the grant program to benefit the general university community. GDM: 4, 5, 6

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.
La Raza Student Cultural Center (#131)

Committee Vote: 6-2-0

Requested Allocation: $45,000  
Recommended Allocation: $25,190

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that La Raza Student Cultural Center receives $25,190 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends La Raza for its quality programming, community outreach, and partnerships with other student groups on campus. However, the Majority finds that several costs incurred by La Raza, including stipends and rent, fell outside of SSF guidelines.

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

1) Deduction of $11,000 for stipends and wages. The stipends and wages could not be justified as necessary for the group to operate, and were thus removed.  
GDM: 10

2) Deduction of $1000 for operational board food. This food did not bring in students, nor did it provide value to the group as a whole.  
GDM: 1a, 4, 5

3) Deduction of $3600 for operational rent. La Raza is located on the second floor of Coffman Union, and the Majority did not see a reason why rent expense would be necessary. GDM: 8

4) Deduction of $1000 for other operational expense “when needed.” This built-in operational reserve lacked justification.  
GDM: 9

5) Deduction of $30 for travel in El Grito. Funding local travel does not fall under SSF guidelines.  
GDM: 3, 4, 5

6) Deduction of $320 for food at general assembly meetings. This food does not provide a service to the student body, nor does it attract members.  
GDM: 1a, 4, 5

7) Deduction of $120 for unspecified “other” at the Immigration Discussion. The Majority could not ascertain what this consisted of.  
GDM: 1

8) Deduction of $30 for travel at Networking Days. Funding local travel does not fall under SSF guidelines.  
GDM: 3, 4, 5
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8) Deduction of $30 for travel for graduate school workshop. Funding local travel does not fall under SSF guidelines. GDM: 3, 4, 5

9) Deduction of $2500 for “other” at College Visits. The Majority could not ascertain what this consisted of. GDM: 1a, 1b, 2, 4, 8

10) Deduction of $180 for gifts at El Colegio Senior Presentations. Gifts benefit only a small number of students GDM: 5

Directives: The Majority encourages La Raza to spend funds on programming instead of stipends and travel.

Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $45,000  
Recommended Allocation: $25,190

Comments: The minority wished to leave La Raza access to at least some of the fees funding to support stipends for group leadership. While the committee are generally very resistant to using fees to fund group leadership, the committee believes that La Raza’s size, scope, impact, and responsibilities in the University community justified small financial incentives for officers. There were a number of aspects of their duties that mirrored a campus job as much as an extracurricular activity.
Lutheran Student Movement (#146)

Committee Vote: 8-1-0

Requested Allocation: $36,585    Recommended Allocation: $20,310

Majority Opinion:

Comments: Lutheran Student Movement has proven that it is capable of putting on regular programs that consistently have good attendance, and special programs that have quite high attendance. There are several expenditures in the proposed budget that the committee does not feel have been fully justified. They are as follows:

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 does not feel that the increase in salaries and stipend expenditures has been fully justified, and therefore deducted $4,150 in SSF funding, leaving $10,000 of student service fees going towards salaries and stipends. GDM: 9, 10

2) The food for some events was determined by the committee to be unjustified as student service fee expenses, due to the fact that they do not benefit students outside the group. Specifically, the food for Worship ($1,350), Soup ($450), and Leadership Development ($500) were determined to be unjustified. In addition, $250 of funding for unspecified other expenses for Leadership Development have been deducted from the request. GDM: 6, 9

3) The full student service fee contribution has been deducted from the Fall Retreat ($900), and the Spring Break trip ($6,000) because these events do not seem to provide a benefit to the student body as a whole. In addition, these are events from which attendees receive great personal benefit and costs should therefore be paid by attendees. GDM: 6, 7, 8, 9

4) A deduction of $1,000 was made from the Stay Awake Study Break because the committee does not believe that hiring masseuses is a responsible use of student money, and the cost has not been fully justified. GDM: 9

5) Finally, $50 has been deducted from the requested amount for Social Event travel, $625 from operational travel expenses, and $100 from service project travel. All of these travel expenses were determined to be unjustified by the group. GDM: 9

(Continued on the following page)
Directives: If Lutheran Student Movement has further justification or explanation for any of the above deductions, they should be presented through follow-up written communication and/or participation in the public hearings.

Please Note: The committee seems to have double counted the deduction for the fall retreat. During final deliberations, this miscalculation will be addressed.

Minority Opinion:

Committee Vote (8-1-0)

Requested Allocation: $36,585  Recommended Allocation: $20,760

Comments: The minority feels that the soup program should not have been cut. LSM provides this as a service to the community and the minority feels this is an open event.
Minnesota International Student Association (#184)

Committee Vote: 8-0-2

Requested Allocation: $86,622  
Recommended Allocation: $75,951

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The majority believes that the Minnesota International Student Association, as an over-arching organization for international students, provides quality service and community to our students. Therefore, the committee has decided to fund Minnesota International Student Association at $75,951.

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

1) Funds that do not demonstrate benefits to the students who are not directly participating in the program and services were deducted: board bonding $500 and board jackets $950.  
   GDM: 6

2) Unexplained needs were deducted: $1821 equipment breakdown and $40 US Bank charges  
   GDM: 1a

3) Excessive spending of $750 for food under Bowling and Pool Night was cut.  
   GDM:1a

4) Because MISA’s operational reserves is high, the committee has decided to cut $4800 to make the operational reserves at about 10%.  
   GDM: 9

5) Community engagement day is held within the city bounds and students can individually cover their local travel costs, which is very minimal. The committee has cut $800 for travel.  
   GDM: 6

Directives: The majority recommends seeking outside funding instead of heavily relying on SSF. Furthermore, the majority recommends generating some fundraising income at some of MISA events at minimal amounts to individuals so that MISA can offset some of its high programming costs.

Minority Opinion:

The minority is opposed to student stipends for student leadership positions that provide valuable student leadership development opportunities as well as benefit students’ resumes.
Minnesota Public Interest Research Group (#95)

Committee Vote: 8-1-1

Requested Allocation: $126,571  Recommended Allocation: $124,211

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee enjoyed MPIRG’s presentation and its enthusiasm in making the students heard. The committee understands there is a conflict of interest when searching for external funding, but still feel there are opportunities to either raise it or other versions of contributions. The committee appreciates MPIRG’s involvement with the study body and wants to continue to fund MPIRG’s initiatives.

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

1) $2,360 cut from the Fall Retreat. The committee feels half of the costs should be funded through other means.  GDM: 1a, 6, 9

Directives: The committee encourages all student groups to look for external funding. There are a variety of ways this can be achieved without compromising neutrality, and the committee urges MPIRG to look into these options.

Minority Opinion 1:

Requested Allocation: $126,571  Recommended Allocation: $104,211

Comments: The use of paid staff must be completely justified, and if groups become too reliant on full time staff, SSF will be extremely limited. The minority is unsure on the use of staff at MPIRG.

Directives: The minority recommends cutting down on the use of staff while increasing student involvement. For final deliberations, the minority recommends providing further information on the salary of the staff and their duties. (i.e. Is the staff also working with MPIRG groups on different universities and if so, are they getting paid by those universities? Are they getting paid by MPIRG, the parent organization?) Such information will greatly help the committee during final deliberations.
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Minority Opinion 2:

Requested Allocation: $126,571  
Recommended allocation: $126,571

Comments: The minority felt that the deduction of fees for the fall retreat seemed inappropriate. The minority felt that the explanation provided by the group for the relevancy of this retreat to the student body was justified.

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 minority felt the budget request was fully justified.  
   GDM: 9

Directives: Try and gain more outside funding for certain events.
Minnesota Student Association (#509)

Committee Vote: 7-1-0

Requested Allocation: $186,376

Recommended Allocation: $182,406

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee enjoyed the presentation and all the work the organization does for the student body. The committee did feel there was an exorbitant amount of food costs and have cut that in consideration to the benefit of the students who pay service fees. There were some issues with the committee not understanding certain parts of MSA’s budget. The budget did not represent the programs clearly, which caused deliberation amongst the committee. The committee feels that during part of the discussion process, MSA members were a distraction and although this did not affect any of the committee’s decisions, it did hinder communication between the members.

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

1) Food: $250 legislative coalition, $500 end of year banquet, and $1350 leadership reception. The committee cut food for these programs because justification for this benefited the university community was not seen. GDM: 9

2) $500 cut from the world fair and $120 from the new administration program for other costs that were not specified and not justified. GDM: 9

Directives: Provide justification and explanation for the others expenses and the committee can reassess funding needs.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: The Minority did not feel that MSA justified its high food costs, or unexplained “other” expenses.

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 food budget was too large, and the price per head was often over $10. This excessive spending does not benefit MSA or the student body. GDM: 1a, 2, 4, 5
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2) Several unspecified “other” expenses were present in the budget given to the committee. These expenses were not justified in any way. 

Directive: Don’t over budget for food expenses, and fully explain “other” expenses in the budget.
Minnesotap (#2582)

Committee Vote: 9-0-1

Requested Allocation: $15,255  Recommended Allocation: $10,350

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee believes that Minnesotap offers a very unique service to students of all levels of tap experience and commends Minnesotap on following up with the directives of last year’s committee of providing beginner classes. In regards to the CHRP, the committee has recommended a significantly smaller allocation because it believes that the amount of value provided to the entire student body by funding many students to attend versus few students is not overly significant. The committee also recommends less spending on the travel of visiting artists, especially when the intended attendance to the events is only 150 people, for artists which cost thousands of dollars.

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

1) $100 deducted for operational parking.  GDM: 1, 6
2) $500 deducted for food at retreats  GDM: 6
3) $300 deducted for students stipends for beginning workshops.  GDM: 6, 10
4) $2,775 deducted from CHRP programming expenses.  GDM: 6

Directives: The Committee would like to see Minnesotap make better use of the time it will have with visiting master artists and create opportunities for more students to have exposure to their knowledge and abilities.
National Society of Black Engineers (#318)

Committee Vote: 7-2-1

Requested Allocation: $9306.99  
Recommended Allocation: $3312

Majority Opinion:

Comments: After reviewing your audit report as well as the provided SSFC application, the committee has adjusted your fees request accordingly with the justifications below.

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 fees Committee felt that the scholarships for the Annual banquet would not be mutually beneficial to the University Community. (-$1,700)  
   GDM:1

2) Student Services Fees are not to be allotted for food purchases, as they are slated to be for your Regional Convention (-$70)  
   GDM:8

3) Student Services Fees are not to cover the cost of regional travel, as they are projected to be in the Regional Convention program. (-$865)  
   GDM:8

4) The committee has reduced the travel costs for your annual convention so that it would cover 4 people to attend this trip. The committee feels that if it would be needed for more to attend that you could look into fundraising options. (-$2,760)  
   GDM:6

5) The fees committee felt that your annual banquet was an event in which only 60 people are slated to attend, so the committee has adjusted your room rental and food accordingly, reducing the food costs by $500, and room rental by $200. (-$700 total)  
   GDM:3

Directives:
Given these reductions, the committee has adjusted your fees request to the amount of $3212 for FY 14. The fees committee was impressed by your sustainability in keeping operational costs down enough to not need the assistance of Student Services Fees. The committee is appreciative of the services your organization offers its members but would prefer to see more advertising to increase engagement in your organization. In your programming very few events have funds allotted for advertising, which makes us feel that outreach to the greater University Community is minimal.
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Minority Opinion:

*Comments:* The minority felt that the NSBE regional convention should be funded the $70.47 towards food and the annual convention should be funded half, only taking away 1,659. These conventions are building the necessary skills both in the academic and professional sense needed to be a successful student, thus, the funding support from SSF would be of help.

*Directives:* In future fees requests, please indicate where the food is being provided from and how necessary it is to provide funding for food at events like the regional convention and annual convention.
Navigators at the University of Minnesota (#129)

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $ $6,000  
Recommended Allocation: $ 5,700

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that Navigators receives $5,700 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends Navigators for providing programming at a low cost. However, some food costs were found unnecessary.

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

1) Deduction of $300 for food/entertainment at Catalyst Launch. This food/entertainment expense provided no benefit to the group or the student body.  
GDM: 1a, 2, 4, 5, 6

Directives: Cut down on unnecessary food costs.

Minority Opinion:

The minority is opposed to providing so much funding for so many people to attend the Weekenders Event.
Queer Student Cultural Center (#238)

Committee Vote: 9-0-1

Requested Allocation: $64,414  Recommended Allocation: $50,606

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that QSCC receives $50,606 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends QSCC for the huge breadth of its programming, and its partnerships with other student groups. However, the Majority found that wage and food costs were unnecessary in some cases, detailed below.

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

1) Deduction of $6,600 for stipends. These stipends were not deemed necessary for group operation.  GDM: 10

2) Deduction of $50 for operational travel reimbursements. These local travel costs did not provide value to the group or student body.  GDM: 1a, 4, 5

3) Deduction of $400 for food at board meetings. Food does not provide value to group or student body.  GDM: 1a, 2, 4, 5, 6

4) Deduction of $225 for member group registration. All student groups must pay these fees, applying for SSF funds does not remove that responsibility.  GDM: 8

5) Deduction of $450 for unspecified other in MBLGTACC and Queer Crafting events. No justification given.  GDM: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6

6) Deduction of $2500 for excessive food costs at KINK conference. Funding lowered to a more reasonable ~$8 per person.  GDM: 2

7) Deduction of $1000 for unspecified other at KINK conference. No justification given.  GDM: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6

8) Deduction of $500 for Ally conference travel. Reduced to half payment for 2 students.  GDM: 4, 5, 6
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9) Deduction of $2083 in overall cuts to Minnesota OUT for excessive cost per head.
   GDM: 2

Directives: QSCC is a model student group concerning partnerships and extensive programming, and should continue to provide these services to the student body. However, excessive stipends and travel expenses should be avoided.
Saint Paul’s Outreach (#1542)

Committee Vote: 8-2-0

Requested Allocation: $89,828  Recommended Allocation: $43,340

Majority Opinion

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee would like to thank you for your exceptionally transparent application. The committee had very few issues as far as determining what funds would be used for with regards to programmatic and operational expenditures. After reviewing your application, the committee has come up with a recommendation with the appropriate justifications for our adjustments as follows.

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 does not feel that it is the role of Student Services Fees to pay the SUA Registration fee (-$25)  GDM: 1

2) The committee did not feel that adequate justification was given for the stipends that you have mentioned in your application (-$30,000)  GDM:10

3) Sending 15 people to the Student Leadership Training does not seem like a responsible use of Student Funds, so instead the committee will allot funds for 4 people to attend this event. The committee feels that increased fundraising as well as individually financed transportation are suitable alternatives to Student Service Fees in this case. (-$4,300)  GDM: 3

4) Due to consistency reasons, the committee will not fund local travel for the Black and White Affair. (-$30)  GDM:8

5) The committee did not see the benefit of funding the Alpha Retreat because of the fact that it is an event by nature that is not inclusive for everyone in the University Community. (-$3,250)  GDM:6

6) Similar to the Student Leadership Training, the committee did not feel that sending 20 people to The SNE event would be an appropriate use of Student Services Fees, so the committee has again allotted for 4 people to attend. (-$6,700)  GDM:3

7) The committee did not feel that the importance of sponsoring the Fan into the Flame Scholarships was properly conveyed in your application. (-$1,925)  GDM:1
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8) For consistency, the committee will not allocate funds for local travel as it is outlined to be used for in your Easter Celebration Event. (-$30)  
9) No local travel coverage for Spoken Event. (-$144)  
10) No local travel coverage for Co-Sponsored Event (-$30)  
11) No local travel coverage for New Rules Event. (-$54)  

Directive: The committee would again like to reiterate our appreciation for the services that St. Paul’s outreach does for the University, as well as for its very thorough application. Based on the information provided it seems that your events have relatively high turnout, which implies that your outreach University wide is exceptional – something that is of particular importance in applying for Student Services Fees.

Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $ 89,828  
Recommended Allocation: $ 43,340  

Comments: The minority would have preserved funding for the full time staff member employed by St. Paul’s Outreach. While the minority would have urged the group to do more to demonstrate the necessity of the staff member (GDM: 9), the minority is concerned that the staff member’s elimination will impede the ability of the group to pursue their other stated goals and responsibly spending the rest of the fees money they were allocated. The group’s other programming requests were presumably based on the expectation they would have a staff member to assist in that programming.
SIAM Student Chapter (#2700)

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

Requested Allocation: $3,325  
Recommended Allocation: $2,950

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee is appreciative of the services this group offers to students through its programming. The committee has made minor adjustments to your request with justifications below.

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

1) It is not the role of Student Service’s Fees to cover the SUA registration fee (-$25) GDM:1

2) The committee felt that 600 dollars was too much to allocate for prizes/ etc. so the committee has reduced this amount. (-$200) GDM:1

3) The committee recognizes the Laboratory tour as an event that is exceptionally beneficial for your organization, but feels that the dinner that coincides is not something that Student Services Fees should cover (-$150 food) GDM:8

Directives: The committee would like to see an increase in SIAM’s advertising initiatives for your Guest Lecture Series as well as your Seminar Series as to attract people from all across the University Community.
Society of Asian Scientists and Engineers (#2749)

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

Requested Allocation: $7,560  Recommended Allocation: $2,940

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Society of Asian Scientists and Engineers requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. In particular, the group’s breadth and depth of programming, and efforts to advance Asian students in the sciences. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with several line items within the Society of Asian Scientists and Engineers’ request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were: $2,687 for the national convention; $1,533 for the regional conference; $400 for retreat food.

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 did not feel that the need to send 15 students to the national convention was adequately justified. The committee has decided to fund 2 students at half reimbursement for the convention
   GDM: 5, 6

2) The committee did not feel that the need to send 15 students to the regional convention was adequately justified. The committee has decided to fund 2 students at half reimbursement for the convention
   GDM: 5, 6

3) The committee did not feel that there was a benefit to funding food for the organizations retreat.
   GDM: 5, 6

Directives: The committee was impressed by SASE’s ability to find funding from outside of the SSF fund and would like to strongly encourage SASE to continue seeking diverse funding sources.
Society of Automotive Engineers, University of Minnesota (#529)

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

Requested Allocation: $19,890  
Recommended Allocation: $18,090

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee had no areas of particular concern with your Fees Application, but did adjust your request with the justifications below.

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 does not see the benefit of funding 20 people to attend the Spring Break Testing. Instead, the committee would advise individual travel coverage or increased grant/organizational contribution to allot for the decrease in student services fees funding. However, the committee does see the need to test the vehicle in a location with more forgiving weather and therefore has allotted for half of the requested amount which should allow for 10 people to attend the testing event. (-$1,800)  

GDM:3

Directives: The committee recognizes your effort in engaging students outside the college of Science and Engineering, but would like to see stronger initiatives with regards to advertising, and community outreach to different colleges on campus.
Solar Vehicle Project (#1465)

Committee Vote: 8-1-1

Requested Allocation: $ 98,470

Recommended Allocation: $ 44,040

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The majority believes the Solar Vehicle Project provides a clear value to the University by giving students significant opportunities to apply knowledge and build career skills while also promoting the University in a positive light. The committee would like to continue to support the Solar Vehicle Project and appreciate the very balanced funding sources the organization has attained through a mix of grants, organizational contributions, and fees. But the majority also believes there were a few components of the fees request that did not fully justify the cost they would require. In particular, the committee thinks that the 3D printer and equipment trailer would require more detailed justification before they could or should be funded with student services fees money. Additionally, the majority recommend cutting all allocated fees money for officer stipends, as the committee believes the leadership and career development opportunities presented by official positions in the Solar Vehicle Project are significant and sufficient incentive for officers.

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 is not convinced that the $3,500 allocated for salaries is necessary or justified given the opportunities provided by leadership in the group and the personal benefit to participants. GDM: 6, 8, 10

2) The committee recommends reducing the fees allocation by $50,000 by eliminating the 3D Printer, trailer, and the majority of the money requested for parking permits from the request. The committee believes the 3D Printer would have a clear benefit to the group, and perhaps even campus, but that the cost and the plan for use need to be more fully justified and planned. The committee believes that $40,000 is an enormous use of fees for a single piece of equipment, and it appeared to be more of a luxury than a necessity for the function and success of the group. Additionally, if a piece of equipment that expensive were purchased exclusively through fees, the committee would want to see a very clear and detailed plan of how it would be fairly shared among all students and student organizations. The committee would consider more support for the trailer if it was ascertained that the current state of the trailer posed a clear safety risk to the students involved in the organization. But our impression was that the primary concern with the current trailer is its appearance and how it reflects on the University. The committee believes this
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concern could be addressed through cheaper measures than full replacement. The committee also supports funding for parking the car, but were not convinced that would cost $1000 per year. If the committee is convinced the trailer poses a safety hazard or the parking expenses can be documented in detail, those funding levels could be reconsidered. GDM: 2, 5, 6, 8

3) The only other recommended reductions to the initial request are the removal of $50 of food for both the Homecoming and Welcome Week events. Since this food would be available only to club members participating in the event, the committee believe it constitutes a personal expense and should not be covered through fees. GDM: 1, 6

Directives: The Committee asks that the leadership of the Solar Vehicle Project consider the benefits they derive from their positions and re-assess whether financial incentive is truly necessary for their positions. The committee appreciate the group’s efforts to be inclusive and to make their work visible in the community, and would like to encourage them to continue these efforts. The committee welcomes any further details about the need for specific items removed in this recommendation, and in future fees requests, and would encourage you to develop very detailed plans and explanations of the needs for any very large ticket items that will be funded exclusively or primarily through fees.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: The Minority did not feel that the Solar Vehicle Project group fully justified their large capital equipment request.

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

1) Solar Vehicle Project asked for a large amount of capital equipment without providing an adequate justification why such expensive capital equipment was necessary for operation. GDM: 2, 5, 6

Directives: If the Solar Vehicle Project desires tools that are a luxury, rather than a necessity, funding should come from other sources.
Somali Student Association (#393)

Committee Vote: 6-5-0

Requested Allocation: $43,000  Recommended Allocation: $22,969

Majority Opinion:

Comments: SSA originally had a scheduled time slot in which they were to present to the committee and cancelled. A new presentation time was agreed upon, and again SSA did not present. Because the presentation is a valuable and necessary part of the SSF application process, the committee saw fit to impose a 25% penalty to Somali Student Association’s eventual funding recommendation. Without a presentation in which to ask clarifying questions, the committee decided to make a funding recommendation based only on the application and budget submitted by the group.

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

1) A deduction of $2,750 was made from the request from operational travel. This travel was not explained or justified. GDM: 9

2) The funding for the Alumni Retreat was cut ($950) because the cost of the event was not justified to the committee and seems to only benefit members of the group (and its alumni). GDM: 6, 9

3) There was $1,000 in unjustified and unexplained operational food expenses. Due to the nature of the category, it is assumed that this food would only be given to members, and therefore not benefit students who pay the fee but do not participate in the group. GDM: 6, 9

4) There were two events that do not seem to require food but still have substantial food budgets. Because the reason for this food was not justified or explained, $1,150 was cut from the request for Fall Basketball Tournament and $850 was cut from the request for Spring Soccer Cup. GDM: 9

5) There is a very high food cost for the Somali Youth Collegiate Leadership Conference. This high cost has not been fully justified. The committee believes that the conference can be just as successful with a lower food budget. Therefore, the committee has deducted $5,000 from the fees request. A similarly high food cost was found in the Freshman Engagement Event, so $675 was deducted from the request for that event. GDM: 6, 9
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**Directives:** Considering the fact that the fees request for the Somali Youth Collegiate Leadership Conference comprises over 25% of the overall fees request, the committee highly recommends that SSA follows up with further information about the event and how it will benefit the university community. In addition, if group members are able to provide further justification for any of the points listed above, the committee urges that they do so before final deliberations, so the follow-up information can be considered while making final funding recommendations.

**Minority Opinion 1:**

*Requested Allocation:* $43,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $0

**Comments:** Before financial accountability comes responsibility. Somali Student Association failed to attend their presentation, a promise met by all other student organizations receiving SSF. To accommodate SSA’s schedule, the committee as a whole went out of its way to reschedule another presentation time—only to be disappointed for a second time without explanation. The minority agrees that Somali Student Association adds diversity and fosters a sense of community at the university. However, Somali Student Association has proven itself incapable of proper communication and organization. The minority highly doubts the legitimacy of SSA’s leadership, and concludes that financial accountability should not be entrusted as such.

**Directives:** The minority recommends planning ahead thoroughly and clearly.

**Minority Opinion 2:**

*Requested Allocation:* $ 43,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $29,880

**Comments:** The minority feels the Somali Student Association has been severely penalized for not making it to the presentations. Not only has the majority cut funding for unspecified expenditures, but a 25% overall cut was assessed due to unexplained expenses the majority felt would have been clarified during presentations. The minority feels this is an overlapping cut and hinders an organization that has large student involvement and contribution to the community.

**Directives:** Show up to the public forums to explain as much as possible in the allotted time.

**Minority Opinion 3:**

The minority is opposed to providing funding for Other (specify) and Other (supplies) without explanation of what this is going towards. This would be a deduction of $1,095 before the penalty
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Minority Opinion 4:

Comments: The minority does not agree with the recommendation for the Somali Student Association. A 25% penalty was assessed to the Somali Student Association for failing to give a presentation to the SSFC. The minority disagrees with this penalty because presenting to the SSFC is not a requirement of the SSF process and the committee had a requested budget which allowed it to assess the merits of each program without seeing a presentation.
Student Services Fees (SSF) Event Grant

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

Requested Allocation: $75,000  
Recommended Allocation: $75,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee recommends to fully fund this group. The committee felt that the budget was well planned and fully adhered to the guidelines.

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 budget requested was justified by the following guidelines: 1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4, 6

Directives: Continue to provide the same level of service, keep up the good work!
**Student Veterans Association (#1474)**

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

*Requested Allocation:* $21,045  
*Recommended Allocation:* $18,870

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* SVA provides a service by linking the University’s veteran community with the university as a whole, and the committee appreciates their efforts.

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

1) A $25 deduction for SUA registration fee. All organizations have to pay this fee, even ones who do not have large enough budgets to qualify for Student Services Fees. Therefore, the majority believes it is not within the responsibility for SSFC to pay these fees.  
   GDM: 6, 8

2) Supplies: Certificates/Awards ($100) were not justified as beneficial to the students who pay this fee.  
   GDM: 1, 9

3) Intramural Sports funding was not justified by this group. (-$700)  
   GDM: 2

4) SVA Conference half of funding can come from SSF funding (-$350)  
   GDM: 3

5) The Ski Trip was found to not be beneficial to all fees-paying students. (-$700)  
   GDM: 3, 8

6) Funding for Military Care Packages were cut because SSF funds cannot be used to directly fund philanthropic causes. (-$300)

*Directives:* If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.
Students Against Hunger #2388

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $4,110

Recommended Allocation: $3,760

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority recommends that Students Against Hunger receives $3,760 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends Students Against Hunger for providing educational programming and expanding the scope of their activities. However, the Majority found some food costs unnecessary.

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

1) Deduction of $50 for operational food. This food provided no value to the group or student body. GDM: 1a, 2, 4, 5, 6

2) Deduction of $300 for food at bi-weekly meetings. Again, this food provided no value to the group or student body. GDM: 1a, 3, 4, 5, 6

Directives: Continue to provide quality programming and remove unnecessary food expenses from future budgets.
Students for a Conservative Voice (#1298)

Committee Vote: 7-3-0

Requested Allocation: $120,093  Recommended Allocation: $76,693

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee would like to thank you for applying for Student Services Fees for FY 14. After reviewing your application, the committee has made adjustments and justified them below.

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 did not feel that the increase in stipends was justified in the presentation and application so the committee has allotted the same amount as last year for these. (-$27,200)  GDM:10

2) Student Services Fees are not to be used for parking expenses. (-$800)  GDM:8

3) Food at meetings is not something that the committee feels should be funded by student funds. (-$500)  GDM:8

4) The committee feels a more appropriate amount for computers would be half the requested amount (-$1,200)  GDM:8

5) For your publishing costs the committee would prefer a more gradual increase in your publication to express widespread demand. This way the committee can ensure that no pamphlets are going to be waste with a 200% increase. In addition, the committee would advise looking into a full page publication instead of a pamphlet to increase the amount of space in each issue; and possibly incorporating advertisements into the Minnesota Republic to increase the amount of outside funding your organization could receive. (-$6,000)  GDM:3

6) It is not the role of Student Services Fees to cover the cost of Group Registration Fees (-$25)  GDM:1

7) Roe v Wade food costs are too high, so a deduction of $50 was recommended. GDM:8

8) The committee feels that the gun range trip is something that is inappropriate to be funded with student serviced fees. Other financing options would be preferred. (-$775)  GDM:2
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9) The committee feels that the number of attendees for the CPAC is too high, so the committee has allotted for 2 attendees instead of 8. (-$6,875)  

Directives: If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the expenditures listed above, the committee urges them to do so either in writing or at the public hearings.

Minority Opinion 1:

Requested Allocation: $120,093  
Recommended Allocation: $57,693

Comments: Professional development opportunities at the university are rare and precious. They provide the gateway to many future internships and career opportunities—they strengthen one’s standing in the professional realm. The board at the Students for a Conservative Voice should not expect the entirety of the student body to bear the burden of paying for their own professional development opportunities. The leadership experience itself will greatly—and directly—benefit those individuals who hold such positions. The requested stipends are excessive.

Directives: The minority recommends cutting down on stipends while increasing the visibility of its products through the reallocation of funds for print.

Minority Opinion 2:

Comments: The minority felt that Students for a Conservative Voice should be funded half of their requested salary of 49,200, which will be $24,600. Since a new position is being added to the following year, an increase of $2,600 was found justifiable by the minority.
Students for a Democratic Society (#1480)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $3,875  Recommended Allocation: $3,295

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the Students for a Democratic Society requesting financial support for 2013-14. The SSFC found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. The SSFC is recommending a $580 deduction for fundraising. Since the organization has done such a great job in the past fundraising, the SSFC believes that Students for a Democratic Society can fundraise at the level of their 2011-2012 year.

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

1) A $580 deduction to include fundraising in the budget. The committee feels that this organization has the ability to fundraise. GDM: 7, 8

Directives: Due to the nature of this group and the fact this this would be its first year receiving SSF funding, the committee urges this group to please keep in mind that SSF funds cannot be given to partisan groups or spent on partisan activities. Taking a stand on an issue is acceptable.
Students for Design Activism (#2544)

Committee Vote: 6-0-1

Requested Allocation: $6,525  
Recommended Allocation: $5,557

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee believes that Students for Design Activism is a unique group that serves a unique part of the campus community. There were a couple of budgeted expenses that the committee felt were unjustified. Those deductions are detailed below.

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 stipends for this group were thought by the committee to be non-essential, so $400 was deducted from the allocation. In addition, the committee feels that $100 for operational food and $25 for gas do not provide a benefit to students who pay the fee but do not participate in this group.

GDM: 6

2) The committee believes that the value brought to the University by the LABASH conference will be similar with two U of M attendees. Due to the high cost of attending conferences, the committee is comfortable with funding two conference attendees at half cost. Therefore, $443 was cut from the request.

GDM: 6

Directives: The committee believes that Students for Design Activism could increase its presence on campus through more effective advertising, as well as collaborations with other colleges and student groups.
Students for Human Life (#1928)

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $19,005  Recommended Allocation: $15,405

Majority Opinion:

Comments: This group provides a perspective that is not always seen on college campuses, and their desire for “peaceful conversations” with those who disagree is commendable.

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

1) It is not the role of student services fees to supply food at regular meetings. (-$800) GDM:8

2) Food for regular meetings was listed in both in programming and operational expenses. Unless this is verified, the committee will reduce the amount by another 800 dollars, as it is not the role of Student Services Fees to allot for food at regular meetings. (-$800) GDM:8

3) The committee feels it is more appropriate to send 2 members to the March for Life event in DC. (-$1800) GDM:3

Directives: The committee urges this group to continue to pursue collaborations with other groups in the hope of increasing the discourse surrounding these important social issues.

Minority Opinion:

Requested Allocation: $19,005  Recommended Allocation: $15,605

Comments: The minority feels that a large portion of funding was cut from March for Life. The minority feels this event is justifiable enough to receive more funding considering there is a conference as well as a march.
Teh Pwn Gaming (#2556)

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

Requested Allocation: $138,600    Recommended Allocation: $35,280

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by Teh Pwn Gaming requesting financial support for 2013-14 and found the group’s request to be in line with the SSFC’s stated guidelines. In particular, the group’s breadth and depth of programming, efforts to bring together all gaming students on campus. That being said, the SSFC did take issue with several line items in Teh Pwn Gaming’s request during initial deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were; $48,600 in salaries; $9,850 in equipment; $2,200 in parking; 2,000 for hoodies; $50 for a Costco account; $1,500 in t-shirts; $500 in food for the Starcraft team; $500 in travel for the Starcraft team; $3,000 in scholarships for the Starcraft team; $3,000 for a Starcraft coach; $500 in food for league of legends; $500 in travel for league of legends team; $3,000 in scholarships for league of legends team; $600 in jerseys for league of legends team; $1,200 in food for gaming lounge; $20 for Holifraggle prizes; $400 for seasonal staff panel; $17,000 for GameCraft; $9,900 for live broadcasting.

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 did not feel that the need to salaries to board of directors was adequately justified. GDM: 10

2) The committee decided that it would be fair to partially fund half of the cost of requested equipment. GDM: 5, 6, 7

3) No information was provided to justify the need of funds for operational parking. GDM: 6, 9

4) No information was provided to justify the need of funds for hoodies. GDM: 6, 9

5) No information was provided to justify the need for a Costco account. GDM: 9

6) The committee did not feel that enough information was provided to justify the need for funds for t-shirts. GDM: 6, 9

7) The committee has concerns that funds for the competitive Starcraft team did not do enough to benefit the general community at the University. GDM: 1, 2, 5, 6
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8) The committee has concerns that funds for the competitive League of Legends team did not do enough to benefit the general community at the University. GDM: 1, 2, 5, 6

9) No information was provided to justify the need of funds for game lounge food. GDM: 1a, 6

10) No information was provided to justify the need of funds for prizes. GDM: 1a, 6

11) The committee does not feel that enough information was provided to justify the use of funds for the seasonal staff panel. GDM: 1, 5, 6

12) The committee was concerned that the size of GameCraft was too large for a first time event and would like to see a smaller event put on for the first year to determine if such an event was feasible. GDM: 3, 4, 5

13) The committee did not see enough need demonstrated for live broadcasting of esports benefit to the campus as a whole. GDM: 1, 9

Directives: The committee feels that Teh Pwn Gaming has a lot of promise as a student organization and that there is a large portion of the student population that would be interested in the programing they seek to provide. The committee would like to see Teh Pwn Gaming demonstrate an ability plan events with 5,000 attendees before entrusting them with large amounts of funds to do so.
**Tesla Works (#2626)**

Committee Vote: 10-0-0

*Requested Allocation:* $22,080  
*Recommended Allocation:* $18,100

**Majority Opinion:**

*Comments:* Tesla Works has shown their ability to work with other groups of similar natures and has demonstrated a willingness and excitement about working across disciplines.

*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 Student Services Fees Committee advises that you use your operational reserves to cover your operational costs in FY14. In accordance with this, the committee has cut the operational Student Services Fees Funding listed in your request. (-$3,020)  
   GDM:7

2) The committee would advise that food costs for your medium project be covered from outside sources. (-$500)  
   GDM:8

3) The committee would advise that food costs for your small project be covered from outside sources (-$200)  
   GDM:8

4) The committee would advise that food costs for your fusor project be covered from outside sources (-$200)  
   GDM:8

5) The committee advises that Student Funds should not cover the cost of local travel for your Off Campus Outreach programming. (-$60)  
   GDM:8

**Directives:** The committee appreciates your craftiness in finding a work space that is of no cost to your organization, and accepts it as a justified explanation for the significant deviation in last year’s proposed budget, per GDM 12. We would advise in the future to use the funds allotted for their intended purposes.
UMN Gymnastics Club (#453)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $5,000  Recommended Allocation: $4,500

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The majority did not approve the full allocation of funds for the UMN Gymnastics Club because the committee found the application to be incorrect. The committee does recommend an allocation of $4,500, which will cover the cost of the group’s rent and utilities and insurance.

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 found it justifiable to allocate $4,500 as there is a need for a place of practice and insurance made by the group.  GDM: 9

Directives: Please revise the budget sheet as well as the section labeled, “program breakdown 2013-2014” to be sure the program totals for both expenses and income columns match.
United Nations Student Association-Model United Nations (#339)

Committee Vote: 9-0-0

Requested Allocation: $13,745  Recommended Allocation: $12,245

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The United Nations Student Association provides a service to students not only by traveling to competitions and representing the University of Minnesota in a positive light, but also by taking the knowledge gained from their competitions and turning it into a similar experience for fees-paying students who are not a part of the group. Turning outside experiences into programming for all students is a fantastic way for groups whose main activities take place off campus to maintain a strong presence in the university community.

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 made one deduction from UNSA’s proposed request. The food costs allocated for the campus conference are comparatively high, and high per-student costs for food do not benefit the student body and have not been fully justified. Therefore, a reduction of $1500 was made.  

GDM: 6, 9

Directives: The committee commends USNA’s work in developing the campus conference and encourages UNSA to continue to think of ways to use their experiences at Model United Nations conferences to benefit the student body.
University Forensic Speaking (#2675)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $51,342  Recommended Allocation: $5,247

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Services Fees Committee believes that the University Forensic Speaking provides a unique service to students at the University and supplements the Academic Curriculum. The Committee does not see the justification of providing a coach for the team considering the number of people currently involved in the group along with the impact it would have on students not participating in the group. The committee does not see travel as an expense which should be entirely covered by student services fees. The committee is excited that University Forensic Speaking wants to significantly increase the number of competitions and events it attends, however, since this is the first year in recent times that University Forensic Speaking is applying for fees, the committee does not feel it is justified to fund such a massive increase in programming with prior demonstration of fiscal responsibility with student service fees. The committee’s recommended allocation has reduced programming spending to an amount it feels is adequate, so that the group can still provide a positive experience for its members while being able to grow.

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

1) $15,000 was deducted for coach stipends.  
   GDM: 3, 6

2) $7,800 was deducted for Judge Stipends.  
   GDM: 3, 6

3) $530 was deducted from AFA lifetime membership (the committee believes less expensive AFA membership options would be a more appropriate use of student service fees).  
   GDM: 9

4) $6672, $11,660, and $4433 were deducted from programming Food, Travel, and Fees respectively.  
   GDM: 3, 9

Directives: Seek additional outside funding to cover the cost of travel, food, and fees for competitions.
University Quidditch League

Committee Vote: 9-1-0

Requested Allocation: $16,000  
Recommended Allocation: $8,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The majority believes that the University Quidditch League develops a community and encourages . However, the University Quidditch League has those qualities of a club sport which has limited benefits to the university students as a whole. Consequently, the majority has decided to fund University Quidditch League $8,000.

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

1) Food cost of $4000 was cut from all programs as food is simply the participants’ needs.

   GDM: 1

2) The committee has deducted $4000 from the Midwest QuidFest, 4th Annual Halloween Cup, 4th Annual Spring Cup, Regionals, and World Cup VII as these events are solely for the participants and do not provide a service to the student body or provide benefits to students who do not participate in the events.

   GDM: 1a, 6

Directives: The majority recommends the University Quidditch League to seek other funds, and to request individual contributions, membership fees, to those who play. Although the current individual contribution is burdensome to many students, the required travel associated with the league is too costly.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: The minority would not have recommended cutting all funding for the tryout-based competition team operating within the UQL. The minority does not believe that the presence of a tryout or application process necessarily means that a group’s opportunities are not available to all students. The chance to try out or seek membership through a fair process seems like a reasonable opportunity for participation, and the minority would support some limited support for students who are traveling to represent the University. Ideally, this club would receive support for its competing team from the Club Sports department rather than fees, but in the absence of that option at present, the minority would support temporary support for the tryout team.
University YMCA (#138)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $45,000  
Recommended Allocation: $38,500

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee was duly impressed with the extensive and varied leadership opportunities the University YMCA offers to University students. The committee was also excited by the cross-college involvement and diversity reflected in students involved in the program. The value to these students and the community were clearly communicated and the request generally reflected fiscal responsibility. The committee appreciated the reduction in salaries requested over the last two fees requests. Thus the Committee is only recommending two cuts to the initial request. The Committee was concerned that the Advisory Ambassador program was entered too generally on the budget. It was unclear how much was being spent in several categories due to the large $9,000 fee that is generalized to include retreats, supplies, awards, etc. The committee did not have a clear sense what the fees would be used for and how much. It would have been helpful to have this larger program broken down into several smaller programs provide greater specificity and accountability for how the money would be distributed between retreat support, supplies, etc. Thus the committee reduced this fee request by $4,500. The committee strongly encourages the University YMCA to provide a clearer breakdown of this program and its costs for our consideration. The committee also reduced the fees request by $2,000 for the travel involved the Advisory Ambassador Program. The committee believes that much of the benefit of off-site retreats is limited to participating students, and thus believe that some of the expense should be covered by personal funds or alternate sources of income. The necessity of holding retreats offsite is not clear to the committee, and so travel expenses were deemed a personal expense rather than a University benefit.

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

1) $6,500 reduction in the fees funding for the Ambassador Advisory Program broken down into a $2,000 reduction for travel expenses and a 50% reduction of the “Other” fee, which was not sufficiently detailed to support such a large expense for a relatively small group of students.

   GDM: 1, 9

Directives: Continue to provide extensive leadership experiences for diverse populations of University students. For future fees allocations or appeals of this year’s funding, please reduce ongoing and complex programs like the Advisory/Ambassador program into smaller pieces and events so that the general distribution of fees funding will be more clear to the committee. The committee encourages you to consider submitting this breakdown this year for consideration.
Viva Kiva (#2794)

Committee Vote: 5-1-2

Requested Allocation: $3,700  
Recommended Allocation: $0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The committee feels that Viva Kiva’s expenses do not provide a justifiable service to the student body. After cutting much of the operational costs, consistent with other organizational funding, the committee feels programming costs are only beneficial to the immediate participants.

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 is no demonstrated benefit to students who pay the student services fees but are not involved in the program.  
GDM: 1a, 6, 9

Directives: Consider finding alternative forms of funding or create programs that involve the University community.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee Minority does believe that Viva Kiva provides a service to the student body and supplements the academic curriculum with how it increases awareness around micro lending and provides leadership experience to the students involved and should be at least partially funded.
Voices Merging (#892)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $ 22,000  
Recommended Allocation: $ 0

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Student Services Fees Committee was unable to recommend any funding to Voices Merging because Voices Merging did not adequately meet the minimum requirements for applying: “All budgets and all financial records for all groups… shall be available for student inspections,” page 16 of the 2013-2014 Student Organization Student Services Fees Handbook.

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

1) All funding was deducted because the budget did not accurately reflect the request for allocation and funding was unable to be and justified traced throughout the budget.   

GDM: 9

Directives: The committee strongly urges Voices Merging to revise their budget to reflect a request of $22,000 (confirmed by the committee during the presentation) as opposed to 55,410 (totaled from the budget).
The Wake

Committee Vote: 8-1-1

Requested Allocation: $52,912
Recommended Allocation: $52,742

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The majority respects The Wake’s ability to provide the university with a wide range of services. Hence, the majority has decided to fund The Wake $52,742 for 2013-2014.

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

1) Spring/fall photo shoot does not require food, and does not benefit the student body or the students not directly involved. GDM: # 1, 6

Directives: The majority recommends The Wake to seek methods to earn funds through appropriate ads. Although The Wake has its appeal with no use of advertisements, the majority believes that the incorporation of ads in The Wake’s growth will be crucial.

Minority Opinion:

Comments: The minority is of the opinion that The Wake should take a hard look at earning some revenue through advertising. If advertisers were sought and chosen carefully, advertisements would add to the quality of The Wake, not detract from it. Any income earned from ad revenue could be paid out as stipends or used to cover the cost of production. The minority is of the opinion that The Wake’s unwillingness to advertise means that it has not fulfilled numbers 7 and 8 of the guidelines for decision-making.
Weisman Art Collective (#2798)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $21,300  Recommended Allocation: $12,000

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee was extremely impressed with Weisman Art Collective’s fees presentation and programming over the past couple years. The committee believes that the mission of integrating students into the museum is a worthy and important one, and was impressed with the vast collaborations with a diverse range of other student groups. The committee is pleased to assist in supporting the organization with fees funding. However, the committee was not persuaded that the increase in overall income from previous years represented by the fees request ($29,630 vs. 18,883 and 19,830) was properly justified by the application and anticipated programming.

In the past couple of years, the Collective has consistently filled its program venues for five large, annual programs, with an overall budget under $20,000. Fully funding the request for next year would raise the group’s annual budget to nearly $30,000. Yet the organization once again proposes holding five major events and actually projects a lower overall attendance (2200 students) than it boasted in 2011-2012 (2600 students). Currently, it does not seem necessary to increase the organization’s funds so sharply simply to improve the quality or experience of events that are already fully attended and extremely well-reviewed.

The Committee is very open to the possibility of increased funding for the Weisman Art Collective, but believes that this funding should be used to increase either the number of events offered and/or the attendance capacity at these events so that more students can benefit from the programs provided. For example, this year the Collective is proposing a film screening that would hold 200 students, but would cost nearly $30 per student in fees funding. Could that event be held in a larger venue or offered multiple times to spread these benefits across a wider range of students?

Based on these concerns, the committee is recommending funding the Collective at a level of $12,000, which would combine with their estimated organizational contributions of $7,900 to keep their overall income equivalent with the current year’s. If the Collective proposes more programming or larger capacities in future requests, the committee would strongly support increased funding.
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The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:

1) Recommended allocation reduced by $9300 to keep funding at consistent levels with this year, since programming number and scope is anticipated to remain the same. GDM: 2(quantity), 5

Directives: Please continue to partner with student groups to provide diverse, high quality programs that will build greater engagement among the student body with the Weisman and make that resource a more fully utilized feature on campus. Consider increasing the amount and size of programs and events to expand opportunities to participate to a wider collection of students. The committee would strongly urge considering additional funding for such efforts.
Wesley Foundation (#2777)

Committee Vote: 6-4-0

Requested Allocation: $93,060

Recommended Allocation: $16,360

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Majority believes that the Wesley Foundation offers a service to the student body and helps to foster a sense of community on the campus, and was impressed with specific events like the Public Forums and Multifaith week. The committee did feel though that a number of expenses were unjustified. Requests to fund programs which occurred off campus where only students in direct attendance would receive benefit were closely examined and adjusted. The request to increase space for the group as well could not be justified with the current demand for programs and services shown by the student group’s attendance and involvement. Many of the programs that the Wesley Foundation requested funding for have the opportunity to benefit students and create a sense of community around campus, however, the current amount of involvement that the Wesley Foundation has did not justify such large expenses in areas such as Food, Entertainment, and Travel.

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

1) $3,000 was deducted for worship consultant. $3,000 was deducted for director travel. $1,500 was deducted for operational food event support and $3,000 was deducted for operational food hospitality. $5,000 was deducted from operational other expenses for hospitality and fundraisers. $1,000 was deducted from equipment: $500 from the television, $500 from “other”). $500 was also deducted from “postage”

2). $8,050 was deducted from UBC Rental under Rent and Utilities breakdown.

3) $2,000, $500, and $1,500, were respectively deducted from Worship, Office Hours, Community Nights.

4) $1,150, $400, and $350 were deducted respectively from programming expenses for the “Fall Retreat”, “Winter Retreat”, and “Leadership Training.”

5) $25,000 was deducted from the “summer trip”, and $5,400 was deducted from “Spring Break Service Trip”, $550 was deducted from “Summer Camping Trip”, $2,700 was deducted from “Ministries network bi-annual conference”.
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6) $100 was deducted from social ministries. GDM: 9

7) A deduction in the amount of $13,000 was made to reduce operational reserves. GDM: 9

Directives: Continue to seek additional funding for events which occur off campus. Increase the reach and of advertising of the group to get more students involved. If group representatives are able to provide further justification for the items listed above, the committee urges them to do so, in the hopes that this follow-up communication can be considered during final deliberations.

Minority Opinion 1:

Comments: The minority is opposed to providing funds for rent when this group did not have rent in previous year’s budgets. Additionally, the group does not serve a large enough number of U of M students to need a physical space.

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

1) Given the size and scope of programming that the Wesley Foundation provides the University, an office space is not a necessity. If an office space is desired, alternative funding should be found. GDM: 2, 5, 6, 8

Directives: Eliminate office space, or fund it with non-SSF funds until said office space can be justified.

Minority Opinion 2:

Comments: The minority does not agree with the recommendation to fund the Wesley Foundation. The minority felt that many of the programs and operations which the Wesley Foundation sought funding for, offered little educational value to the campus community and that with the amount of outside funding that they were receiving, that the Wesley Foundation could fully operate without SSF funding.
Women’s Student Activist Collective (#266)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $31,476  
Recommended Allocation: $16,302

Majority Opinion:

Comments:
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 did not feel that the need for Staff and Interns was properly conveyed in the application and presentation. (-$10,000)  
   GDM: 10

2) SUA Fee is not to be paid via Student Services Fees. (-$25)  
   GDM: 1

3) The committee has concluded that Paychex under consultant and professional fees was not adequately justified/ explained in your application. (-864)  
   GDM: 10

4) Student Fees are not to cover parking costs. (-$150)  
   GDM: 8

5) The committee believes that student funds should not cover the operational food costs under “fees committee meeting” (-$250)  
   GDM: 8

6) The committee does not see the need for Student Services Fees to cover the cost of Condoms and lube. (-$150)  
   GDM: 2

7) Magazine subscriptions should be funded via other sources. (-$50)  
   GDM: 2

8) For Pro-choice Lobby Day, the committee feels that donations should not be made using Student Services fees because Student Services Fee money must not be, directly or indirectly, used to ... donate directly to charitable organizations or philanthropic causes.

9) The committee advises against the use of student funds for goodie bags in your Consent week program. (-$60)  
   GDM: 1

10) The committee feels 600 dollars for entertainment during consent week is not an appropriate allocation of student funds. (-$600)  
    GDM: 3
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11) Student funds should not be used to cover the costs of local travel for the Co-Sponsorship event with RSO. (-$200) GDM:8

12) The committee has adjusted the allocations for advertising for the following events: F-Word Series ($900), Discussion Panel ($500), Fundraising Concerts ($500), International Women’s Day ($800). The projected attendance for these events is not in accordance with the total allotment for advertising. (-$2,700 total) GDM:3

13) The committee feels that the Feminist Sleepover is a program in which private funding would be more appropriate. (-$75) GDM:2

*Directives:* While the committee realizes the importance of reaching out to all people across the University of Minnesota to increase involvement in your programs; the committee would like to see more responsible use of advertising money. Social Media, flyer distributions, chalking, as well as postering are all options to consider that show considerable results with a relatively low cost.
Young Americans for Liberty (#2291)

Committee Vote: 8-0-0

Requested Allocation: $ 5,000

Recommended Allocation: $ 3,200

Majority Opinion:

Comments: The Committee recognizes that Young Americans for Liberty provides unique benefits and opportunities to students here at the University of Minnesota. The Committee’s recommendation is to fund the groups programming and operations, minus expenses which the committee believes aren’t a necessity to the group’s operations or should not be paid for by student services fees money.

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

1) $900 deducted for stipends. GDM: 3, 6, 9, 10
2) $300 deducted for meeting food. GDM: 6
3) $100 deducted for other. GDM: 9
4) $500 deducted for retreat. GDM: 6

Directives: Consider less expensive forms of advertisement, such as utilizing social media. Seek more external funding.