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Chair's Preface

The committee would like to thank you for taking the time to read through its final recommendations. The committee was delighted to have the opportunity to explore the many valuable benefits, programs, and events the University of Minnesota's student groups and organizations bring to campus. From the onset, it was clear that our University's motto, "Driven to Discover," not only describes the academic prowess and mission of the University, but also the ambition, creativity, and collaboration of our driven student population.

To be sure, the committee this year was also driven to make fair, viewpoint neutral allocation recommendations for the student services fee. In order to achieve this end, the committee did not consider any of the viewpoints that applicants may promote or stand for while making allocation recommendations. Whereas principles in this manner are typically considered in many of society's institutions when making value judgments, the committee instead referred to and applied the guidelines for decision making which have been approved by the Office for Student Affairs and are governed by the Board of Regents.

Specifically, there are 13 guidelines for decision making (Handbook, pp. 17-18, and on next page). The committee is charged with making responsible, viewpoint neutral recommendations for allocating fees funding using the guidelines. The committee consistently used the guidelines when reviewing each funding request on case-by-case. The committee used its authority to weight and apply the guidelines, choosing to find, in many cases, the first guideline lexically superior. The committee also paid special attention to guideline 9 and 10.

It should be noted that while many student groups and organizations have operations and programming that fulfilled many if not all of the guidelines, such a fact did not guarantee approval for funding. As the Board of Regents requires, the committee also must consider the openness of operations and programs as well as a host of other related criteria (such as minimum application criteria that require no profit, and thus a zero carryover for groups).

As you browse the final recommended allocations, please be reminded by the tremendous amount of work the committee has completed thus far. Combined, committee members spent over 1,400 hours considering requests for 64 groups. Ample time was devoted to each request, no consideration was left unchecked or unnoticed, and the committee acted with resolve and thoroughness. In the rationales included in this document, the committee explained its actions, referencing the guidelines and justification for the allocation figures it arrived at over the course of deliberations. Minority opinions are also provided in addition to the majority, if applicable.

I attest that this year the committee acted in responsible, viewpoint neutral ways. It has considered all the information it was provided before final deliberations. Its final recommendations ensure the student services fee will be allocated wisely.

Best Regards,
Kyle R. Kroll
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.
   a. In response to its own needs, operating risks (i.e. fluctuations in enrollment) and budgeting practices, organizations should establish an internal requirement for reserve funds.
   b. This requirement is not translated into an arbitrary SSF rule, i.e. 10% of operating funds. It is recommended that operating reserves for student groups be between 0-10%, but a minimum reserve is not required.
   c. Administrative units are not required to maintain minimum or maximum reserves.
   d. The SSFC has the ability to reduce financial reserves for any organization – administrative unit or student group – if proper justification is not found for the requested amount.

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.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**African Student Association** (#339)

*Requested Allocation:* $17,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $15,412

*Comments:* The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation by the African Student Association requesting financial support for 2012-13. 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 African 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 African Student Association’s request during final deliberations, upon a more thorough review. Areas that SSFC felt were outside of student organization funding guidelines were; $300 for items viewed as donations, $388 for a surplus or carry over, $300 funding food for board/executive meetings and $400 for operational travel.

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

1) The fee cannot be used for donations or philanthropy directly. GR: 1

2) A carryover of $388 was subtracted from the request. GR: 9

3) The committee did not feel that food at the board/executive meetings were integral or related to the guidelines in any substantial way. GR: 1, 2, 5, 6

4) Operational travel was not justified and did not seemingly relate to the guidelines. GR: 1, 9

*Directives:* The committee asks that fees money not be used for food at board/executive meetings. We ask that ASA raise external funds for its philanthropy.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

All-Campus Elections Commission (#369)

Requested Allocation: $3,900  
Recommended Allocation: $3,260

Comments: The Committee has approved the request of ACEC. ACEC has provided an appropriate budget for its advertising campaign, effectively proved its employment of food at its “Get out the Vote” events, and employed its carryover from the previous year, all of which allows the Committee to find ACEC’s request justifiable. The Committee is also pleased to see that SSF funds only slightly more than 50% of ACEC’s budget.

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

1) Budget request justified, except for the carryover; $640 deducted due to carryover since student groups applying for fees are not allowed to have a profit at the end of the fiscal year GR: 1a, 1c, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and Minimum Application Criteria

*Directives:* Continue to maintain well-documented attendance figures.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Al-Madinah Cultural Center (#612)

Requested Allocation: $75,000  Recommended Allocation: $64,000

Comments: The Majority recommends that Al-Madinah receives $64,000 in SSF funding for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends Al-Madinah in the breadth of its programming, and on the improvement in fiscal responsibility over the previous year. However, the Majority finds that some of the events Al-Madinah hosts targets too specific a crowd or does 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 handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GR) numbers supporting each point:

1) Deduction of $2,000 for a ski trip. This event is not accessible to all students and does not provide a service to the greater student body following the event. GR: 5, 1a

2) Deduction of $4,000 for programming advertising. The event is not fully justified in the need for such large advertisement needs. Proper efficient advertising can be achieved with smaller funding. GR: 9

3) Deduction of $1,000 for senior gifts. This event benefits only a small number of students. GR: 5

4) Deduction of $4,000 from room rental. Al-Madinah currently holds a room for its own use in Coffman – funding has not been justified as to why other rooms are required for events such as Brothers Bashes, Leadership Events. GR: 9

Directives: The Majority recommends that Al-Madinah continue to search for outside sources of funding, as SSF funds a large majority of Al-Madinah’s budget.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-1-0)

American Indian Student Cultural Center (#274)

Requested Allocation: $31,250  
Recommended Allocation: $24,800

Comments: The Committee overall believes this organization demonstrated thoroughly their impact and commitment to the total student population at the University of Minnesota. However, a reduction of $5,000 in “salaries, wages, and stipends” was recommended because there wasn’t sufficient evidence to necessitate an increase from 2010-2011. Upon final review of the AISCC budget, the following reductions were made: $450 in carryover, $800 in operational food, and $200 in operational travel.

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

1) While it is understood that having student workers can be beneficial, the question still remains: should all the students who pay fees pay for them to do the work laid out in the application? Could this same work be accomplished by dedicated volunteers? GR: 10b

2) Reductions of $800 from operational food, $200 from operational travel, and $450 in carryover were made because the committee did not feel that those portions of the request were justified or necessary. The relevant question was why should all fee paying students pay for operational travel and food? Because there is a reserve built into the budget, there also seems no need for the carryover. GR: 6, 9, and Minimum Application Criteria

Directives: Please use food money wisely. Next year, provide us with information about how integral operational food and travel are to the group's meeting its mission.

Minority Opinion Rationale

American Indian Student Cultural Center (#274)

Requested Allocation: $31,250  
Recommended Allocation: $N/A

Comments: The Minority would have deducted $10,000; The Minority feels that the salaries are not justified, and that salaries for student workers can be offset by use of volunteer student members to staff the desk/conduct day-to-day business for the AISCC. The Minority’s opinion is concurrent with the Majority’s.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GR) numbers supporting each point:
1) Deduction of $10,000 from salaries and stipends. AISCC Did not demonstrate that the financial need for student workers CANNOT be fulfilled elsewhere GR: (8)

_Directives:_ The Minority believes that the salaries for student desks workers at the AISCC was not fully justified. The Minority urges the AISCC to split its desk worker work amongst a greater amount of voluntary students, rather than placing the work on 1-2 students who then receive wages.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (#139)

Requested Allocation: $4,000

Recommended Allocation: $2,656

Comments: The majority felt that the group did demonstrate the benefit of its programs to the organization and students on campus who are involved. The following deductions were made to the requested allocation: Carryover was reduced by $119. The Paper Conference budget was reduced by $250, (which was based on taking into account the travel costs for 5 students). Operational reserves was reduced by $200 to reflect an appropriate reserve for the recommended budget. Operational travel was reduced by $100 and operational food was reduced by $100 because the committee does not feel like these two expenses benefit students or the U of M campus. Lastly, $575 was reduced because of the unexplained imbalance between program and operational expenses.

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

1) The group has demonstrated efforts to secure funding outside of SSFC funds GR: 7

2) Quality of programs is consistent with the mission of the organization GR: 2

3) Unclear if the programs are affecting a breadth of services to students across academic departments. GR: 4

4) Deductions were justified by referring to the guidelines for decision making and making a reasonable judgment as to how much of each program or line item should be paid for with fees. GR: 1, 2, 5, 6, 9

Directives: For next year, please ensure that budget sheets are filled out fully in order to reflect where all students service fees funds are to be spent. Provide justification of the benefit to the U of M students and the greater U of M campus for all programs.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

Pre-med AMSA (#54)

Requested Allocation: $75,075  
Recommended Allocation: $33,790

Comments: Overall the committee was impressed by this organization. They held many events that the committee thought brought value to the campus community. In particular the committee applauds the Feed My Starving Children event that brings students all over campus together to the field house to do service work. The Majority did feel that the request for this year was exorbitant. The final allocated amount accounted for a funding of $2,500 in operations. From programming we deducted $3,550 from the social networking event, $6,800 from the semi-annual dinner, $6,845 from the Davis conference, $1,150 from the Jon Hopkins conferences, $6,500 from the AMSA national conference, and $1,500 for the AMSA Regional conference. These numbers were determined by calculating a more reasonable allocation to pay for part of the conferences, as full funding for the amount of members going was not justified, and a more reasonable part of the social events as the committee felt that the ratio of money spent to students in attendance was too high.

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

1) Deductions were made to only fund part of the conference expenses. GR: 1a, 1c, 6
2) Deductions were made from operational expenses. GR: 9
3) The majority wanted to fund many of the events that contributed to the overall campus community. GR: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6

Directives: The committee believes that this increase will allow AMSA to operate at a very increased level. The committee would like AMSA to make discretionary decisions about how many students get to go to more than one or two conferences. We would like to see as many students as possible going to the various conferences; spread the attendance around your large member base.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

American Society of Civil Engineers (#676)

Requested Allocation: $10,000

Recommended Allocation: $9,000

Comments: In general, the committee (unanimous majority) was very impressed with the programming the ASCE puts on for civil engineering students. In particular, the committee was surprised that ASCE was able to orchestrate such a large career fair for students, which the committee would have expected the civil engineering department to host. This fact clearly demonstrates that ASCE is an integral part of the civil engineering community on campus.

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

1) The committee deducted $1,000 from the fees request for the brown-bag lunches program. We believe this event is somewhat justified, but we felt $2,500 for the entire program was excessive. GR: 1a, 1c, 9

Directives: For the upcoming year, the committee encourages ASCE to continue to provide the career fair for students as well as seek financial contributions from members attending the steel bridge and concrete canoe events to help pay for travel. Please limit fees spending on food.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Amnesty International (#174)

Requested Allocation: $4,900

Recommended Allocation: $4,864

Comments: All committee members agreed that Amnesty International 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 (which was evident in their structured presentation). Furthermore, Amnesty International collects a good amount of outside funding, primarily in donations.

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

1) Committee found budget request to be justifiable, but deducted $36 for carryover. GR: 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, and Minimum Application Criteria

Directives: Continue exceptional attention to SSF guidelines in the future (particularly those listed above).
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

Asian American Student Union (#157)

*Requested Allocation: $84,950*  
*Recommended Allocation: $79,325*

**Comments:** The Majority recommends funding of $79,325 for the ASU for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends ASU on the breadth, depth, and impact of its events throughout the school year. The Majority believes that the ASU provides a wonderful focal point for its plethora of affiliate members, all of whom generate programming of great value for the greater U of MN campus.

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

1) Deduction of $5,625.83 from carryover. ASU should endeavor not to have any carryover from year-to-year since it already has a reserve. GR: 9, and Minimum Application Criteria

**Directives:** The Minority urges the ASU to not generate a carryover from year-to-year, but rather place any funds needed for the July-September range (before SSF checks arrive) into a reserve account. Ensure that difference (incomes minus expenses) are $0. Doing this, limit your request next year to what is wholly needed.
Ayn Rand Study Group (#2373)

Requested Allocation: $89,950  
Recommended Allocation: $12,100

Comments: The Majority was concerned with the extent of this request. For a small group without demonstration of vast SSF-paying student impact, extremely large advertising budgets without the visibility to match this request, and the use of paid staff and students to maintain a group with a relatively small number of events, the majority has made the decisions as followed based on the reasons above, paired with the presentation ARSG gave to the committee and provided narrative and program information. Upon receiving further information, the majority understands why the event budgets were similar/identical. Due to the similarities in the type of and scope of events, this seems understandable/clear now. The majority appreciated further information on the matter. However, the request still appears unreasonable, particularly the very large advertising request. The majority is aware of the vast advertising work that can be done with far less, and due to the scope and mission of ARSG, the majority felt a smaller amount would be sufficient. Similarly, the majority suggests an attempt to co-sponsor events with other groups on campus and to seek out grant opportunities. This can provide funds this group may believe they need outside of the allocated SSF funds. Also, this should increase the member base and event attendance that will strengthen this group for future SSF requests. The need for general meeting food has not been justified. The majority sees that this group certainly stimulates the U academic curriculum and that it provides a service across many departments. Also, the leadership that presented the group’s request was successful at conveying ARSG’s intent and message. However, with unreliable and regular leadership turnover, the majority suggests that ARSG enacts a plan for surprise leadership losses so that stability remains constant and that the SSF majority can be confident in the security of SSF funds and the use of said funds. The majority still found no justification for operational expenses, including rent, stipends, and wages at this point in the group’s progress. The majority does not believe that SSF money should cover the cost of study materials in that they are not accessible widely, and because of the access U students have to libraries on and near campus. Similarly due to the size of regular meetings utilizing these materials, this does not appear unreasonable to accommodate. The fees committee is concerned with the lack of outside funding, especially considering this exceptionally large fees request. The justification by ARSG for this is that with unstable leadership, the focus on planning for programming, and the amount of time and effort this takes, this is unreasonable for this group at this point in time. However, this is why the majority believes that a stable leader base and member base is essential before this group has such a large operating budget, and programming budget. The majority suggests gaining a member base through smaller budget events with a focus on the interesting material this group has to offer would benefit and strengthen this organization for the long term.

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

1) Subtractions of $2300 for advertising, $6400 for entertainment, and $1600 were made from the Laissez-faire capitalism conference. The majority did not feel such a large budget was
justifiable or reasonable, and that a budget of $700 could allow for widespread advertising if utilized wisely. In that the focus of these events should be on SSF-paying students, flyering on the East and West banks and St. Paul Campus would provide extensive advertising possibilities and community draw. The majority does not believe the use of costly online/Facebook advertising was reasonable considering cost and does not suggest the use of this marketing in that it does not just target the U community. Entertainment costs are extraordinary. This event is academically beneficial and is quite unique, yet the majority suggests requesting some speakers or campus professors to donate their time, or receive smaller compensation. Similarly, this would lessen the travel costs if more efforts were kept local until there is justification for specific speakers outside of this community/area. Funds granted for entertainment and travel account for local efforts, and allow for some larger scale speakers and necessary travel, with encouragement to seek outside funds and co-sponsorships. GR: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8

2) Subtractions of $1800 for advertising, $600 for entertainment, and $400 from travel were made for each of the 4 other programming events. Please see justification in point 1.) in that the event request and scope is quite similar. GR: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8

3) Subtraction of $2000 for general meeting food was made. The committee did not see justification for this request, nor that it was fulfilling guidelines as stated: GR: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8

4) A deduction of $53,150 was made from the operational budget. GR: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10b, 12

Directives: The majority suggests that ARSG does not seek to work with such an extensive budget until a group of passionate and interested individuals are found to maintain a stable leadership base. Similarly, grassroots member advertising and word of mouth on campus can travel quite far. Co-sponsorships could help this group gain a stable member and leadership base that could manage the kind of request being made. The majority believes this group must be build by its members and campus interest, and not through a small member base and a budget of almost $90,000. This group, at its core, fulfills numerous SSF guidelines, but the demonstration of service to the greater student body must be provided before fees can be allocated in such large amounts. This is clearly demonstrated in the SSFC Guidelines for Decision Making. Please refer to these guidelines in the coming year when making an SSF request and when building the ARSG. Continue serving the campus community with a unique academic perspective. The majority looks forward to seeking the work that comes out of ARSG in the coming year.

Minority Opinion Rationale

**Ayn Rand Study Group (#2373)**

*Requested Allocation: $89,950  Recommended Allocation: $N/A*

*Comments:* For the size of the group and the breadth of the programming done, the minority does not believe the Ayn Rand Study Group deserves such a large funding allocation. Especially considering the amount of money in reserves from the previous year.
The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GR) numbers supporting each point:

1) The group does not have enough of a grass roots base to justify this large of a funding allocation GR: 1, 4, 5

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Black Graduate and Professional Students Association (#956)

Requested Allocation: $8,672  
Recommended Allocation: $8,672

Comments: The committee found all aspects of BGAPSA's budget, programming and operations to be within Student Handbook Guidelines. The committee found in initial and final deliberations that the requested amount was a figure that was reasonable to the work being done by this student group. We see a great amount of work being done to the campus through this group and a demand for the services that BGAPSA provides.

Directives: Continue to provide valuable programming to graduate students. You have this committee's support.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

**Black Motivated Women (#1821)**

*Requested Allocation: $14,635  
Recommended Allocation: $11,045*

*Comments:* The committee continues to be impressed with this organization’s mission and outreach. As a result, we are increasing our financial support from last year by 27%. However, we did notice that $1,774 in carryover was listed for last year.

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

1) $2000 reduction in food for Gala. GR: 7: Efforts to secure funding in addition to the student services fees.

2) $1590 removed from support for fashion show. GR: 5: Targeting of programs and services to the largest number of students consistent with the need.

*Directives:* The committee encourages BMW to charge attendees a portion of the Gala dinner expense. The committee historically has not funded gifts or give-away items, which are a significant portion of this event’s budget. For next year’s request, please be sure to clarify how large your reserve is by placing it in the budget sheet. We allowed the carryover line to be paid for because it was a reserve, according to the application, but next year, this will not be allowed.
Majority Opinion Rationale (6-2-2)

Black Student Union (#243)

Requested Allocation: $64,565  
Recommended Allocation: $55,080

Comments: The Committee was overall very impressed with BSU’s outreach and its ability to obtain funding in addition to Student Services Fees. The majority still struggled to see the benefit that the Ebony Ball had for the entire campus but was glad to see BSU obtained a quote to have the event on campus and that they may consider doing so.

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

1) The Majority was a little confused about why there were rent costs in Coffman. However, based on the rent and utility bills BSU provided to the committee, the majority decided to only deduct $1,323 for rent from the $5,000 requested. The majority also felt the benefits of cable TV in the office seemed justified and therefore reinstated the $1,000 requested. GR: 1a, 1b, 8

2) A recommended deduction of $7,762 for the Ebony Ball event has been made based on the estimate BSU provided to have the event on campus. The majority decided to fund room rental and half of the food costs for this event. GR: 7, 8

3) Operational food and travel expenses were deducted in the amount of $400.00. Taking all information provided by BSU, the majority felt neither of these line items were justified. GR: 1a, 1b

Directives: N/A

Minority Opinion Rationale

Black Student Union (#243)

Requested Allocation: $64,565  
Recommended Allocation: $N/A

Comments: The minority did not want to student services fees to fund cable television for this organization as it did not believe cable would truly benefit the greater campus community. The minority also did not want to fund the College Day program, as it did not feel that paying for the food and travel expenses for students to visit and learn about the U of M was a justifiable expense to assess onto the general student population. Essentially, the fee paying students should not be paying for things that only go towards benefiting non-paying visitors.
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 did not believe cable or college day benefits the greater student population. GR: 1, 2, 3

*Directives:* Use cable money for more beneficial programming or operations.
Majority Opinion Rationale (6-4-0)

Bridges International (#2355)

Requested Allocation: $14,333  
Recommended Allocation: $3,811

Comments: The majority felt that Bridges International did a good job of welcoming international students to the university and helping them adjust to University life. The group's primary benefit to students is in the form of enhanced community on campus. The committee's recommended allocation figure will allow Bridges to grow next year.

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

1) The majority did not believe that give-away prizes for Bridges' fall activities fair booth was an appropriate use of student services fees. GR: 1a

2) Thirteen seasonable and holiday-themed parties were outlined in Bridges' program breakdowns. The committee decided to fund half of the cost of these programs, noting that although the events do not provide a service to students, they do help foster community on campus, and thus receive some consideration. GR: 1c

3) Bridges requested $2,800 to use to purchase a fridge and projector. The majority believed that this amount was excessive for the purchase purposes. The majority chose to fund $450 for the purchase of these two items. GR: 1a, 2

4) Bridges hoped to compensate its partner organization, CRU, for using its premises for storage, general meetings, and events. After reviewing CRU's budget, the majority found it would be inappropriate for fees to be used for this purpose since CRU does not already pay rent for its space. GR: 9

5) The majority, after reviewing the benefits of Bridges' Vision Conference program, did not believe the program was justified in its proposed use of fees. The entire amount was deducted from the request. GR: 1, 6, 9

6) A further reduction of $222 was made for the carryover. GR: Minimum Application Criteria

7) Given all of these reductions, a further reduction of $500 was made to the created reserve since the budget, unless other income is secured, should be smaller than expected in the request. GR: 9

Directives: For next year, the majority would like to see Bridges International engage more students on campus. The majority also believes that the seasonal and holiday-themed parties could be reduced or combined to form larger events for more students. If Bridges would like to participate in future conferences using fees monies, it will need to fully justify how the conference fits the guidelines for decision making (p. 17, Fees Handbook).
Minority Opinion Rationale

*Bridges International* (#2355)

*Requested Allocation: $14,330  Recommended Allocation: $N/A*

*Comments:* It is the opinion of the minority that the Vision Conference should receive some funding from student fees. The majority has failed to acknowledge that this Committee has provided funding for all other student groups who applied for various forms of student travel.

*Directives:* Next time this group applies for conference funding, it is recommended that it explains more specifically what benefit such a conference would bring to the campus and other students, making sure to fit guidelines 1a, 1b, and 1c.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Campus Atheists, Skeptics, and Humanists (#63)

*Requested Allocation:* $9,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $7,788

*Comments:* The committee continues to see the valuable contribution that Campus Atheists Skeptics and Humanists makes to the intellectual dialogue at the university.

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

1) A reduction of $1,022 was made to eliminate the excessive carryover anticipated for next year. GR: Minimum Application Criteria

*Directives:* Please be sure to restrict your request to what is actually needed, being sure to have a near-zero carryover for the requested year.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Catholic College Student Group (#518)

Requested Allocation: $7,553.59  Recommended Allocation: $6,954

Comments: The committee greatly appreciates CCSG’s willingness to rework their schedule and operational strategy. Their updated narrative and budget were quite admirable. The committee made only a 50% reduction for food during the Spring Break Service Trip.

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

1) Half of the food expense ($600) was not supported by the committee for the Spring Break Service Trip. GR: 1a, 1b, 6

Directives: All previous directives were taken. The committee now suggests that each student pay for half of their food on the Spring Break Service Trip or that fundraising help supplement the SSF funding.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Chabad At the U of M (#2555)

Requested Allocation: $31,025  
Recommended Allocation: $12,425

Comments: The majority felt that the organization has an array of programs and does well in working to include a diverse population of students and other organizations in their programming. The requested funding for food was high in relation to the amount of students Chabad is reaching. About 2/3 of the requested funds for food was cut, and the committee feels the remaining amount is still a sufficient amount of money to put towards food at events.

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

1) Would like to see more outside funding GR: 7

2) Have a large amount of programs and the programs fit well with the mission of the organization.  GR: 2

3) Helping to foster a sense of community  GR: 1

4) Unclear of the benefit to students who pay the fee, but do not participate in the programs offered.  GR: 6

5) A reduction of 2/3 of the food expenses requested to be paid with fees was made since the cost was seen as excessive, despite special dietary requirements. GR: 1, 9

6) A reduction of $1000 was made for the leadership conference from an excessive travel cost for the students attending. GR: 1, 2, 9

7) A reduction of $1000 was made for the "recreational activities," which the committee felt was only partially justified. GR: 1, 9

Directives: Try to secure more outside funding for next year's request; perhaps ask participants to help supplement the food costs.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

Collegians for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT) (#789)

Requested Allocation: $199,125   Recommended Allocation: $85,483

Comments: The unanimous majority on the committee was impressed with the broad range of programs CFACT puts on each year. It was also impressed with diverse academic backgrounds of its student members. However, the committee was wary of the number of off-campus programs CFACT puts on. The committee would very much like to see CFACT do more on-campus programming and involve even more students. For the recommended allocation CFACT gets, it should be able to involve hundreds, if not thousands, of students, but as of yet, the committee has not seen any objective evidence stating that this has happened. The recommended allocation is a very generous amount even if CFACT members and officers do not think so. In relation to the request, it may seem as if the committee has punished CFACT, but it is quite the opposite. This is a hearty amount of money that any group on campus should be proud and happy to receive. The committee anticipates stellar programming with this money.

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

1) The committee was impressed with the number of academic backgrounds students involved with CFACT have. It is obvious that CFACT gathers a diverse group of students. GR: 4

2) CFACT has done a good job in securing funding other than fee’s money. GR: 7

3) The group provided requested documentation of their handout upon request. GR: 3

4) CFACT has a large and expensive office space near campus. It is unclear whether the office space functions in a way that the committee desires (i.e. office spaces should not only be a place for work to be accomplished by officers, but also a place for meetings and events.) Even after justification, the committee did not feel the space was reasonable for its purposes. GR: 9

5) It was also unclear if some of the programs CFACT is running are benefiting fee paying students who do not participate. Some programs showed obvious benefits. GR: 6

6) The majority felt that CFACT was unable to fully justify the use of staff, wages, and stipends; therefore, a reduction of $53,200 was made. Insurance and benefits was reduced by $13,190 to reflect the reduction in salaries, wages, and stipends. GR: 10

7) The committee deducted $3,200 from consultant/professional fees, which was agreed to be a sufficient amount for the needs of the group with the suggested budget. GR: 1, 6, 9

8) The equipment was reduced by $3,000 as the committee felt the items requested could be purchased with an allocation of $2,000. GR: 9
9) Rent and utilities was reduced by $5,000, as the majority felt that this amount would allow the group to rent a space sufficient for what their needs are. GR: 1, 2, 3, 9

10) Operational travel costs were reduced by $1,500, as the committee does not feel parking should be funded through fee’s funds, as it does not benefit the campus or students. This is also why operational food was reduced by $2,000. GR: 1, 2, 3, 6, 9

11) The reserve account was reduced by $10,000 to reflect a reserve that will be appropriate for the recommended budget and $127 of carryover was deducted. GR: 9 and Minimum Application Criteria

12) For programming the following reductions were made: Lakes Program $6,000, Eco-Summit $4,150, Mining Program $2,000, Issues and Policy Program $5,500, and Energy Program $2,775. Lastly, $2,000 was reduced from programming advertising. The reductions were made to the programs based on the opportunities they bring to students on campus, the benefit they bring to fee paying students who don’t participate, as well as the greater U of M campus. GR: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9

Directives: For future fee requests include more about the benefit of staff to the organization. We would prefer to not see how you compare salaries and wages that other organizations are getting, but rather how paid staff will benefit your organization. Include more information on who has access to your office as well as how the office is utilized in a considerable way. Include more information on the impact of your events to fee paying students who do not participate, as well as the greater U of M campus. Attempt to do more programming on campus and involve more students. We recognize the 50+ members that are already involved in CFACT actively, but we'd like to see hundreds affected by CFACT. Bring your programming to as many as possible. Involve even more students on campus. Decide what is most important to spend money on and make wise spending choices. Keep accurate records of performance for next year’s fees request.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Community Child Care Center (#765)

*Requested Allocation: $82,000*  
*Recommended Allocation: $82,000*

*Comments:* This group clearly demonstrated the benefits provided to students by its programming, the demand of students, the ability to serve students with its operations, and its ability to secure outside funding. Their increases in expenses were very modest, and the group has shown responsibility with its funding in the past. The SSFC unanimously decided to fund this group in its entirety.

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

1) This group provides a great benefit to students.  
GR: 1

2) This group showed the demand given by students for its services and how it fulfilled those needs to the greatest amount of students possible.  
GR: 3, 5

3) This group has significant outside funding.  
GR: 7

*Directives: N/A*
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Como Early Learning Center (#748)

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

Comments: The committee unanimously agrees to fully fund Como Early Learning Center’s request for $75,000 of funds from Student Service Fees. Their written application narrative, budget, and formal presentation were of high quality and completed on time.

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

1) Budget request justified GR: 1a, 1c, 2, 3, 6, 7

Directives: Continue the exceptional attention to the SSF guidelines in the future (particularly those noted above). Please consider increasing your request next year to decrease reliance on enrollment fees from student parents.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Campus Crusade for Christ (#1035)

*Requested Allocation:* $27,062  
*Recommended Allocation:* $25,962

**Comments:** The Committee believed this organization demonstrated successfully its impact to the larger University of Minnesota community. Note, from our initial funding recommendation an increase of $400 for telephone and fax expenses and $2318 of carryover to be added to your reserves, based on clarified justifications. However, there *still* were a few reductions made to the programming budgets for line items that weren’t sufficiently justified as required by the SSFC guidelines.

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

1) Programming: Reduction of $1100. - The Committee thought the amount of money spent for holiday parties wasn’t sufficiently justified. The thought was that the holiday parties would be limited to the participants in CRU and not necessarily open to all students of UMN (i.e. the Valentine’s Day Party). GR: 1, 6

*Directives:* N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Disabled Student Cultural Center (#230)

*Requested Allocation:* $20,318  
*Recommended Allocation:* $20,318

*Comments:* The committee found all aspects of the DSCC budget, programming and operations to be within Student Handbook Guidelines.

*Directives:* Continue to provide valuable services and programming for disabled students at the University.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

**Engineers Without Borders (#1469)**

*Requested Allocation: $13,002.50  Recommended Allocation: $13,003*

*Comments:* In general, the committee (unanimous majority) was very pleased with the presentation and request made by Engineers without Borders. The committee was pleased to see the amount of advocacy and education brought back to campus by Engineers without Borders and that a great amount of the money requested was to increase campus involvement and campus wide projects. Overall, Engineers without Borders demonstrates their importance on this campus to both the engineering community and the rest of the University community.

*The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the handbook guidelines for decision making reference:*

1) We were very impressed by the request and budget set forth by Engineers without Borders. GR: 1a, 1b, 1c, 9

*Directives:* For the upcoming year, the committee encourages Engineers without Borders to continue to bring advocacy and education to the University campus as well as increase campus involvement because it is an integral part of growing an organization and sharing what you have learned across a wide array of majors and fields.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-1-0)

Finlanders at the U of M (#68)

Requested Allocation: $1,710  
Recommended Allocation: $660

Comments: The majority holds that due to the inaccessibility of the ‘coffee hours’ in which knowledge of the Finish language is a requirement, the majority decided not to fund this event. However, all other programs were beneficial to the broader U of MN community and provide events with demonstrated quality and benefit.

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

1) Do not fund coffee hour series GR: 1a

2) Fund all other events. GR: 1a, 1b, 1c, 3, 4, 5, 7

Directives: The majority recognizes that due to the ‘penny rule’ stating each student cannot pay less than a penny for a group’s budget, the committee suggests a ten percent reserve is set up for the organization in the form of $66 and that the remaining ~$22 dollars beyond the recommended allocation of $660 be put toward new innovative ideas for this organization. Ideas should bring a service to the greater student body, similar to all programming in place aside from the coffee hour program. The fees committee requests that no SSF money be put toward funding food or other expenses for the coffee hour event because it does not fulfill the guidelines for SSF.

Minority Opinion Rationale

Finlanders at the U of M (#68)

Requested Allocation: $1,710  
Recommended Allocation: $0

Comments: The minority felt that it would be more appropriate for Finlanders to seek funding through other income sources such as MSA grants.

Directives: Apply for grants through MSA.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Fraternity Purchasing Association (#1215)

Requested Allocation: $20,000  Recommended Allocation: $11,367

Comments: The majority was very impressed with the level of services provided by FPA to its member organizations, and transitive student members. However, the majority did not feel that it would be appropriate to use fees to pay for one-time expenses FPA may be facing as a result of office changes (a large depreciation expense). Organizations which use FPA's services pay fees based on respective levels of FPA service use. The majority, however, did feel it was appropriate to use fees to help pay for the FPA's service, from which many students benefit. Since the FPA has agreed to actively look to provide its services to more organizations on campus, the majority felt that FPA fulfilled the guidelines for decision making in a substantial way.

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

1) The only reduction made was for a past depreciation expense. The majority did not feel the fee would be appropriately used to pay for the expense. However, the committee did feel it was appropriate to help pay for some of FPA's services. The reduction was $8633, the amount the committee best understood to be the depreciation expense. GR: 1c, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9

Directives: Please use fees to help pay for the service. Unfortunately, the depreciation expense will need to be passed onto member organizations. The committee also expects FPA to increase its membership to more than 70 different organizations.
Majority Opinion Rationale (6-3-1)

Go First (#2467)

Requested Allocation: $91,030  
Recommended Allocation: $57,180

Comments: In general, the committee was very impressed by the presentation and amount of involvement brought forth by Go First. The committee was pleased to see the increase in membership and participation as well as the wide array of diversity across majors that have been reached. Overall, Go First demonstrates their importance on and off the University campus towards leadership and mentoring.

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

1) Stipends and wages for Go First were quite excessive and were not justified therefore the committee believed that it was not an appropriate use for student service fees therefore $12,000 was deducted.  GR: 1

2) $400 for travel was deducted from operations because it cannot be justified and the committee agrees that operational travel is not an appropriate use of student service fees. GR: 6

3) The committee deducted a total of $16,450 from programming due to the excessive traveling for conferences and volunteering events outside of the University of Minnesota while not being able to justify how a select number of people are impacting the University community as well. The committee believes that volunteer travel is not an appropriate use of student service fees. GR: 1, 6, 7

4) $3,000 was viewed as quite excessive for operational printing therefore the committee deducted $2,000 from printing. GR: 1, 6, 7

5) $3,000 directed towards food expenses in the operational income were challenged because the fees committee believes that it is limiting and food is not a necessary allocation outside of programming for student service fees. GR: 1, 6

Directives: For the upcoming year, the committee encourages Go First to program as already done yet continue to fundraise and receive funds from outside sources because a large amount of the travel expenses are limited to a certain amount of students and cannot be justified of the importance on the university community campus. The committee also encourages Go First to harbor campus involvement and continue to outreach because the membership is continuing to grow.
Minority Opinion Rationale

Go First (#2467)

Requested Allocation: $91,030   Recommended Allocation: $57,180

Comments: The minority did not feel that Go First should have lost so much for their stipends, as well as $16,400 for travel related costs.

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

1) This group does well in supplementing academic curriculum through their programs and activities. GR: 1

2) They have students involved from a breadth of academic departments GR: 4

3) They show how their activities benefit the campus and students, even if those students are not directly participating in activities. GR: 6

Directives: In future fees request please emphasize again how the stipends benefit your groups, as well as how beneficial the conferences are to the work you are doing. Point out how they are inclusive, benefit the students going, what you bring back to campus, and how they benefit the greater U of M campus.

Minority Opinion Rationale

Go First (#2467)

Requested Allocation: $91,030   Recommended Allocation: $N/A

Comments: The Minority did not believe that the committee fully took the Follow-Up Meeting Justification narrative into consideration. Information was not addressed fully for points b.), c.), d.), or e.). The Minority finds this deeply concerning and that the proper attention was NOT given to this group. The Minority has no allocation suggestion, because it is integral that a group of viewpoint neutral committee members delegate on the raised topics prior to selecting a number to fund.

Directives: The minority recommends that Go First consider utilizing the appeal process to further have their information heart. The minority recommends that the Follow-Up Meeting Justification be brought to the appeals committee and that it is emphasized that the SSFC did not address points c.) through e.) whatsoever, and that b.) was not taken fully into account. Similarly, The Minority suggests that Go First further details the amount of funding would be necessary to
fund parking costs for speakers brought to campus and that this number is separated from the request because the Minority agrees with the Majority in that parking contracts are not justifiable use of SSF funding.

Minority Opinion Rationale

Go First (# 2467)

Requested Allocation: $91,030  
Recommended Allocation $45,030

Comments: The Minority is in agreement with the Majority on all issues of funding except for salaries and stipends.

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

1) Deduction of all stipends and salaries ($24,300) as these staff members only benefit members of a rather small student group. GR: 10

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (5-3-2)

Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA) (#155)

Requested Allocation: $404,826  
Recommended Allocation: $392,126

Comments: The committee unanimously agreed to initially fully fund the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly’s (GAPSA) request for $404,826 of funds from Student Service Fees, but after receiving a new budget and more information via discovery in the fees process, the committee reconsidered its initial recommendation. The student group does a significant amount of work for graduate students and exceeded all of the SSF requirements, but some of its programming and operations, upon further review, was deemed unjustified or not meeting any of the guidelines for decision making.

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

1) Budget request mostly justifiable. GR: 1-13

2) A reduction of $1100 and $2000 was made after finding no adequate justification for operational travel and food expenses. GR: 1, 2, 9

3) The McEvoy Award, while a great award on campus, does not seem to fit the guidelines for decision making in a justifiable way. Consistent with other recommendations, a reduction of $3300 was made for the cost of the award giveaway. GR: 1, 6, 9

4) A reduction of $2300 was made for costs associated with executive board meetings and personnel meetings. While the meetings are long, the committee would like more justification for why food is required for these meetings. Money was left for the larger assemblies that last longer and involve more people. GR: 1, 9

5) A reduction of $4000 was made for an excessive food cost for the President's reception put on by GAPSA. The committee feels the $4000 left over for food is appropriate. GR: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9

Directives: Thank you for all of your hard work throughout the SSF process as well as throughout the school year. Your contributions to this university are greatly appreciated! The committee stresses that GAPSA attempt to build in some leadership development and retention programs to ensure strong and consistent leadership for years to come.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Habitat for Humanity at the University of Minnesota (#335)**

*Requested Allocation: $16,596  Recommended Allocation: $16,596*

*Comments:* The committee found all aspects of Habitat for Humanity's budget, programming and operations to be within Student Handbook Guidelines.

*Directives:* We'd love to see something built on campus, if possible. Imagine the possibilities!
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Hillel: Jewish Student Union (#175)**

*Requested Allocation: $45,000*  
*Recommended Allocation: $41,000*

**Comments:** The Majority recommends a funding of $41,000 for the next fiscal year. The Majority was pleased with the quality of presentation provided. The Majority commends Hillel on the sheer quantity of events provided, especially the quality and service of food at these events.

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

1) Deduction of $2,000 from events that provide items to charity. SSF cannot fund portions of events that outright give to charitable foundations – the event must target the student body. GR: 1a

2) Deduction $1,000 from decorations. Excessive funding for decorations not justified. GR: 9

3) Deduction of $1,000 from gift bags/give aways. Does not benefit the general student body – this only benefits greatly a few specific students. GR: 5

*Directives:* The Majority urges Hillel to further breakdown its programming budget in future years, as it is difficult to ascertain to what specific events some programming funding will be directed toward (for example, break down “Israel” funding into Independence Day, 7 subs and soaps showing, and Israeli cooking, rather than just one large event). The Majority also reminds Hillel that events should benefit the greater student body, and to not ask of SSF to fund portions of events such as gift bags or give aways.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Hmong Minnesota Student Association (#291)

Requested Allocation: $20,000  Recommended Allocation: $19,200

Comments: The committee found all aspects of the HMSA's budget, programming and operations to be within Student Handbook Guidelines. Additionally, the committee was impressed with the efficiency of HMSA. The committee has taken off $800 for operational food since it was used for mere meetings that weren't justified as consistent with the guidelines for decision making or the mission of the organization.

Directives: Please continue to do a great job providing cultural programming for students on campus.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Humphrey Students of Color Association (#2536)**

*Requested Allocation: $2,715*  
*Recommended Allocation: $2,365*

*Comments:* The committee found that for a group that is just in its first few years of organization that Humphrey Students of Color had a quality amount of programs that benefitted not just the graduate population but the undergraduate population as well. The events that the Humphrey Students of Color put forth are beneficial to the missions that they hold of furthering the advancement of diversity. A small deduction was made for food expenses.

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

1) While the committee was impressed with the group, it didn’t feel that food for general meetings was providing a service to the student body, supplementing the academic curriculum, and/or helping to foster a sense of community on the TC campus GR: 1a, 1b, 1c, 9

*Directives:* We hope this money will help HSCA reach out to more students, undergraduates and graduates alike.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Impact Movement (#1030)

*Requested Allocation: $4,560*  
*Recommended Allocation: $4,410*

Comments: The Committee believed this organization demonstrated successfully its impact (no pun intended) on the larger University of Minnesota community and has fully justified its request. However, there was a recommendation for a reduction of $150 of carryover which violates the minimum application criteria (i.e. the non-profit status of groups).

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

1) Our recommendation is to award $4,410.00. This figure has been reached after a careful review of all projected expenses expected to be incurred by this organization for 2012-2013 school year. The carryover was reduced from the request since a reserve was in place. GR: 1, 7, 9

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Interdisciplinary Perspectives on International Development (I PID) (#2393)**

*Requested Allocation: $3,175*  
*Recommended Allocation: $2,775*

**Comments:** The committee voted to fund I PID’s entire Student Service Fee funding request except the movie nights (which totaled $400). All other programming was superb and stuck to SSF requirements.

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

1) Student Service Fees cannot pay for anything that is illegal. GR: Legality

**Directives:** In order to show films in public you must buy the rights to the film. Please provide proof that you will be able to do so, and submit the funds that will be needed so the committee can re-evaluate I PID’s movie nights funding request.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Interdisciplinary Transportation Student Organization (#975)**

*Requested Allocation: $1,450  Recommended Allocation: $1,450*

*Comments:* The Student Service Fees Committee heard the Interdisciplinary Transportation Student Organization’s presentation to request funding for 2012-13. In subsequent review and discussion of the request, the SSFC has decided that the organization continues to provide a valuable service to students.

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

1) The request was fully justified and provides obvious benefits to students. GR: 1, 9

*Directives:* N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

**Interfraternity Council (#124)**

*Requested Allocation: $13,620  Recommended Allocation: $6,310*

*Comments:* The Student Service Fess Committee heard the InterFraternity Council’s request for 2012-13 funding. Based on the merits of the group’s plan, the SSFC has decided the request warranted funding, but reduced the level of that funding based on the guidelines established for funding student groups. The SSFC struck the two stipends for summer staff (reduction of $1,000) and reduced the funding for the promotional publication (reduction of $3,500) and the underwriting of the ambassador program (reduction of $2,500) by 50%.

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

1) The staff was not fully justified or did not seem reasonable for the work. The publication was equally expensive and seemingly excessive. The ambassador program cuts follow this justification.  GR: 9, 10

*Directives:* Please try to involve as many free volunteers as possible in your recruiting. Use what we have given for those things that you think are most important to providing benefit to students.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**In the Mix (#2284)**

*Requested Allocation: $6,420  Recommended Allocation: $6,420*

*Comments:* Due to the student group’s excellent programming and commitment to the SSF process, the committee is recommending to fund In the Mix fully for 2012-2013.

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

1) Budget request justifiable GR: 1a, 1b, 1c, 6

*Directives:* In future fees request please be sure your requested amount matches in both your narrative and your prepared budget.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

La Raza (#131)

Requested Allocation: $65,000       Recommended Allocation: $39,700

Comments: In general, the committee (unanimous majority) was very pleased with the presentation given by La Raza Cultural Center. The amount of cultural awareness, interdisciplinary involvement, and campus involvement was phenomenal and we were pleased to evaluate the request.

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

1) The increase in stipends was quite excessive and could not be justified therefore the committee deducted $6,500 from stipends, salaries, and wages because the stipends, salaries and wages increase could not be justified. GR: 1, 9, 10

2) The fees committee believed that the rent and utilities was quite excessive and not a proper use of student service fees and could not be justified therefore there was a $2,500 deduction. GR: 1, 9

3) $2,000 was deducted in regards to food for the Mentorship Program because the fees committee believes that it is not a proper use of student service fees and food is not viewed as a necessity. GR: 1, 6

4) The committee deducted $7,500 in regards to the College Access Program because it was a unique program but was not justified as to how it could serve the University of Minnesota fee paying student population therefore costs for various items were deducted GR: 1, 4, 6, 7

5) The committee deducted $5,400 due to La Raza’s balance/carryover for the projected year. GR: 1

6) $250 was deducted from the Lunch with Faculty event. GR: 1, 6

7) $1000 was deducted from the operational food and $150 from operational travel GR: 1, 6

Directives: For the upcoming year, the committee encourages La Raza to continue to perform and provide opportunities as done so yet it is highly encouraged that the student group applies for various grants both in and outside of the University of Minnesota as well as fundraise because various events cater to more non-fee paying individuals as opposed to fee paying students therefore it is difficult to justify whether funds could be permitted. The student fees committee also encourages La Raza to have a reserve account.
Majority Opinion Rationale (7-1-2)

**Lutheran Student Movement (##146)**

*Requested Allocation: $47,235  Recommended Allocation: $32,235*

*Comments:* In general, the committee was very pleased with the presentation given by Lutheran Student Movement. Lutheran Student Movement does a great job of programming and being very inclusive and widespread across the University campus as well as spreading knowledge and campus involvement across the University.

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

1) The fees committee recommended $17,200 for operations in regards to salaries, wages, and stipends therefore the operational income of $17,200 was justified and fully recommended. GR: 1, 9

2) The request for the leadership development training was deducted by $1000 because of the excessive request for 14 leaders/people/board members. GR: 1, 6

3) $14,000 was deducted from the May Term international Trip because the student fees committee believes that it is an appropriate allocation and use of student service fees. GR: 9

*Directives:* For the upcoming year, the committee encourages Lutheran Student Movement to continue to provide programs for the University Campus and beyond yet to also continue to fundraise and look for outside sources of funding in order to provide various excursions such as the May International Trip.

Minority Opinion Rationale

**Lutheran Student Moment (## 146)**

*Requested Allocation: $47,235  Recommended Allocation $26,335*

*Comments:* The Minority feels that the paid positions of Administrative Assistant and Social Justice and Service Coordinator were not justified for funding from student services fees. The position descriptions could be filled by a non-paid student member. The Minority agrees with all other funding recommendations by the Majority.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GR) numbers supporting each point:
1) $5900 for the Administrative Assistant and the Social Justice and Service Coordinator. See above. GR: 10

*Directives:* Many administrative positions can be fulfilled by non-paid student members.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Men’s Club Basketball (#2650)

Requested Allocation: $5,000  Recommended Allocation: $0

Comments: The majority recognizes the amount of effort put in by this group in recent years to compete against other schools on the club level. The Majority did see the need for this as an intermural sport, however, do not believe the fee should be used to pay for intermural sports. The majority of the expense was to pay for the group to travel to compete against different schools, and the majority did not see a benefit from this to the greater campus community. The ability for students to freely join this group was significantly constrained. Because of this, the majority did not believe that assessing a fee to the general student population was appropriate. The committee would like to respond to the points that the group brought up. The committee did, in fact, hear from the group’s presentation that it has not been able to get funding from rec sports. While the committee believes this to be unfortunate, it doesn’t justify funding from SSFC. The group stated that, by the very nature of basketball, the group cannot be open to more than a few students. The committee believes this might be true in the context of a single team going to compete. This is, in fact, the reason why the committee is reluctant to fund the group. The money would only go towards funding a few people to travel and compete, and do nothing on campus to benefit the greater student body. The committee understands that a survey at the rec center showed that a majority of students at the rec center thought having a men’s basketball club team would benefit the greater community, and the committee would agree. We would only agree, though, under the conditions that the practices were open to the general student body, there weren’t tryouts to restrict membership, and the group could demonstrate how paying for some students to go to compete would bring back value to the greater campus community. The committee does not understand the logic that “taxpayers are extremely willing to fund a group like the club basketball team, and moreover will be very upset if we do not get funding while almost every other group does. If you don’t fund us, you will have to answer to the taxpayers.” Finally, the committee does applaud the efforts that the group made in its presentation and very much does appreciate the handout that it gave the committee. Funding is not guaranteed, however, and simply having a very adamant presentation does not justify a fee onto the general student population. Fee money is only assessed when a clear benefit to the student body is apparent, and the committee stands by its initial decision to fund this group at $0.

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

1) The expenses for this group did not benefit the greater campus community. GR: 1, 6

2) The exclusivity of the group was problematic. GR: 5, 6

Directives: The fees committee believes this group should be funded, and would suggest that the recreation center should fund them as an intermural sport.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Minnesota International Students Association (#189)**

*Requested Allocation: $88,450  Recommended Allocation: $85,600*

*Comments:* The Student Service Fees Committee heard the Minnesota International Student Associations request for 2012-13 funding. In reviewing the request, the Committee was in support of the majority of MISA’s request. The Committee was impressed with both the quantity and quality of the programs delivered, as reflected the number of participants who attended MISA programs last year. In general the SSFC has reduced requests for food monies across allocations to all student groups. As we continue to receive more and more requests the SSFC has tried to honor as many requests as possible and in so doing has looked at food costs at regular meetings as being something we cannot afford to support. More specifically, in the MISA program focused on aiding students with school shopping, we do not think it appropriate to fund transportation to the Mall of America.

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

1) The request for this group was largely justified. GR: 1, 9

2) $1500 was deducted for operational food, which was not seen as justified. GR: 1, 9

3) $850 was deducted for travel to and from the Mall of America for shopping. GR: 1, 9

4) $500 was deducted for travel for community engagement days, which are often held off campus. GR: 1, 9

*Directives:* Please attempt to use cheaper methods of transportation to the Mall of America (i.e. the light rail or buses). Please try to do more community engagement days on campus.
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-0-2)

MPIRG (#95)

Requested Allocation: $184,050  
Recommended Allocation: $153,820

Comments: In general, the committee was very pleased with the presentation given by MPIRG and in impressed by the dedication and involvement the organization has campus wide. MPIRG does a great job in granting campus involvement and has shown that the organization is an integral part of the University and student body community. The committee was enticed by the Minnesota Voice Grant which would have paid for half an extra position, if funded. The committee ultimately decided that only one position was justified.

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

1) The fees committee deducted $25,000 in regards to the salaries, stipends, wages as well as insurance and health benefits of having an additional UMTC Youth Voter Organizer. GR: 1,9, 10

2) The committee deducted $1,279 from rent and utilities under operational income. GR: 1, 6

3) There was also a deduction of $3,000 in Telephone and Fax due to the excessive request and the committee believed it was not an appropriate use of Student Service Fees. GR: 1, 9, 10

4) There was also a deduction of $500 from operational travel GR: 1, 9,

5) There was also a deduction of $451 due to carry over. GR: 1, 9,

Directives: For the upcoming year, the committee encourages MPIRG to continue campus involvement and to consider reaching out for external funding for the organization whether it be fundraising, applying for University Grants or outside/external grants. This is something we encourage all student groups to do.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

Minnesota Student Association (#509)

Requested Allocation: $172,000  Recommended Allocation: $159,663

Comments: The committee was generally impressed with MSA's programming for students. As a student government, the committee found MSA's mission and achievements very admirable and of contingent importance. However, although most of MSA's request was justifiable, upon further review in final deliberations, the committee did make some additional reductions in the recommended allocation from the initial recommendation.

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

1) A reduction of $237 was made due to expected carryover. GR: Minimum Application Criteria

2) An unexplained $12,100 in "other expenses" was reduced from the request. There was no information provided in the application or throughout the fees process explaining this expense. GR: 1, 9

3) The reduction for forum food from initial deliberations was added back since additional information suggested that forum food was justified. GR: 1, 9

Directives: The committee would also like to recommend that MSA provide more advertising for its events. The committee also passes a critical eye over some of the programming provided by MSA and asks that MSA consider putting on programs that engage students even more than in the past.
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-2-0)

Minnesotap (#2582)

Requested Allocation: $63,482.25  
Recommended Allocation: $15,425

Comments: The committee was extremely impressed by the amount this group meets, performs, as well as the number of people they perform for. The committee also sympathizes with the difficulty the group has experienced in finding space to practice. The original dollar amount the majority recommended paid for their Aurora Digitalis Premier Party, Spring Showcase, Fall Beginner Workshop, Fall and Spring retreats, a kickoff meeting, as well as a decent amount of floor mats to practice on in any space. After hearing public opinion, the majority felt the travel expenses were more justified, and so increased the initial by $2,000 to pay for part of it. The committee also added $5,650 to allow for the purchase of more mats. If Minnesotap still wishes to purchase office space and renovate it into a dance studio, a final allocation of $15,425 could go a long way. The committee still feels, though, that funding the cost of purchasing an entire dance studio for a group of so few people is still excessive, and believes this dollar amount to be extremely generous.

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

1) Parts of the trips were funded, as they bring back value to the club.  GR: 1

2) The committee gave enough to fund many new mats, or pay for part of a new studio. The committee was not willing to give full funding, though.  GR: Need for studio not justified.

3) Funding was allocated for events that the Majority believed positively benefited the broader student community.  GR: 1, 2, 3

Directives: Minnesotap informed the committee that, if they built a space, they would allow for on campus dance groups to practice there as well. They also stated that they would not, in fact, limit the group’s size or restrict participation by level of dance ability. They stated that they were dedicated to engaging beginners, and would hold classes to introduce people to tap dancing. Because the committee took this information into consideration and in order to demonstrate responsibility, Minnesotap should follow through with these pledges (they are not bound to building the studio) and the future fees committee should look very closely at this in deciding how much money to give.
Minority Opinion Rationale

MinnesoTap (#2582)

*Requested Allocation: $63,682.25*  *Recommended Allocation: $N/A*

*Comments:* The minority still felt that the increase in recommended funding was not enough for MinnesoTap to remain operational. The minority felt more funding for the dance studio should have been recommended. MinnesoTap clearly articulated the benefits the group provides to the campus, dance students, and the academic dance curriculum that the University dance system clearly is not supporting.

*Directives:* N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

National Society of Black Engineers (#318)

Requested Allocation: $10,925  
Recommended Allocation: $5,325

Comments: The committee was impressed by this group's programming, as well as its ability to secure outside funding. The committee made a few reductions to the request to come to the recommended number including: $3,000 from operational expenses for an unjustified travel expense, $100 for the food drive, $2,000 for the travel for the BRIDGE program, and $500 for the board meetings.

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

1) The general programming was extensive, included many people, and was extremely educational as well as beneficial to the community. GR: 1, 2, 3, 5

2) The food drive give-a-ways were not viewed as a justified funding expense. GR: 1, 6

3) The committee generally has not seen general meeting food as justified. GR: 1, 2, 6

4) The committee viewed the travel for the BRIDGE program excessive. The committee in general has been less willing to provide funding the programs that do outreach to high school students as it has less effect on fee paying students. GR: 5, 6, 8

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Navigators (#129)

*Requested Allocation:* $8,800  
*Recommended Allocation:* $3,150

**Comments:** The Majority recommends a funding of $3,150 for the Navigators for the next fiscal year. The Majority commends the Navigators on the strong student foundation and attendance at weekly meetings. However, with respect to the type of event being held, the Majority does not feel that the excessive amount of funding for food at these events are not justified in terms of the group’s mission, and that the type of events put on by the Navigators does not require the requested amount.

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

1) Deduct $900 for spring break trip, as this event does not benefit a multitude of students outside of those who travel. GR: 5

2) Deduct $1,000 for leadership meeting food, as this is not integral to the student group mission, and is available to only a small number of students on a consistent basis. GR: 2

3) Deduct $900 for food for weekly meetings, as this is not integral to the student group mission. GR: 2

4) Deduct $350 for fall/spring socials, following precedent (excessive budget request without outside funding) GR: 10

5) Deduct $200 for food in summer meetings (see point 2, 3) GR: 2

6) Deduct $2,300 for large carry forward into the next fiscal year – this excessive carry forward was not justified. Please try to have income minus expenses equal 0. If there are funding requirements for early fall semester, put funds into reserves. GR: 10

**Directives:** Perhaps put funding into reserves for summer/early fall events.
Majority Opinion Rationale (6-3-1)

Nikola Tesla Patent Producers (#2626)

Requested Allocation: $110,532  Recommended Allocation: $44,336

Comments: The majority feels that NTP^2 has programs that are consistent with their mission, they are serving students in a broad range of academic departments, and are supplementing academic curriculum through their programs. The group also demonstrated the importance of having a space in which to work on their projects. The majority would have like to have seen more outside funding. The following cuts were made to the requested allocation: $18,000 for stipends as the committee did not feel that these stipends were fully justified for the work being done. Rent was reduced by $27,000, which still leaves the group sufficient funding to find a space. Carryover was reduced by $280, operational food was reduced by $1,500 and operational travel was reduced by $150.

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

1) Through its programs the group is supplementing academic curriculum and helping to foster a sense of community on campus. GR: 1

2) The programs are consistent with the organizations mission. GR: 2

3) The group is serving students from an array of academic disciplines. GR: 4

4) The group has shown the benefits of their programs to students who pay SSF’s but are not participating directly in the projects. They have also shown the benefit to the greater U of M campus. GR: 6

5) The group has not secured outside funding. GR: 7

Directives: For future requests try to secure more outside funding. Also, provide specific details on who is helping to pay for the rent of the space you will be getting.

Minority Opinion Rationale

Nikola Tesla Patent Producers (#2626)

Requested Allocation: $110,532  Recommended Allocation $63,602

Comments: The Minority is impressed with the amount and quality of programming conducted by Nikolas Tesla Patent Producers. Considering that NTP^2 is a newer group, but this group has
demonstrated their strong leadership, output potential, and impact upon the broader campus community through large shows, the Minority feels that much of the start up costs and programming should be covered by SSF fees. However, NTP^2 must look for a significant amount of outside funding sources to cover much of their organizational budget, and SSF cannot cover all of the requested budget.

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

1) Deduct $27,000 for rent and utilities – must look for cheaper locations if possible, or find outside funding. GR: 8

2) Deduct $18,000 for salaries and stipends – the need for stipends are not justified for a group that focuses on matters of interest. GR: 10

3) Deduct $1,500 for operational food – not justified for need. GR: 2

4) Deduct $150 for operational travel GR: 2

5) Deduct $280 for carryover GR: 9

Directives: NTP^2 must look for outside sources of funding for such a large organizational budget. NTP^2 should not consider requesting stipends for a student group in which students work on issues of self-interest or self-improvement (learning engineering/electrical skills does not show need for stipends).

Minority Opinion Rationale

Nikola Tesla Patent Producers (#2626)

Requested Allocation: $110,532  Recommended Allocation $N/A

Comments: The Minority is impressed with the amount and quality of programming conducted by Nikolas Tesla Patent Producers. However, they did not find that the student group provided sufficient information at their final meeting to support their programming needs or justify their stipends and rent request.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-1)

Queer Student Cultural Center (#238)

Requested Allocation: $50,000  
Recommended Allocation: $48,450

Comments: The unanimous majority on the committee was very impressed with the variety of programming put on by officers and members of the QSCC. The group encompasses a large variety of perspectives and obviously contributes heavily to the community on campus. Ranging from programming to general operations, the committee is excited to see what QSCC does next year with its funding increase. If the QSCC can maintain high levels of member dedication and involvement, while also including more students than ever before, it will have performed admirably.

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

1) Much of the budget was fully justified, but some reductions were made. GR: 9

2) The first reduction was for $250 in expense operational travel and $500 in expensed operational food that the majority did not deem fit under the guidelines for fees. GR: 1a

3) The "Minnesota OUT! Campus Conference" was over-funded in the submitted program breakdown by $500, and this amount was deducted from the request. GR: 9

4) A reduction of $300 was made for the unexplained other expense in the operational expense budget. GR: 9

Directives: The majority hopes the QSCC continue providing its valuable service and community-building events and programs next year. The recommended allocation is in line with general guidelines and also allows the QSCC to grow at a reasonable, healthy rate.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Saint Paul's Outreach (#1542)

*Requested Allocation:* $89,977  
*Recommended Allocation:* $55,674

*Comments:* Saint Paul’s Outreach presented convincing rationale at the public hearings on the value of their staff to their mission and the need for SSF in this area. As a result, the committee provided funding for operational expenses, as outlined in 5) below. With respect to programming expenses, the committee has taken a stricter stance about funding food for programs that serve only a few members, such as leadership retreats and expenses for off-sight retreats.

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

1) Reduction of $3840 for food SNE. GR: 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.

2) Reduction of $362 for the leadership program, which although does provide a beneficial service, is unreasonably expensive for its benefits. GR: 6

4) Reduction of $1000 for Alpha Retreat. GR: 8

5) Reduction of $1000 for Flame Retreat. GR: 8

7) Elimination of SSF support in the amount of $24,839 for Operations. GR: 10 (The committee’s final allocation of $25,000 for “Operations” should be used for salaries, rent, and any other expense except for operational food and travel. The committee’s final allocation in this category is still guided by GR #10: 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.)

*Directives:* We recommend that SPO make the case to SPO National to maintain and increase funding to support growth of this organization.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Society of Automotive Engineers at the University of Minnesota (#529)

Requested Allocation: $18,625  Recommended Allocation: $18,625

Comments: The Student Service Fees Committee heard the Society of Automotive Engineers request for 2012-13 funding. The SSFC reviewed and discussed the request and found that the group's track record of providing practical learning opportunities for members of the University of Minnesota student community to fit within the SSFC’s guidelines for request. The SSFC was also cognizant of the group's efforts to secure outside funding.

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

1) SAE's budget was fully justified to the committee. GR: 1, 7

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-0)

Somali Student Association (#393)

Requested Allocation: $34,940  Recommend Allocation: $27,590

Comments: The Majority was fully impressed by SSA’s presentation and budget preparation. Deductions were made based on lack of justification for SSF money to compensate for certain budget items or events based on event description and group presentation. However, these events that saw deductions were funded in part due to their fulfillment of many SSFC Guidelines for Decision-Making.

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

1) Subtraction of $650 for operational food. The committee did not see justification for this line item. GR: 1a, 1b, 3, 5, 6, 8

2) Subtraction of $3200 for food and travel on the Pre-College event budget on the basis that the food and transportation for non-SSF paying individuals is not directly applicable to SSF-paying students. GR: 1a, 1c, 5, 6, 8,

3) Subtraction of 3500 for the leadership conference on the basis that half of the food budget would be a fair amount for SSF to accommodate. GR: 6, 9

Directives: Please continue such thorough and successful work in future years. In future presentations ensure that each line item is thoroughly justified based on the SSFC Guidelines, and that any work with non-SSF paying students is justified based on the impact it brings to SSF paying students, while not focusing as much on the impact this will make on outside communities. The Majority appreciates the impact being made outside of the U community, yet that is not the intent of SSF use.
Majority Opinion Rationale (9-0-0)

**STAND: A Student Anti-Genocide Coalition (#1912)**

*Requested Allocation: $400  Recommended Allocation: $0*

*Comments:* STAND's budget did not justify any of its request. The one opportunity the group had to provide information to justify its request, the presentation, was unattended by any group member. The committee, thus, recommends $0.

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

1) Budget not justified, application requirements not fulfilled.  GR: 9, Application Requirements

*Directives:* All student groups should inform the committee if they no longer wish to pursue fees. Applying and doing nothing else wastes the committee's valuable time.
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-0-2)

**Student National Medical Association ( #597)**

*Requested Allocation: $14,520  Recommended Allocation: $8,365*

*Comments:* The Student Service Fees Committee heard the presentation from the Student National Medical Association for funding for 2012-13. While the SSFC felt that a good portion of the request had merit, in terms of the group’s providing service to a broad range of majors across the University, the SSFC has reduced student groups request across board in the areas of food and travel. Facing increasing numbers of requests from a growing number of student groups, the SSFC has made the commitment to fund as many requests as possible and in so doing, we have had to make some hard funding decisions and the SSFC has decided that reducing food expenditures, particularly as it relates to weekly meetings and also reducing travel support, seemed to be the most equitable way to stretch student fee dollars.

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

1) $500 was deducted for operational food that was not justified for the group. GR: 9

2) $800 was deducted for food for the "Mentoring Program" since it did not seem appropriate that this food be integral to mentorship. GR: 1, 9

3) $260 was deducted for the "State Fair Event," leaving $90 for SNMA to learn about bone marrow and blood pressure screening processes. GR: 1b

4) $200 was deducted for the "SNMA Food Drive Contest." Fees will not be used to buy Gold n' Plump turkeys for SNMA so that it may win this contest. GR: 1, 2, 6, 9

5) $1500 for general body meetings did not seem justified. GR: 1, 9

6) $2895 was deducted across the regional and medical education conferences for excessive costs given the benefits of the conferences and the number attending. GR: 1, 2, 3, 9

*Directives: N/A*
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-0-0)

Student Services Fee (SSF) Event Grant

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

*Comments:* The committee recommends to fully fund the Student Services Fee Event Grant request of $75,000 for the 2012-2013 academic year. The proposed budget was well thought-out and adheres to all of the SSF requirements.

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

1) Budget request justifiable  
GR: 1a, 1b, 1c, 2, 3, 4, 6

*Directives:* If your organization needs more funds in the future to keep up with the growing demand of funding requests, please do not hesitate to ask. If a future request is higher but fully justified (which all of your requests have been thus far), the SSF Committee will likely grant reasonable requests.
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-2-0)

**Student Veterans Association (#1474)**

*Requested Allocation: $19,793.50  Recommended Allocation $17,794*

*Comments:* The Committee feels that the SVA follows very closely to their mission statement, and recommends a majority of the initial request. The Committee especially is willing to fund the intramural teams, as these events are phenomenal in forging friendships and camaraderie amongst traditional and veteran students.

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

1) Deduct $1,100 for ski trip, as this event is too selective and expensive for its low impact upon the group as a whole. This should be a self-funded trip for its entertainment purposes. GR: 1, 3, 6, 9

2) Deduct $400 for operational food. This was not justified when every Friday has pizza for its members. GR: 10

3) Deduct $500 for SVA conference, following precedent of funding ~$250/student for student travel to conferences. GR: 1a

*Directives:* N/A

Minority Opinion Rationale

**Student Veterans Association (#1474)**

*Requested Allocation: $19,793.50  Recommended Allocation $N/A*

*Comments:* It is the opinion of the minority that SVA’s ski trip should receive some funding. The majority fails to acknowledge the variety of entertainment programs funded for other groups, such as retreats, and gala’s. The majority instead would rather hang their hat on the idea that SVA would be traveling off campus for this program, however other groups travel for their retreats. In short the minority feels SVA is being underfunded unfairly because they chose to be transparent about their programming, instead of calling their ski-trip bonding time a retreat. Which several groups have retreats in which the Committee doesn’t know the details of what all could be happening on them. Lastly, the ask for this trip wasn’t much, the majority has funded Gala’s upwards of $10,000, and these events are often purely social events.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

**Students Against Hunger (#2388)**

*Requested Allocation: $2,200  Recommended Allocation: $2,200*

*Comments:* Students Against Hunger provided the unanimous majority with a strong case to fund its request based on the uniqueness of its programming and the ample student learning and community-building that will result from such events as "Global Poverty Project" and "Hunger Banquet." The committee hopes that funding will help the group put on these intriguing events.

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

1) Budget fully justified to committee. GR: 1b, 1c, 9

*Directives:* N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-2-0)

Students for a Conservative Voice (#1298)

*Requested Allocation:* $142,000  *Recommended Allocation:* $83,560

Comments: The committee was particularly impressed with the number of publications reaching the hands of students and the compliance with audits and Committee requests for more information. The majority was concerned however, with the amount of requested student fees going towards student stipends, speaker costs, and parking expenses.

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

1) The following has been deducted from operational expenses: $1,200 for food, $32,000 for salaries, wages, and stipends, $5,840 for taxes, $500 for professional fees, and $2,000 for travel. The majority feels that many of these requested numbers are quite excessive relating to the overall services provided to the student body and Twin Cities campus. GR: 1a, 1c, 6

2) Consistent with established committee precedents for conferences, food funding was cut for both the CPAC and RNC conferences in the amount of $2,100. Travel costs were reduced to the $250/person constant established by the committee in the amounts of $500 for the RNC event and $2,400 for the CPAC event. There were concerns with the amount of students benefiting from such conferences. GR: 1a, 2, 6

3) The Majority feels that advertising costs of $2,000 for the MSA Candidate Debate are quite high without proper breakdown or justification of potential reach and specific advertising material costs, and has therefore reduced advertising funding by $1,500. GR: 2, 5

4) The Majority has recommended reducing the fees requested for the John Stossel event by $10,000 and would encourage a co-sponsorship or a campaign to raise additional funding for the event outside of Student Fees. GR: 7, 8

Directives: The Majority would encourage SCV to charge admission or organize a co-sponsorship initiative for big name speakers in the future.
Minority Opinion Rationale

**Students for a Conservative Voice (#1296)**

*Requested Allocation:* $N/A  
*Recommended Allocation:* $N/A

*Comments:* The minority felt SCV did an amazing job following up with requested documents and bringing material justification to the committee’s attention. The minority believed the committee didn’t thoroughly consider the follow-up material SCV provided. Extra funding for staff felt justified enough to provide more funding for salaries than the majority recommended. The minority felt that a push for voting seemed premature. SCV’s request and additional material should have received the same careful consideration other groups received.

*Directives:* N/A

Minority Opinion Rationale

**Students for a Conservative Voice (#1298)**

*Requested Allocation:* $142,000  
*Recommended Allocation:* $79,560

*Comments:* Students for a Conservative Voice had a rather in depth budget and the committee was particularly impressed with the number of publications reaching the hands of students through your work. The minority was rather a bit concerned about the SCV co-sponsorship funding.

*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 would recommend that $4000 was deducted in regards to co-sponsorship funding because it cannot be justified through the application or narrative. The money has the opportunity to be a carry over to next year and that is not a proper use of student fees because it cannot be accounted for. The co-sponsorship funding cannot be justified through the application or in the future therefore is it not a proper use of student service fees.  
GR: 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9

*Directives:* Specify this programming so future Student Fees committee members can justify the request. The money has the opportunity to be a carry over to next year and that is not a proper use of student fees.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Students for Design Activism (#2544)

Requested Allocation: $4,300  Recommended Allocation: $3,600

Comments: The Committee believed this organization demonstrated sufficiently how they intend to impact the larger University of Minnesota community. Therefore, for the 2012-2013 school year the Committee recommends an allocation of $3,600 of student fee funding. This is a result of adding back $100 for programming food from initial deliberations.

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

1) Operational Food: Reduction of $200. - It was the general consensus of the Committee that food operational food did not meet the SSFC guidelines. The relevant question being, why should all fee paying students pay for the organizational leaders to have food at their personal meetings? It isn't as if the meetings are events in which the fee paying students could attend. GR: 1, 6, 7

2) Programming: Reduction of $500. - This reduction is a result $500 food cut for LABash. It is the general consensus of the Committee that groups should not use food to generate interest in the organization. Additionally, when it comes to traveling and registration fees for conferences, the Committee agreed to pay for some of the expenses not all of them as all fee paying students will not benefit from conference. GR: 6, 7

Directives: If you would like the committee to reconsider, please submit additional justification. Also, please find a way for this organization to have their LABash experience to benefit the the UMN community (i.e., a teach out or giveback, etc.). Also, as a result of receiving a SSFC allocation, this organization MUST institute an advertising campaign to gain greater student participation. Everyone shouldn’t have to be a graduate student, or design student, remember everyone’s student fees helped to support this organization!
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

United Nations Student Association – Model U.N. (#339)

Requested Allocation: $28,710.78

Recommended Allocation: $11,800

Comments: The committee (unanimous majority) was impressed with UNSA’s growth plan and efforts to host a conference at the U of M campus. The ability to bring back valuable information from conferences was not clearly expressed, however, and the expectation to cover ~80% of costs with Student Fees seemed a bit excessive. Overall, the committee would like to see more events and seemed excited about the potential to host a conference.

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

1) The committee recommends cutting operations food by $500 to remain consistent with the belief that this doesn’t directly benefit the campus or fee paying students. GR: 1a, 1c

2) $4,576 and $11,835 were recommended to be cut respectively from the fall conference and spring conference. The committee was unsure as to the direct benefit to the campus and other fee paying students, and wanted to remain consistent with the $250/person precedent set forth for travel and room rental costs. GR: 1a, 1c

Directives: Look to host more events on campus and potentially spend more on advertising to increase awareness of the group.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

University of Minnesota Solar Vehicle Project (#1465)

Requested Allocation: $12,100  Recommended Allocation: $12,100

Comments: The committee was extremely impressed by this group. The group gets more than $200,000 from outside sources. All of the group’s travel and capital expenses are paid for by external fundraising. This group is only requesting fees money for on campus events that directly go to benefiting the greater campus community. For these reasons the committee voted to fund the group’s full funding request.

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

1) Funding given towards on-campus events that directly go towards benefiting students.  GR: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7,

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (8-2-0)

University Quidditch League (#2586)

Requested Allocation: $27,000  Recommended Allocation: $15,500

Comments: The Committee believed this organization demonstrated successfully its impact on the larger University of Minnesota community. Therefore, for the 2012-2013 school year the Committee recommends an allocation of $15,500 of student fee funding, a reduction of $11,500 from the requested allocation. This increase allocation from the Committee’s initial recommendation is a result of the additional operational support of $1,000 for equipment, $1000 for supplies, $500 for printing and $2000 for rent and storage.

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

1) Operational Expenses: Reduction of $7500: $2000 of the reduction was from “salaries, wages and stipends” and $5500 from rent. It is the opinion of the Committee that student stipends weren’t justified in the application for student fees funding. Additionally, this organization isn’t asking for an office space in which they could share with the larger community, instead the ask is for a playing field, and student fee funding cannot support that entirely. GR: 10b, 6

2) Programming: Reduction of $4000: When it comes to traveling and registration fees for conferences or sporting events, the Committee agreed to pay for some of the expenses not all of them as all fee paying students will not benefit from conference or sporting event. The methodology to this determination was to allocate $250 for approximately 16 students to travel to the World Cup event. GR: 6

Directives: N/A

Minority Opinion Rationale

University Quidditch League #2586

Requested Allocation: $27,000  Recommended Allocation: $15,500

Comments: The minority is unclear of the benefit to the U of M campus, as well as the benefit to students who pay fees but do not participate directly in the organization.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the handbook guidelines for decision making reference (GR) numbers supporting each point:
1) Unclear of the contribution to the following providing a service, supplementing curriculum, or fostering a sense of community. GR: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7

2) Additionally, the World Cup event bears no relation to providing a service to the student body. In no way does the World Cup event fit the guidelines. GR: 1a, 1b, 1c, 9

Directives: N/A
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

University YMCA (#138)

*Requested Allocation: $45,000*  *Recommended Allocation: $33,817*

*Comments:* Even after receiving more information about the Y-tutors, Y-buddies, and Physical, Healthy, Driven program, the committee did not feel the programs fit the guidelines for decision making enough. We subtracted $1900 from Y-tutors, $4700 from Y-buddies, and $2950 from the Physical, Healthy, Driven program. In final deliberations, the committee also subtracted $1633 for carryover.

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

1) Couldn't see a benefit to all student with above-mentioned programs. GR: 1a

2) Could not see how the programs targeted students that had the need. GR: 5

3) A zero carryover is required for applying groups. GR: Minimum Application Criteria

*Directives:* Please use fees to benefit university students.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Voices Merging (#892)

Requested Allocation: $28,335  
Recommended Allocation: $22,744

Comments: The unanimous majority was extremely impressed with Voices Merging's ability to involve students at the University in creative, cultural expression. The majority found that Voices Merging is an integral part of campus community and that its beneficial effects extend beyond its programming and into everyday campus life. The majority feels that with the recommended figure, Voices Merging will be a successful organization yet again next year.

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

1) In Voices Merging's budget, carryover was projected at $3,661 for the end of year 2012-2013. The group already does have a reserves account, so this amount was deducted from the request. GR: 9

2) The majority did not feel that reimbursing members for gas expenses was an appropriate use of fees money, and so $400 was deducted from the request. GR: 1a, 9

3) The "High to College School" program, while very admirable, only slightly fits any of the guidelines for decision making, so part of its requested fees funding amount, $1,530, was deducted from the request. GR: 1a, 2, 4, 6, 9

Directives: The majority encourages Voices Merging to continue its open mic nights and provide an outlet for students to be creative and address societal issues. The majority also would like Voices Merging to supply copies of its newsletter and documentary for next year's fees request.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

The Wake (#819)

Requested Allocation: $60,000  
Recommended Allocation: $58,168

Comments: The Committee believed this organization demonstrated successfully its impact on the larger University of Minnesota community. Therefore, for the 2012-2013 school year the Committee recommends an allocation of $58,168 of student fee funding, a reduction of $1,832 from the requested allocation.

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

1) Operational Expenses: Reduction of $1,832. - $300 of the reduction was from “food” and $1,532 was from the difference remaining (income less expenses). It was the general consensus of the Committee that food operational food did not meet the SSFC guidelines. The relevant question being, why should all fee paying students pay for the organizational leaders to have food at their personal meetings? It isn’t like the meetings are events in which the fee paying students could attend. Additionally, because there is a reserve built into the budget there is no need for the added $1532 (1,531.60 rounded to the nearest dollar). GR: 6, 9

Directives: Keep and present better records for publication readership for next year's fees request, if there will be one.
Majority Opinion Rationale (10-0-0)

Women's Student Activist Collective (#266)

Requested Allocation: $30,000  
Recommended Allocation: $29,400

Comments: The committee (majority rationale, unanimous vote) strongly felt that WSAC has shown consistency in providing quality programming.

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

1) A deduction of $500 was made for operational food costs; this decision was made by the committee due to the lack in justification for adhering to SSF guidelines. A $100 deduction was made for operational travel, which was not justified. The committee concluded that operational food and travel does not provide a service to SSF paying students who do not participate in WSAC on an operational level. GR: 1, 9

Directives: Please continue such quality work on future SSF requests. The budget was thorough, and both the application and presentation demonstrated overall clear adherence to SSF guidelines.
### Calculated Totals

**Requested Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Groups and Organizations Requested</td>
<td>$2,454,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Governments (MSA and GAPSA) Requested</td>
<td>$576,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requested</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,031,394</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Groups and Organizations Recommended</td>
<td>$1,730,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Governments (MSA and GAPSA) Recommended</td>
<td>$551,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recommended</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,282,192</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requested Less Recommended Allocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Groups and Organizations Difference</td>
<td>$724,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Governments (MSA and GAPSA) Difference</td>
<td>$25,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>$749,202</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>